Agenda

Minnetonka City Council

Regular Meeting, Monday, June 12, 2017

6:30 P.M.
Council Chambers

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call: Wiersum-Bergstedt-Wagner-Ellingson-Allendorf-Acomb-Schneider
4. Approval of Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes: May 8 and 22, 2017 regular council meetings
6. Special Matters: None
7. Reports from City Manager & Council Members
8. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters Not on the Agenda
9. Bids and Purchases: None
10. Consent Agenda - Items Requiring a Majority Vote:
   A. Resolution approving Hennepin County residential recycling grant agreement
   B. Items concerning implementation of a SAC/REC deferral program
   C. Resolution approving HOMESTEAD PLACE, a 2-lot subdivision, with lot width at setback variances at 3625 Plymouth Road
   D. Resolution authorizing the city of Minnetonka to participate in the Mayors’ Monarch Pledge
   E. Items concerning a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road (Lone Lake Park):
      • Conditional use permits for recreational uses within: (1) required wetland buffer; and (2) floodplain;
      • Wetland setback variance; and
      • Floodplain alteration permit.
F. Resolution approving setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Point Road

11. Consent Agenda - Items Requiring Five Votes: None

12. Introduction of Ordinances: None

13. Public Hearings: None

14. Other Business:

A. Metropolitan Council Transit Cooperation Agreement

Recommendation: Approve the Transit Cooperation Agreement

B. Items related to Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East:

1) Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East;
2) Resolution identifying the need for Livable Communities Demonstration Account – Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Funding and authorizing an application for grant funds; and
3) Resolution supporting a tax credit application related to Newport Midwest “The Mariner.”

Recommendation: Review concept plan and adopt the resolutions (4 votes)

C. Resolution regarding participation in the Hennepin County CDBG program, and Joint Cooperation Agreement for the Urban Hennepin County Community Block Grant Program in Fiscal Years 2018-2020

Recommendation: Adopt the resolution and approve the agreement (4 votes)

D. Items concerning Ridgedale Festival:

1) Amendment to the existing sign plan; and
2) Amendment to the existing master development plan for façade changes.

Recommendation: Adopt the resolution denying the requests (4 votes)

E. 2018–2022 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

Recommendation: Adopt the resolution (5 votes)
F. Public safety facilities design services contract, CIP amendment, and resolution authorizing an internal loan for the first phases of the contract to be repaid with future bond proceeds, if bonding is approved

Recommendation: Approve the contract with Wold Engineers and Architects (4 votes), amend the CIP (5 votes) and adopt the resolution (4 votes)

G. 2018–2022 Economic Improvement Program (EIP)

Recommendation: Adopt the resolution (4 votes)

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None

16. Adjournment
1. **Call to Order**

   Mayor Terry Schneider called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

   All joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. **Roll Call**

   Council Members Dick Allendorf, Patty Acomb, Tim Bergstedt, Tony Wagner, Bob Ellingson, and Mayor Schneider were present. Brad Wiersum was excused.

4. **Approval of Agenda**

   Bergstedt moved, Acomb seconded a motion to accept the agenda, as presented. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

5. **Approval of Minutes: None**

6. **Special Matters:**

   Assistant City Manager Perry Vetter provided an update on the city’s communication division’s efforts and initiatives.

   Allendorf gave kudos to the communication staff for their work.

   Schneider said he has heard comments from residents about noticeable improvements to the Minnetonka Memo. He thanked staff.

7. **Reports from City Manager & Council Members**

   City Manager Geralyn Barone reported on recent city events and upcoming council meetings.

   Wagner reported he was at the Minnetonka Big Willow Baseball Association opening day. He thanked staff and the council for moving up the capital improvements to the fields.

8. **Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters not on the Agenda**
9. **Bids and Purchases:**

   **A. Bids for the 2017 Mill and Overlay Project**

   Barone gave the staff report.

   Wagner moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to award contract to Bituminous Roadways, Inc. for the 2017 Mill and Overlay Project No. 17407 in the amount of $1,055,734.95. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

   **B. Bids for Cold Storage Building Construction Project**

   Barone gave the staff report.

   Wagner thanked staff for the public engagement process with the Creekside neighborhood.

   Wagner moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to award the Base Bid and Alternate #1 to Odesa II, LLC in the amount of $280,648.00. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

   **C. Bids for Lake Street Extension and Ringer Road Forcemain Installation**

   Barone gave the staff report.

   Schneider praised GM Contracting for donating its work in 1976 for the Big Willow pond.

   Wagner moved, Acomb seconded a motion to award contract to GM Contracting, Inc. in the amount of $160,578.75. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

10. **Consent Agenda – Items Requiring a Majority Vote:**

   **A. Resolution approving the final plat of MAYFAIR AT COPPERFIELD a three-lot subdivision at 14700 Copperfield Place**

   Allendorf moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-044 approving the final plat of MAYFAIR AT COPPERFIELD. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
B. Ordinance amending City Code Section 525, concerning property maintenance

Allendorf moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to adopt ordinance 2017-06 amending City Code 525, concerning property maintenance. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

11. Consent Agenda – Items requiring Five Votes: None

12. Introduction of Ordinances: None

13. Public Hearings: None

14. Other Business:

A. Ordinance amending fire code

Barone gave the staff report.

Acomb moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to adopt ordinance 2017-07. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

B. Amendment to the liquor license for Zuhrah Shriners at 6120 Blue Circle Drive for an outdoor patio

Community Development Director Julie Wischnack gave the staff report.

Wagner moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to approve the amendment to include the outdoor patio in the licensed premise for Zuhrah Shriners. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

C. Preliminary and final plats, with front yard setback variances, and waiving the McMansion Policy, for THE ENCLAVE AT REGAL OAK at 3639 Shady Oak Road and 3627 Regal Oak Lane

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Wagner said the staff report indicated that not much could change given the space limitations. Technically, however, just because the plans were submitted, it did not hold the applicant to anything. Gordon said this particular grading plan would be difficult to change because of the area involved. The ability to work in the front yard was difficult as well because of the rain gardens. He agreed technically something could change, but he didn’t think it could change much. Wagner said historically the McMansion policy was adopted because the council felt it lacked any control if there
was buildable area. For this development there was control because of grading plan for this specific site. Gordon said that was a fair statement.

Schneider said the McMansion policy was also created to reduce an anomaly in the broader area.

Michael Halley, 18610 Clear View Drive, said he was representing the applicant, Roger Anderson who could not attend the meeting. Halley said this was a conventional R1 plat. From their perspective they thought the variance request was reasonable particularly because of the precedent set on Regal Oak. They do not want to invoke the McMansion Policy. There were three R1 lots and there were numerous conversations with the council and planning commission about trying to do something a little innovative. He said he and Anderson were committed to three R1 lots. If that was at the expense of the variance request, so be it. He didn’t want the situation to be where he comes in with the building permit and it was somehow extrapolated the city’s intent was not met.

Schneider said he assumed that because of the topography and three lots, the homes would be custom designed homes. Halley said that was exactly right. The proposal was 180 degrees from what was originally proposed. These would be three large custom homes.

Vanessa Greene, 3632 Arbor Lane, said she appeared at previous meetings and remained concerned about the amount of trees being destroyed and the impact to the habitat for the wildlife that lives on the property. She was mortified by the size of the proposed homes. Her home is 1,300 square feet and she would be looking at a huge mansion and the wooded area would be gone. She implored the developer to focus some of the mitigation efforts to putting mature trees between the homes so there was still some feeling of living in a wooded area with some privacy.

Allendorf said the variance of the front yard setback was a good variance because of the neighborhood and it was good for the developer because it would make the homes appear as they had been planned out. He didn’t see any reason to risk a bigger house here than the McMansion Policy would allow. As he looked at the neighborhood there were two 6,000 square foot homes that were quite a ways away. There was a 5,100 square foot home a little closer but beyond that the homes were smaller. He hated to give up a control that the entire council worked for and studied and put into effect. He supported the variance but would not vote for waiving the McMansion Policy.
Schneider said it was his understanding the applicant would probably not do the shorter front yard setback and take out more trees so it would be counterproductive to have a bigger house.

Allendorf said he thought it was in the developer's self-interest to go closer to the road.

Ellingson said he was under the impression the applicant did not request the variance that it was something the staff thought was a good idea. Gordon said the applicant requested the variance after having a discussion with staff. Ellingson said he thought the variance was a good idea.

Wagner said he tended to agree with Allendorf's comments but with the idea that staff truly believed and the developer agreed that the grading plan basically gets the development within 100 square feet. This gave him some comfort. The council worked a long time on the McMansion Policy to preserve neighborhood character. There would be a change here but there really only potentially was the ability of lot one to get quite a bit bigger. Houses on a county road tend not to be as well desired as houses that are further back. He was 50/50 because he agreed with Allendorf about the value of the policy but he was somewhat comfortable given the grading.

Bergstedt said the proposal had been before the council a number of times in different iterations. From where it started with a bunch of small cookie cutter houses to a R1 development was a big improvement. He thought the front yard setback made all the sense in the world because the trees in the back were protected. Because of the grading he wasn't overly hung up with the McMansion Policy.

Acomb thought this was the first time the McMansion Policy had come up during her time on the council. She appreciated the variance for the front yard setback because it helped the neighborhoods in the front and back by providing more buffering. She appreciated Wagner's comments that the house size couldn't get much bigger because of the grading but she worried about setting a precedent by waiving the McMansion Policy.

Wagner said there weren't many lots that were this steep that didn't fall under the steep slope ordinance. Gordon said moving the homes around to make them larger had the potential to impact the high priority trees and that was why there was some comfort with the plan that showed the grading. Wischnack said a project that had a similar slope issue was Hopaca Hollow.
Acomb asked if the tree ordinance that helped limit the rest of the development would also help limit lot one. Gordon said in terms of the ability to grow, lot one had the most ability. Wischnack said the total difference with all three lots between applying the McMansion Policy or not applying it was 500 square feet.

Allendorf said the developer asked, and staff agreed it was a good idea, for the front yard setback variance. It was in the developer's self-interest to have the variance. If the McMansion Policy was used, the fear was the developer would move the homes back and encroach more on the trees. This wouldn’t be in the developer’s self-interest. If the policy was waived the city loses all control over the size of the house. What was currently before the council was the footprint that came in from the developer. That footprint didn’t have to be the one that eventually gets built on. He didn’t see why the city would give up the control.

Schneider said there were smaller homes in the area that were built in the 1950s and 1960s, and they may be subject to redevelopment sometime in the future. There were half-acre lots that need to be closer to the road because of the shape of the property. He said the real risk was these would be very nice custom designed homes and if there were a lot of restrictions placed upon what could be done, it would scare away potential buyers. No one would really notice the 500 square feet in this overall neighborhood. He would rather have custom designed homes that allow people to have the ability to do what they want to do within the constraints of setbacks and trees. The reason the McMansion Policy was done was for situations where there were long streets with small homes on them. That wasn’t what was happening with this development. This was a strange lot and the plan had greatly improved over time.

Wagner said the point about custom designed homes was a good one and he trusted staff’s calculations about the potential square footage difference.

Wagner moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-045 approving preliminary and final plats, with front yard setback variances, and waiving the McMansion Policy, for THE ENCLAVE AT REGAL OAK at 3639 Shady Oak Road and 3627 Regal Oak Lane. Acomb, Bergstedt, Wagner, Ellingson and Schneider voted “yes.” Allendorf voted “no.” Motion carried.

D. Items concerning Ridgedale Restaurants at 1415 Wayzata Blvd.

Gordon gave the staff report.
Wagner said he had talked with a few residents who had concerns about the desire for the density to occur closer to the mall. He asked staff to discuss that the master development plan had already been agreed to in 2013 when Nordstrom moved into the mall. The council didn’t have the ability to change the master development plan unless the applicant agreed with the changes. Gordon said it was important for a mall of this size to have a master development plan. Some of the concerns raised at the planning commission meeting related to intensity. If the city were to sit on the three areas for a longer period of time and nothing happened because the market wasn’t there for restaurants then that would be the time to revisit the master plan. But things had moved along on schedule as predicted in 2012-2013. Wagner noted if the city wanted something different it didn’t have the ability to change things unless General Growth agreed. He understood the concerns from neighborhood to the west about intensity and future intensity. Anything that happens at the mall requires all the anchors to agree. He said the council’s intent was to try and continue to stage the density closer to the mall as the comp plan process proceeds.

Schneider said there was quite a robust discussion as the vision document was developed. There was a lot of discussion about what a vibrant, engaged, denser regional center would look like. It wasn’t just tall buildings, it was the vibrancy, the activities, and a place not just to shop but also included entertainment and restaurants. All this was part of the general discussion. The density will happen when the economics of the Ridgedale Center dictate structured parking. This will happen at some point in time.

Acomb said she understood the concerns. It makes sense to have increased density closer to the mall but currently it’s a sea of parking lot. This was a step in the right direction away from that.

Bergstedt said bringing restaurants to the area had long been discussed and now there was an applicant who wanted to do that. The city didn’t have a whole lot of options but he certainly was not discouraged at all that there will be some new businesses in the sea of parking lot.

Wagner moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-046 approving final site and building plans and resolution 2017-047 approving conditional use permits for restaurant uses and outdoor seating areas. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None
16. **Adjournment**

Wagner moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:52 p.m. All voted “yes.” **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Maeda  
City Clerk
Minutes
Minnetonka City Council
Monday, May 22, 2017

1. Call to Order

Mayor Terry Schneider called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

All joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

Council Members Patty Acomb, Brad Wiersum, Tim Bergstedt, Tony Wagner, Bob Ellingson, Dick Allendorf, and Terry Schneider were present.

4. Approval of Agenda

Bergstedt moved, Acomb seconded a motion to accept the agenda with an addendum to item 13C. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

5. Approval of Minutes: April 24 and May 1, 2017 regular council meetings

Acomb moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to approve the April 24, 2017 meeting minutes, as presented. Acomb, Wiersum, Bergstedt, Wagner, Ellingson, and Schneider voted “yes.” Allendorf abstained. Motion carried.

Acomb moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to approve the May 1, 2017 meeting minutes, as presented. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

6. Special Matters: None

7. Reports from City Manager & Council Members

City Manager Geralyn Barone reported on upcoming city events and council meetings.

Schneider said that it appeared that the provisions that would have ended the Southwest Light Rail have been removed from the bills still being negotiated at the legislature.

8. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters not on the Agenda

9. Bids and Purchases: None
10. Consent Agenda – Items Requiring a Majority Vote:

A. Resolution approving agreement with MnDOT

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-048 authorizing a master partnership contract with the Minnesota Department of Transportation. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

B. Resolution approving a conditional use permit for an eight-resident licensed residential care facility at 5531 Eden Prairie Road

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-049 approving a conditional use permit for an eight-resident licensed residential care facility at 5531 Eden Prairie Road. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

C. Request for temporary banners at Destiny Hill Church at 13207 Lake Street Extension

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to approve sign permit for display of temporary signage at 13207 Lake Street Extension for the “Grand Opening.” Approval subject to the following conditions: (1) temporary signage must not exceed 35 square feet in total area; (2) temporary signage must be setback at least 10 feet from all property lines and cannot be located within any right-of-way; and (3) temporary signage may be displayed for up to 45 days for the event. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

11. Consent Agenda – Items requiring Five Votes: None

12. Introduction of Ordinances:

A. Items concerning implementation of a SAC/REC deferral program:

1) Resolution amending Council Policy No. 12.4 regarding Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees and adopting Council Policy No. 12.10 regarding Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program
2) Master SAC Deferral Agreement with Metropolitan Council
3) Introduce the ordinance amending city code

Community Development Director Julie Wischnack gave the staff report.
Wagner said the staff report indicated that if someone decides four years into a five-year assessment that their business no longer can handle it, the city wouldn’t be charged the additional deferral charges. He asked if he had understood that correctly. Wischnack confirmed that was correct.

Schneider said this was a fairly creative program that had probably been underutilized. He has seen many two or three people businesses that thought they had a good business idea only to find they owed a $35,000 fee. This can really kill a project.

Wiersum moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-050 amending Council Policy No. 12.4 regarding Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees and adopting Council policy No. 12.10 regarding Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program; and to approve the master SAC Deferral Agreement with Metropolitan Council; and to introduce an amending Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka City Code. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

13. Public Hearings:

A. Temporary on-sale liquor license for The Rotary Club of Minnetonka Foundation, 14600 Minnetonka Blvd.

Barone gave the staff report.

Chris Rosenlund from the Minnetonka Rotary Club said the license was being requested to run the beer concession at Summerfest. Funds will go into the foundation.

Schneider opened the public hearing at 6:45 p.m. No one spoke. He closed the public hearing at 6:45 p.m.

Acomb moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to grant the temporary liquor license in connection with a fundraising event for The Rotary Club of Minnetonka Foundation. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

B. On-sale Wine and On-sale 3.2% Malt Beverage liquor licenses for Greenfield Farm + Vine, Inc., DBA Farm + Vine at 1700 Plymouth Road

Barone gave the staff report.

Schneider opened the public hearing at 6:47 p.m.
Doug Sams, the applicant, said his attorney had advised setting up a separate corporate entity for the business.

Schneider closed the public hearing at 6:47 p.m.

Wagner moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to continue the public hearing to June 26, 2017. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

C. Off-sale liquor licenses for Target Corporation, 4848 Co Rd 101

Wischnack gave the staff report.

Jason Fremstad, senior director of adult beverages for Target Corporation, said the plans to add a liquor store to the location were part of Target’s philosophy to deliver a convenient, affordable, one-stop shopping experience for their guests. Focus groups and research have delivered a loud and clear message that their guests want the convenience and affordability of being able to buy their adult beverages while on their Target run. He said over the past year, Target has learned that close to 70 percent of their adult guests purchase adult beverages somewhere. What has changed since the 2015 application was Target recently announced plans to invest $7 billion into the business over the next three years. Much of that for store remodels to meet changing consumer demands in a new era of retail. He said Target’s alcohol business was established and growing across the country. There are seven locations in Minnesota that sell wine and spirits. There have been zero violations of selling 3.2 beer to minors at the Minnetonka location. Statewide there have been no violations anywhere since 2008. He said Target has been a proud member of Minnetonka for over 35 years.

Linda Roslansky, 431 Trapline Lane, Chanhassen, said she was a parent and volunteer in the Minnetonka School District, serves on the Tonka Cares Coalition and was an advocate for at risk kids. There already were liquor stores within two miles from the high school. Studies show that close proximity of liquor stores to schools was a known risk factor for youth consumption. Keeping kids safe and healthy was more important than convenience for adult consumers.

Schneider closed the public hearing at 6:57 p.m.

Bergstedt noted the Target location was in his ward and when it was previously before the council, he supported granting the license. He thought it provided a complimentary service. It is a difficult time for brick and mortar retail businesses. Target has been a great neighbor for a long time. When he visits other states, adult beverages are available for
purchase in grocery stores 24/7. He didn’t think there was anything revolutionary about Target’s request. He thought their liquor store would be a nice addition.

Wagner said he also supported granting the license. He noted he and the mayor voted against granting the license the last time because it was clear there were not the necessary votes in support. His comments that meeting centered around believing convenience was important for residents and Target had shown they were a responsible retailer with only selling to legal age purchasers. He said because they already had a license to sell 3.2 beer, technically one could make the argument the city wasn’t adding a full license but was adding a partial license. He received emails indicating extra stops made it difficult for parents with young children. He didn’t think granting the license was out of bounds for a responsible retailer in a 2,500 square foot location. The request fell within the council’s policy.

Wiersum said he visited Target’s Chaska liquor store. It probably was the nicest liquor store he has ever been in. He was convinced Target was a quality retailer and he valued having them in the community. He appreciated all they do in the community and that they are a Minnesota corporation. He has long held that this area and the city are already well served. He didn’t see much difference between this application and the last one. His vote and his attitude toward it were the same. With Total Wine coming to the city the number of liquor stores was decreased by one but the total square footage of all the stores combined increased by 20 percent. He preferred to wait to see the impact of that increase. He has long held that increased access led to increased consumption and he thought the argument about the proximity of the proposed store with the high school had some merit.

Allendorf said the last time the proposal came before the council he made the comment that he hadn’t seen any application that fit the council policy more closely than this one. He was going to support granting the license.

Acomb said there were regulations around liquor stores because of the recognition that there were public safety and health risks involved. She noted the recent community survey had a question about the number of liquor stores in the city and 68 percent of the people indicated they thought the city had enough with its current number. She said there already were liquor stores in the area and her decision not to support granting the license had nothing to do with Target. She was a faithful and loyal Target shopper.

Ellingson said this Target location was his wife’s favorite and they shop there often. He agreed this part of the city was already adequately served.
The availability of alcoholic beverages was expanded quite a bit with the approval of Total Wine.

Schneider noted it would take five votes to approve the license and it appeared there were not five votes given the comments.

Fremstad said he would like to request a delay on the vote to address outstanding questions and potential options.

Schneider said he didn’t see what the options would be. Wischnack said if the council articulated what might change their mind, then there might be an option available for Target. There were circumstances with Total Wine that caused their license to eventually get approved. Schneider said he preferred that Target withdrew their application because he didn’t see that anything had changed since the last time they applied and didn’t see anything changing significantly in the future.

Fremstad said in preparation for the meeting there had been discussions with owners from other liquor stores in the city to do what Total Wine did to address the concern about the city already being adequately served.

City Attorney Corrine Heine said it would require four votes to table the item.

Bergstedt moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to table the item. Wiersum, Bergstedt, Wagner, Ellingson, Allendorf, and Schneider voted “yes.” Acomb voted “no.” Motion carried.

Heine said the understanding was the item was tabled indefinitely until the applicant asked for it to be considered again. Schneider confirmed this.

D. Resolution vacating public drainage and utility easements at 15815 Minnetonka Boulevard and 15820 Wood Knoll Lane

City Engineer Will Manchester gave the staff report.

Schneider opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. No one spoke. He closed the public hearing at 7:10 p.m.

Allendorf moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-051 approving the vacation of the drainage and utility easements. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
14. Other Business:

A. Conditional use permit for a telecommunications tower with a height variance on the property located at 4525 Williston Road

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Wiersum asked for clarification about the photos Verizon had provided. Gordon clarified the height of the towers that was shown in the pictures. Wiersum said the pictures were helpful.

Bergstedt said the tower was in his ward and there were two neighborhood meetings. At the first meeting, one person attended. At the most recent neighborhood meeting, no resident showed up. He said when the pole first goes up, it will look pretty big. He feared that if the pole was 150 feet it would result in losing the colocation opportunities and that would lead to more monopoles. Going with the extra 30 feet provided better options. He asked with the changing technology, if it would lead to monopoles becoming obsolete at some point. Gordon said the small cell technology was evolving but the structures would always be needed to provide feedback from the small cell sites. He said the best analogy was the relationship between wireless routers and devices like cell phones and tablets.

Wiersum said when this proposal first came up he was pretty vocal about his dislike for it. He complimented staff for helping to educate him and see that this was better than the alternatives. He agreed with Bergstedt’s comments about the colocation opportunity. An extra 30 feet made a lot more sense than having two or three more poles.

Karyn O’Brien, 323 North Cedar Street, Chaska, said she was representing Verizon. She requested the sunset provision of the conditional use permit be extended from 12 months to 18 months. She said the leasing process had not yet begun. That process would require additional time. Gordon said the expiration date was December 31, 2018. O’Brien indicated this would work for Verizon.

Schneider said he thought the 180 feet was the right thing to do particularly because of the colocation. Everyone has gotten used to the water tower so adding the pole was not that big of a deal. He has talked with more and more people who want to give up their landline phones but are concerned because of poor coverage for their cell phones. This would help some people make the change.
Bergstedt moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-052 approving a conditional use permit for a telecommunication facility with a height variance at 4525 Williston Road. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

B. Appeal of planning commission denial of a sign plan amendment for the CycleBar at Ridgedale Center

Gordon gave the staff report.

Wagner said the staff report mentioned a nonconforming, non-approved sign with a slightly similar circumstance. He asked for more information. Gordon said the sign was at the south entrance and was for LensCrafters. LensCrafters has an interior entrance in the mall. They also have a door that sits behind a pillar making it hard to see. This is the entrance for the optician portion of the office. Immediately to the left of the door is the name of the store in small letters on the face. Staff was not aware of this until receiving the CycleBar application. Staff was following up with LensCrafters to address the issue.

Wiersum said the staff report noted that window signs were available to the applicant and the city had no regulation of window signs. Looking at the façade of CycleBar there were windows where a sign could go. He asked if a window sign could go on the upper level windows. Gordon said this was something staff discussed with the applicant. Currently the design was for the upper level windows to be opaque and that would need to be changed if a sign was put on the inside window. Wiersum said the applicant had the option to do this. Gordon said that was correct.

Wagner said the city had made some considerations for some signs at Ridgedale. He asked if the size variance for these signs was for the ordinance or for the sign plan for Ridgedale. Gordon said the variances approved were all consistent with the uses identified in the sign plan. The variances have all been for the size of the sign.

Allendorf said he visited the location and noticed a sandwich sign. There were sandwich signs near every main entrance to the mall. He asked what the procedures were for making sure sandwich signs were in compliance. Gordon said the sandwich sign by this location was a temporary sign in the city code. He said the sign was troubling to him because it might not allow for somebody to identify it from the street and the street was a long ways away. Allendorf asked if the council followed the staff recommendation, if this would allow CycleBar to use a sandwich sign. Gordon said he thought a sandwich sign might be allowable.
Greg Rendell from Sign-Source said what was being requested was for CycleBar to be allowed to have a sign over the exterior of their location. This was the only entrance to their location. He cited the need because of the unique situation. This was the only location at the mall with one door and the door was to the exterior. There needed to be a sign to help customers identify the location. Most of the customers would come before the mall opens. He said the planning commission liked the look of the sign but was concerned about setting a precedent. The precedent had already been set by the LensCrafters sign. Staff wasn’t aware of the sign and no other tenants had come in asking to do the same thing. The other staff concern was what happened if Sears went out of business and several other stores move into that part of the mall. He said at that point in time General Growth would have to change its code but the code wouldn’t have to be changed for this one unique situation. Not having an exterior sign would be very detrimental to CycleBar’s success.

Wagner asked if the mall needed city approval to add exterior doors and entrances. Gordon said the mall could add entrances and he did not know if this would require them to go through a master plan review. Minimally they would need a building permit.

Wagner said normally he tended to be a little more lenient on sign variances at Ridgedale because of the distance from the mall to the road and the value signs provide for shoppers. He agreed with the planning commission that this sign was very attractive. He thought CycleBar would be a great addition to the mall. Everybody knows the southeast corner of the mall will be going under a massive transformation over the next few years and it is unknown what this would look like. He said he had great hesitation to open the door to setting a precedent for anything that was against the existing sign plan. As much as he wants this business to succeed, he had too great of concern to go against the staff recommendation.

Allendorf said CycleBar had the option of putting a sign in the window. If they didn’t have that alternative, he would wonder if the city wasn’t being too harsh on their business plan by not allowing them to be recognized from the exterior. Because there was an alternative available, he supported the staff recommendation. He thought the city should continue to think about the bigger picture for this part of the mall.

Schneider said as the council had looked at signage, particularly at Ridgedale, he had repeatedly stated what should be looked at is proportionality and quality and overall feel rather than some prescriptive magic number that established limits. So far, the things the council has decided upon have been well received. From an aesthetic and design
standpoint he thought what CycleBar came up with was top notch. He eventually would like to see the sign at their location. The caveat was without some clear direction and overall holistic looking at the center and how it might evolve into a more exterior facing shops, which was the current trend, the city could end up with a collage of all types of signs with no uniformity. He didn't want that to happen. When there finally is a bigger picture plan than he would encourage CycleBar to do this sign. The city shouldn’t be stifling the ability of having more storefronts and activity at this part of the mall. He thought it would be productive if General Growth came forward with a plan, and the council could then discuss sign regulations.

Wiersum said he agreed with Schneider’s comments and wanted CycleBar to be successful. He thought with some creativity on the window sign there was a reasonable alternative. The council had to look at this holistically because the mall was such an important part of the community. Sign ordinances and sign plans were difficult to do but it was better to do them upfront rather than after the fact.

Acomb said coming into the meeting she thought CycleBar’s request made some sense given the doorway and the uniqueness of the location compared to other parts of the mall. She said the other council members’ comments made her think the holistic approach was important. She appreciated CycleBar’s interest in coming to the mall and having something other than another retail store at the mall.

Bergstedt said he was not a fan of window signs especially the one on an office building on Highway 7 that he drives by every day. The council knows there will be major changes coming to this part of the mall so he thought it would be shortsighted, even though there was sympathy for what was being asked for, to approve the request without first having a conversation with General Growth.

Wagner moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-053 upholding the commission’s denial. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

15. Appointments and Reappointments:

A. Reappointments to the senior citizen advisory board

Schneider moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to approve the reappointments to the senior advisory board. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
B. **Appointments to the comprehensive guide plan steering committee**

Schneider said he was pleased to round out the steering committee with the appointment of two women. Being new to the community, Farhia Mohamed expressed concern about her ability to contribute, until he explained what the committee did and then she was excited about being asked to serve. He said Barb Westmoreland would bring an important perspective to the committee.

Bergstedt thanked Schneider for his work in putting together the committee.

Schneider moved, Acomb seconded a motion to approve the appointment of Farhia Mohamed and Barb Westmoreland to the 2040 Minnetonka Comprehensive Guide Plan Steering Committee. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

16. **Adjournment**

Bergstedt moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 p.m. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Maeda
City Clerk
**City Council Agenda Item #10A**  
**Meeting of June 12, 2017**

**Brief Description:** Resolution approving Hennepin County residential recycling grant agreement

**Recommended Action:** Adopt the resolution

**Background**

The city of Minnetonka has had a history of receiving grants from Hennepin County for its recycling program. The revenue received is from the distribution of SCORE (Select Committee on Recycling and the Environment) funds that Hennepin County receives from the State. Hennepin County distributes the SCORE funds according to the terms and conditions of the Residential Recycling Funding Policy. Minnetonka currently receives approximately $130,000 to $135,000 annually, which is used as a revenue source for the Environmental Fund.

On November 29, 2016, Hennepin County adopted changes to the Residential Recycling Funding Policy to allocate more money to cities for organics recycling programs. The new funding policy will help reach a 75% recycling rate goal by 2030, established in State Statute and by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency in its Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Policy Plan. It is estimated that organic waste, including food and compostable paper, makes up about one-fourth of residential trash and the county recognizes that organics recycling is the greatest opportunity to reduce the amount of trash going to the landfills.

The new funding policy will continue to fund city recycling programs, but will gradually shift more funds to support organics recycling. In 2017, 20% of funding will be allocated to organics recycling programs. By 2020, half of the funding will be dedicated to supporting organics recycling. Curbside recycling grant projections over the next four years for the city of Minnetonka are below, indicating the shift of funds from recycling to organics.

### Projected Recycling Grants for Minnetonka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected Curbside Recycling Funds</th>
<th>Projected Organics Recycling Funds*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$134,772 (80%)</td>
<td>$33,693 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$117,925 (70%)</td>
<td>$50,539 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$101,079 (60%)</td>
<td>$67,386 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$84,232 (50%)</td>
<td>$84,232 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject to change based on number of households participating in organics

The amount of organics funds received each year will be based on a ratio of Minnetonka organics customers to all Hennepin County organics customers, capped at
$25 per household. Organics recycling has grown in Minnetonka from 200 customers in 2015 to 550 customers as of May 1, 2017, out of approximately 16,560 eligible households. Separate grant funds have been received from the county to enroll 60 new organics customers in 2017. City staff will continue to collaborate with the county to explore and institute methods to increase participation as required.

In order to continue to receive grant funding, the city must approve the new agreement with Hennepin County. This agreement would run for four years and terminate on December 31, 2020.

**Recommendation**

Approve the Residential Recycling Grant Agreement between the city of Minnetonka and Hennepin County.

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Merrill King, Finance Director

Originated by:
  Brian Wagstrom, Public Works Director
I. Policy Description

A. Background

The Hennepin County Board of Commissioners has determined that curbside collection of recyclables and organics from Hennepin County residents is an effective strategy to reduce reliance on landfills, prevent pollution, conserve natural resources and energy, improve public health, support the economy, and reduce greenhouse gases. Therefore, the county adopted the goals established in State Statute and by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) in its Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Policy Plan and developed a Residential Recycling Funding Policy to help reach a 75% recycling rate by 2030.

The county will distribute all Select Committee on Recycling and the Environment (SCORE) funds received from the state to cities for curbside collection of residential recyclables and organics. If cities form a joint powers organization responsible for managing a comprehensive recycling and waste education system for the residents of those cities, the county will distribute recycling and organics grants to that organization. Cities are expected to fulfill the conditions of the policy.

B. Term of the Policy

Hennepin County is committed to implement this policy and continue distributing all SCORE funds received from the state for the purpose of funding curbside residential recycling and organics programs from January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2020. The county may revise this policy if it determines changes are needed to assure compliance with state law and MPCA goals established for metropolitan counties. In the event that SCORE funds are eliminated from the state budget or significantly reduced, the county will consult with municipalities at that time and develop a subsequent recommendation to the board on continuation of this policy and future funding of curbside recycling and organics programs.

C. Grant Agreements

Each municipality seeking funding under the terms of the Residential Recycling Funding Policy must enter into a recycling grant agreement with the county for a term concurrent with the expiration of this policy, December 31, 2020. The grant agreement must be accompanied by a resolution authorizing the city to enter into such an agreement.

D. Fund Distribution

The county will distribute to Hennepin County municipalities 100% of SCORE funds that the county receives from the state. SCORE funds will be dedicated to two different purposes: 1)
curbside recycling and 2) curbside organics recycling. SCORE funds are based on revenue received by the State of Minnesota from the solid waste management (SWM) tax on garbage services. SCORE funds are subject to change based on the SWM tax revenue received by the state and funds allocated by the legislature. Funds distributed to municipalities for the current calendar year will be based on SCORE funds received by the county in the state’s corresponding fiscal year.

II. Recycling

A. Allocation of Funds

The following formula will be utilized to determine a city’s recycling SCORE grant each year.

Percent of SCORE funds allocated to curbside recycling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City recycling grant calculation:

\[
\text{Recycling grant amount available to the city} = \left( \frac{\text{Number of households with curbside recycling in city}}{\text{Total number of households with curbside recycling in county}} \right) \times \text{Total SCORE Funds available for recycling}
\]

Eligible residential households are defined as single family through eight-plex residential buildings or other residential buildings where each housing unit sets out its own recycling container for curbside collection. The number of eligible households will be determined by counting the number of eligible households on January 1 of each funding year. The city will report the number in its application for funding.

B. Application for Funding

Each municipality must complete an annual grant application by February 15 to receive funding for that year. The application consists of a web-based report and a planning document provided by the county. The web-based report asks for contract, program, tonnage, and financial
information. The participation rate for the curbside recycling program must also be included in the web-based report. The municipality must calculate its participation rate during the month of October. The methodology for measuring participation must be provided to the county upon request. The planning document asks for a description of activities the city will implement to increase recycling and make progress toward county objectives.

C. Use of Funds

The following requirements apply to the use of recycling funds:

1. All grant funds accepted from the county must be used for waste reduction and recycling capital and operating expenses in the year granted. The county will not reimburse any funds in excess of actual expenses.

2. A municipality or joint powers organization may not charge its residents through property tax, utility fees, or any other method for the portion of its recycling program costs that are funded by county grant funds.

3. Municipalities must establish a separate accounting mechanism, such as a project number, activity number, or fund that will separate recycling revenues and expenditures from other municipal activities, including solid waste and yard waste activities.

4. Recycling and waste reduction activities, revenues, and expenditures are subject to audit.

5. Municipalities that do not contract for curbside recycling services will receive grant funds provided that at least 90% of the grant funds are credited back to residents and the city meets all minimum program requirements. The additional 10% may be used for municipal administrative and promotional expenses.

D. City Requirements

1. Materials Accepted

At a minimum, the following materials must be collected curbside:

- Metal food and beverage cans;
- Glass food and beverage containers;
- Cardboard boxes;
- Newspaper and inserts;
- Mail, office and school papers;
• Cereal, cracker, pasta, cake mix, shoe, gift, and electronics boxes;
• Boxes from toothpaste, medications and other toiletries;
• Magazines and catalogs;
• Aseptic and gable-topped containers; and
• Plastic bottles and containers, #1 – Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET, PETE), #2 High Density Polyethylene (HDPE), #4 – Low Density Polyethylene (LDPE) and #5 – Polypropylene (PP) plastic bottles, except those that previously contained hazardous materials or motor oil.

The county may add materials to this list and require municipalities to begin collection within one year of receiving notification from the county. Municipalities will notify the county if materials not found on this list will be collected.

2. Education and Outreach

The partnership between the county and municipalities has been highly effective in educating residents and motivating behavior change. In order to continue this partnership and increase these efforts, program activities of municipalities must be coordinated with county and regional efforts. Municipalities must adhere to the following requirements:

a. Use county terminology when describing recycling guidelines, including the description of materials accepted and not accepted, preparation guidelines, and promotional materials;

b. Use images provided by the county or the Solid Waste Management Coordinating Board (SWMCB) if using images of recyclables;

c. Provide recycling information on the city’s website, including materials accepted and not accepted, a recycling calendar, and links to county resources;

d. Mail a recycling guide to residents each year using a template developed jointly with the county. The county will design and print the guide. If a municipality does not use the template produced by the county, the municipality may develop its own guide at the municipality’s expense, but it must be approved by the county. If the municipality relies on the hauler to provide the recycling guide, this guide requires approval by the county.

e. Complete two educational activities from a menu of options developed by the county.
Any print material that communicates residential recycling guidelines that were not provided by the county template will require county approval. This does not apply to waste reduction and reuse, articles on recycling that do not include guidelines, or social media posts. The county will respond within five business days to any communication piece submitted.

3. Recycling Performance

On an annual basis, municipal recycling programs must demonstrate that a reasonable effort has been made to maintain and increase the pounds of recyclables per household collected from their residential recycling programs.

If a municipality does not demonstrate measurable progress, a recycling improvement plan must be submitted by the municipality within 90 days of being notified by the county. The recycling improvement plan must be negotiated with the county and specify the efforts that will be undertaken by the municipality to improve its recycling program to yield the results necessary to achieve county objectives.

In cooperation with the county, the municipality may be required to participate in waste and recycling sorts to identify recovery levels of various recyclables in its community. Based on the results of the study, the county and municipality will collaborate to increase the recovery of select recyclable materials being discarded in significant quantities.

E. Grant Payments

The county will make two equal payments to the municipality. One payment will be made after the county receives the application, which consists of the web-based report and the planning document. A second payment will be made after basic program requirements, education and outreach requirements, and recycling performance have been confirmed and approved. If the municipality meets the county requirements, both payments will be made during the same calendar year. Funding will be withheld until the municipality meets the requirements of this policy.

III. Organics Recycling

A. Allocation of Funds

The following formula will be utilized to determine a city’s organics recycling SCORE grant each year:
Percent of SCORE funds allocated to curbside organics recycling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City organics recycling grant calculation:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of households with curbside organics in city}}{\text{Total number of households with curbside organics in county}} \times \text{Total SCORE funds available for organics} = \text{Organics grant amount available to the city}
\]

If the formula above results in cities receiving grants where the dollar amount per participating household is greater than $25 per year, then a cap will apply. The funding cap per participating household is $25 per year. The most the county will grant a city is $25 per participating household per year. If funds are left over because of the cap, those funds will carry over into the following year’s SCORE funds.

Eligible residential households are defined as single family through eight-plex residential buildings or other residential buildings where the household is signed up for organics service and the household sets out its own container with organics for curbside collection. The number of eligible households will be determined by counting the number of eligible households on September 1 of each funding year. The city will report the number in the application for funding.

**B. Application for Funds**

Each municipality must complete an annual application provided by the county by September 1 to receive funding. As a part of the application, a city must submit the number of households signed up for and receiving curbside organics service.

**C. Use of Funds**

The grant funds may be used for program expenses, including the following:

- Discount to new customers
- Discount to existing customers
- Referral incentives
- City contract costs
• Education and outreach
• Compostable bags
• Kitchen containers
• Carts

Program administration is not an eligible expense. Yard waste expenses are not eligible. If organics are co-collected with other waste, the organics expenses must be tracked separately. If a city passes funds through to a hauler, 100% of those funds must be credited to residents’ bills.

In addition, the following requirements apply:
• All grant funds must be used during the term of the agreement. Funds not spent must be returned to the county.
• Funds must be expended on eligible activities per Minnesota State Statute 115A.557.
• A municipality or joint powers organization may not charge its residents through property tax, utility fees, or any other method for the portion of its organics program costs that are funded by county grant funds.
• Municipalities must account for organics expenditures separately upon request by the county. Expenditures are subject to audit.

D. Education and Outreach Requirements

The partnership between the county and municipalities has been highly effective in educating residents and motivating behavior change. In order to continue this partnership and increase these efforts, program activities of municipalities must be coordinated with county and regional efforts. The following requirements apply:

1. Use county terminology when describing organics recycling guidelines, including the description of materials accepted and not accepted, preparation guidelines, and promotional materials;

2. Use images provided by the county or the SWMCB if using images of organic materials;

3. Provide organics recycling information on the city’s website, including material accepted and not accepted, service options, and links to county resources;

4. Work with the county to develop promotional resources to increase participation.
E. Reporting

A report on the city’s organics program must be submitted electronically to the county by February 15 following each year. The report must include, but is not limited to, the following:

Basic Program Information
- Hauler(s)
- Collection method
- Where organics were delivered to and processed
- Is service opt-in or opt-out
- Cost of service to residents; contract cost for city
- How the service was billed
- Items included in service, such as curbside collection, cart, compostable bags, etc.

Results
- Tons
- Number of households signed up
- Average pounds per household per year
- Participation (set-out rate on pickup day)
- Program costs
- How funds were used

F. Grant Payment

The county will make one organics grant payment to a municipality each year. The payment will be made after the county receives the application and confirms that the municipality meets the requirements of this policy.
RESIDENTIAL RECYCLING GRANT AGREEMENT

This Agreement is between the COUNTY OF HENNEPIN, STATE OF MINNESOTA, A-2300 Government Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55487 (“COUNTY”), on behalf of the Hennepin County Environment and Energy Department, 701 Fourth Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415-1600 (“DEPARTMENT”) and the CITY OF MINNETONKA, 11522 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, Minnesota 55305 (“CITY”).

The parties agree as follows:

1. TERM AND COST OF THE AGREEMENT

This Agreement shall commence upon execution and expire on December 31, 2020, unless cancelled or terminated earlier in accordance with the provisions herein.

Annual grant payments shall be calculated as set forth in Section 3.

2. SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED

The CITY shall apply for annual grant funds and operate its Recycling Program as more fully described in Attachment A, the Residential Recycling Funding Policy.

3. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

The COUNTY will distribute to Hennepin County municipalities 100% of SCORE funds that the COUNTY receives from the state. SCORE funds will be dedicated to two different purposes: 1) curbside recycling and 2) curbside organics recycling. SCORE funds are based on revenue received by the State of Minnesota from the solid waste management (SWM) tax on garbage services. SCORE funds are subject to change based on the SWM tax revenue received by the state and funds allocated by the legislature. Funds distributed to municipalities for the current calendar year will be based on SCORE funds received by the COUNTY in the state’s corresponding fiscal year.

Recycling

The following formula will be utilized to determine a CITY’S recycling SCORE grant each year.

Percent of SCORE funds allocated to curbside recycling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY recycling grant calculation:

\[
\text{Number of households with curbside recycling in city} \frac{}{\text{Total number of households with curbside recycling in county}} \times \text{Total SCORE funds available for recycling} = \text{Recycling grant amount available to the city}
\]

Eligible residential households are defined as single family through eight-plex residential buildings or other residential buildings where each housing unit sets out its own recycling container for curbside collection. The number of eligible households will be determined by counting the number of eligible households on January 1 of each funding year. The CITY will report the number in its application for funding.

The COUNTY will make two equal payments to the CITY. One payment will be made after the COUNTY receives the application, which consists of the web-based report and the planning document. A second payment will be made after basic program requirements, education and outreach requirements, and recycling performance have been confirmed and approved. If the CITY meets the COUNTY requirements, both payments will be made during the same calendar year. Funding will be withheld until the CITY meets the requirements of the Residential Recycling Funding Policy.

Organics

The following formula will be utilized to determine a CITY’S organics recycling SCORE grant each year.

Percent of SCORE funds allocated to curbside organics recycling:

- 2017: 20%
- 2018: 30%
- 2019: 40%
- 2020: 50%

CITY organics recycling grant calculation:

\[
\text{Number of households with curbside organics in city} \frac{}{\text{Total number of households with curbside organics in county}} \times \text{Total SCORE funds available for organics} = \text{Organics grant amount available to the city}
\]
If the formula above results in the CITY receiving a grant where the dollar amount per participating household is greater than $25 per year, then a cap will apply. The funding cap per participating household is $25 per year. The most the COUNTY will grant a CITY is $25 per participating household per year. If funds are left over because of the cap, those funds will carry over into the following year’s SCORE funds.

Eligible residential households are defined as single family through eight-plex residential buildings or other residential buildings where the household is signed up for organics service and the household sets out its own container with organics for curbside collection. The number of eligible households will be determined by counting the number of eligible households on September 1 of each funding year. The CITY will report the number in the application for funding.

The COUNTY will make one organics grant payment to the CITY each year. The payment will be made after the COUNTY receives the application and confirms that the CITY meets the requirements of the Residential Recycling Funding Policy.

4. PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

INTENTIONALLY OMITTED

5. INDEPENDENT CITY

CITY shall select the means, method, and manner of performing the services. Nothing is intended nor should be construed as creating or establishing the relationship of a partnership or a joint venture between the parties or as constituting CITY as the agent, representative, or employee of COUNTY for any purpose. CITY is and shall remain an independent contractor for all services performed under this Agreement. CITY shall secure at its own expense all personnel required in performing services under this Agreement. CITY’s personnel and/or subcontractors engaged to perform any work or services required by this Agreement will have no contractual relationship with COUNTY and will not be considered employees of COUNTY. COUNTY shall not be responsible for any claims that arise out of employment or alleged employment under the Minnesota Unemployment Insurance Law or Minnesota Statutes, chapter 176 (which may be referred to as the “Workers’ Compensation Act”), on behalf of any personnel, including, without limitation, claims of discrimination against CITY, its officers, agents, contractors, or employees. Such personnel or other persons shall neither accrue nor be entitled to any compensation, rights, or benefits of any kind from COUNTY, including, without limitation, tenure rights, medical and hospital care, sick and vacation leave, workers’ compensation, unemployment compensation, disability, severance pay, and retirement benefits.
6. INDEMNIFICATION

CITY shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless COUNTY, its present and former officials, officers, agents, volunteers and employees from any liability, claims, causes of action, judgments, damages, losses, costs, or expenses, including reasonable attorney’s fees, resulting directly or indirectly from any act or omission of CITY, a subcontractor, anyone directly or indirectly employed by them, and/or anyone for whose acts and/or omissions they may be liable in the performance of the services required by this Agreement, and against all loss by reason of the failure of CITY to perform any obligation under this Agreement. For clarification and not limitation, this obligation to defend, indemnify and hold harmless includes but is not limited to any liability, claims or actions resulting directly or indirectly from alleged infringement of any copyright or any property right of another, the employment or alleged employment of CITY personnel, the unlawful disclosure and/or use of protected data, or other noncompliance with the requirements of the provisions set forth herein.

7. INSURANCE

A. With respect to the services provided pursuant to this Agreement, CITY shall at all times during the term of this Agreement and beyond such term when so required have and keep in force the following minimum insurance coverages or CITY’s actual insurance limits for primary coverage and excess liability or umbrella policy limits, whichever is greater:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Commercial General Liability on an occurrence basis with contractual liability coverage:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aggregate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products—Completed Operations Aggregate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Advertising Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Occurrence—Combined Bodily Injury and Property Damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Workers’ Compensation and Employer’s Liability:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer’s Liability. Bodily injury by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident—Each Accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease—Policy Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease—Each Employee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Professional Liability—Per Claim 1,500,000
   Aggregate 2,000,000

   The professional liability insurance must be
   maintained continuously for a period of two years
   after the expiration, cancellation or termination of
   this Agreement.

   B. An umbrella or excess policy is an acceptable method to provide the required
   commercial general insurance coverage.

   The above establishes minimum insurance requirements. It is the sole
   responsibility of CITY to determine the need for and to procure additional
   insurance which may be needed in connection with this Agreement. Upon written
   request, CITY shall promptly submit copies of insurance policies to COUNTY.

   CITY shall not commence work until it has obtained required insurance and filed
   with COUNTY a properly executed Certificate of Insurance establishing
   compliance. The certificate(s) must name Hennepin County as the certificate
   holder, and as an additional insured for the commercial general liability coverage
   required herein. A self-insured retention (SIR) applicable to the commercial
   liability coverage is not acceptable, unless expressly agreed to in writing by
   COUNTY. If the certificate form contains a certificate holder notification
   provision, the certificate shall state that the insurer will endeavor to mail to
   COUNTY thirty (30) day prior written notice in the event of
   cancellation/termination of any described policies. If CITY receives notice of
   cancellation/termination from an insurer, CITY shall fax or email a copy of the
   notice to COUNTY within two business days.

   CITY shall furnish to COUNTY updated certificates during the term of this
   Agreement as insurance policies expire. If CITY fails to furnish proof of
   insurance coverages, COUNTY may withhold payments and/or pursue any other
   right or remedy allowed under contract, law, equity, and/or statute.

   CITY waives all rights against COUNTY, its officials, officers, agents,
   volunteers, and employees for recovery of damages to the extent that damages are
   covered by insurance of CITY.

8. **DUTY TO NOTIFY**

   CITY shall promptly notify COUNTY of any claim, action, cause of action or litigation
   brought against CITY, its employees, officers, agents or subcontractors, which arises out
   of the services described in this Agreement. CITY shall also notify COUNTY whenever
   CITY has a reasonable basis for believing that CITY and/or its employees, officers,
   agents or subcontractors, and/or COUNTY, might become the subject of a claim, action,
   cause of action, administrative action, criminal arrest, criminal charge or litigation arising
   out of and/or related to the services described in this Agreement.
9. **DATA**

CITY, its officers, agents, owners, partners, employees, and volunteers shall, to the extent applicable, abide by the provisions of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, chapter 13 (MGDPA) and all other applicable state and federal laws, rules, regulations and orders relating to data privacy or confidentiality, which may include the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA). For clarification and not limitation, COUNTY hereby notifies CITY that the requirements of Minnesota Statutes section 13.05, subd. 11, apply to this Agreement. CITY shall promptly notify COUNTY if CITY becomes aware of any potential claims, or facts giving rise to such claims, under the MGDPA or other data or privacy laws.

Classification of data as trade secret data will be determined pursuant to applicable law and, accordingly, merely labeling data as “trade secret” does not necessarily make the data protected as such under any applicable law.

10. **RECORDS – AVAILABILITY/ACCESS**

Subject to the requirements of Minnesota Statutes section 16C.05, subd. 5, COUNTY, the State Auditor, or any of their authorized representatives, at any time during normal business hours, and as often as they may reasonably deem necessary, shall have access to and the right to examine, audit, excerpt, and transcribe any books, documents, papers, records, etc., which are pertinent to the accounting practices and procedures of CITY and involve transactions relating to this Agreement. CITY shall maintain these materials and allow access during the period of this Agreement and for six (6) years after its expiration, cancellation or termination.

11. **SUCCESSEORS, SUBCONTRACTING AND ASSIGNMENTS**

A. CITY binds itself, its partners, successors, assigns and legal representatives to COUNTY for all covenants, agreements and obligations herein.

B. CITY shall not assign, transfer or pledge this Agreement and/or the services to be performed, whether in whole or in part, nor assign any monies due or to become due to it without the prior written consent of COUNTY. A consent to assign shall be subject to such conditions and provisions as COUNTY may deem necessary, accomplished by execution of a form prepared by COUNTY and signed by CITY, the assignee and COUNTY. Permission to assign, however, shall under no circumstances relieve CITY of its liabilities and obligations under the Agreement.

C. CITY shall not subcontract this Agreement and/or the services to be performed, whether in whole or in part, without the prior written consent of COUNTY. Permission to subcontract, however, shall under no circumstances relieve CITY of its liabilities and obligations under the Agreement. Further, CITY shall be fully responsible for the acts, omissions, and failure of its subcontractors in the
performance of the specified contractual services, and of person(s) directly or indirectly employed by subcontractors. Contracts between CITY and each subcontractor shall require that the subcontractor’s services be performed in accordance with this Agreement. CITY shall make contracts between CITY and subcontractors available upon request. For clarification and not limitation of Section 15E, none of the following constitutes assent by COUNTY to a contract between CITY and a subcontractor, or a waiver or release by COUNTY of CITY’s full compliance with the requirements of this Section: (1) COUNTY’s request or lack of request for contracts between CITY and subcontractors; (2) COUNTY’s review, extent of review or lack of review of any such contracts; or (3) COUNTY’s statements or actions or omissions regarding such contracts.

D. As required by Minnesota Statutes section 471.425, subd. 4a, CONTRACTOR shall pay any subcontractor within ten (10) days of CONTRACTOR’s receipt of payment from COUNTY for undisputed services provided by the subcontractor, and CONTRACTOR shall comply with all other provisions of that statute.

12. MERGER, MODIFICATION AND SEVERABILITY

A. The entire Agreement between the parties is contained herein and supersedes all oral agreements and negotiations between the parties relating to the subject matter. All items that are referenced or that are attached are incorporated and made a part of this Agreement. If there is any conflict between the terms of this Agreement and referenced or attached items, the terms of this Agreement shall prevail.

B. Any alterations, variations or modifications of the provisions of this Agreement shall only be valid when they have been reduced to writing as an amendment to this Agreement signed by the parties. Except as expressly provided, the substantive legal terms contained in this Agreement including but not limited to Indemnification, Insurance, Merger, Modification and Severability, Default and Cancellation/Termination or Minnesota Law Governs may not be altered, varied, modified or waived by any change order, implementation plan, scope of work, development specification or other development process or document.

C. If any provision of this Agreement is held invalid, illegal or unenforceable, the remaining provisions will not be affected.

13. DEFAULT AND CANCELLATION/TERMINATION

A. If CITY fails to perform any of the provisions of this Agreement, fails to administer the work so as to endanger the performance of the Agreement or otherwise breaches or fails to comply with any of the terms of this Agreement, it shall be in default. Unless CITY’s default is excused in writing by COUNTY, COUNTY may upon written notice immediately cancel or terminate this
Agreement in its entirety. Additionally, failure to comply with the terms of this Agreement shall be just cause for COUNTY to delay payment until CITY’s compliance. In the event of a decision to withhold payment, COUNTY shall furnishing prior written notice to CITY.

B. For purposes of this subsection, “Data” means any data or information, and any copies thereof, created by CITY or acquired by CONTACTOR from or through COUNTY pursuant to this Agreement, including but not limited to handwriting, typewriting, printing, photocopying, photographing, facsimile transmitting, and every other means of recording any form of communication or representation, including electronic media, email, letters, works, pictures, drawings, sounds, videos, or symbols, or combinations thereof.

Upon expiration, cancellation or termination of this Agreement:

1. At the discretion of COUNTY and as specified in writing by the Contract Administrator, CITY shall deliver to the Contract Administrator all Data so specified by COUNTY.

2. COUNTY shall have full ownership and control of all such Data. If COUNTY permits CITY to retain copies of the Data, CITY shall not, without the prior written consent of COUNTY or unless required by law, use any of the Data for any purpose or in any manner whatsoever; shall not assign, license, loan, sell, copyright, patent and/or transfer any or all of such Data; and shall not do anything which in the opinion of COUNTY would affect COUNTY’s ownership and/or control of such Data.

3. Except to the extent required by law or as agreed to by COUNTY, CITY shall not retain any Data that are confidential, protected, privileged, not public, nonpublic, or private, as those classifications are determined pursuant to applicable law.

C. Notwithstanding any provision of this Agreement to the contrary, CITY shall remain liable to COUNTY for damages sustained by COUNTY by virtue of any breach of this Agreement by CITY. Upon notice to CITY of the claimed breach and the amount of the claimed damage, COUNTY may withhold any payments to CITY for the purpose of set-off until such time as the exact amount of damages due COUNTY from CITY is determined. Following notice from COUNTY of the claimed breach and damage, CITY and COUNTY shall attempt to resolve the dispute in good faith.

D. The above remedies shall be in addition to any other right or remedy available to COUNTY under this Agreement, law, statute, rule, and/or equity.

E. COUNTY’s failure to insist upon strict performance of any provision or to exercise any right under this Agreement shall not be deemed a relinquishment or
waiver of the same, unless consented to in writing. Such consent shall not constitute a general waiver or relinquishment throughout the entire term of the Agreement.

F. This Agreement may be canceled/terminated with or without cause by either party upon thirty (30) day written notice.

G. If this Agreement expires or is cancelled or terminated, with or without cause, by either party, at any time, CITY shall not be entitled to any payment, fees or other monies except for payments duly invoiced for then-delivered and accepted deliverables/milestones pursuant to this Agreement. In the event CITY has performed work toward a deliverable that COUNTY has not accepted at the time of expiration, cancellation or termination, CITY shall not be entitled to any payment for said work including but not limited to incurred costs of performance, termination expenses, profit on the work performed, other costs founded on termination for convenience theories or any other payments, fees, costs or expenses not expressly set forth in this Agreement.

H. Upon written notice, COUNTY may immediately suspend or cancel/terminate this Agreement in the event any of the following occur: (i) COUNTY does not obtain anticipated funding from an outside source for this project; (ii) funding for this project from an outside source is withdrawn, frozen, shut down, is otherwise made unavailable or COUNTY loses the outside funding for any other reason; or (iii) COUNTY determines, in its sole discretion, that funding is, or has become, insufficient. COUNTY is not obligated to pay for any services that are provided or costs or expenses or obligations incurred or encumbered after the notice and effective date of the suspension or cancellation/termination. In the event COUNTY suspends, cancels or terminates this Agreement pursuant to this paragraph, COUNTY shall pay any amount due and payable prior to the notice of suspension or cancellation/termination except that COUNTY shall not be obligated to pay any amount as or for penalties, early termination fees, charges, time and materials for services not then performed, costs, expenses or profits on work done.

I. CITY has an affirmative obligation, upon written notice by COUNTY that this Agreement may be suspended or cancelled/terminated, to follow reasonable directions by COUNTY, or absent directions by COUNTY, to exercise a fiduciary obligation to COUNTY, before incurring or making further costs, expenses, obligations or encumbrances arising out of or related to this Agreement.

14. SURVIVAL OF PROVISIONS

Provisions that by their nature are intended to survive the term, cancellation or termination of this Agreement do survive such term, cancellation or termination. Such provisions include but are not limited to: SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED (as to ownership of property); INDEPENDENT CITY; INDEMNIFICATION; INSURANCE;
15. CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

In order to coordinate the services of CITY with the activities of the Environment and Energy Department so as to accomplish the purposes of this Agreement, Ben Knudson, Waste Reduction and Recycling Specialist, or his successor, shall manage this Agreement on behalf of COUNTY and serve as liaison between COUNTY and CITY.

16. COMPLIANCE AND NON-DEBARMENT CERTIFICATION

A. CITY shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local statutes, regulations, rules and ordinances currently in force or later enacted.

B. CITY shall comply with all applicable conditions of the COUNTY grant.

17. PAPER RECYCLING

COUNTY encourages CITY to develop and implement an office paper and newsprint recycling program.

18. NOTICES

Unless the parties otherwise agree in writing, any notice or demand which must be given or made by a party under this Agreement or any statute or ordinance shall be in writing, and shall be sent registered or certified mail. Notices to COUNTY shall be sent to the County Administrator with a copy to the originating COUNTY department at the address given in the opening paragraph of this Agreement. Notice to CITY shall be sent to the address stated in the opening paragraph of this Agreement or to the address stated in CITY’s Form W-9 provided to COUNTY.

19. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

CITY affirms that to the best of CITY’s knowledge, CITY’s involvement in this Agreement does not result in a conflict of interest with any party or entity which may be affected by the terms of this Agreement. Should any conflict or potential conflict of interest become known to CITY, CITY shall immediately notify COUNTY of the conflict or potential conflict, specifying the part of this Agreement giving rise to the conflict or potential conflict, and advise COUNTY whether CITY will or will not resign from the other engagement or representation. Unless waived by COUNTY, a conflict or potential conflict may, in COUNTY’s discretion, be cause for cancellation or termination of this Agreement.
20. MEDIA OUTREACH

CITY shall notify COUNTY, prior to publication, release or occurrence of any Outreach (as defined below). The parties shall coordinate to produce collaborative and mutually acceptable Outreach. For clarification and not limitation, all Outreach shall be approved by COUNTY, by and through the Public Relations Officer or his/her designee(s), prior to publication or release. As used herein, the term “Outreach” shall mean all media, social media, news releases, external facing communications, advertising, marketing, promotions, client lists, civic/community events or opportunities and/or other forms of outreach created by, or on behalf of, CITY (i) that reference or otherwise use the term “Hennepin County,” or any derivative thereof; or (ii) that directly or indirectly relate to, reference or concern the County of Hennepin, this Agreement, the services performed hereunder or COUNTY personnel, including but not limited to COUNTY employees and elected officials.

21. MINNESOTA LAWS GOVERN

The laws of the state of Minnesota shall govern all questions and interpretations concerning the validity and construction of this Agreement and the legal relations between the parties and their performance. The appropriate venue and jurisdiction for any litigation will be those courts located within the County of Hennepin, state of Minnesota. Litigation, however, in the federal courts involving the parties will be in the appropriate federal court within the state of Minnesota.

22. COOPERATIVE PURCHASING

At the time of this Agreement: (1) Hennepin County is a signature party to the Joint Powers Purchasing Agreement (Agreement No. A131396) (the “JPA”); (2) the Minnesota Counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Olmsted, Ramsey, Scott and Washington are signatories to the JPA (“Cooperative Members”); (3) if agreed upon pursuant to a separate agreement between CITY and any Cooperative Member, the JPA allows a Cooperative Member, subject to the terms of the JPA, to purchase the same or substantially similar services based upon terms that are the same or substantially similar to those set forth in this Agreement including but not limited to price/cost; and (4) COUNTY shall have no obligation, liability or responsibility for any order or purchase made under the contract between a Cooperative Member and CITY.
COUNTY BOARD AUTHORIZATION

Reviewed by the County Attorney’s Office

Assistant County Attorney

Date: ______________________________

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA

By: ______________________________________
Chair of Its County Board

ATTEST: ____________________________________
Deputy/Clerk of County Board

Date: _____________________________________

By: ______________________________________
County Administrator

Date: _____________________________________

Recommended for Approval

By: ______________________________________
Acting Director, Environment and Energy Department

Date: _________________________________

By: ______________________________________
Assistant County Administrator - Public Works

Date: _________________________________

MUNICIPALITY
CITY warrants that the person who executed this Agreement is authorized to do so on behalf of CITY as required by applicable articles, bylaws, resolutions or ordinances.*

Printed Name: ______________________________
Signed: _________________________________
Title: _________________________________
Date: _________________________________

*CITY shall submit applicable documentation (articles, bylaws, resolutions or ordinances) that confirms the signatory’s delegation of authority. This documentation shall be submitted at the time CITY returns the Agreement to the COUNTY. Documentation is not required for a sole proprietorship.
Resolution No. 2017-xxx

Resolution approving Hennepin County residential recycling grant agreement

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 115A.552, Counties shall ensure that residents have an opportunity to recycle.

1.02. Hennepin County Ordinance 13 requires that each city implement and maintain a recycling program.

1.03. Hennepin County Board adopted changes to the Hennepin County Residential Recycling Funding Policy to allocate more money to cities for organics recycling programs. The agreement will expire on December 31, 2020.

1.04. In order to receive grant funds, the City must sign the agreement.

1.05. The City wishes to receive these grant funds each year.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. The city council hereby adopts Resolution 2017-xxx approving Hennepin County Residential Recycling Grant Agreement; Contract No. A166411.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

_____________________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

_____________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on August 17, 2015.

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
City Council Agenda Item #10B  
Meeting of June 12, 2017

**Brief Description**  
Items concerning implementation of a SAC/REC deferral program.

**Recommendation**  
1) Adopt the ordinance amending Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka city code  
2) Adopt the resolution establishing the interest rates for deferrals  
3) Adopt the resolution amending Council Policy No. 12.10

**Background**  
The city council reviewed the program for deferral of Sewer Access Charges (SAC-Met Council) and Residential Equivalency Charges (REC-city) at their last meeting, May 22. The council introduced the ordinance for implementation of the program; adopted the resolution creating/amending the policy; and approved the agreement with the Met Council.

Since the council review, there were two items that needed to be added and amended through resolutions:

- The Met Council is only allowing one time period to be chosen for the deferral period (5 or 10 years, not either). The city has opted to use 10 years as the deferral period, as many of our businesses have a significant SAC/REC fees to pay.
- Because of the set time period, the city no longer needs the tiered interest rates, and has now set 3.30% for all deferrals. The city then reviews interest rates for assessments annually and amends that rate by resolution.

**Recommendation**  
Staff recommends the city council:  
1) Adopt the ordinance amending Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka city code  
2) Adopt the resolution establishing the interest rates for deferrals  
3) Adopt the resolution amending Council Policy No. 12.10

Submitted through:  
Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
Merrill King, Finance Director  
Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

Originated by:  
Alisha Gray, Economic Development and Housing Manager  
Celeste McDermott, Community Development Specialist
City Council Agenda Item #12A and Minutes
Meeting of May 22, 2017
City Council Agenda Item #12A  
Meeting of May 22, 2017

**Brief Description**  
Items concerning implementation of a SAC/REC deferral program:

1) Resolution amending Council Policy No. 12.4 regarding Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees and adopting Council Policy No. 12.10 regarding Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program

2) Master SAC Deferral Agreement with Metropolitan Council

3) Introduce the ordinance amending city code

**Recommendation**  
Adopt the resolution to implement a SAC/REC Deferral Program, approve the Master SAC Deferral Agreement and introduce the ordinance amending city code

**Background**  
The Metropolitan Council charges a one-time Sewer Access Charge (SAC) fee when a business connects to the regional wastewater (sewer) system for the first time. The Met Council may also charge SAC when a business grows or changes the use of its space, which may create more potential demand on the system. If SAC is due, the city will also require a city Residential Equivalency Charge (REC) fee to be paid before the issuance of a permit. The fees assist the Met Council and city with funding for wastewater pipes and treatment plants to serve current and future members.

New businesses or a business that is planning to occupy an existing tenant space must contact the Met Council to determine if the current SAC credits (SAC fees paid in the past for the property) match the intended use of the space. If not, the Met Council will analyze business’ space and use, apply any SAC credits, and provide the business with a letter with the additional SAC fees that are required. The current SAC fee for 2017 is $2,485, and the city’s REC fee is $2,852. Both fees are due to the city prior to obtaining a permit or license. The Met Council charges SAC to local governments, who pass the fee on to the property owner or business.

SAC is determined based on the maximum potential wastewater flow created by the activities at the location (food preparation, dishwashing, floor cleaning, manufacturing, restroom use, etc.). Some business types have higher water usage and therefore pay more in SAC fees. For example, a restaurant may choose to locate in a tenant space that was formerly occupied by a cell phone retailer. In this example, the change in use from a retail store to a restaurant would require an additional five SAC fees. The SAC fee, in
combination with the city REC fee is $5,337, multiplied by 5, totals $26,685. Although the city and Met Council work to educate businesses and property owners, the fee can be a surprise to new business owners and can lead to a delay in opening the business. In some instances, business owners are unable to pay the fee and must terminate its lease. The business owner should always contact the Met Council prior to signing a lease to discuss any available SAC credits and to receive an estimated SAC determination.

In order to minimize the impact of the payment of the Sewer and Water Residential Equivalency Charges (REC’s) to new or expanding businesses within the city of Minnetonka, staff is proposing a deferral option to pay the REC fees over time versus at the time the building permit is issued. This program will be in conjunction with the Metropolitan Council’s Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) Deferral Program adopted in 2013. The Met Council’s program allows for the deferment of SAC fees for small businesses that receive a SAC determination of 25 SAC units or less prior to SAC credits being applied. The city’s program will follow the same guidelines as the program established by the Met Council.

There are several benefits to the program. Deferring the SAC and REC fees makes it easier for small businesses (who often have limited capital) to locate in Minnetonka. In particular, high water uses such as restaurants, daycares and hairdressers tend to be affected by the SAC and REC fees. The goal of this business development program is to incentivize business expansion and markets for new businesses to locate in the city by minimizing the impact of upfront fees.

**Proposed Program Guidelines**

Under the new program, the city of Minnetonka would enter into an agreement with eligible business and/or property owners to defer a portion of the SAC and REC payments over a five- or ten-year term depending on the deferral amount. Under the new program, businesses will be required to pay 20% down at the time of application to be eligible to participate. The remaining 80% will be deferred over a period of five or ten years and property owners will be billed on a monthly basis. The interest rate will be fixed at 2.45% for 5-year deferrals and 3.30% for 10-year deferrals for the 2017 fiscal year, which are rates indexed to the current year Aaa municipal bond rate. Annually by resolution, the council will determine the interest rate to be applied to deferred payments; this action will take place at the same time the other city rates and fees are adopted. The business owner and/or property owner must both agree to participate in the program and will be required to complete an application, and sign a Deferred Payment Agreement.

**Deferral Structure**

The structure of the deferral includes, but is not limited to the following requirements:

1. The SAC determination for the business is 25 units or less prior to SAC credits.
2. Deferral must be for 2 or more SAC/REC units.
3. A maximum of 25 of each SAC and REC units may be deferred.
4. The deferral term is 5 years if deferring between 2 and 15 units, or 10 years if deferring 15 to 25 units.
5. Interest rate will be fixed at 2.45% for 5-year deferrals and 3.30% for 10-year deferrals. This rate is current for the 2017 fiscal year and will be determined annually by the city council.
6. A down payment, equal to 20% of the total fee for SAC and REC after credits are applied, is due at the time of application.
7. Property owners and/or businesses will be billed on a monthly basis.
8. The property owner and/or business owner must complete an application and execute the Deferred Payment Agreement to be eligible to participate in the program.
9. In the case of a business closure, the business or property owner must notify the city’s Community Development Specialist. The city will verify the closure and future SAC and REC payment obligations will be waived as long as the city is notified immediately. The waiving of any future SAC and REC fees follows the Met Council program guidelines and is intended to assist small businesses, although it will not be available to all businesses in the city. Any outstanding SAC and REC fees accrued before notifying the city would be due immediately or assessed to the property.
10. In the event of a default, any outstanding SAC and REC payments will be assessed to the property and the property owner waives the right to contest the assessment.
11. SAC/REC credits are non-transferable and are tied to the property to which they were applied.

Eligible Businesses

In order to be eligible, a business cannot include any residential component (i.e. housing, hotels, motels, camps) and must have a SAC determination of 25 or fewer units before any credits are applied. Commercial buildings, schools, hospitals, non-profits and churches are considered eligible, as are some industrial uses provided they do not discharge Industrial Wastewater as defined by the Metropolitan Council’s SAC Procedural Manual.
Ineligible Conditions

A business is not eligible for this program if:

- The fee owner’s property taxes are delinquent.
- The business is not in good standing with the State of Minnesota, or is in violation of Minnetonka City Code.
- The property is not located within the city of Minnetonka.
- The business does not meet the definition of eligible commercial properties in the Metropolitan Council’s SAC Deferral Program and the city of Minnetonka REC Deferral Program.

Sample Payment Schedule

Below is a sample payment schedule for an eligible small business with a determination of 5 SAC and 5 Sewer and Water REC units, before credits. Under the terms of the program, the property owner will pay to the city an initial payment of 20% of the total units, or $5,337.11, at the time of the building permit. The remaining deferral payment will be repaid at a fixed rate of 2.45% over a 5 year term (deferrals for 16 or more units will be repaid over a 10 year term).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total Amount Due</th>
<th>Payable at time of application (20)%</th>
<th>Payable over 5 –year term (plus 2.45% interest)</th>
<th>Estimated monthly payment with interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC Fee*</td>
<td>5 SAC units x $2,485 (in 2017)</td>
<td>$12,425</td>
<td>$2,485</td>
<td>$9,940</td>
<td>$176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City REC Fees*</td>
<td>5 Sewer/Water REC units x $2,852 (in 2017)</td>
<td>$14,261</td>
<td>$2,852</td>
<td>$11,408</td>
<td>$202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 SAC/REC units</td>
<td>$26,686</td>
<td>$5,337</td>
<td>$21,348</td>
<td>$378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SAC and REC Fees are determined annually and are subject to change.

Budgetary/Fiscal Issues:

There is minimal risk to the city. In the event of a business closure, the business and/or property owner is not required to make future payments as long as the city is notified of the closure. The SAC/REC units that are paid in full will remain tied to the property for a future tenant. If a business and/or property owner becomes delinquent on payments while in operation the city will have the option of assessing the outstanding payments to the property. In the case of a change of ownership, the full amount of the deferral will be
due upon sale. In the short term, it could mean slightly lower REC fee revenue since participants in the program would only pay 20% initially with the remainder paid over a period of 5 or 10 years.

**Process Overview for the Proposed Program**

1. The city will enter into an agreement with the Met Council to participate in their deferral program.
2. If a business is interested in participating in the program, they will submit an application to the city.
3. If the application is approved by city staff, a deferral agreement will be executed between the city and the business/property owner.
4. The business will be billed on a monthly basis for both their SAC and REC fees. The fees will be included with their water bill and processed through the Utility Fund.
5. The city will pay the Met Council the SAC fees collected on an annual basis.
6. In the event of a business closure, all future SAC and REC fees will be waived from the time that the city is notified of the closure. The credits that have been paid for will be applied to the property, including partial credits.
7. In the event of a default, any unpaid fees will be assessed to the property.

**Steps needed to Implement Program**

- City Council adopts the resolution amending Council Policy No. 12.4 regarding Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees and adopts Council Policy No. 12.10 regarding Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program
- City Council approves the Master SAC Deferral Agreement
- City Council approves the ordinance amending Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka City Code to reference the program.

**Approval Timeline**

The proposed timeline for the Metropolitan Council Sewer Availability and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program implementation:

- May 22, 2017 – Adoption of the resolution by the city council regarding council policies to implement a SAC/REC Deferral Program and approval of the Master SAC Deferral Agreement with Metropolitan Council
- May 22, 2017 – Introduction of the ordinance amending city code to the city council
- June 12, 2017 – Adoption of the ordinance by the city council
EDAC Review

On April 27, 2017, the EDAC recommended the city council approve the Master SAC Deferral Agreement with the Metropolitan Council and related documents to offer the deferral program to Minnetonka businesses.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the city council approve the following agreement and resolution related to the SAC/REC Deferral Program and introduce the ordinance amending city code:

1) Resolution amending Council Policy No. 12.4 regarding Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees and adopting Council Policy No. 12.10 regarding Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program
2) Master SAC Deferral Agreement with Metropolitan Council
3) Introduce the ordinance amending Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka city code

Future Required Actions:

- June 12, 2017 – Adoption of ordinance by the city council

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Merrill King, Finance Director
  Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

Originated by:
  Alisha Gray, Economic Development and Housing Manager
  Celeste McDermott, Community Development Specialist
Supplemental Information

- Program Guidelines
- Metropolitan Council Deferral Agreement
- Minnetonka Deferral Agreement
- Proposed Amendment to Council Policy Number 12.4
- Proposed Council Policy Number 12.10
- Proposed Ordinance Amending Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka City Code
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution amending council policy 12.4 regarding sanitary sewer and water connection fees and adopting council policy no. 12.10 regarding a deferred payment program for such fees

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1.   Background.

1.01. The city collects sewer availability charges imposed by the Metropolitan Council, in accordance with state law and city ordinance.

1.02. The city also collects water availability charges (termed “residential equivalency charges) as provided by Minnetonka City Code section 1200.025 and Council Policy No. 12.4.

1.03. As currently administered, the Metropolitan Council and Minnetonka charges are collected at the time of issuance of a building permit.

1.04. The Metropolitan Council has adopted a program to allow deferred payment of its sewer availability charges for eligible small businesses.

1.05. The city council desires to encourage small business development in the city by adoption of a program that allows eligible small businesses to pay sewer availability charges and water residential equivalency charges over a period of five to ten years, with interest.

Section 2.   Council Action.

2.01. The city council amends Council Policy 12.4, regarding sanitary sewer and water connection fees, as shown on the attached Exhibit A.

2.02. The city council approves and adopts Council Policy 12.10, regarding “Metropolitan Council sewer availability charge and city residential equivalency charge payment deferral program,” as shown on the attached Exhibit B.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on .

________________________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor
Attest:

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

**Action on this resolution:**

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on .

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Deferral Program Guidelines

In order to minimize the impact of the payment of the Met Council’s Sewer Availability Charges (SAC’s) and Minnetonka’s Sewer and Water Residential Equivalency Charges (REC’s) to new or expanding businesses within the city of Minnetonka, the city will provide a deferral option to pay the SAC and REC fees over time versus at the time the building permit is issued. This program will be in conjunction with the Metropolitan Council’s Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) Deferral Program adopted in 2013. The Metropolitan Council’s program allows for the deferment of SAC fees for small businesses that receive a SAC determination of 25 SAC units or less prior to SAC credits being applied. Under the deferral program, the city of Minnetonka will enter into an agreement with eligible business and property owners to spread the SAC and REC payments over a five or ten year term depending on how many units are being deferred. This program is established by city ordinance and is intended to parallel the Metropolitan program guidelines.

Deferral Structure

The structure of the deferral includes, but is not limited to the following requirements:

1. The SAC determination for the business is 25 units or less prior to SAC credits.
2. Deferral must be for 2 or more SAC/REC units.
3. A maximum of 25 of each SAC and REC units may be deferred.
4. The deferral term is 5 years if deferring between 2 and 15 units, or 10 years if deferring 16 to 25 units.
5. Interest rate will be fixed at 2.45% for 5 year deferrals and 3.30% for 10 year deferrals. This rate is current for the 2017 fiscal year.
6. A down payment, equal to 20% of the total fee for SAC and REC after credits are applied, is due at the time of application.
7. Property owners and/or businesses will be billed on a monthly basis.
8. Property owner and/or business owner must complete an application and execute the Deferred Payment Agreement to be eligible for the program.
9. In the case of a business closure, the business or property owner must notify the city’s Community Development Specialist. The city will verify the closure and future SAC and REC payment obligations will be waived as long as the city is notified immediately. Any SAC and REC fees accrued before notifying the city would be assessed to the property.
10. In the event of a default, any outstanding SAC or REC payments will be assessed to the property and the property owner waives the right to contest the assessment.
11. SAC/REC credits are non-transferable and are tied to the property to which they were applied.

Eligible Businesses

In order to be eligible, a business cannot include any residential component (i.e. housing, hotels, motels, camps, etc) and must have a SAC determination of 25 or fewer units before any credits are applied. Commercial buildings, schools, hospitals, non-profits and churches are considered eligible, as are some industrial uses provided they do not discharge Industrial Wastewater as defined by the Metropolitan Council’s SAC Procedural Manual.
Ineligible Conditions

- The fee owner’s property taxes are delinquent.
- The business is not in good standing with the State of Minnesota, or is in violation of Minnetonka City Code.
- The business does not meet the definition of eligible commercial properties in the Metropolitan Council’s SAC Deferral Program and the city of Minnetonka REC Deferral Program.

Sample Payment Schedule

Below is a sample payment schedule for an eligible small business with a determination of 5 SAC and 5 Sewer and Water REC units, before credits. Under the terms of the program, the property owner will pay to the city an initial payment of 20% of the total units, or $5,337.11, at the time of the building permit. The remaining deferral payment will be repaid at a fixed rate of 2.45% over a 5 year term (deferrals for 16 or more units will be repaid over a 10 year term).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total Amount Due</th>
<th>Payable at time of application (20)%</th>
<th>Payable over 5 –year term (plus 2.45% interest)</th>
<th>Estimated monthly payment without interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC Fee*</td>
<td>5 SAC units x $2,485 (in 2017)</td>
<td>$12,425</td>
<td>$2,485</td>
<td>$9,940</td>
<td>$165.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City REC Fees*</td>
<td>5 Sewer/Water REC units x $2,852.11 (in 2017)</td>
<td>$14,260.55</td>
<td>$2,852.11</td>
<td>$11,408.44</td>
<td>$190.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 SAC/REC units</td>
<td>$26,685.55</td>
<td>$5,337.11</td>
<td>$21,348.44</td>
<td>$355.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SAC and REC Fees as well as interest rates are determined annually and are subject to change.

If you have any questions or would like to receive an application for the Metropolitan Council SAC Deferral Program or city of Minnetonka REC Deferral Program, please contact Celeste McDermott, Community Development Specialist, at cmcdermott@eminnetonka.com or 952-939-8234.

If you have questions regarding the building permits please contact the inspections division at 952-939-8394.
**REVISED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY:</th>
<th>City of Minnetonka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY ADDRESS:</td>
<td>14600 Minnetonka Blvd, Minnetonka, MN 55345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTACT PERSON:</td>
<td>Celeste McDermott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY-WIDE SAC DEFERRED AMOUNT:</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY-WIDE SAC DEFERMENT PERIOD:</td>
<td>5 or 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYMENT MONTH(S):</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MASTER SAC DEFERRAL AGREEMENT**

THIS MASTER SAC DEFERRAL AGREEMENT (“Agreement”) is entered into by and between the Metropolitan Council, a public corporation and political subdivision of the State of Minnesota, with business offices at 390 Robert Street North, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101 (“Council”), and the local government unit identified above as the “Community.”

**Recitals**

1. The Council owns and operates the metropolitan disposal system. Under Minnesota Statutes section 473.517, subdivision 3, the costs of acquisition, betterment and debt service associated with the “reserve capacity” of the system must be allocated among and paid by the respective local government units in the metropolitan area through a sewer availability charge (“SAC”) for each new connection or increase in capacity demand to the metropolitan disposal system within each local government unit.

2. Individual property or business owners whose properties are either newly connected or increase capacity demand to the metropolitan disposal system do not pay SAC to the Council. However, local government units that pay SAC to the Council for new connections or increased capacity demands typically pass on those costs to property and business owners by assessing property and business owners a “Local SAC” which sometimes includes local add-on charges.

3. Minnesota Statutes section 473.517, subdivision 6 authorizes the Council to provide for the deferment of payment of all or part of the allocated costs which are allocated by the Council to a local government unit in any year pursuant to section 473.517, subdivision 3. The deferments are repayable at such time or times as the Council shall specify, with interest.

4. At its November 28, 2012 meeting, the Council adopted changes to its SAC program including a small business SAC deferral program. The changes became effective January 1, 2013. At its January 22, 2014 meeting, the Council adopted changes to the SAC deferral program that became effective immediately upon adoption.

5. The Council wants to encourage and help communities promote business development by deferring community SAC payment obligations pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 473.517, subdivision 6, so participating communities may pass through to businesses the benefits of deferred SAC payments by the communities. The Council’s *Sewer Availability Charge Procedure Manual*
(January 2014) states that communities that want to participate in a SAC deferral program must execute a standard master SAC deferral agreement with the Council.

6. To obtain a deferment of a SAC payment obligation and provide assistance to businesses, communities will submit to the Council a signed master SAC deferral agreement. For the term of the master agreement, communities will have the option to note on their monthly SAC reporting, on forms as provided by the Council, the eligible SAC liabilities for which the communities are requesting a SAC payment deferment from the Council. For each such subject SAC liability the deferment will be effective as of the first day of the subsequent month (e.g., for an April building permit that is reported for SAC in May, the deferment will be effective as of June 1).

7. In order to define the rights and obligations of the Community and the Council and the relevant SAC deferral arrangements, the Community and the Council agree as follows:

**Article 1 - Definitions**

1.1 **Definition of Terms.** Unless otherwise provided or indicated by the context, the terms defined in this article have the meanings given them in this article. Capitalized terms or phrases used in this Agreement have the meanings given them in the most recent version of the Council’s Sewer Availability Charge Procedure Manual (the “SAC Procedure Manual”).

(a) **Community.** “Community” means a “Community” or “Customer Community” as those terms are defined in the SAC Procedure Manual.

(b) **Determination.** “Determination” has the meaning ascribed to that term in the SAC Procedure Manual.

(c) **Regional Portion of Local SAC.** The “Regional Portion of Local SAC” means that portion of the Community’s SAC payment obligations to the Council that the Community passed on to properties within the Community’s jurisdiction and does not include any local add-on charges.

(d) **SAC Deferred Amount.** “SAC Deferred Amount” means the amount of the Community’s SAC obligation under Minnesota Statutes section 473.517, subdivision 3 that has been deferred pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 473.517, subdivision 6 and the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

(e) **Business.** “Business” means a property or business for which the aggregate SAC Determination results in a liability of twenty-five (25) SAC units or less, before application of any Credits available on the Site. Business does not include any type of “Residential Property” or “Publicly Assisted Housing” as those terms are defined in the SAC Procedure Manual; nor does it include motels, hotels, camps, nursing homes, senior housing or prisons. Business includes “Commercial Properties,” as that term is defined in the SAC Procedure Manual, but only when the aggregate SAC Determination for a Commercial Property is twenty-five (25) SAC units or less, before any applicable Credits.

**Article 2 – SAC Deferred Amount; Interest; Payments**
2.1 **SAC Deferred Amount.** Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement and applicable law, the Council will allow the Community to defer payment on the Community’s SAC obligations for Business properties within the Community’s jurisdiction in an amount not to exceed eighty percent (80%) of the SAC due for the properties that are either newly connected or increase capacity demand to the metropolitan disposal system. The percentage by which the Community elects to defer payment on the Community’s SAC obligations must be applied on a community-wide basis to all participating Businesses within the Community’s jurisdiction. The “Community-Wide SAC Deferred Amount” is stated as a percentage on Page 1 of this Agreement. The deferment is available only to properties for which the aggregate Determination is twenty-five (25) SAC units or less. In each instance in which the Community exercises this deferment option, the SAC amount that is not deferred is due and payable at the time the SAC liability is incurred by the Community. Payments on the non-deferred amounts are due with the regular SAC reporting to the Council, pursuant to the SAC Procedure Manual. The deferred SAC liability begins accruing interest on the first day following the regular SAC reporting.

2.2 **Interest.** Annually at each calendar year-end, the Council will determine the average rate on its wastewater bonds, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 473.517, subdivision 6. All new SAC deferrals during the following calendar year will be subject to that interest rate, but that interest rate will be fixed for the duration of the deferment period for each deferral originated in that calendar year. Interest on unpaid SAC Deferred Amount balances will be computed in whole months, however, payments to the Council can be annual.

2.3 **Payments.** When the Council invoices the Community for payments on its SAC Deferred Amount, the Council will provide the Community with a payment schedule that amortizes the SAC Deferred Amount and interest on that deferred amount over the term of the deferment period. The Community’s payment schedule will list the Business properties for which the Community elected to defer payments on the Community’s SAC obligations to the Council. The Community will make payments to the Council at least annually. The Community may elect to make payments semi-annually or more frequently to correspond with the Community’s Local SAC collections, assessments or other payments from Businesses, but the same payment schedule must apply to all Community SAC Deferred Amounts. The month(s) the Community elected to make its SAC payments to the Council under the payment schedule are identified on Page 1 of this Agreement as the “Payment Month(s).” The Community may repay or prepay the Council the unpaid balance of a SAC Deferred Amount at any time prior to the end of the deferment period. Any repayment or prepayment made by the Community shall be without penalty to the Community. The Community’s payment schedule will be recalculated during the term of the deferment period to reflect: (a) repayments or prepayments by the Community; (b) the Community’s election (if any) to discontinue making payments on its SAC Deferral Amount for a Site pursuant to Section 4.2(b); (c) any Community payments to the Council pursuant to Section 4.1(b); or (d) the addition of new Business properties for which the Community elects to defer payment on the Community’s SAC obligations to the Council.

2.4 **Local SAC Payments from Businesses.** Subject to the limitation stated in Sections 3.2 and 4.1, the Community may enter into a payment or other agreement with each Business for payment of Local SAC to the Community on terms and conditions agreed to by the Community and the Business. Except as described in Section 4.2, failure of a Business to make its Local SAC payments to the Community or the Community’s failure (or choice) not to assess or collect Local SAC from a Business shall not relieve the Community of its obligation to pay the Council any unpaid SAC.
Deferred Amount, plus interest, or otherwise meet its SAC payment obligations under Minnesota Statutes section 473.517, subdivision 6 or other law.

Article 3 - Term of Deferments

3.1 Term of Agreement. Unless otherwise terminated pursuant to this Agreement, this Agreement shall remain in force and effect until the term of the last deferment period expires for Business properties listed on the Community’s payment schedule. The Council reserves the right to cancel, suspend or modify its SAC deferral program at any time and for any reason upon thirty (30) calendar days written notice to the Community. If the Council cancels, suspends or modifies its SAC deferral program it will honor all existing SAC deferrals which the Community elected to make under this Agreement prior to the cancellation, suspension or modification. The Community is responsible for giving timely notice to the Community’s participating Businesses or prospective participant Businesses of any cancellation, suspension or modification of the Council’s SAC deferral program that may affect the Community’s local SAC deferral program.

3.2 Term of Deferment. The Community elects the term of the SAC deferments between the Council and the Community, but the maximum term of a Community’s SAC deferment shall not exceed ten (10) years. The Community may have only one SAC deferment period and must have the same SAC deferment period for all Business properties covered by this Agreement. The Community’s “Community-Wide SAC Deferment Period” is identified on Page 1 of this Agreement.

Article 4 – Local SAC Deferrals

4.1 Local Terms and Conditions. The Community will be responsible for identifying property and business owners that qualify for the Community’s SAC deferral program pursuant to any Community terms or conditions. The Council will disapprove a Community deferral request only if a property or business owner does not qualify as a Business as defined in this Agreement. Because the Council’s SAC deferral program is intended to benefit Businesses, the Community must administer its local SAC deferral program in a revenue-neutral manner. The Community agrees its SAC payments to the Council will not be less than the Regional Portion of Local SAC payments the Community receives from participating Businesses.

(a) Local Deferment Period. The Community agrees it will not allow a Business a less generous deferment period (i.e., a shorter deferment period) for payment of the Regional Portion of Local SAC than the term of the Community’s Community-Wide Deferment Period. This Agreement is not intended to govern the payment or deferment of any local add-on charges by the Community (if any) for Business properties.

(b) Local Deferred Amount. The Regional Portion of Local SAC deferred by the Community for a Business’s benefit shall not be less than the Community’s SAC Deferred Amount. If a Business elects to prepay the Community some or all of the Regional Portion of Local SAC deferred by the Community, the Community must make a like payment to the Council to cover the Community’s SAC obligations to the Council for the Business property. If a Business elects to prepay some of the Regional Portion of Local SAC deferred by the Community the Council will recalculate the Community’s payment schedule.
4.2 **Unpaid Local SAC.** If a Business ceases operations or moves from the Site and does not require the incremental wastewater capacity represented by the SAC deferral, the Community may exercise one of the following two options:

(a) **Continue SAC Payments.** The Community may continue to make its payments to the Council under the payment schedule. If the Community elects this option it will accrue SAC Credits for the Site in accordance with the SAC Credit provisions of the *SAC Procedure Manual*.

(b) **Discontinue SAC Payments.** The Community may discontinue making its payments to the Council on the Community’s SAC Deferral Amount for the Site. The Community must notify the Council if the Community elects this option and it must certify to the Council that the incremental capacity no longer is needed at the Site. The Community is responsible for making all SAC payments on the SAC Deferral Amount that were due prior to the notice. The Site will not be credited with the portion of the wastewater capacity not paid (for future SAC Determinations), but will receive Credit for actual SAC paid (including partial units). No Community SAC deferral payments to the Council will be refunded. Net Credits will be available to the Community for Community-Wide Credits only if a new SAC Determination establishes a permanent reduction of capacity demand.

4.3 **Late Community Payments.** If the Community makes a late SAC deferral payment to the Council, an additional administrative charge of two percent (2%) of the unpaid balance of the SAC Deferred Amount per month (or such higher interest rate allowable under law) will be applied.

**Article 5 - Notices**

5.1 **Written Notices.** Any notice, request, demand and other correspondence required by or made in accordance with this Agreement shall be in writing and delivered:

To the Council: Metropolitan Council
Attn: MCES Finance Director
390 Robert Street North
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101-1806

To the Community: The Community’s “Contract Person” identified on Page 1
At the “Community Address” identified on Page 1

5.2 **Notice Delivery.** Any notices or other correspondence shall be deemed to have been received: (a) three (3) calendar days after the date on the notice if the notice is sent by U.S. Mail; or (b) the next business day from the date on the notice if the notice is sent by facsimile or by e-mail.

**Article 6 - Defaulting Liabilities**

6.1 **Liability.** To the extent permitted or authorized by law, the Community will hold the Council harmless and indemnify the Council against any actions, charges, claims, costs, damages, demands, expenses, liabilities, losses and proceedings which the Council may suffer or be subject to as a result of any default by a Business or the Community of the Community’s SAC payment obligations under this Agreement or under applicable law. A Business’s failure to pay Local SAC shall not relieve the
Community of its obligation to pay the Community’s SAC obligations to the Council. Nothing in this Agreement shall be interpreted as a waiver of any liability limitations or immunities granted to the Council and the Community by Minnesota Statutes chapter 466 or by other applicable state or federal law.

6.2 Survival of Terms. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, the validity of this Article and the Community’s obligation to pay its SAC obligations shall survive the expiration or termination of this Agreement.

Article 7 - Miscellaneous

7.1 Dispute Resolution. Any dispute arising under this Agreement shall be settled through consultations between the Council’s and the Community’s representatives. If an agreement regarding a dispute cannot be reached within thirty (30) days upon notice of a dispute from the Council or the Community, either party is then entitled to bring such dispute before the courts of this state or take such action as otherwise allowed by law.

7.2 Exercise of Rights. Any rights, powers and remedies granted to the Council and the Community by this Agreement shall not preclude or limit any other rights, powers and remedies available to the Council or the Community in accordance with law and other provisions of this Agreement. The exercise of any rights, powers and remedies by the Council or the Community shall not preclude the Council or the Community from exercising any other rights, powers and remedies available to the Council or the Community. No failure or delay by the Council or the Community to exercise any of their respective rights, powers and remedies under this Agreement or in accordance with applicable laws shall be construed as a waiver of such rights, powers, and remedies. The waiver of any right, power or remedy, in whole or in part, shall not preclude the Council or the Community from exercising any of their other respective rights, powers or remedies.

7.3 Severability of Provisions. Each provision in this Agreement shall be severable from and independent of the other provisions. If one or more provisions are held to be invalid, illegal or unenforceable, the validity, legality and enforceability of the remaining provisions of this Agreement shall not be affected and shall remain in force and effect.

7.4 Amendments and modifications. Any amendments or modifications to this Agreement shall be in writing and shall become effective only upon execution of the amendment by the Council’s and the Community’s authorized representatives.

7.5 Assignment. The Community shall not assign any of its rights or obligations under this Agreement to any third party, even if the Site which was the subject of the SAC liability is removed from the jurisdiction of the Community. The Community may not barter, trade, sell or otherwise treat any SAC payment obligation deferments or SAC Credits as a commodity and the Council will not honor any agreements between the Community and any third parties that purport to barter, trade, sell or otherwise treat any SAC payment obligation deferments or SAC Credits as a commodity.

7.6 Successors. This Agreement shall be binding on the legal successors of the Council and the Community, whether by operation of law or otherwise.
7.7 Warranty of Legal Capacity. The individuals signing this Agreement on behalf of the Community and the Council represent and warrant on the Community’s and the Council’s behalf respectively that the individuals are duly authorized to execute this Agreement on the Community’s and the Council’s behalf respectively and that this Agreement constitutes the Community’s and the Council’s valid, binding and enforceable agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Community and the Council have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives. This Agreement is effective on the date of final execution by the Council.

COMMUNITY

By: ____________________________
Print Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________

By: ____________________________
Print Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

By: ____________________________
Print Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________

By: ____________________________
Print Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________
DEFERRED PAYMENT AGREEMENT

This Deferred Payment Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into this ____ day of __________, 2017 by and between the city of Minnetonka, a Minnesota municipal corporation with an address of 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, MN 55345 ("City"), __________, a Minnesota corporation with an address of __________________ ("Operator"), and __________, a Minnesota Limited Liability company with an address of __________________ ("Owner").

WHEREAS, the Operator proposes to create and operate a __________________ ("Business") on property located at _______________________ ("Property"). Owner is the fee owner of the Property;

WHEREAS, the Business will be a change in use of the Property and the Owner is therefore subject to charges for sewer from the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services Division ("MCES") and charges for water from the City. The charges are based on Sewer Availability Charge ("SAC") units;

WHEREAS, MCES has determined that the Property should be charged three ____ SAC units for the change in use;

WHEREAS, City Code Section 1200.025 allows qualified business owners to defer the payment of sewer availability and water access charges;

WHEREAS, Owner and Operator seek to have the payment of sewer availability and water access charges owed for the Business deferred.

NOW THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. **Recitals.** The recitals set forth above are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.
2. **Fees.** The Owner is responsible for the following fees in relation to the establishment of the Business on the Property:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Amount Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCES Sewer Accessibility Charge</td>
<td>SAC units x $2,485 per unit</td>
<td>$_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Sewer Residential</td>
<td>REC units x $1,026.75 per SAC unit</td>
<td>$_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalency Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Water Residential</td>
<td>REC units x $1,825.36 per SAC unit</td>
<td>$_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalency Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$_________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Payment of Fees.** Owner, or Operator on behalf of Owner, shall pay to the City all fees set forth in Paragraph 2 according to the following schedule:

   a. Initial Payment. $________ due at time of issuance of a building permit.
   b. Deferral Payments. $________ with interest at an annual rate of ___% due in equal monthly payments of $_______ over ___ months. Interest shall begin accruing upon the execution of this Agreement. The first monthly payment shall be due on ______________, 2017. All future payments shall due on the 1st of each month until the fees and interest are paid in full. The final monthly payment shall be due on ______________. The final monthly payment shall consist of any and all amounts remaining due under this Agreement.
   c. Prepayment. The amounts due under this Agreement may be prepaid without penalty. Interest shall accrue on the balance due at the rate set forth above up and to the date all amounts due under this Agreement are paid in full.

4. **Recalculation of Credits.** In the event the SAC units for the Property change for any reason after execution of this Agreement, any new fees assessed shall be due and payable pursuant to the City Code and shall not be subject to this Agreement.

5. **Ceasing business operations.** If the business ceases operations or moves from the Property, the owner and operator are responsible for making the deferral payments required by paragraph 3 of this Agreement up until the time that the owner or operator informs the City in writing that the business has ceased operations or has moved from the Property. No further payments will be required under this Agreement if MCES does not require the City to pay its MCES sewer availability charge relating to the business. If MCES requires the City to pay its MCES sewer availability charge, any balance remaining due under this Agreement, including interest, shall become immediately due and payable without demand or notice by the City.

6. **Default.** “Default” shall mean the failure to make payments pursuant to the terms herein or any other breach of this Agreement and failure to cure the default within ten days of the mailing of written notice by the City to Owner and Operator by United States Mail.

7. **Remedy.** Upon Default, any balance remaining due under this Agreement, including interest, shall become immediately due and payable without demand or notice by the
City. In addition, Owner and Operator agree that the full balance due, including interest and any applicable collection or administrative costs incurred by the City, may be assessed against the Property pursuant to Minn. Stat. Chapter 429 or certified to the taxes on the Property pursuant to Minn. Stat. 444.075 or any other applicable law. Owner and Operator waive any and all procedures related to any such assessment or certification, including but not limited to notice, hearing and appeal of the assessment and waive any and all rights to appeal or otherwise contest or challenge the levying of special assessments up to a maximum of $_______ against the Property. The owner and operator agree that any requirements of Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 429 with respect to the adoption or levying of the special assessments are waived to the extent that those requirements are not met.

8. **Costs of Collection.** To the extent permitted by law, Owner and Operator agree to pay all costs of collection, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and legal expenses, incurred by the City in collection of any amounts due herein.

9. **Notices.** Notices to be given under this Agreement shall be given by enclosing the same in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid and deposited in the U.S. Postal Service, addressed to the parties as listed above.

10. **Assignment.** None of the parties shall assign this Agreement, nor any interest arising herein, without the written consent of the other parties.

11. **Run with the Land.** The covenants, waivers and agreements contained in this Agreement shall run with the Property and shall bind future owners of the Property and their heirs, successors and assigns. Owner agrees to provide a copy of this Agreement to any buyer of the Property before Owner signs a purchase agreement to sell the Property.

12. **Governing Law.** The laws of the State of Minnesota govern this Agreement.

13. **Severability.** The provisions of this Agreement are severable. If any portion of this Agreement is, for any reason, held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be contrary to law, such decision shall not affect the remaining provisions of this Agreement.

14. **Entire Agreement.** The entire Agreement of the parties is contained herein. This Agreement supersedes all oral agreements and negotiations between the parties relating to the subject matter hereof as well as any previous agreements presently in effect between the parties relating to the subject matter hereof. Any alterations, amendments, deletions, or waivers of the provisions of this Agreement shall be valid only when expressed in writing and duly signed by the parties, unless otherwise provided herein.

15. **Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be considered an original.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF,** this Agreement has been executed as of the day and year first above written.
City of Minnetonka

BY: ________________________________
   Terry Schneider
   Mayor

BY: ________________________________
   Geralyn Barone
   City Manager

STATE OF MINNESOTA )
 ) ss.
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on _____________ by Terry Schneider, mayor of the City of Minnetonka, a Minnesota municipal corporation, on behalf of the corporation.

________________________________________
Notary Public

Notary Stamp

STATE OF MINNESOTA )
 ) ss.
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on _____________ by Geralyn Barone, city manager of the City of Minnetonka, a Minnesota municipal corporation, on behalf of the corporation.

________________________________________
Notary Public

Notary Stamp
OPERATOR

By:
Its:

STATE OF MINNESOTA  )
) ss.
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN  )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on __________ by
____________________, on behalf of the corporation.

__________________________________________
Notary Public

Notary Stamp
OWNER

By:
Its:

STATE OF MINNESOTA   )
) ss.
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN   )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on ___________ by
___________________, on behalf of the corporation.

________________________________________
Notary Public

Notary Stamp

THIS INSTRUMENT WAS DRAFTED BY:

City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard
Minnetonka, MN  55345
Policy Number 12.10
Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program

Purpose of Policy: This policy establishes procedures to regulate, coordinate, and facilitate the approval of certain sewer and water fee deferrals for eligible businesses or properties.

Introduction
This policy governs the use of two programs, including the Metropolitan Council's "SAC Deferral Program" for certain sewer fees ("Regional Program") and the city of Minnetonka's Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees, calculated in accordance with City Council Policy 12.4 ("Local Program"). Hereinafter, the city of Minnetonka is referred to as the "city".

Eligible businesses or properties can apply for the deferral of a portion of one or more sewer/water fees, including:

1. Metropolitan Council Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) – Regional Program sewer fee; and
2. Minnetonka Sewer and Water Residential Equivalency Charges (REC's) – Local Program fees.

Authorization and Funding Sources
On November 28, 2012 (based on Minnesota Statutes 473.517, Subd. 6), the Metropolitan Council adopted changes to its SAC program to include a small business deferral program. The Regional Program which became effective on January 1, 2013, and was later amended, allows a deferment of SAC fees up to ten (10) years at a low annual interest rate based on Metropolitan Council Environmental Services' (MCES) average cost of debt per statute and is applied to all new deferrals originating in that particular year. The Minnetonka Regional Program and Local Program will allow deferment of SAC and REC fees over a five or ten year term with a fixed interest rate determined by the city each fiscal year.

The deferral program established by this Council Policy 12.10 includes the following categories:

1. "Regional Program" allows eligible small businesses or property owners to apply for a sewer availability charge deferment for a maximum of 25 SAC charges.
2. "Local Program" allows eligible small businesses or property owners to apply for a city water access charge deferment for a maximum of 25 REC charges to match the terms and conditions of the Regional Program.

The City Council reserves the right to suspend or terminate the program based on availability of funding.
Program Objective
The Metropolitan Council's stated objective is to encourage and help communities promote small business development by deferring SAC payment obligations. The city of Minnetonka's goal is to minimize the financial impact to new or expanding businesses.

Eligibility
For the Regional Program and Local Program, an eligible applicant is a “small business” as defined in a Master SAC Deferral Agreement between Minnetonka and the Metropolitan Council. “Business” means a property or business for which the aggregate SAC Determination results in a liability of twenty-five SAC units or less, before application of any Credits available on the Site. “Business” does not include any type of “Residential Property” or “Publicly Assisted Housing” as those terms are defined in the Metropolitan Council’s SAC Procedure Manual; nor does it include motels, hotels, camps, nursing homes, senior housing or prisons. “Business” includes “Commercial Properties,” as that term is defined in the SAC Procedure Manual, but only when the aggregate SAC Determination for a Commercial Property is twenty-five SAC units or less, before any applicable credits.

Deferral Structure
The structure of the deferral includes, but is not limited to the following requirements:

1. The property owner and/or business owner must complete an application and execute the Deferred Payment Agreement to be eligible for the program.
2. The SAC determination for the business must be 25 units or less prior to SAC credits.
3. The deferral must be for 2 or more SAC/REC units.
4. A maximum of 25 of each SAC, Sewer REC and Water REC units may be deferred.
5. The deferral term is 5 years if deferring between 2 and 15 units, or 10 years if deferring 15 to 25 units.
6. A down payment, equal to 20 percent of the total fee for SAC and REC after credits are applied, is due at the time of application.
7. Annually by resolution, the council will determine the interest rate to be applied to deferred payments. The interest rate will differ depending on whether the deferral term is 5 or 10 years.
8. The deferred amount will be payable in monthly installments over the term of the deferral, together with accrued interest at the rate determined by the city council. The city will bill the property owner and/or businesses on a monthly basis.
9. In the case of a business closure, the business or property owner must notify the city’s Community Development Specialist. The city will verify the closure, and future SAC and REC payment obligations will be waived as long as the city is notified immediately. Any SAC and REC fees accrued before notifying the city will be assessed against the property.
10. In the event of a default, any outstanding REC payments will be assessed to the property. The property owner must waive the right to contest the assessment in the Deferred Payment Agreement.
11. SAC/ REC credits are non-transferable and are tied to the property to which they were applied.

**Ineligible Conditions**
- The fee owner’s property taxes are delinquent.
- The business is not in good standing with the State of Minnesota, or is in violation of Minnetonka City Code.
- The business does not meet the definition of an eligible commercial property in the Metropolitan Council’s SAC Deferral Program and the city of Minnetonka REC Deferral Program

**Administration**
The city manager is responsible for administering the Regional Program on behalf of the Metropolitan Council in accordance with the Master SAC Deferral Agreement between the city and the Metropolitan Council. The city manager is responsible for administering the Local Program on behalf of the city.
Policy Number 12.4
Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees

Purpose of Policy: This policy establishes the procedure used to calculate sanitary sewer and water connection fees.

Introduction
This policy is adopted to implement the city's authority under Minn. Stat. Chap. 444 and City Code Section 1200.025. The fees established by this policy are intended to ensure that all properties pay a just and equitable share of the sanitary sewer and water infrastructure serving them.

Connection fees will be based on the amount of system capacity that is used. The standard method for calculating system capacity is through a SAC unit (sewer access charge). The Metropolitan Council calculates the number of SAC units for each proposed development within the city. A single family home is charged one SAC unit, and other property uses are charged SAC units based on building size and number of plumbing units.

Guidelines

• **Rates and Charges**
  Fees for the use and availability of the city’s water and sanitary sewer systems will be determined by the use of a “Residential Equivalent Charge” (“REC”). Water and sanitary sewer connection fees will be calculated by multiplying the established water REC, and the established sanitary sewer REC times the number of SAC units that are calculated by the Metropolitan Council.

• **Establishing REC’s**
  The city council will establish the REC by resolution based on an analysis of the financing needs for the water and sanitary sewer systems. Thereafter, the council will annually, by resolution, increase the REC for water and for sanitary sewer based upon the construction index found in the “Engineering News Record”. REC’s will be evaluated and adjusted every fifth year to make certain the connection fees are sufficient to pay for an equitable portion of the costs of installing and upgrading trunk facilities, and all or a portion of pumping, treatment, and storage facilities.

• **Fee Payment**
  Connection fees must be paid prior to issuance of a building or connection permit, whichever occurs first, except when deferred in accordance with Council Policy No. 12.10. Beginning January 1, 2013, no connection fee is due when a single family home that is connected to sewer and water is demolished and replaced by another single family home. To pay fees through a special assessment, the owner must furnish proof of ownership and waive any rights to a public hearing and any appeal of the special assessment adopted by the city council.
Deferred Hookup Fees
Deferred hookup fees were assigned to certain properties before 2009 using the city’s previous sewer and water hookup fee rate formula. These properties benefited from a trunk sewer or water project, but were not required to connect to the city’s utility system at the time of the project installation. The connection fees established under this policy replace the previous hookup fee policy, but some outstanding deferred hookup fees remain. The following provisions apply to these outstanding hookup fees.

• **Interest**
  Simple interest will be charged from the date of, and at the rate of, the special assessments for the project. Interest may not accrue beyond the term of those special assessments, which is 20 years.

• **Notice**
  City staff will annually send a notice to the owner of each property that has deferred hookup fees. The notice will indicate the amount that is pending, including accrued interest.

• **Fee Payment**
  Deferred hookup fees must be paid before issuance of a building permit or connection permit or at the time of subdivision, whichever occurs first.

Adopted by Resolution No. 91-9264
Council Meeting of August 19, 1991

Amended by Resolution No. 99-121
Council Meeting of July 12, 1999

Amended by Resolution No. 2003-077
Council Meeting of August 25, 2003

Amended by Resolution No. 2009-035
Council Meeting of May 4, 2009

Amended by Resolution No. 2013-036
Council Meeting of May 13, 2013

Amended by Resolution No. 2013-103
Council Meeting of September 16, 2013

**Amended by Resolution No. 2017-_____
Council Meeting of ______________, 2017**
Ordinance No. 2017-

An Ordinance amending section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka City Code, relating to water and sanitary sewer connection fees

The City of Minnetonka Ordains:

Section 1. Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka City Code, relating to water and sanitary sewer fees and permits, is amended to read as follows:

1. No person may connect to the city water or sanitary sewer systems without first obtaining a permit from the city, The permit will not be granted unless the - and paying the required fees specified in section 710 required by adopted council policy have been paid or deferred in accordance with that policy. The person must also obtain any other permits required by other provisions of this code for plumbing work, electrical work, excavations in city streets, or other work. On designated low lots where the lift pump unit is provided by the city, the cost of the electrical permit is waived. The person must comply with all terms of the permits that are issued.

Section 2. A violation of this ordinance is subject to the penalties and provisions of Chapter XIII of the city code.

Section 3. This ordinance is effective 30 days after publication.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on *

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

The stricken language is deleted; the underlined language is inserted.
Action on this Ordinance:

Date of introduction:  May 22, 2017
Date of adoption:  
Motion for adoption: 
Seconded by:  
Voted in favor of: 
Voted against: 
Abstained: 
Absent: 
Ordinance adopted.

Date of publication:

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of an ordinance adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
12. Introduction of Ordinances:

A. Items concerning implementation of a SAC/REC deferral program:

1) Resolution amending Council Policy No. 12.4 regarding Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees and adopting Council Policy No. 12.10 regarding Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program

2) Master SAC Deferral Agreement with Metropolitan Council

3) Introduce the ordinance amending city code

Community Development Director Julie Wischnack gave the staff report.

Wagner said the staff report indicated that if someone decides four years into a five-year assessment that their business no longer can handle it, the city wouldn’t be charged the additional deferral charges. He asked if he had understood that correctly. Wischnack confirmed that was correct.

Schneider said this was a fairly creative program that had probably been underutilized. He has seen many two or three people businesses that thought they had a good business idea only to find they owed a $35,000 fee. This can really kill a project.

Wiersum moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2017-050 amending Council Policy No. 12.4 regarding Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees and adopting Council policy No. 12.10 regarding Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program; and to approve the master SAC Deferral Agreement with Metropolitan Council; and to introduce an amending Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka City Code. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

13. Public Hearings:

A. Temporary on-sale liquor license for The Rotary Club of Minnetonka Foundation, 14600 Minnetonka Blvd.

Barone gave the staff report.

Chris Rosenlund from the Minnetonka Rotary Club said the license was being requested to run the beer concession at Summerfest. Funds will go into the foundation.
Items to be adopted
Ordinance No. 2017-

An Ordinance amending section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka City Code, relating to water and sanitary sewer connection fees

The City of Minnetonka Ordains:

Section 1. Section 1200.025, subdivision 1 of the Minnetonka City Code, relating to water and sanitary sewer fees and permits, is amended to read as follows:

1. No person may connect to the city water or sanitary sewer systems without first obtaining a permit from the city. The permit will not be granted unless the and paying the required fees specified in section 710 required by adopted council policy have been paid or deferred in accordance with that policy. The person must also obtain any other permits required by other provisions of this code for plumbing work, electrical work, excavations in city streets, or other work. On designated low lots where the lift pump unit is provided by the city, the cost of the electrical permit is waived. The person must comply with all terms of the permits that are issued.

Section 2. A violation of this ordinance is subject to the penalties and provisions of Chapter XIII of the city code.

Section 3. This ordinance is effective 30 days after publication.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

The stricken language is deleted; the underlined language is inserted.
Action on this Ordinance:

Date of introduction:
Date of adoption:
Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Ordinance adopted.

Date of publication:

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of an ordinance adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on June 12, 2017.

________________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Resolution No. 2017-
Resolution establishing the interest rate fees for business participating in the SAC and REC deferral program

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The City Council approved Resolution 2017-050 on May 22, 2017 adopting a Council Policy pertaining to the deferral of the Metropolitan Council’s sewer accessibility charges and the city’s water residential equivalency charges for qualifying small businesses.

1.02. This policy states that the interest rate charged to businesses participating in the deferral program will be determined annually by resolution.

1.03. The City Council, upon recommendation from the City Manager and city staff, deems it proper and in the public interest to establish such an interest rate.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. The interest rate shall be 3.30%, and shall become effective for billings prepared on or after June 13, 2017.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

__________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

__________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on .

________________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution amending
council policy no. 12.10 regarding a deferred
payment program for sanitary sewer and water connection fees

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The City Council originally approved Resolution 2017-050 on May 22, 2017 adopting a Council Policy pertaining to the deferral of the Metropolitan Council’s sewer accessibility charges and the city’s water residential equivalency charges for qualifying small businesses.

1.02. This policy allowed for two different deferral periods depending on the number of charges a business is deferring.

1.03. The Metropolitan Council has requested that cities choose only one deferral period at this time.

1.04. The City Council deems it appropriate to update the existing policy to establish a uniform deferral period.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. The City Council amends Council Policy 12.10, regarding “Metropolitan Council sewer availability charge and city residential equivalency charge payment deferral program,” as shown on the attached Exhibit A.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

_____________________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

_____________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:
Motion for adoption:  
Seconded by:  
Voted in favor of:  
Voted against:  
Abstained:  
Absent:  
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on May 22, 2017.

__________________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Policy Number 12.10
Met Council Sewer Availability Charge and City Residential Equivalency Charge Payment Deferral Program

Purpose of Policy: This policy establishes procedures to regulate, coordinate, and facilitate the approval of certain sewer and water fee deferrals for eligible businesses or properties.

Introduction
This policy governs the use of two programs, including the Metropolitan Council’s “SAC Deferral Program” for certain sewer fees (“Regional Program”) and the city of Minnetonka’s Sanitary Sewer and Water Connection Fees, calculated in accordance with City Council Policy 12.4 (“Local Program”). Hereinafter, the city of Minnetonka is referred to as the “city”.

1. Eligible businesses or properties can apply for the deferral of a portion of one or more sewer/water fees, including:

2. Metropolitan Council Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) – Regional Program sewer fee; and Minnetonka Sewer and Water Residential Equivalency Charges (REC’s) – Local Program fees.

Authorization and Funding Sources
On November 28, 2012 (based on Minnesota Statutes 473.517, Subd. 6), the Metropolitan Council adopted changes to its SAC program to include a small business deferral program. The Regional Program which became effective on January 1, 2013, and was later amended, allows a deferment of SAC fees up to ten (10) years at a low annual interest rate based on Metropolitan Council Environmental Services’ (MCES) average cost of debt per statute and is applied to all new deferrals originating in that particular year. The Minnetonka Regional Program and Local Program will allow deferral of SAC and REC fees over a five or ten year term with a fixed interest rate determined by the city each fiscal year.

The deferral program established by this Council Policy 12.10 includes the following categories:

1. “Regional Program” allows eligible small businesses or property owners to apply for a sewer availability charge deferment for a maximum of 25 SAC charges.
2. “Local Program” allows eligible small businesses or property owners to apply for a city water access charge deferment for a maximum of 25 REC charges to match the terms and conditions of the Regional Program.

The City Council reserves the right to suspend or terminate the program based on availability of funding.

Program Objective
The Metropolitan Council’s stated objective is to encourage and help communities promote...
small business development by deferring SAC payment obligations. The city of Minnetonka’s goal is to minimize the financial impact to new or expanding businesses.

**Eligibility**
For the Regional Program and Local Program, an eligible applicant is a “small business” as defined in a Master SAC Deferral Agreement between Minnetonka and the Metropolitan Council. “Business” means a property or business for which the aggregate SAC Determination results in a liability of twenty-five SAC units or less, before application of any Credits available on the Site. “Business” does not include any type of “Residential Property” or “Publicly Assisted Housing” as those terms are defined in the Metropolitan Council’s SAC Procedure Manual; nor does it include motels, hotels, camps, nursing homes, senior housing or prisons. “Business” includes “Commercial Properties,” as that term is defined in the SAC Procedure Manual, but only when the aggregate SAC Determination for a Commercial Property is twenty-five SAC units or less, before any applicable credits.

**Deferral Structure**
The structure of the deferral includes, but is not limited to the following requirements:

1. The property owner and/or business owner must complete an application and execute the Deferred Payment Agreement to be eligible for the program.
2. The SAC determination for the business must be 25 units or less prior to SAC credits.
3. The deferral must be for 2 or more SAC/REC units.
4. A maximum of 25 of each SAC, Sewer REC and Water REC units may be deferred.
5. The deferral term is 5 years if deferring between 2 and 15 units, or 10 years if deferring 15 to 25 units.
6. A down payment, equal to 20 percent of the total fee for SAC and REC after credits are applied, is due at the time of application.
7. Annually by resolution, the council will determine the interest rate to be applied to deferred payments. The interest rate will differ depending on whether the deferral term is 5 or 10 years.
8. The deferred amount will be payable in monthly installments over the term of the deferral, together with accrued interest at the rate determined by the city council. The city will bill the property owner and/or businesses on a monthly basis.
9. In the case of a business closure, the business or property owner must notify the city’s Community Development Specialist. The city will verify the closure, and future SAC and REC payment obligations will be waived as long as the city is notified immediately. Any SAC and REC fees accrued before notifying the city will be assessed against the property.
10. In the event of a default, any outstanding REC payments will be assessed to the property. The property owner must waive the right to contest the assessment in the Deferred Payment Agreement.
11. SAC/REC credits are non-transferable and are tied to the property to which they were applied.
Ineligible Conditions

- The fee owner’s property taxes are delinquent.
- The business is not in good standing with the State of Minnesota, or is in violation of Minnetonka City Code.
- The business does not meet the definition of an eligible commercial property in the Metropolitan Council’s SAC Deferral Program and the city of Minnetonka REC Deferral Program.

Administration

The city manager is responsible for administering the Regional Program on behalf of the Metropolitan Council in accordance with the Master SAC Deferral Agreement between the city and the Metropolitan Council. The city manager is responsible for administering the Local Program on behalf of the city.

Adopted by Resolution No. 2017-050
Council Meeting of May 22, 2017

Amended by Resolution No. 2017-050
Council Meeting of June 12, 2017
Resolution approving HOMESTEAD PLACE, a 2-lot subdivision, with lot width at setback variances at 3625 Plymouth Road

Adopt the resolution approving the request

The applicant, HP Holdings, LLC, is proposing to subdivide the property at 3526 into two lots. The existing home and accessory structure would be removed and two new homes would be constructed. The proposal requires approval of preliminary plat with two-lot width at setback variances.

The planning commission considered the request on May 18, 2017. The staff report and associated plans are attached. Staff recommended approval of the preliminary plat noting:

1. The property is one of the largest residential properties in the surrounding area. The proposed lots would allow for lots that are more similar to those that exist in the neighborhood.

2. Over 60-percent of the lots within the existing neighborhood have substandard lot widths at the setback line. Therefore, the requested variance would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

3. The city has restricted the floor area ratio to the highest existing FAR in the neighborhood for the new homes in recent review of several subdivision requests with width at building setback variances. However, staff did not recommend the restriction for Homestead Place, as more than half of the lots within the surrounding neighborhood had substandard lot widths.

At the meeting, a public hearing was opened to take comment and one resident appeared to speak, inquiring about post-construction drainage conditions. Following the public hearing, the commission discussed how the new homes would fit into the existing neighborhood.

Planning Commission Recommendation

On a 6-0 vote, the commission recommended that the city council approve the proposal.
Their recommendation included a modification to the resolution to restrict the size of the proposed homes to a floor area ratio of 0.22. Minutes from that meeting are attached.

**Since Planning Commission Hearing**

There have been no changes to the proposal or additional information received since the planning commission’s meeting on this item.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the city council adopt the attached resolution approving HOMESTEAD PLACE. This resolution includes the following condition of approval:

9. All lots and structures within the development are subject to all R-1 zoning standards. In addition:

   a) The homes are limited to a maximum floor area ratio of 0.22. Floor area includes the sum of the fully exposed horizontal area of a building, as measured from exterior walls and including attached garage space and enclosed porch areas, and one-half the horizontal area of any partially exposed level such as a walkout or lookout level.

Through: Geralyn Barone, City Manager
         Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director
         Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner

Originator: Ashley Cauley, Senior Planner
Brief Description  Preliminary plat, with lot width at setback variances, for HOMESTEAD PLACE, a two-lot subdivision at 3625 Plymouth Road.

Recommendation  Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the proposal.

Introduction

The 1.3-acre subject property located at 3625 Plymouth Road is currently improved with a single-family home and a small accessory structure. The home was originally constructed in 1954 and has a non-conforming side yard setback of 6.5 feet from the north property line. The property is relatively flat and has three high-priority trees. One of the high priority trees is located near the existing home and two are located in the southwest corner of the property.

Proposal

The applicant, HP Holdings, LLC, has submitted an application to subdivide the existing property into two lots. The existing home and accessory structure would be removed in order to accommodate two new homes.

The two lots would meet minimum lot area requirements for properties zoned R-1, as outlined in the subdivision ordinance. However, a variance is required to reduce the lot width at the building setback line on both lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required by ordinance</th>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>Lot 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total area</strong></td>
<td>22,000 sf</td>
<td>29,252 sf</td>
<td>28,969 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildable area</strong></td>
<td>3,500 sf</td>
<td>~ 15,360 sf</td>
<td>~ 15,130 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width at ROW</strong></td>
<td>80 ft</td>
<td>99 ft</td>
<td>98 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width at setback</strong></td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>99 ft *</td>
<td>98 ft *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot depth</strong></td>
<td>125 ft</td>
<td>295 ft</td>
<td>296 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* requires variance

Primary Questions and Analysis

A land use proposal is comprised of many details. In evaluating a proposal, staff first reviews these details and then aggregates them into a few primary questions or issues. The following outlines both the primary questions associated with the primary subdivision and staff’s findings.
• **Are the proposed lots reasonable?**

Yes. The city’s subdivision ordinance outlines minimum area and dimensional standards for single-family residential lots. While the proposed lots would meet and exceed minimum R-1 standards for lot area, the lots require lot width at setback variances. Staff finds this request reasonable.

When a subdivision requires a variance, the city has a broad discretion in the approval or denial of the proposal. The subdivision ordinance states that variances “may be granted but not mandated” when an applicant meets the burden of proof proving that:

Reasonableness: The existing property is 1.3 acres in size and has lot depth of 295 feet. These existing conditions far exceed what is required by ordinance. The property is located in an area that has varying degrees of nonconforming lot widths at the building setback line. In fact, over 60% of the lots within the existing neighborhood have substandard lot widths at setback.

Unique Circumstance and Character of the Neighborhood: The subdivision ordinance allows the city to consider variances for lots with substandard lot widths when the subdivision of the property would not set precedent that would alter the character of the neighborhood. The subject property is one of the largest residential properties in the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed lot widths would allow for lots more similar to those within the existing neighborhood. Further, more than half of the lots within the neighborhood have substandard lot widths. As such, staff finds that the proposed variance request would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

• **Would the proposal meet the tree ordinance?**

Generally, yes. Based on size and species alone, the site has five high priority trees. However, in addition to size and species, to be classified as high-priority trees must be structurally sound and healthy. Two red cedar trees are diseased and would not be considered high priority given their existing condition. As such, the site has just three trees classified as high-priority. The proposal would result in removal of just one – or 33 percent – of the site’s high priority trees.

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat, with lot width at setback variances, known as HOMESTEAD PLACE.

Originator: Ashley Cauley, Senior Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
Supporting Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>17017.17a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>3625 Plymouth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>HP Holdings, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Land Uses</td>
<td>All properties to the north, east, south and west are single family residential homes, zoned R-1 and guided for low density residential homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Guide Plan designation: Low density residential Zoning: R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMansion Policy</td>
<td>The city has recently reviewed and approved subdivision requests requiring lot width at building setback variances. In those cases, as conditions of approval, the city restricted the floor area ratio (FAR) to the highest existing FAR in the neighborhood. These conditions were consistent with the city’s McMansion Policy, which sets a maximum FAR for homes requiring a variance to the highest FAR of the other single-family homes within 400 feet of the property or 1,000 feet along the same street. It is important to note that, in those cases, the proposed lots were generally less wide than others in the area. In other words, they were not clearly consistent with existing development pattern. As previously noted, in the case of the proposed HOMESTEAD PLACE, the proposed lot widths would result in lots similar to those within the existing neighborhood. Further, more than half of the lots within the neighborhood have substandard lot widths. Given the existing development pattern, staff does not believe a FAR restriction should be applied. Nevertheless, for information purposes, the highest FAR of the surrounding area is 0.22. Given the large size of the proposed lots, a FAR of 0.22 on the lots would be a home with a total floor area of 6,500 square feet. This includes the above-grade area, half the area of a walkout or lookout basement and an attached garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>As required by the subdivision application process, generalized home footprints, locations, and grading plans have been submitted by the applicant. Specific plans would be submitted and reviewed by staff at the time of building permits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stormwater

Stormwater management would be required for each of the new homes to provide for infiltration, water quality and rate control for all impervious surfaces. Each of the homes would provide individual stormwater management, which would be reviewed at the time of a building permit.

Natural Resources

Best management practices must be followed during the course of site preparation and construction activities. This would include installation and maintenance of a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, and tree protection fencing. As a condition of approval, the applicant must submit a construction management plan detailing these management practices.

Neighborhood Comments

The city sent notices to 55 area property owners and received no comments to date.

Pyramid of Discretion

This Proposal

Motion Options

The planning commission has three options:

1. Concur with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council adopt the resolution approving the subdivision.

2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council deny the request. The motion must include a statement as to why the denial is recommended.

3. Table the request. In this case, a motion should be made to table the request. The motion should include a statement as to why the request is being tabled with direction to staff, the applicant or both.
Subject: Homestead Place, 3625 Plymouth Road

Voting Requirement

The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council on the applicant’s proposal. A recommendation for approval requires an affirmative vote of a simple majority. The city council’s final approval requires affirmative votes of five members.

Deadline for Decision

August 15, 2017
Subject Property

Project: Homestead Partners Plymouth Rd
Address: 3625 Plymouth Rd
Project No. 17010.17a

Location Map

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES WORKSHEET for 3625 Plymouth Road

Project Description. HP Holdings, LLC, is proposing to remove the existing home built in 1954 at 3625 Plymouth Road and divide the property into two single-family residential lots. The two properties would access onto Plymouth Road and would require lot width variances. By ordinance, the minimum lot width is 110 feet. HP Holdings, LLC, is requesting variances to reduce the lot width from 110’ to 99’ for Lot 1 and 110’ to 98’ for Lot 2.

Reasonableness and Unique Circumstance. The existing lot (197’ in width) is larger than any of the lots on Plymouth Road and in the immediate area. Majority of the lots on Plymouth Road and in the immediate area have lot widths less than 110’. This, coupled with the lot’s depth, presents a circumstance not common to all similarly zoned properties in the area.

Neighborhood Character. Based on the plat submitted, the homes built on the two newly created lots would be more similar in size to existing and newly homes built in the area than would one large home built on the one exiting lot.
### Homestead Place
Minnetonka, Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>37865-015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre pared for:</td>
<td>HP Holdings, LLC 525 15th Ave. S. Hopkins, MN 55343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Tom Bakritges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel:</td>
<td>952-249-2123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre pared by:</td>
<td>Sathre-Bergquist, Inc. 150 Broadway Ave. S. Wayzata, MN 55391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>David Pemberton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel:</td>
<td>952-476-6000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>Lot 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Area</td>
<td>29,252 s.f.</td>
<td>28,969 s.f.</td>
<td>58,221 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETLAND AREA</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET AREA</td>
<td>29,252 s.f.</td>
<td>28,969 s.f.</td>
<td>58,221 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>99 l.f.</td>
<td>98 l.f.</td>
<td>+/- l.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>+/- l.f.</td>
<td>+/- l.f.</td>
<td>+/- l.f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>RE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>RE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>RE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact: David Pemberton
952-476-6000

Prepared by: Sathre-Bergquist, Inc.
150 Broadway Ave. S.
Wayzata, MN 55391

Prepared for: HP Holdings, LLC
525 15th Ave. S.
Hopkins, MN 55343

Contact: Tom Bakritges
952-249-2123

Date: April 14, 2017
3703 EXISTING HOUSE

5/9/17
EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK.  THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF HIS FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTILITIES.

VERIFY LOCATION & MAINTAIN EXISTING SERVICES FOR CONNECTION TO NEW HOUSE. VERIFY LOCATION & ELEVATION.
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN OR SPECIFICATION WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

_________________________________________________________
ROBERT S. MOLSTAD, P.E.

Date: _____________________               Lic. No. _________________

---

USE (INCLUDING COPYING, DISTRIBUTION, AND/OR CONVEYANCE OF INFORMATION) OF THIS PRODUCT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED WITHOUT SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC.'S EXPRESS WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION. USE WITHOUT SAID AUTHORIZATION CONSTITUTES AN ILLEGITIMATE USE AND SHALL THEREBY INDEMNIFY SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC. OF ALL RESPONSIBILITY.

SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO HOLD ANY ILLEGITIMATE USER OR PARTY LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES OR LOSSES RESULTING FROM ILLEGITIMATE USE.

---
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REVISIONS
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CHECKED BY
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04/13/17
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---

MINNETONKA, MINNESOTA

SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC.
150 SOUTH BROADWAY WAYZATA, MN. 55391  (952) 476-6000

---

MINNETONKA, MINNESOTA

HP HOLDINGS LLC.
Highest FAR in neighborhood: 0.22

Subject Property

Surrounding FAR

Map prepared by: City of Minnetonka
Resolution
Resolution No. 2017-
Resolution approving the preliminary plat of HOMESTEAD PLACE
with lot width at setback variances, at 3625 Plymouth Road

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01 HP Holdings, Inc has requested preliminary plat approval for HOMESTEAD PLACE, a two-lot subdivision with lot width at setback variances (Project 17017.17a).

1.02 The property is located at 3625 Plymouth Road. It is legally described as follows:

Lot 62 and the south 65 feet of Lot 63, “COUNTRY HOMES”, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

1.03 On May 18, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed plat. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. The commission considered all of the comments received and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended that the city council grant preliminary plat approval.

Section 2. General Standards.

2.01 City Code §400.030 outlines general design requirements for residential subdivisions. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution. One design standard requires that lots be at least 110 feet wide at the front yard setback line. The applicant is proposing to reduce the front width at setback to 99 feet for Lot 1 and 98 feet for Lot 2.
2.02 By City Code §400.055, a variance from the subdivision requirements may be granted but not mandated, when the applicant meets a burden of proving that: (1) the proposed variance is a reasonable use of the property, considering things such as functional and aesthetic justifications for the variance and improvement to the appearance and stability of the property and neighborhood; (2) the circumstances justifying the variance are unique to the property, are not caused by the landowner, are not solely for the landowner’s convenience, and are not solely because of economic considerations; and (3) the variance would not adversely affect or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 But for lot widths at setback, the preliminary plat would meet the design standards as outlined in City Code §400.030.

3.02 The proposed preliminary plat would meet the variance standards as outlined in City Code §400.055:

1. Reasonableness: The existing property is 1.3-acres in size and has a lot depth of 295 feet. These existing conditions far exceed what is required by ordinance. In fact, the lot is one of the largest residential parcels within the neighborhood. Further, the property is located in an area where properties have varying degrees of nonconforming lot widths at the setback line. Over 60% of the lots within the existing neighborhood have substandard lot widths.

2. Unique Circumstance and Character of the neighborhood: The subdivision ordinance allows the city to consider variances for lots with substandard lot widths when the subdivision of the property would not set precedent that would alter the character of the neighborhood. The subject property is one of the largest residential properties in the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed lot widths would allow for lots more similar to those within the existing neighborhood. Further, more than half of the lots within the existing neighborhood have substandard lot widths. As such, the proposed variance request would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood.


4.01 The above-described preliminary plat is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:
1. Final plat approval is required. A final plat will not be placed on a city council agenda until a complete final plat application is received.

   a) The following must be submitted for a final plat application to be considered complete:

      1) A final plat drawing that clearly illustrates the following:

          a. The following drainage and utility easements:

              1. Minimum 10-foot wide drainage and utility easements adjacent to the public right-of-way(s) and along the northern property line.

              2. A minimum 7-foot wide drainage and utility easements along the south property line.

              3. Over the extents of the stormwater management facilities in the rear yards of both lots, as approved by the city engineer.

      2) Title evidence that is current within thirty days before release of the final plat for the city attorney’s review and approval.

2. Prior to final plat approval:

   a) This resolution must be recorded with Hennepin County.

   b) The documents outlined in section 4.01(1)(a)(2) above must be approved by the city attorney.

3. Prior to release of the final plat for recording:

   a) Submit the following:

      1) Two sets of mylars for city signatures.

      2) An electronic CAD file of the plat in microstation or DXF.
3) Park dedication fee of $5,000.

4. Subject to staff approval, HOMESTEAD PLACE must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified by the conditions below:

- Preliminary plat dated March 29, 2017
- Site plan dated April 14, 2017
- Grading plan dated April 14, 2017
- Erosion control plat dated April 24, 2017
- Tree preservation plan dated April 24, 2017

6. Prior to issuance of a building permit for the first new house within the development, submit the following documents:

a) A letter from the surveyor stating that boundary and lot stakes have been installed as required by ordinance.

b) Proof of subdivision registration and transfer of NPDES permit if applicable.

7. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any of the lots within the development:

a) Submit the following items for staff review and approval:

1) A construction management plan. This plan must be in a city-approved format and outline minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance. If the builder is the same entity doing grading work on the site, the construction management plan submitted at the time of grading permit may fulfill this requirement.

2) Stormwater maintenance agreements for the stormwater management facilities. These agreements must be reviewed and approved by the city attorney and then recorded with Hennepin County.

3) Final grading and tree preservation plan for the lot. The plan must be in substantial conformance with Grading Plan and Tree Preservation plans dated April 24, 2017:
a. Show sewer and water services to minimize impact to any significant or high-priority trees. No trees may be removed for installation of services.

b. No more than 35% of the high priority trees can be removed.

4) A tree mitigation plan. The plan must meet minimum mitigation requirements as outlined in ordinance. However, at the sole discretion of staff, mitigation may be decreased.

5) Confirm the water service location.

6) Grading and construction activity to be located to minimize impacts to adjacent trees.

7) Driveway permits will be required for the new driveway entrances. These entrances should be located to avoid the curb stop.

8) Cash escrow in an amount to be determined by city staff. This escrow must be accompanied by a document prepared by the city attorney and signed by the builder and property owner. Through this document the builder and property owner will acknowledge:

- The property will be brought into compliance within 48 hours of notification of a violation of the construction management plan, other conditions of approval, or city code standards; and

- If compliance is not achieved, the city will use any or all of the escrow dollars to correct any erosion and/or grading problems.

If the builder is the same entity doing grading work on the site, the cash escrow submitted at the time of grading permit may fulfill this requirement.

b) Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, tree and wetland protection fencing and any other measures identified
on the SWPPP for staff inspection. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

c) Install heavy duty fencing, which may include chain-link fencing, at the conservation easement. This fencing must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

d) Submit all required hook-up fees.

8. No tree removal is permitted on either lot prior to issuance of the building permit on that lot.

9. All lots and structures within the development are subject to all R-1 zoning standards. In addition:

   a) The homes are limited to a maximum floor area ratio of 0.22. Floor area includes the sum of the fully exposed horizontal area of a building, as measured from exterior walls and including attached garage space and enclosed porch areas, and one-half the horizontal area of any partially exposed level such as a walkout or lookout level.

10. All lots within the development must meet all minimum access requirements as outlined in Minnesota State Fire Code Section 503. These access requirements include road dimension, surface, and grade standards. If access requirements are not met, houses must be protected with a 13D automatic fire sprinkler system or an approved alternative system.

11. During construction, the streets must be kept free of debris and sediment.

12. The property owner is responsible for replacing any required landscaping that dies.

13. The city must approve the final plat within one year of preliminary approval or receive a written application for a time extension or the preliminary approval will be void.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

__________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor
Attest:

__________________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

__________________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Planning Commission Minutes
C. Preliminary plat with lot width at setback variances for Homestead Place, a two-lot subdivision at 3625 Plymouth Road.

Chair Kirk introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Cauley reported. She recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Tom Bakritges, Homestead Partners, applicant, stated that staff has done a nice job explaining the history of the surrounding area. He concurred with the staff report as written and the recommendation proposed by staff. He appreciated the commissioners’ time. He was available for questions.

The public hearing was opened.

Peggy Thomson, 3618 Plymouth Road, stated that she is happy that one would be torn down and two would be constructed. Her one concern is that the one lot that is not built on is quite low. She was concerned water would drain from the raised lots onto her property. She already has a river travel through her front yard when it rains. She questioned how the drainage would be handled.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Cauley explained that the sites would be graded to direct stormwater east to stormwater facilities.

Calvert stated that the neighborhood currently has houses of all shapes and sizes. She was concerned that the houses in the renderings would be too large. She favored the new houses fitting in with the neighborhood.

Powers agreed. The area is lovely. He would favor the new houses to be built a little smaller than they are depicted in the rendering.

Mr. Bakritges explained that the rendering was provided as an example of the elevations for staff. His company also developed the houses in the neighborhood on the east side. The buyer would determine the size of their house. He noted keeping the size compatible with the neighborhood.

In response to Chair Kirk’s request, Cauley provided the floor area ratios (FAR) for houses in the area. The ordinance requirements for an R-1 housing district would restrict the size of a new house. The FAR restriction would allow houses with up to 6,500 square feet in size to be built on the proposed lots.
Powers supported recommending that the FAR restriction be applied. Calvert agreed.

Sewall supported limiting the house size to 6,500 square feet.

Kirk noted that the neighborhood is already eclectic. Calvert said that building anything would change the feel of the neighborhood.

Schack noted that the lots would be very deep which would limit the view of the mass of the houses from the street.

**Schack moved, second by Powers, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat with a modification to restrict the size of the houses to an FAR of .22 and lot width at setback variances for Homestead Place.**

*Knight, Powers, Schack, Sewall, Calvert, and Kirk voted yes. O’Connell was absent. Motion carried.*
City Council Agenda Item #10D
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description  Resolution authorizing the city of Minnetonka to participate in the Mayors’ Monarch Pledge

Recommendation  Adopt the resolution

Background

Monarch butterflies were once the most recognizable butterfly in North America, fluttering over farm fields, woodlands, and prairies from southern Ontario to northern Mexico and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. However, in just the past 20 years, the monarch population has declined by more than 80 percent. This dramatic decline has been linked to habitat loss and climate change in the butterflies breeding and overwintering areas and the widespread use of agrochemicals and genetically modified crops, which limit the growth of milkweeds — the only plants that monarch caterpillars can eat.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the United States Department of Agriculture declared the monarch a priority species. This designation acknowledges that the monarch’s “habitat needs are representative of healthy, functioning ecosystems and conservation efforts benefit a wide variety of species.” Protecting monarchs also helps to protect a wide range of other pollinators and species at other levels of the food web.

About 85 percent of all flowering plants on earth, including roughly one-third of the fruits and vegetables we eat, require the assistance of animal pollinators in order to produce fruit and seeds. Unfortunately, all groups of pollinators are declining globally. This could have serious impacts on our food supply and the health of our planet.

The National Wildlife Federation has initiated several national initiatives to promote monarch conservation. These programs encourage participation at all levels: by individuals and families, classrooms, and communities. The Mayors’ Monarch Pledge is one such initiative. By participating in the pledge, mayors and local government officials commit to educating residents and staff about monarch conservation and to implementing straightforward yet meaningful actions to conserve monarch habitat.

Municipalities, residents, businesses, schools, and faith-based organizations undertake practices that affect pollinators, including landscaping, mowing, chemical use, and more. Small changes to those practices can have large impacts on pollinators, to their detriment or benefit. The Mayors’ Monarch Pledge emphasizes the unique role municipal governments can play in helping to save the imperiled monarch butterfly and by extension, other pollinators by restoring and enhancing habitat “right where people live, work, learn, play and worship.”
The city has a long history of working to protect and restore native habitat in Minnetonka and to educate residents about pollinators and other species that form healthy ecosystems. Citywide collaboration, and connection with residents and other organizations, will continue to strengthen this effort.

**City of Minnetonka Findings**

The Mayors’ Monarch Pledge includes 24 possible action steps in three categories: (1) Communications and Convening, (2) Program and Demonstration Gardens, and (3) Systems Change. In taking the Pledge, a city agrees to implement at least three of the 24 steps in the coming year. Cities that pledge to enact eight or more steps receive special recognition as part of the program’s Leadership Circle. Of the 304 Pledge signatories nationwide, two cities have become Monarch Champions by committing to all 24 steps.

So far, 18 Minnesota cities have signed the Mayors’ Monarch Pledge. Minnetonka would be only the second Minnesota city to qualify for the Leadership Circle (taking 8 steps or more). In fact, the city is very close to achieving Monarch Champion level (all 24 steps required).

- **Communications and Convening**

  These steps promote conversations within and beyond the organization; we are more likely to succeed when we share knowledge and resources.

  Action steps in this category:
  - Issue a proclamation to raise awareness about monarch/pollinator needs
  - Launch a public communication effort
  - Communicate with community garden groups
  - Convene staff and identify opportunities for revised mowing and planting programs
  - Convene a meeting with gardening leaders in the community.

  *All steps in this category are ongoing or will be completed in 2017.*

- **Program and Demonstration Gardens**

  Through this group of 12 steps, cities model best practices and provide resources that empower residents to be agents of change in their community.

  Action steps in this category:
  - Host or support a native plant sale
  - Facilitate or support milkweed seed collection/propagation
• Plant a monarch-friendly demonstration garden
• Create monarch habitat in outlots
• Plant milkweed and native nectar plants in medians and rights-of-way
• Launch a program to plant milkweed and nectar plants in school gardens
• Earn recognition through other habitat conservation programs
• Create a monarch neighborhood challenge
• Initiate or support citizen science efforts
• Add milkweed and nectar producing plants in community gardens
• Expand invasive species removal programs
• Host or support a city monarch butterfly festival.

All steps in this category are ongoing or will be completed in 2017.

• Systems Change

The seven steps in Systems Change focus on developing a long-term strategy to support the health of pollinators and their habitat through best practices, strategic planning, and revision of city ordinance.

The following action steps reflect practices already adopted by the city:
• Remove milkweed from the list of noxious plants
• Change weed/mowing ordinances to allow for native habitats
• Direct city property managers to consider the use of milkweed and native plants at city properties
• Integrate monarch/pollinator habitat conservation into city plantings.

Four of the seven steps in this category will be completed in 2017.

These action steps are attainable in the future:
• Amend the landscape code to require a specific percentage of native plants/shrubs/trees
• Update the landscape code to support integrated pest management and reduced pesticide use
• Adopt pesticide practices that are not harmful to pollinators.
Staff Recommendation

Adopt the resolution authorizing the city of Minnetonka to participate in the Mayors’ Monarch Pledge.

Submitted through:
   Geralyn Barone, City Manager
   Brian Wagstrom, Public Works Director

Originated by:
   Jo Colleran, Natural Resources Manager
   Christine Petersen, Natural Resources Administrator
### Mayors’ Monarch Pledge Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Step</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications &amp; Convening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Issue a proclamation to raise awareness about the decline of the monarch</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Monarch and Pollinator Awareness Month proclamation goes before city council in July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butterfly and the species’ need for habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Launch a public communication effort to encourage citizens to plant</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Natural Resources has a long commitment to educating residents about pollinators. In 2016-2017, this information will be communicated via newsletter, website, e-newsletter, social media, employee intranet, at Open House and State of the City, and through interpretive signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monarch gardens at their homes or in their neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicate with community garden groups and urge them to plant native</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Presented to seniors’ Garden Club on March 13, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milkweeds and nectar-producing plants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Convene city park and public works department staff and identify</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Natural Resources, Parks and Facilities staff are working together to educate volunteers about opportunities to incorporate pollinator-friendly plants into ornamental and seasonal park plantings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for revised mowing and milkweed/native nectar plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planting programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Convene a meeting with gardening leaders in the community to discuss</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Presented at Freshwater Society’s pollinator workshop (a continuing education event for Master Water Stewards that was also open to the public) on March 7, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnerships to support monarch butterfly conservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program &amp; Demonstration Gardens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Host or support a native plant sale or milkweed seed giveaway event.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The city has hosted a native plant sale since 2010. In 2017, the sale will be part of an event called Pollinator Field Day (12 July).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Facilitate or support a milkweed seed collection and propagation effort.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The city’s restoration specialist collects seeds every fall in city parks. In 2016, swamp and butterfly milkweed seeds were collected from Grays Bay Marina and the PW rain gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Plant a monarch-friendly demonstration garden at City Hall or other</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Demonstration garden added in Nov. 2016, along the path leading to the west portion of Civic Center Park; interpretive signage and waystations planned for spring 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prominent location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Convert abandoned lots to monarch habitat.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Oric Ave outlot restoration will include invasive species removal and native prairie plantings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Plant milkweed and native nectar plants in medians and public rights-</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Black-eyed Susan and sedum used in median plantings along Shady Oak Rd will appeal to monarchs; the “serpentine drive” portion of Williston Rd has flowering shrubs, perennials, and annuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of-way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Launch a program to plant native milkweeds and nectar plants in school</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>An ambitious community garden project is being installed at Scenic Heights Elementary School, led by Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District and Barr Engineering with consultation from city staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardens by engaging students, teachers, and the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Earn recognition for being a wildlife-friendly city by expanding your</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Minnetonka has been a Tree City USA since 1994, and in 2015 received the Arbor Day Foundations Growth Award for innovative, sustainable community forestry practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action plan to include other wildlife and habitat conservation efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through a program like the NWF Community Wildlife Habitat program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Create a monarch neighborhood challenge to engage neighborhoods and</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Information about the PolliNeighbor Challenge will be provided to the police department for distribution at Night for Neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeowners’ associations within the city to create habitat for the monarch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butterfly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Initiate or support citizen-science efforts that help monitor monarch</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Pollinator Field Day will include citizen science demonstrations; this topic will also be highlighted in communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>migration and health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Add milkweed and nectar producing plants in community gardens.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>The natural resources division and the recreation department collaborated to educate community gardeners at Kelly Park about annual plants that benefit pollinators and vegetable gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Step</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand invasive species removal programs to make it possible to re-establish native milkweed and nectar plants to the landscape.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Since the mid-1990s, natural resource staff have worked to remove invasive species so that native prairie, woodland, and shoreland species can re-establish in city parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host or support a city monarch butterfly festival.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Pollinator Field Day will include family and educational events to celebrate monarchs, pollinators, and their habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove milkweed from the list of noxious plants in city weed/landscaping ordinances (if applicable).</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Minnetonka follows the state list, which does not include milkweed as noxious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change weed or mowing ordinances to allow for native prairie and plant habitats.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>This is already in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of native plants, shrubs and trees that must be used in city landscaping ordinances and encourage the use of milkweed where appropriate.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Plantings are not regulated to this degree but staff can provide resources to help developers, builders and landscapers make choices that are more beneficial to monarchs/pollinators.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct city property managers to consider the use of native milkweed and nectar plants at city properties where appropriate.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Public Works is collaborating with other departments to attain this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate monarch butterfly conservation into the city’s Park Master Plan, Sustainability Plan, Climate Resiliency Plan or other city plans.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Addressed in the Resource Management chapter of the city’s 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change landscape ordinances to support integrated pest management and reduced use of pesticides and insecticides.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(In the long term, the city could review and update the landscape ordinance with integrated pest management and chemical reduction in mind.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt pesticide practices that are not harmful to pollinators.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(This is generally the city’s practice, however we cannot ban pesticides outright and the city has no control over the practices of nurseries and seed growers.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution authorizing the City of Minnetonka to participate in the
Mayors’ Monarch Pledge

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 Monarch butterflies were once the most recognizable butterfly in North America, fluttering over farm fields, woodlands, and prairies from southern Ontario to northern Mexico and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. However, in just the past 20 years, the monarch population has declined by more than 80 percent; and

1.02 Protecting monarch butterflies helps to protect a wide range of other pollinators and species at other levels of the food web; and

1.03 Approximately 85 percent of all flowering plants on earth, including roughly one-third of the fruits and vegetables we eat, require the assistance of animal pollinators in order to produce fruit and seeds. Globally, all groups of pollinators are declining. This decline could have serious impacts on our food supply and the health of our planet; and

1.04 Local governments have the unique opportunity to help save the imperiled monarch butterfly and, by extension, other pollinators by restoring and enhancing habitat right where people live, work, learn, play and worship; and

1.05 The city has a long history of working to protect and restore native habitat in Minnetonka and of educating residents about pollinators and other species that form healthy ecosystems. Citywide collaboration, and connection with residents and other organizations, will continue to strengthen this effort.
Section 2. BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, that the city:

2.01 Authorizes the city of Minnetonka to participate in the National Wildlife Federation’s Mayors’ Monarch Pledge; and

2.02 Will promote the involvement of residents, businesses, schools, and faith-based organizations to undertake practices that positively affect pollinators; and

2.03 Will claim credit for implementing 21 of the 24 potential action steps and will work toward addressing the remaining three steps; and

2.04 Appoints the natural resources division of the public works department to serve as the Mayors’ Monarch Pledge coordinator for documentation and implementation of these action steps; and

2.05 Will post a summary of the city’s practices on the city of Minnetonka’s website.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

_______________________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

_______________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

___________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL
City Council Agenda Item #10E  
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description

Items concerning a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road (Lone Lake Park):

- Conditional use permits for recreational uses within: (1) required wetland buffer; and (2) floodplain;

- Wetland setback variance; and

- Floodplain alteration permit.

Recommendation

Adopt the resolution approving the requests.

Background

In 2007, the city approved construction of an Applewood Pointe senior cooperative building on the property at 5709 Rowland Road. The approval included construction of a trail partially on the private, residential property and partially within Lone Lake Park immediately to the east. In the short term, the trail was intended to provide access from the existing Rowland Road sidewalk and residential building to a wooded knoll in the park. The written report associated with the proposal noted that, in the long term, the city envisioned a link between this knoll and existing trails within Lone Lake Park. The Applewood Pointe project, and therefore the trail, was not constructed in this location.

In 2015, the city approved construction of The Chase at Nine Mile Creek apartment building (At Home Apartments) on the Rowland Road property. Again, a trail connection between the public sidewalk, private residential building, and Lone Lake Park was contemplated. However, the specific location, feasibility, and costs had not been determined at that time but envisioned the park dedication ($530,000) to be reimbursed to the developer (up to $400,000) for the construction of the connection.

Proposal

A detailed construction plan has now been developed for a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge connection from Rowland Road and The Chase to existing trails within Lone Lake Park. As proposed, a crushed gravel trail would be extended north and east from the existing public sidewalk and apartment building. The trail would extend eastward along the southern portion of an existing wooded knoll within the park. The trail would then connect to a proposed boardwalk crossing of an existing wetland and floodplain area. After crossing the wetland, the trail would meander northward and connect to a proposed pedestrian bridge over Nine Mile Creek. Finally, the trail would connect to
existing trails in Lone Lake Park. The new trail/boardwalk/bridge would add roughly 0.25 miles of pathway to the park’s existing 1.6 miles.

The plan as presented represents a public/private collaboration. Over the last year, public works, natural resources, and planning staff have spent many hours walking the area with representatives of Rowland Investments, the owners of The Chase, to determine an appropriate alignment for the trail/boardwalk/bridge.

**Planning Commission Hearing**

The planning commission considered the proposal on May 18, 2017. The commission report and associated plans are attached. Staff recommended approval of the proposed trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge. At the meeting, a public hearing was opened to take comment. Two area residents addressed the commission. One resident expressed support for the proposal and asked some general questions regarding park/trail planning. (Planning staff spoke with and emailed the resident following the meeting with answers and information.) The second resident spoke in opposition to the proposal, indicating that the existing sidewalk on Bren Road and an existing “link” to the park - further to the east was sufficient.

**Planning Commission Recommendation**

On a 6-0 vote, the commission recommended the city council approve the proposal.

**Since Planning Commission Hearing**

There have been no changes to the proposal or recommendations since the planning commission hearing.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the city council adopt the resolution approving conditional use permits, wetland setback variance, and floodplain alteration permit for a trail, boardwalk and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road.

Through:  Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director  
Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner

Originator:  Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
May 18, 2017

Brief Description  
Items concerning a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road (Lone Lake Park):

- Conditional use permits for recreational uses within: (1) required wetland buffer; and (2) floodplain;
- Wetland setback variance; and
- Floodplain alteration permit.

Recommendation  
Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the requests.

Background  
In 2007, the city approved construction of an Applewood Pointe senior cooperative building on the property at 5709 Rowland Road. The approval included construction of a trail partially on the private, residential property and partially within Lone Lake Park immediately to the east. In the short term, the trail was intended to provide access from the existing Rowland Road sidewalk and residential building to a wooded knoll in the park. The written report associated with the proposal noted that, in the long term, the city envisioned a link between this knoll and existing trails within Lone Lake Park. The Applewood Pointe project, and therefore the trail, was not constructed.

In 2015, the city approved construction of The Chase at Nine Mile Creek apartment building on the Rowland Road property. Again, a trail connection between the public sidewalk, private residential building, and Lone Lake Park was contemplated. However, the specific location, feasibility, and costs had not been determined at that time.

Proposal  
A plan has now been developed for a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge connection from Rowland Road and The Chase to existing trails within Lone Lake Park. As proposed, a crushed gravel trail would be extended north and east from the existing public sidewalk and apartment building. The trail would extended eastward along the southern portion of an existing wooded knoll within the park. The trail would then connect to a proposed boardwalk crossing of an existing wetland and floodplain area. After crossing the wetland, the trail would meander northward and connect to a proposed pedestrian bridge over Nine
Mile Creek. Finally, the trail would connect to existing trails in Lone Lake Park. The new trail/boardwalk/bridge would add roughly 0.25 miles of pathway to the park’s existing 1.6 miles.

The plan as presented represents a public/private collaboration. Over the last year, public works, natural resources, and planning staff have spent many hours walking the area with representatives of Rowland Investments, the owners of The Chase, to determine an appropriate alignment for the trail/boardwalk/bridge. The proposed alignment requires:

- **Conditional Use Permits.**

  By city code, recreational uses – including trails – and bridge footings larger than two feet in diameter are conditionally-permitted within required wetland buffers.

  By city code, uses impacting more than 1,000 square feet or 20 cubic yard of floodplain area are conditionally-permitted.

- **Wetland Setback Variance.** By city code, though trails are conditionally-permitted within wetland buffers, they must also maintain a 20-foot setback from wetland edges. Some small areas of the proposed trail – on the south side of the wooded knoll, where it connects to proposed boardwalk, and on the peninsulas north and south of the proposed bridge – would be located less than 20 feet from the wetland edge and would technically require a setback variance. Similarly, abutments supporting the bridge would be located less than 20 feet from wetland edge.

- **Floodplain Alteration Permit.** Though the final design of the proposed bridge has not been established, staff anticipates that its abutments would likely result in some amount of floodplain alteration.

**Primary Questions and Analysis**

The following outlines the primary land use questions associated with the proposed trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge.

1. **Are the proposed trail, boardwalk, and bridge appropriate?**

   Yes. The trail, boardwalk, and bridge are appropriate for several reasons, including:

   - Pedestrian trails are reasonable uses of both private and public spaces and would be similar to existing uses in several city parks.

   - The proposal was conceptually considered and approved in both 2007 and 2015.
• The proposal would afford members of the public greater access to natural areas of Lone Lake Park.

2. Are the anticipated impacts acceptable?

Yes. While some tree removal – 12 significant trees and 2 high-priority trees in marginal health – would occur to accommodate the pathway, the alignment was specifically established to minimize impact to trees and other natural resources. The proposed trail, boardwalk, and bridge are intended to increase enjoyment of the community’s natural resources.

Staff Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving conditional use permits, wetland setback variance, and floodplain alteration permit for a trail, boardwalk and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road.

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
Supporting Information

### Surrounding Land Uses

- **Northerly:** Lone Lake Park
- **Easterly:** Lone Lake Park
- **Southerly:** Rowland Road
- **Westerly:** Multi-family residential

### Planning

- **Existing Zoning:** PUD and R-1
- **Guide Plan designation:** High-Density Residential and Parks

### Park Dedication Fees

Park dedication is frequently required during development. By city code, the city may determine whether to receive this dedication in the form of cash or land dedication, or may credit work that creates a public benefit. In several recent approvals the city has used a combination of these options. For instance, developers have agreed to install and maintain trails or other public facilities; the costs associated with such are essentially deducted from the otherwise required cash.

Rowland Investments (also known as At Home Apartments), the developer of The Chase at Nine Mile Creek, submitted required park dedication fees in 2015. Staff has indicated to the developer that some, but not all, of these fees would be refunded based on actual trail/boardwalk/bridge construction costs.

### Materials

As currently planned, the proposed trail would be constructed of crushed gravel. Staff chose this material for three primary reasons: (1) the majority of the proposed alignment is relatively flat; (2) the trail would connect with an existing crushed gravel trail in Lone Lake Park; and (3) the trail would not be maintained during the winter months. However, to avoid erosion issues, staff would again evaluate the alignment during the course of construction to determine if any small stretches should be paved due to their grade and, therefore, potential for erosion.

As planned, the boardwalk and bridge would be constructed with treated lumber materials, including the decking, and be of similar design to those in Jidana, Minnehaha Creek Headwaters, and Minnetonka Mills parks.

### Construction

If approved, tree and brush removal would occur sometime after July 10, which is considered the end of oak wilt season. Boardwalk and bridge placement would occur during with winter months.
The city would contract and supervise the tree/brush removal. Rowland Investments, would construct the trail, boardwalk, and bridge. As a condition of approval, appropriate legal agreements would be required between Rowland Investments and the city.

**CUP Standards:**

**Trails**

The proposed trail would meet the conditional use permit standards for work within the wetland district as outlined in City Code §300.26.

1. The use is consistent with the intent of this ordinance;

   *Finding:* The intent of ordinance requirements as they pertain to the wetland district is to protect the community’s natural water resources while allowing for reasonable development. The proposed trail would not have significant, adverse impact on wetland areas. Rather, it is intended to increase enjoyment of these natural resources.

2. The use is consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the comprehensive plan;

   *Finding:* The proposed trail would be consistent with the comprehensive plan. Lone Lake Park is classified as a Community Park in the 2030 Plan. Per the plan, such parks are intended to provide a combination of passive and active recreational activities for the entire community.

3. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed improvements;

   *Finding:* The proposed trail would not adversely impact public facilities, utilities, or services.

4. The use is consistent with the city's water resources management plan;

   *Finding:* The proposed trail has been reviewed by the city’s water resources engineer and found to be consistent with the water resources management plan.

5. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare;
**Finding:** The proposed trail would not adversely impact public health, safety, or welfare. Rather, the pathway is intended to increase enjoyment of the community’s natural resources.

6. Water bodies receiving runoff entering wetlands, floodplain or shoreland areas shall not be adversely impacted by the water quality of runoff;

**Finding:** The proposed trail would add a negligible amount of impervious surface to the area surrounding the creek. As such, staff does not anticipate any adverse impact to the water quality of runoff.

7. No structure or fill may be placed which adversely affects the minimum required water storage capacity as defined in the water resources management plan of a property;

**Finding:** The proposed trail would not impact water storage capacity.

8. No structure subject to periodic inundation shall be designed for human habitation or shall the structure be serviced with public utilities;

**Finding:** No habitable structures are proposed.

9. Structures shall have a low flood damage potential and shall be firmly anchored;

**Finding:** The trail has low flood damage potential.

10. Service facilities, such as electrical and heating equipment, must be located a minimum of two feet above the flood elevation defined in the water resources management plan;

**Finding:** No service facilities are proposed.

11. There shall be no storage of materials which are flammable, explosive or otherwise dangerous to human, animal or plant life;

**Finding:** No storage of materials is proposed.

12. There shall be only minimal interference with wetland vegetation; and
Finding: No interference with wetland vegetation is proposed.

13. Required approvals shall be secured from all appropriate jurisdictions, including the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, governing watershed district. Any conditions imposed upon such approvals shall be met.

Finding: The improvements must be approved by the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District. City staff has already been in contact with the district regarding the project. No other agency approval is required.

Variance Standard: The proposed trail would meet the variances standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. Purpose and Intent of the Ordinance. The intent of the wetland setback requirement is twofold, to protect the functionality and the aesthetic of wetland areas. The proposed trail would meet this intent. Given the size of the wetland complex, the areas of variance would be just small point intrusions that would not have any significant negative impact on the functionality or aesthetic of the adjacent wetlands.

2. Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Lone Lake Park is guided for park use. The requested variance would not impact this intended land use.

3. Practical Difficulties. There are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance:

   a) Reasonableness: The requested setback variance is reasonable given the size of the surrounding wetland complex, representing a point intrusion that would not have any significant negative impact on the functionality or aesthetic of the wetland complex.

   b) Character of Locality. The areas of setback variance are internal to the park, in areas not currently easily accessible to the public. The setback variance would not impact the aesthetics or character of this area.

   c) Unique Circumstance. There are unique circumstances influencing the location of the proposed trails and, therefore, the proposed setbacks.

      1) The required wetland setback could be met on the
wooded knoll. However, relocating the trail further to the north would likely result in additional grading and tree impacts.

2) The required wetland setback could not be met on peninsula areas nor at the small portions of the trail where it connects to proposed boardwalks.

**Floodplain Standard:** Any floodplain alteration for bridge abutments would meet the outlined in City Code §300.24 Subd. 9:

1. The magnitude of the alteration is appropriate relative to the size of the floodplain district.

   **Finding:** The alteration area would be relatively small given the large floodplain area within the creek corridor.

2. The amount of any increase in buildable area is appropriate in comparison to the amount of buildable area before alteration.

   **Finding:** The alteration would not increase buildable area of any property.

3. The alteration will not negatively impact the hydrology of the floodplain.

   **Finding:** The alteration would not negatively impact the hydrology of the floodplain, given the small area of fill relative to the larger area.

4. Floodplain mitigation areas will not negatively impact adjacent properties.

   **Finding:** As a condition of approval, the floodplain mitigation area would not negatively impact adjacent properties.

5. The alteration will meet the intent of the city's water resources management plan and the subdivision and zoning ordinances;

   **Finding:** The alteration would meet the intent of the city's water resources management plan and the zoning ordinances.

6. The alteration will not adversely impact governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed public
improvements; and

**Finding:** This standard is met.

7. The alteration will not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

**Finding:** This standard is met.

**Neighborhood Comments**
The city has sent notice to 338 area property owners and has received no written comments to date.

**Pyramid of Discretion**

**Motion Options**
The planning commission has three options:

1. Concur with the staff recommendation. In this case a motion should be made recommending the city council adopt the resolution approving request.

2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council deny the requests. This motion must include a statement as to why denial is recommended.

3. Table the request. In this case, a motion should be made to table the items. The motion should include a statement as to why the requests are being tabled with direction to staff, the applicant, or both.

**Voting Requirement**
The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council. A recommendation for approval of the requests requires an affirmative majority vote. The city council’s final approval requires an affirmative vote of five members.
Location Map

Project: Lone Lake Trail
Address: 5624 Shady Oak Rd

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
Directions of Descriptions

1. The boundary lines shown hereon are for reference only. They were obtained as best as possible through the use of the Surveying Equipment and Surveying Techniques that were available to the Surveyor. The Surveyor did not have access to any other marking in the field such as Trees, Fence Lines, Water Rights, Access Keys, and other Field Markings that could provide an additional reference for the Surveyor to determine the true Line of the Property. The Surveyor did not have access to the deed records of the property or the surrounding properties. The Surveyor did not have access to the original Surveyors’ Notes or any other information that could provide the true Line of the Property. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

2. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

3. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

4. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

5. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

6. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

7. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

8. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

9. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

10. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

11. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

12. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

13. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

14. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

15. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

16. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

17. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

18. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

19. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

20. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

21. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

22. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

23. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

24. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

25. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

26. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

27. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

28. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

29. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

30. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

31. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

32. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

33. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.
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37. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

38. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

39. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

40. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

41. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

42. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.

43. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.
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54. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.
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60. The Surveyor used the best information available to him and determined the best Line of the Property that was consistent with the best information available to him.
GENERAL NOTES

1. DESIGN STRESSES ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH "STANDARD SPECIFICATION FOR HIGHWAY BRIDGES" A "GUIDE SPECIFICATION FOR DESIGN OF PEDESTRIAN BRIDGES" BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (AASHO) 2020 EDITION.

2. BRIDGE MEMBERS ARE FABRICATED FROM HIGH STRENGTH, LOW ALLOY, ENHANCED ATMOSPHERE CORROSION RESISTANT ASTM A441 COLDFORMED WELDED SQUARE AND RECTANGULAR TUBES, AND ASTM A516, ASTM A7, OR ASTM A572 GRADE 50 PLATE AND STRUCTURAL SHAPE [F = 50,000 PSI] OR 3.3 x 10 SOUTHERN YELLOW PINE [F = 120,000 PSI]. ALUMINUM COPPER QUARTERNARY (ACQ) TREATED TO A 0.6% PENTETRATION OR TO REFUSAL, OR AZALE B3C04E [MC] TO A 0.6% PENTETRATION OR TO REFUSAL.

3. BRIDGE DECKING IS 19 X 12 SELECT STRUCTURAL W14 X 100 P10 X 100/12.T. FEET X 1/2 INCH. ALUMINUM COPPER QUARTERNARY (ACQ) TREATED TO A 0.6% PENTETRATION OR TO REFUSAL, OR AZALE B3C04E [MC] TO A 0.6% PENTETRATION OR TO REFUSAL.

4. THE GAS METAL ARC WELDING PROCESS OR FUX CORE ARC WELDING PROCESS WILL BE USED. WELDING TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AWS D1.1.

5. ALL TOP AND BOTTOM CHORD SHAPES SHALL BE COMPLETE PIERCERMA CAM (OR CO) WITH THE EFFECTIVE "THROAT" OF A PIERCAM (OR CO) ADJUSTED TO THE THICKNESS OF THE LIGHTEST GAUGE MEMBER IN THE CONNECTION. WELDS SHALL BE APPLIED AS FOLLOWS:

   a) BOTH ENDS OF VERTICALE, DIAGONALS, AND FLOOR BEAMS SHALL BE WELDED ALL AROUND.
   b) BRACES DIAGONALS WILL BE WELDED ALL AROUND.
   c) MISCELLANEOUS NONSTRUCTURAL MEMBERS WILL BE STITCH WELDED TO THEIR SUPPORTING MEMBERS.

6. BRIDGE DESIGN IS ONLY BASED ON COMBINATIONS OF THE FOLLOWING LOADS WHICH WILL PRODUCE MAXIMUM CRITICAL MEMBER STRESSES.

   a) TOTAL LOAD - LOAD ONG THE FULL DECK AREA OR ONE 10,000 LB VEHICLE LOAD, THE LOAD SHALL BE DISTRIBUTED AS A FOUR-WHEEL VEHICLE WITH 50% OF THE LOAD ON THE FRONT WHEELS, THE WHEEL TRACK WIDTH OF THE VEHICLE SHALL BE 6' 0" AND THE WHEEL BASE SHALL BE 15' 0". THE VEHICLE SHALL BE POSTIONED SO AS TO PRODUCE THE MAXIMUM STRESSES IN EACH MEMBER, INCLUDING DECKING.

   b) 30 PSI WIND LOAD ON THE FULL HEIGHT OF THE BRIDGE, AS ENCLODED. C.20 PSI WIND LOAD APPLIED TO THE WINDWARD QUARTER POINT OF THE TRANSVERSE BRIDGE WIDTH (ASSIGNED TO 1/4). 1/4.

7. CLEANING: ALL EXPOSED SURFACES OF STEEL SHALL BE CLEANED IN ACCORDANCE WITH STEEL STRUCTURES PUBLISHING COUNCIL SURFACES PREPARATION SPECIFICATION NO. 1 BRUSH-OFF BLAST CLEANING, SSPE-8/FLATTEST EDITION.

8. MINIMUM MATERIAL THICKNESS OF 1/16" ON ALL STRUCTURAL MEMBERS.
Resolution No. 2017-

Conditional use permits, wetland setback variance, and floodplain alteration permit for a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The city of Minnetonka and Rowland Investments, LLC. are proposing to construct a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge connection from existing public sidewalks on Rowland Road and The Chase at Nine Mile Creek apartment building to existing trails within Lone Lake Park.

1.02 The properties on which the trail/boardwalk/bridge would be constructed are located at 5609 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road. They are legally described on Exhibit A of this resolution.

1.03 Portions of the proposed trail would be located within the required wetland buffer and floodplain areas. By City Code §300.23 Subd.7, public recreational uses, such as trails, are conditionally-permitted in wetland buffers. By City Code § 300.24 Subd.5, uses generally permitted in floodplain areas – such as the proposed bridge – require a conditional use permit if involving excavation or fill of greater than 1,000 square feet or 20 cubic yards of floodplain.

1.04 Portions of the proposed trail would be located less than 20 feet from the delineated wetland edge. City Code 300.23 Subd.8(b)(2) requires that trails be located at least 20 feet from the wetland district and outside of any required buffer. Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 6, and City Code §300.07 authorizes the city to grant variances.

1.05 Portions of the proposed bridge abutments would require a floodplain alteration permit and conditional use permit under City Code §300.24.
1.06 On May 18, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge. The commission considered all of the comments and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended that the city council approve the proposal.

Section 2. STANDARDS.

2.01 City Code §300.26 outlines the following standards that must be met for granting of conditional permits within the wetland and floodplain zoning districts. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

2.02 By City Code §300.07 Subd. 1, a variance may be granted from the requirements of the zoning ordinance when: (1) the variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this ordinance; (2) when the variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and (3) when the applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance. Practical difficulties means: (1) the proposed use is reasonable; (2) the need for a variance is caused by circumstances unique to the property, not created by the property owner, and not solely based on economic considerations; and (3) the proposed use would not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.

2.03 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9(c), states that in reviewing floodplain alteration permits, the city will consider whether certain general standards are met. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

2.04 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9(d), states that an alteration permit will not be granted unless certain specific standards are met. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

Section 3. FINDINGS.

3.01 The proposed trial would meet all minimum conditional use permit standards for uses within the wetland buffer and floodplain as outlined in City Code §300.26.

1. The intent of ordinance requirements as they pertain to the wetland district is to protect the community’s natural water resources while allowing for reasonable development. The proposed trail would not have significant, adverse impact on wetland or floodplain areas. Rather, it is intended to increase enjoyment of these natural resources.
2. The proposed trail would be consistent with the comprehensive plan. Lone Lake Park is classified as a Community Park in the 2030 Plan. Per the plan, such parks are intended to provide a combination of passive and active recreational activities for the entire community.

3. The proposed trail would not adversely impact public facilities, utilities, or services.

4. The proposed trail has been reviewed by the city’s water resources engineer and found to be consistent with the water resources management plan.

5. The proposed trail would not adversely impact public health, safety, or welfare. Rather, the pathway is intended to increase enjoyment of the community’s natural resources.

6. The proposed trail would add a negligible amount of impervious surface to the area surrounding the creek. As such, staff does not anticipate any adverse impact to the water quality of runoff.

7. The proposed trail would not impact water storage capacity.

8. No habitable structures are proposed.

9. The trail would have low flood damage potential.

10. No service facilities are proposed.

11. No storage of materials is proposed.

12. No significant interference with wetland vegetation is proposed.

13. As a condition of this resolution, the trail must be approved by the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District.

3.02 The proposed trail would meet the variance standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. Purpose and Intent of the Ordinance. The intent of the wetland setback requirement is twofold, to protect the functionality and the aesthetic of wetland areas. The proposed trail would meet this intent. Given the size of the wetland complex, the areas of variance would be just small point intrusions that would not have any significant
negative impact on the functionality or aesthetic of the adjacent wetlands.

2. Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Lone Lake Park is guided for park use. The requested variance would not impact this intended land use.

3. Practical Difficulties. There are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance:

   a) Reasonableness: The requested setback variance is reasonable given the size of the surrounding wetland complex, representing a point intrusion that would not have any significant negative impact on the functionality or aesthetic of the wetland complex.

   b) Character of Locality. The areas of setback variance are internal to the park, in areas not currently easily accessible to the public. The setback variance would not impact the aesthetics or character of this area.

   c) Unique Circumstance. There are unique circumstances influencing the location of the proposed trails and, therefore, the proposed setbacks.

      1) The required wetland setback could be met on the wooded knoll. However, relocating the trail further to the north would likely result in additional grading and tree impacts.

      2) The required wetland setback could not be met on peninsula areas nor at the small portions of the trail where it connects to proposed boardwalks.

3.03 Any bridge abutments would meet the floodplain alteration standards as outlined in City Code §300.24 Subd. 9:

   1. The alteration area would be relatively small given the large floodplain area within the creek corridor.

   2. The alteration would not increase buildable area of any property.

   3. The alteration would not negatively impact the hydrology of the floodplain, given the small area of fill relative to the larger area.
4. The floodplain mitigation area would not negatively impact adjacent properties.

5. The alteration would meet the intent of the city's water resources management plan and the zoning ordinances.

6. The alteration would not adversely impact governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed public improvements; and

7. The alteration would not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The above-described conditional use permit, wetland setback variance, and floodplain alteration permit is approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the trail/boardwalk/bridge must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified below.
   - Topographic and Tree Inventory Survey dated March 8, 2017
   - Boardwalk specification dated November 2005
   - Bridge specification dated September 19, 2014. Final design must minimize impacts to the shore impact zone.

2. Prior to any site work on the private or public property:
   a) A pre-construction meeting between city staff, Rowland Investments, and pertinent contractors must be conducted.
   b) A public trail easement over the portion of the trail on 5709 Rowland Road must be submitted for review and approval of the city attorney. The easement must then be filed at the County.
   c) Rowland Investments, LLC, and the city of Minnetonka must enter into a legal agreement outlining tree removal, construction activities, cost reimbursement, and on-going maintenance of the trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge.
   d) Appropriate permits must be obtained from the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District.
e) Tree and wetland protection fencing and any other erosion control measures as required by natural resources staff must be installed and inspected. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

3. Existing wetland buffer areas must be maintained.

4. Compensatory water storage must be provided in an amount at least equal to that filled. The creation of this storage area must not result in removal of regulated trees, adversely impact wetlands or existing wetland buffers.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

_______________________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

_________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent: Allendorf
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

__________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
SEAL
EXHIBIT A

Parcel 1:

All that part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 35, Township 117, Range 22 lying south of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway right-of-way and lying northerly of Rowland Road as established in Document No. 3806560, according to the United State Government Survey thereof and situated in Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Parcel 2:

That part of the Chicago, Milwaukee and Pacific Railroad right-of-way in the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 35, Township 117, Range 22, Hennepin County, Minnesota, which lies southeasterly of a line parallel with and distant 75.00 feet southeasterly from the centerline of said railroad right-of-way and which lies northeasterly of the northeasterly right-of-way of Rowland Road, on file and of record in the Office of the Hennepin County Recorder.
City Council Agenda Item #10F
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description
Resolution approving setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Point Road

Recommendation
Adopt the resolution approving the various requests

Background
The applicant, Grant Dattilo, is proposing changes to the existing home and property on McKenzie Point Road. The structural changes to the home are primarily aesthetic, including a slightly wider roof overhang, small second story bump out, and slight deck expansion. Changes to the site include removal of existing impervious surfaces and minor earthwork within the 100-year floodplain. Though the proposed construction and site changes are relatively minor, given the non-conformities of the existing lot and home, several approvals are required: side yard setback variance, expansion permit, shoreland setback variance, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit.

Planning Commission Hearing
The planning commission considered the proposal on May 18, 2017. Just prior to the planning commission meeting the applicant requested to split the request into two separate approvals, those related to the street side (west) and those related to the lakeside (east). The request was based on the fact that the planning commission has final authority on the street side items (roof overhang and second story bump-out), but not the lake side items (deck expansion and landscaping). Splitting the requests allowed the applicant an earlier construction start for the street side of the project, while waiting for the city council’s decision on the lakeside portion.

The staff report from the commission meeting and various plans and documents describing the proposal are attached. Staff recommended approval of both the street and lakeside requests, noting:

1) That there is a unique circumstance with the property. The subject property is substandard in size and is encumbered by various setback requirements.

2) The requests would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is largely defined by having structures with non-conforming setbacks due to variances granted by the city or construction predating city ordinance.

3) Approving these requests would result in the removal of impervious surfaces, enhance the protection of natural resources, and increase floodplain storage on the site.
At the commission meeting, a public hearing was opened to take comment. An adjacent resident spoke during this time and stated concerns regarding drainage and fire hazards since the subject home and adjacent home were so close. However, he mentioned that some of these concerns were eased after speaking with staff and the applicant.

**Planning Commission Recommendation**

On a 6-0 vote, the commission approved the street side requests – an expansion permit and variance for the roof overhang and second story bump-out – and recommended approval of the lakeside requests – setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for a deck expansion and landscaping. Meeting minutes are attached.

**Since Planning Commission Hearing**

There have been no changes to the proposal or additional information received since the planning commission’s meeting.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the city council adopt the resolution approving setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for a deck expansion and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Pointe Road.

Through:  Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
          Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director  
          Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner

Originator:  Drew Ingvalson, Planner
## MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
May 18, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Items concerning additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Point Road:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Expansion Permit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Setback Variances;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Floodplain alteration permit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Conditional use permit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the requests.

### Proposal

The applicant, Grant Dattilo, is proposing to:

- Construct a 3.7-foot roof overhang;
- Construct a 1.3-foot, 2nd story bump out;
- Add a 2-foot deck expansion; and
- Remove impervious surfaces and retaining walls, add a small retaining wall, and conduct minor earthwork within the 100-year floodplain.

Please see attached documents for illustrations.

#### Proposal requirements:

This proposal requires:

- **Expansion Permit**: Expansion of principal structure within required side yard setbacks. The proposed roof overhang and second story bump out would maintain existing, non-conforming setback from the south property line.

- **Variance**: Principal structure and deck encroaching further into the required shoreland, floodplain, side yard setbacks. The roof overhang would encroach further into the north side yard setback and the proposed deck expansion would encroach further into required shoreland and floodplain setbacks.
• Floodplain Alteration Permit: The entire rear yard of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain. The proposed deck construction, removal of the impervious surface, and earthwork within this area is considered an “alteration” and would require a floodplain alteration permit.

• Conditional Use Permit: A conditional use permit is required for any structure constructed in the 100-year floodplain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North setback (side yard)</td>
<td>7 ft.</td>
<td>7 ft.</td>
<td>3 ft.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South setback (side yard)</td>
<td>7 ft.</td>
<td>2.5 ft.</td>
<td>4.5 ft. **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreland Setback</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
<td>17 ft.</td>
<td>15 ft.***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year storm setback</td>
<td>2 ft.</td>
<td>1 ft.</td>
<td>1 ft.***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vertical)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year storm setback</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft.***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(horizontal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* requires setback variance
** requires expansion permit
*** requires setback variance and CUP

Note: Floodplain Alteration Permit required for any earthwork completed in floodplain

Approving Body
The planning commission makes a recommendation to the city council, which has final authority to approve or deny the request. (City Code §300.06.4)

Site Features
The subject property is located on the south side of Lake Minnetonka, directly west of the Gray's Bay Causeway. The lot was created in 1914 as part of the T.R. McKENZIE’S GROVELAND PARK subdivision. The existing lot is approximately 4,600 square feet in area.

The property is improved with a 3,454 square foot, two-story home with a tuck under garage. The home was originally constructed in 1939 and reconstructed in 1990. The property has multiple non-conforming setbacks. (See attached).

A large portion of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain itself and the entire property is within the required 100-year floodplain setback. Given this, the property contains no buildable area.
The property currently exceeds the 30 percent impervious surface allowed within 150 feet of the lake. The house alone (not including the deck) covers about 32 percent of the surface of the lot. Thus, it would not be possible to meet the 30 percent required without removing part of the existing home.

**Staff Analysis**

Staff supports the applicant’s proposal and the associated requests.

**Expansion Permit.** The proposed expansion permit would meet the standards outlined in city code:

- **REASONABLENESS:** The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setbacks requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The requested permit meets this intent. The majority of homes within the subject neighborhood have non-conforming setbacks similar to the applicant's proposal. Additionally, the expansion permit would not result in the bump out and roof overhang additions being located any closer to the south side property line.

- **UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE:** The subject property is substandard in size and encumbered by various setback requirements and 100-year floodplain setbacks. Any construction on the property would require an expansion permit or variance.

- **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:** The immediate area contains several homes that do not meet required setbacks, due to variances or being constructed prior to the adoption of city ordinance. In addition, the second story bump out and roof overhang would not encroach further into the required side yard setback than the existing home. As such, the requested expansion permit would not negatively impact the area or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

**Variances.** The proposed variances (side yard, shoreland, and floodplain) would meet the variance standards outlined in city code:

- **INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE:** The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setbacks requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The intent of the shoreland and
floodplain setback ordinances is to preserve, protect, and enhance the environmental, recreational and hydrological resources and functions of the city’s water systems. The floodplain ordinance intent is also in place to minimize the loss of life and property damage due to flooding.

1. The variances would not result in the existing home being located any closer to property lines, but would extend the overhang further into the required side yard setbacks and would extend the deck into the shoreland and floodplain setbacks;

2. The overhang variances would not negatively impact existing building separations; and

3. The existing deck does not allow the passage of water through it and, thus, is considered an impervious surface. The applicant has proposed using slotted decking that would allow the passage of water and has proposed further impervious surface reduction through removal of a pavers areas and retaining walls. These changes will increase water retention on site and enhance the environmental protection of natural resources.

• COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The proposed variances are consistent with the comprehensive plan. The property is guided for low-density residential uses. The guiding principles in the comprehensive plan provide for maintaining, preserving and enhancing existing single-family neighborhoods. The variances would not negatively impact the residential character of the neighborhood and would provide investment in the property to enhance its use.

• REASONABLENESS: The request for a roof overhang, bump out, and deck extension are reasonable requests for a single-family property. The overhang and bump out will not negatively impact the neighborhood and the proposed deck, with the proposed landscaping, will enhance natural resource protection.

• UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The subject property is substandard in size and encumbered by various setback requirements and 100-year floodplain.
1. The subject property is less than 50 feet wide at its widest point, which is less than half the required width (110 feet), and is less than 5,000 square feet in area (22,000 square is required); and

2. The entire property is encumbered by the 100-foot floodplain setback. Any construction on the property would require expansion permits or variances.

- NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER: The requested variances would not negatively impact the character of the existing neighborhood. Rather:

  1. The majority of the homes within 400 feet of the subject property have received variances or special approvals for home construction or additions.

  2. The variances would allow for investment into a property through the construction of new additions; and

  3. The variances would have no negative impact on adjacent properties.

**Conditional Use Permit.** The requested conditional use permit is reasonable for four reasons:

- The requested conditional use permit would result in the removal of an existing impervious deck from the floodplain, construction of a new, pervious deck, and small additions (roof overhang and bump out). The construction of the proposed deck would increase floodplain storage on the property and the small additions would have no impact on floodplain storage as they currently cover existing impervious surfaces.

- The requested conditional use permit would not result in adverse impacts to the floodplain. Rather, the new deck would create floodplain storage on the site.

- As the entire rear yard of the subject property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a conditional use permit would be required for any new construction in this area.

- The proposal would meet the conditional use permit standard for construction within floodplain. The specific
standards are outlined in the “Supporting Information” section of this report.

**Floodplain Alteration Permit.** The requested floodplain alteration permit is reasonable for four reasons:

- The proposal would not result in any net fill of floodplain. Rather, through the slats in the new deck and removal of impervious surface, the proposal would actually increase floodplain storage on the property.
- The floodplain alteration would not result in removal or loss of any protected trees.
- As the entirety of the rear yard of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a floodplain alteration permit would be required for any new construction in the area.
- The proposal would meet the general and specific floodplain alteration permit standards. These standards are outlined in the “Supporting Information” section of this report.

**Summary Comments**

Staff acknowledges that the applicant’s proposal requires multiple approvals. However, these approvals are generally based on significant non-conformities of the existing lot and home. The proposed construction and site changes are, in fact, relatively minor.

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city adopt the resolution approving an expansion permit, setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for a roof overhang, bump out, deck expansion, and landscaping.

Originator: Drew Ingvalson, Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
### Supporting Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project No.</strong></th>
<th>17009.17a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property</strong></td>
<td>2807 McKenzie Point Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Grant Dattilo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Surrounding Land Uses** | North and South: R-1, Single-Family Homes  
East: Lake Minnetonka  
West: Single-Family Homes (City of Woodland) |
| **Planning**    | Guide Plan designation: low density residential  
Zoning: R-1 |
| **History**     | In 1987, the city approved variances to reduce the south side yard setback from 7 ft. to 3 ft. for second story addition and attached garage.  
In 1988, the city approved multiple variances for the construction of a new home. The variances were to:  
- Reduce lot width at setback from 90 ft. to 29 ft.;  
- Reduce south side yard setback from 7 ft. to 2.3 ft.;  
- Reduce north side yard setback from 7 ft. to 3 ft.; and  
- Reduce lowest floor elevation from 2 ft. above ordinary high water mark to elevation of existing foundation. |
| **Natural Resources** | The small bump out and roof extension proposed would not increase the impervious on the site as they are located over existing impervious areas. Furthermore, the proposed plan would reduce existing impervious areas and increase stormwater retention, due to the following:  
- Conversion of the existing deck surface from a solid surface to slotted deck boards would allow water to infiltrate to the soil below.  
- Removal of existing paver areas adjacent to the shoreline as well as the small row of retaining wall block west of the pavers would enhance water infiltration. |
| **Variance and Non-conforming Lots** | The subject neighborhood has a long history of variances and non-conforming properties due to the early platting of the land. The subject neighborhood was platted in 1914 and several of the homes were constructed prior to the adoption of city ordinances or have been granted variances or special approvals for non-|
Subject: Dattilo, 2807 McKenzie Point Road

conformities. With the exception of two lots, all of the properties on McKenzie Point Road have non-conforming lot dimensions. Additionally, 10 of the 12 lots within 400 feet of the subject property have been granted a special approval (variance, expansion permit, floodplain alteration permit, etc.). (See attached.)

**Small lot**

By City Code §300.10 Subd.7, properties that are defined as qualifying small lots are allowed lesser setbacks from property lines than “typical” properties. To be defined as a small lot, a property must be less than 15,000 square feet; have been a lot of record prior to February 12, 1966; and must be located in an area in which the average size of residential lots is less than 15,000 square feet.

After staff review, the subject property does qualify as a small lot. The property is approximately 4,600 square feet in lot size, was platted in 1914, and the average lot size of the surrounding neighborhood is approximately 14,061 square feet.

This provision permits side yard setbacks to be 10 percent the width of the lot, but in no case less than seven feet. The subject lot is permitted seven-foot side yard setbacks.

**McMansion Policy**

The McMansion Policy is a tool the city can utilize to ensure new homes or additions requiring variances are consistent with the character of the existing homes within the neighborhood. By policy, the floor area ratio (FAR) of the subject property cannot be greater than the largest FAR of properties within 1,000 feet on the same street, and a distance of 400 feet from the subject property.

The subject property currently has the largest FAR of properties within 400 feet (0.80). However, the bump out addition would not increase the property’s FAR beyond its current amount, thus complying with the McMansion Policy. (See attached.)

**Expansion Permit**

An expansion permit for a non-conforming use may be granted, but is not mandated, when the applicant meets the burden of proving that:

1) The proposed expansion is a reasonable use of the property, considering such things as:

   a. functional and aesthetic justifications for the expansion;
   b. adequacy of off-street parking for the expansion;
c. absence of adverse off-site impacts from such things as traffic, noise, dust, odors, and parking; and
d. improvement to the appearance and stability of the property and neighborhood.

2) The circumstances justifying the expansion are unique to the property, are not caused by the landowner, are not solely for the landowner's convenience, and are not solely because of economic considerations; and

3) The expansion would not adversely affect or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

**Variance Standard**
A variance may be granted from the requirements of the zoning ordinance when: (1) it is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance; (2) it is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and (3) when an applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance. Practical difficulties mean that the applicant proposes to use a property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the ordinance, the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner, and, the variance if granted, would not alter the essential character of the locality. (City Code §300.07).

**Floodplain Alteration Permit Standards**
In reviewing alteration permits, the city will consider whether the following general standards are met:

1) The magnitude of the alteration is appropriate relative to the size of the floodplain district;

2) The amount of any increase in buildable area is appropriate in comparison to the amount of buildable area before alteration;

3) The alteration will not negatively impact the hydrology of the floodplain;

4) Floodplain mitigation areas will not negatively impact adjacent properties;

5) The alteration will meet the intent of the city's water resources management plan and the subdivision and zoning ordinances;

6) The alteration will not adversely impact governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed public
improvements; and

7) The alteration will not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

Notwithstanding the general standards, no alteration permit will be granted unless the following specific standards are met.

1) On all properties within the city:

a. Water storage must be maintained and provided in an amount at least equal to that filled unless acceptable hydrologic engineering data has been presented and approved by the city engineer indicating that conditions have changed such that the floodplain characteristics will be maintained even with proposed floodplain fill.

b. Floodplain fill area must be located no more than 20 feet from any existing or proposed structure, except where required by the city engineer to achieve a required evacuation route.

c. Where floodplain alteration is required for construction of a driveway, the driveway must be no wider than 12 feet and must be located to minimize impact to the floodplain.

d. Floodplain alteration, including the creation of compensatory water storage, must not result in removal of regulated trees, adversely impact wetlands or existing wetland buffers, or be located within public easements. The city council may waive this condition if the proposed alteration would improve existing site conditions.

e. If the alteration will change the boundary of the floodplain district, a zoning map amendment is also required under subdivision 10 below. (City Code §300.24(9))
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and the United States Federal Emergency Management Agency and Army Corps of Engineers. (City Code §300.26(4))

**Natural Resources**

Best management practices must be followed during the course of site preparation and construction activities. This would include installation and maintenance of erosion control fencing.

**Pyramid of Discretion**

![Pyramid Diagram]

**Motion Options**

The planning commission has three options:

1. Concur with staff’s recommendation. In this case a motion should be made recommending the city council approve the requests.

2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case a motion should be made recommending the council deny the requests. This motion must include a statement as to why the denial is recommended.

3. Table the request. In this case a motion should be made to table the item. The motion should be made include a statement as to why the request is being tabled with direction to staff, the applicant or both.

**Neighborhood Comments**

The city sent notices to 19 area property owners and has received no comments.

**Voting Requirement**

The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council. A recommendation requires an affirmative vote of a
simple majority. The city council's final approval requires an affirmative vote of five members.

| Deadline for Decision | July 24, 2017 |
Location Map

Project: Dattilo Residence
Address: 2807 McKenzie Point Rd
Project No. 17009.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
I hereby certify that this survey, plan or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Registered Land Surveyor under the laws of the State of Minnesota.
Proposed Site Map

2807 McKenzie Point Road, Wayzata MN, 55391

**Key**
- House
- Driveway and Sidewalks
- Flagstone Style Walking Stone Pavers Large Space
- Tool Shed
- 8" Retaining Wall Blocks
- Hardcover Patio Block
- Large Tree
- Permeable Deck
- Permeable Deck Expansion
- Plants

NORTH

[Diagram of the proposed site map with key elements labeled]
Variance Request 2807 McKenzie Point Road, Wayzata
MN, 55391

Legal Description

PID: 08-117-22-33-002
Municipality: Minnetonka
Addition Name: T R MCKENZIES GROVELAND PARK
Lot: 003

Survey

See attached survey for the property.

Practical Difficulties Worksheet

Describe why the proposed use is reasonable.

With regards to the 2nd story bump out, expansion of the current west awning, and addition to the new north side awning. All of this is over current hardcover and will not increase that percentage. The bump out does not get any closer to the property line then the current house, and does not come out even as far as the current awning on the west side. The new awning would provide cover and protection to individuals walking to my front door, and does not create any problems for the neighboring property.

With regards to the 2’ expansion of the current deck on the east side. The deck expansion will not be visible to anyone on the lake since there is a flower planter that is currently there. The increase allows a more practical use for the deck with regards to furniture and functionality. By agreeing to take out the large amount of hardcover next to lake I am eliminating a lot of seating area for guests. This small expansion would help replace some of that.

Describe unique circumstance, why the need is not from the property owner, and why it is not solely based on economics.

With regards to the 2nd story bump out, expansion of the current west awning, and addition to the new north side awning. This lot when divided was made very narrow, and was done well before I owned it. I want to do this because it will provide better
cover and safety for people at my house. It will also make the house look better and make the neighborhood overall nicer.

With regards to the 2’ expansion of the current deck on the east side. This lot when divided was made very narrow, and was done well before I owned it. The house sits closer to the shoreline then most properties because of the year that it was built. The expansion allows furniture to fit better and allow extra seating.

**Describe why the variance would not alter the character of the neighborhood.**

With regards to the 2^nd^ story bump out, expansion of the current west awning, and addition to the new north side awning. In addition with regards to the 2’ expansion of the current deck on the east side. The majority of the neighborhood is made up of houses that do not follow the zoning and setback requirements. Both my neighbor to the north and to the south have received variances to place structures closer to the property line then I am requesting.

**Grading and Drainage Plan**

There will be no grading change done during the course of the variance. The above mentioned property is flat, and will stay that way. Where the block is being removed a permeable soil will be put in its place.

**Building Rendering**

See attached building rendering for the property.

**Floor Plan**

See attached Current and Proposed Site Map for the property. The footprint of the house does not increase.

**Written Statement**

With regards to the 2^nd^ story bump out, expansion of the current west awning, and addition to the new north side awning. I am requesting to change the current 24” awning on the west side of the house to 44”. In addition I want to continue the 44” awning to my front door creating a cover over the walkway on the north side. A gutter will run the entire length of the north side awning to prevent additional water from the
neighbor’s property. The 2nd Story bump out would come out from the house 16”
towards the west, and be 11’ wide by 10’ tall. The roof line would not be any taller, and
would match the current roof. The bump out would not get any closer to the property
line then the current house is. By being able to do the above-mentioned changes I will
update the look of the house, and make the neighborhood overall nicer.

With regards to the 2’ expansion of the current deck on the east side. This variance
would allow a great decrease of hardcover on the property especially in the first 50’ of
the shoreline. It would also take steps to preserve water quality and provide natural
plantings to make the property look more natural. An adjustment would be made to
the current retaining wall on the north. Currently the property is at 84% hardcover, the
proposed change would bring the hardcover down to 71%. If you take the first 50’ of
property from the lake, and approve this variance, there would be a decrease of 34%
hardcover in that area. If you take the first 50’ of property from the lake and remove
the house footprint, so all that you were left with was sidewalks, decks, and blocks.
There would be a 65% decrease of hardcover. By planting 12”along the seawall except
where you need to access the docks you would be preventing contaminants from
entering the water, the plants would absorb water instead of it entering the lake, and it
will give it a more natural look for those on the lake. Increasing the deck by 2’ would
not change the view for anyone looking at the property since currently there is a 4’
planter in front of it. That planter will be made 2’ smaller, and will not get any closer to
the water. Due to the fact that I currently have all of the additional hardcover for guests
to sit, and would be losing that, the deck expansion would allow me more seating.
ITEM 8A – 5013 Mayview Road

One of the applicant’s names was incorrectly noted in the report as “Sharron” rather than “Shannon.” The resolution is correct.

ITEM 8B – 2807 McKenzie Point Road

The applicant has requested to split their request into two separate approvals.

1. Approval for a street-side roof overhang and bump-out. This request requires planning commission approval, subject to appeal to city council, for a:
   • Side yard setback variance from 7 feet to 3 feet from the north property line; and
   • Expansion permit to maintain existing, non-conforming 4.5-foot setback from south property line.

2. Approval for a lakeside deck expansion and landscaping. This request requires city council approval for a:
   • Shoreland setback variance from 50 feet to 17 feet;
   • Floodplain vertical setback variance from 2 feet to 1-foot;
   • Floodplain horizontal setback variance from 20 feet to 0 feet;
   • Floodplain alteration permit for earthwork in floodplain; and
   • Conditional use permit for construction of additions to a non-conforming home.
The request is based on the fact that the planning commission has final authority on the bump-out and roof overhang, but not the deck expansion and landscaping. If the commission approves the bump-out and overhang, a building permit could be issued for this work.

This would allow the applicant an earlier construction start for this portion of their project, while waiting for the City Council’s decision on the deck expansion and landscaping proposal.

Amended resolutions are attached.
Planning Commission Resolution No 2017-12

Resolution approving an expansion permit and side yard setback variance for additions at 2807 McKenzie Pointe Road

Be it resolved by the Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The applicant, Grant Dattilo, is proposing the following:
   1. Construction of a 3.7-foot roof overhang; and
   2. Construction of a 1.3-foot, second story bump out;

1.02 The proposal requires the following:
   1. Expansion permit to maintain existing, non-conforming 4.5-foot setback from south property line.
   2. Side yard setback variance from 7 feet to 3 feet from north property line.

1.03 The subject property is located at 2807 McKenzie Point Road.

1.04 The property is legally described as follows:

Lot 3, T. R. MCKENZIE’S GROVELAND PARK, HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA

1.05 City Code §300.29 Subd. 3(g) allows expansion of a nonconformity only by variance or expansion permit.

1.06 City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c) authorizes the city to grant expansion permits.

1.07 Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 6, and City Code §300.07 authorizes the city to grant variances.
Section 2. STANDARDS

2.01 Setback Requirements:

1. City Code §300.10 Subd. 5 outlines minimum setback requirements from property lines. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2. City Code §300.10 Subd. 7 outlines setback exemptions for qualifying small lots. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2.02 City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c) outlines the expansion permit standards. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

2.03 By City Code §300.07 Subd. 1, a variance may be granted from the requirements of the zoning ordinance when: (1) the variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this ordinance; (2) when the variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and (3) when the applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance.

Section 3. FINDINGS

3.01 The proposal meets the ordinance standards outlined in the preceding section of this resolution.

1. The proposal meets the expansion permit standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 7(c):

   a) REASONABLENESS: The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setback requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The requested permit meets this intent. The majority of homes within the subject neighborhood have non-conforming setbacks similar to applicant’s proposal. Additionally, the expansion permit would not result in the second story bump out addition and roof overhang being located any closer to the south side property line.

   b) UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The subject property is substandard in size and encumbered by various setback requirements and 100-year floodplain setbacks. The subject house encroaches into several of these setbacks and most
addition proposals would require an expansion permit or variances.

c) CHARACTER OF LOCALITY: The immediate area contains several homes that do not meet required setbacks, due to variances or being constructed prior to the adoption of city ordinance. In addition, the second story bump out and roof overhang would not encroach further into the required south side yard setback than the existing home. As such, the requested expansion permit would not negatively impact the area or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

3.02 The proposal meets the variance standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE: The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setback requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The requested permit meets this intent. The majority of homes within the subject neighborhood have non-conforming setbacks similar to applicant’s proposal. As such:

a) The variances would not result in the living space of the home being located any closer to property lines, but would extend the overhang further into the required side yard setbacks; and

b) The overhang variance would not negatively impact existing building separations.

2. CONSISTENT WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The proposed variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The property is guided for low-density residential uses. The guiding principles in the comprehensive plan provide for maintaining, preserving and enhancing existing single-family neighborhoods. The variances would not negatively impact the residential character of the neighborhood and would provide investment in the property to enhance its use.

3. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES:

a) REASONABLENESS: The request for a roof overhang is a reasonable requests for a single-family property. The overhang would not negatively impact the neighborhood.

b) UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The subject property is
substandard in size. The subject property is less than 50 feet wide at its widest point, which is less than half the required width (110 feet), and is less than 5,000 square feet in area (22,000 square required).

c) CHARACTER OF LOCALITY: The requested variances would not negatively impact the character of the existing neighborhood. Rather:

a) The majority of the homes within 400 feet of the subject property have received variances or special approvals for home construction or additions,

b) The variance would allow for investment into a property through the construction of new additions; and

c) The variance would have no negative impact on adjacent properties.

Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The planning commission approves the above-described requests for expansion permit and variance subject to the findings outlined in section 3 of this resolution. Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:

   • Survey/Site Plan dated April 14, 2017.

   • Building elevations dated April 14, 2017.

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit:

   a) A copy of this resolution must be recorded with the County and a copy of the recorded document returned to the city.

3. This approval will expire on December 31, 2018, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

Adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on May 18, 2017.
Brian Kirk, Chair

ATTEST:

Kathy Leervig, Deputy City Clerk

ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

Motion for adoption: Powers
Seconded by: Calvert
Voted in favor of: Knight, Powers, Schack, Sewell, Calvert, Kirk
Voted against: 
Abstained: 
Absent: O’Connell
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on May 18, 2017.

Kathy Leervig, Deputy City Clerk

SEAL
B. Items concerning additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Point Road.

Chair Kirk introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Ingvalson reported. He recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Powers asked if impervious pavers could be added later. Ingvalson answered that the property owner would need approval from the city to increase a nonconformity.

In response to Knight’s question, Ingvalson explained that the proposal would not change the driveway.

Grant Dattilo, 2807 Mckenzie Point Road, applicant, stated that the impact would be minimized. A gutter would be added. The two-foot expansion would not be visible from the lake because of the planters.

The public hearing was opened.

John Kretsch, 2805 Mckenzie Point Road, stated that water currently travels onto his sidewalk on the side which his disabled brother needs to use in the winter. Mr. Dattilo said that he would fix the water drainage problem. Mr. Kretsch was concerned with a fire hazard since the structures would be so close. He learned that the materials used would be fire resistant. He is impressed with the plans. The house would look much nicer than it does currently.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Calvert confirmed with Ingvalson that separate approval would be needed to make an addition that would connect walls to the proposed overhang. A building permit and approval of expansion of a nonconformity would be required. The proposal would allow for more floodplain storage on the site.

Chair Kirk said that all of the houses on the street have similar setbacks. The request is fair.

Knight stated that residents of the neighborhood choose to have close neighbors in exchange for being on the lake. The proposal did not bother him.
Powers moved, second by Calvert, to adopt the resolution approving an expansion permit and variance for the roof overhang and the bump out with a modification provided in the change memo dated May 18, 2017.

Knight, Powers, Schack, Sewall, Calvert, and Kirk voted yes. O’Connell was absent. Motion carried.

Chair Kirk stated that an appeal of the planning commission’s decision must be made in writing to the planning division within 10 days.

Calvert moved, second by Schack, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution approving setback variances, floodplain alternation permit, and conditional use permit for a deck expansion and landscaping with a modification provided in the change memo dated May 18, 2017.

Knight, Powers, Schack, Sewall, Calvert, and Kirk voted yes. O’Connell was absent. Motion carried.

This item is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its meeting on June 12, 2017.
Resolution No 2017-

Resolution approving setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Pointe Road

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The applicant, Grant Dattilo, is proposing the following:

1. A 2-foot deck expansion; and

2. Removal of impervious surfaces and retaining walls, add a small retaining wall, and conduct minor earthwork within the 100-year floodplain.

1.02 The proposal requires the following:

1. Shoreland setback variance from 50 feet to 15 feet

2. Floodplain vertical setback variance from 2 feet to 1 foot.

3. Floodplain horizontal setback variance from 20 feet to 0 feet.

4. Floodplain alteration permit for earthwork within the floodplain.

5. Conditional use permit for construction of additions to a non-conforming home.

1.03 The subject property is located at 2807 McKenzie Point Road.

1.04 The property is legally described as follows:

Lot 3, T. R. MCKENZIE’S GROVELAND PARK, HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA
1.05 Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 6, and City Code §300.07 authorizes the city to grant variances.

1.06 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9 authorizes the city to grant floodplain alteration permits.

1.07 City Code §300.06 authorizes the city to grant conditional use permits.

Section 2. STANDARDS

2.01 Setback Requirements:

1. City Code §300.25 Subd. 7 outlines minimum setback requirements from ordinary high water levels. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2. City Code §300.24 Subd. 8 outlines minimum horizontal and vertical setback requirements from floodplain elevation. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

3. City Code 300.25 Subd. 9 outlines minimum setback requirements from the ordinary high water level of Lake Minnetonka. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2.02 By City Code §300.07 Subd. 1, a variance may be granted from the requirements of the zoning ordinance when: (1) the variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this ordinance; (2) when the variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and (3) when the applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance.

2.03 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9 outlines the standards which must be met for approval of a floodplain alteration permit. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

2.04 City Code §300.26 Subd. 2 and Subd. 4 outlines the general and specific conditional use permit standards within the floodplain district. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

Section 3. FINDINGS

3.01 The proposal meets the variance standards outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE: The intent of the shoreland and
floodplain setback ordinances is to preserve, protect, and enhance the environmental, recreational and hydrological resources and functions of the city’s water systems. The floodplain ordinance intent is also in place to minimize the loss of life and property damage due to flooding.

a) The variances would not result in the living space of the home being located any closer to property lines, but would extend the deck into the shoreland and floodplain setbacks;

b) The deck variance would not negatively impact existing building separations; and

c) The existing deck does not allow the passage of water through it and is considered an impervious surface. The applicant has proposed using slotted decking that would allow the passage of water and has proposed further impervious surface reduction through removal of paver areas and retaining walls. These changes will increase water retention on site and enhance the environmental protection of natural resources.

2. CONSISTENT WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The proposed variances are consistent with the comprehensive plan. The property is guided for low-density residential uses. The guiding principles in the comprehensive plan provide for maintaining, preserving and enhancing existing single-family neighborhoods. The variances would not negatively impact the residential character of the neighborhood and would provide investment in the property to enhance its use.

3. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES:

a) REASONABLENESS: The request for a deck extension is a reasonable request for a single-family property. The proposed deck extension would not negatively impact the neighborhood and, with the proposed landscaping, would enhance natural resource protection.

b) UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The entire property is encumbered by the 100-foot floodplain setback. Any construction on the property would require expansion permits or variances.

c) CHARACTER OF LOCALITY: The requested variances would not negatively impact the character of the existing
neighborhood. Rather:

a) The majority of the homes within 400 feet of the subject property have received variances or special approvals for home construction or additions.

b) The variances would allow for investment into a property through the construction of new additions; and

c) The variances would have no negative impact on adjacent properties.

3.02 The proposal would meet the general and specific standards for construction of structures within the floodplain district as outlined in City Code §300.26 Subd. 2 and Subd. 4.

1. The requested conditional use permit would result in the removal of an existing impervious deck from the floodplain, construction of a new, pervious deck. The construction of the proposed deck would increase floodplain storage on the property and would have no adverse impact on the floodplain.

2. The requested conditional use permit would not result in adverse impact to the floodplain. Rather, the new deck would create floodplain storage on the site.

3. As the entire rear yard of the subject property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a conditional use permit would be required for any new construction in this area.

3.03 The proposal would meet the standards for approval of a floodplain alteration permit outlined in City Code §300.24 Subd. 9.

1. The proposal would not result in any net fill of floodplain. Rather, through the slats in the new deck and removal of impervious surface, the proposal would actually increase floodplain storage on the property.

2. The floodplain alteration would not result in removal or loss of any protected trees.

3. As the entirety of the rear yard of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a floodplain alteration permit would be required for any new construction in the area.
Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The city council approves the above-described requests for variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit subject to the findings outlined in section 3 of this resolution. Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
   - Survey/Site Plan dated April 14, 2017
   - Building elevations dated April 14, 2017

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit:
   a) A copy of this resolution must be recorded with the County and a copy of the recorded document returned to the city.
   b) The applicant must obtain approvals from all other interested agencies.
   c) As part of the deck permit application, final plans must be submitted which are in general conformance with proposed plan date stamped April 14, 2017 and specifically comply with all of the following requirements:
      1) Show removal of the existing paver area adjacent to the lake as well as the short row of retaining wall block along the west side of the pavers.
      2) Include plantings to help soften the visibility of the deck surface as viewed from the lake.
      3) Provide for a 12-inch landscape strip above the retaining wall adjacent to the lake to help keep lawn care practices away from the lake edge.
   d) Install erosion control fencing as required by staff for inspection and approval. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.
3. Prior to final inspection of the deck, the soils in areas of the removed impervious must be decompacted as necessary to allow infiltration and the landscaping removed and installed per the approved plan.

4. This approval will expire on December 31, 2018, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL
City Council Agenda Item #14A  
Meeting of June 12, 2017

**Brief Description**  Metropolitan Council Transit Cooperation Agreement

**Recommendation**  Approve the Transit Cooperation Agreement

**Background**

On August 1, 2013 the city of Minnetonka entered into a Transit Cooperative Agreement with the Metropolitan Council to provide bus transit services to the city through Metro Transit. In April 2016, the city council approved an amendment to the agreement to extend the term to expire on July 31, 2017.

**History**

Bus transit service has been available in Minnetonka dating back for many years. This service has been provided by Metro Transit, as a service of the Metropolitan Council. The service in Minnetonka has and continues to be focused on express route (very few stops), peak service to downtown Minneapolis and the University of Minnesota, with limited local and midday routes. Much of the transit design is directly related to the low density of the city.

In 2000, Minnetonka was granted authority, by the state, to opt-out of the Metro Transit system. In 2002, Minnetonka exercised its opt-out authority; however, it was determined to be in the best interest of the city to contract with Metro Transit to provide transit service for the community. At that time, the city and the Metropolitan Council entered a Transit Cooperation Agreement for transit service and continued that agreement until 2013, when the new contract was renegotiated.

In 2010 and 2011 the city conducted a transit study. The purpose of the study was to better understand the transit services provided to, and available to, the city; whether the city’s residents and businesses were receiving transit service levels similar to other communities; and to provide an analysis of options for future transit service that will best meet the needs of the city’s residents and businesses, including looking at what happens when LRT becomes operational. The study determined that the city is receiving its money’s worth for transit; however, Metro Transit may not be fully responsive to the needs of the community. It was recommended that a new contract with Metro Transit/Metropolitan Council be negotiated with enhanced local service.

In 2012, Metro Transit conducted a sector study, in cooperation with the city. The purpose of the study was to ensure transit access to affordable housing, seniors and people with disabilities; improve local access circulation; and maintain the integrity of the regional system. The final report was presented to the city council in November.
2012 and several transit system changes were implemented in 2013 as part of the study.

Key points of the current agreement (adopted in 2013):

- The length of the agreement is for three years; either party may terminate the agreement with 12 months advanced notice.
  - The agreement was renegotiated in 2013. The agreement was extended and will expire on July 31, 2017.

- The current document identifies the city’s calculated transit funds and then the Metropolitan Council performs the service to the city based on that amount.
  - The chart below depicts the fare revenues and MVST (Motor Vehicle Sales Tax) funding for 2016. In 2016, Metro Transit received a total of $5,240,652 to provide transit services in Minnetonka.

- Minnetonka will receive transit service that is at least comparable to and commensurate with Metro Transit Service provided to other cities in the Metro Transit System.
  - The city has conducted research in the past that indicates that this has been met.

- The city and Metro Transit will meet quarterly to review issues.
  - Minnetonka staff continue to meet quarterly to discuss transit services and plan for future Southwest Light Rail Transit connections.

- Minnetonka may request re-evaluation of the routes and service levels when there is a major change in land use which may affect transit. This includes the construction of a light rail line or major re-development.
  - In 2016, staff coordinated with Metro Transit to evaluate moving the bus stops on Plymouth Road in front of Target and Lunds & Byerlys as part of the road reconstruction project. As a result, the stop will be moved closer to Highland Bank, which will provide safer pedestrian access to the stop and will include a new bus stop pad.
  - Staff continues to discuss Southwest Light Rail Transit connectivity opportunities and opening day plans.

- Metro Transit will maintain its capital infrastructure in Minnetonka in a condition comparable to its other infrastructure in the region.
  - Staff met with Greg Williams of Metro Transit at the Park and Ride at I394 and Country Road 73 and the State Fair parking lot last summer. Staff discussed maintenance concerns regarding long grass, scrub trees, security, and replacing trees at these locations. Metro Transit addressed these maintenance concerns.
Minnetonka must notify Metro Transit when planning for public improvements that have the potential to impact transit service.
  o Staff is coordinating with Metro Transit on the road reconstruction project on Plymouth Road and the bridge and overlay projects planned in Opus. In addition, staff continues to coordinate with Metro Transit on new Opus developments and Southwest Light Rail.

Metro Transit will provide Minnetonka staff the opportunity to review marketing and communication materials and distribution plans affecting Minnetonka before they are finalized.
  o Staff continues to coordinate with Metro Transit to review marketing and communication materials. In addition, staff communicates any proposed route changes on the city’s social media outlets. Recent examples included the expanded services on Route 9 and Route 615.

### Transit System Changes

Several changes were made to the transit system in Minnetonka as a result of the 2013 Metro Transit study and increased/decreased ridership demand (see attached map for additional detail). Some of the changes included:

- Expanded weekend service hours on Route 9—Route 9 is a local route serving eastern Minnetonka, St. Louis Park, and south Minneapolis. Two additional round trips (4 total) were added each weekday. This change was implemented in August 2013.

- Expanded weekday service hours on Route 615—Route 615 is a local route running from the Ridgedale area through Hopkins and on to St. Louis Park. The service hours were expanded to include more evening hours. This change was effective August 2013.

- New local route—A new weekday and Saturday local route, Route 614, from Minnetonka Heights in the southwest sector of the city to Ridgedale was implemented in late August 2013. Ridership has not been strong on this route, and likely will need changes.

- Express Bus Service—There were minor changes to the express bus service network (outside of the I-394 corridor) beginning in August 2013.

- In 2013, weekday midday service on Route 675 was increased from 60 to 30 minutes. Route 675 operates Monday through Sunday along I-394 serving Ridgedale, Wayzata, Mound and park-rides along I-394.

- In 2014, an outbound trip was added to Route 672—a I-394 weekday express route serving Plymouth Road park-ride, Carlson Center, Wayzata, Long Lake and Orono.
• In 2015, one outbound and two inbound weekday trips were added to Route 12--a local route on Hennepin, Lake Street, Excelsior Boulevard, 11th Avenue South serving downtown Minneapolis, Uptown, St. Louis Park, Hopkins and the Opus area of Minnetonka Monday through Sunday.

• In 2015, due to low ridership, Saturday service on Route 614 was discontinued; its service hours were reinvested on Route 615 to increase service frequency from 60 to 30 minutes.

• Route 568 which operated between downtown Minneapolis and Opportunity Workshop via Nicollet Avenue and 50th Street was eliminated March 19, 2016 due to low ridership. It was replaced by extending a Route 46 morning trip and afternoon trip to Opportunity Workshop. Route 46 is a crosstown route that operates between St. Paul's Highland Park neighborhood and 50th Street in Edina.

Funding

In 2002, Minnetonka exercised its opt-out authority; however, it was determined to be in the best interest of the city contract with Metro Transit to provide transit service for the community. This service is funded through the MVST and through fare revenues that are collected through ridership. The chart below depicts the fare revenue and MVST estimates that were prepared as part of the 2010 Minnetonka Transit Study and the 2015/2016 estimated Minnetonka fare revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Bus Trips, Estimated Ridership Fare Revenue, and MVST Revenue</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Scheduled Bus Trips*</td>
<td>102,716</td>
<td>110,938</td>
<td>110,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Estimated Ridership*</td>
<td>590,200</td>
<td>625,262</td>
<td>615,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fare Revenue*</td>
<td>$1,273,394</td>
<td>$1,193,134</td>
<td>$1,367,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual MVST Estimate</td>
<td>$2,623,000</td>
<td>$3,600,859</td>
<td>$3,872,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Revenue Estimate</td>
<td>$3,896,394</td>
<td>$4,793,993</td>
<td>$5,240,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on Fall data

In addition, Metro Transit receives funding through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for capital projects such as park and ride facilities, trains, buses, maintenance facilities, equipment, and transportation planning. The FTA funding is applied system wide.
***Ridership***

Annual ridership has risen slightly since 2008. However, there was a large jump in ridership between 2012 and 2013 because of additional local service for routes 9 and 615 that were part of the West Suburban Service Changes project. In addition, there were additional weekly trips added to route 675 to connect midday service between downtown and Ridgedale.

### Annual Transit Bus Trips Serving Minnetonka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Annual Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>92,055</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>103,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>89,760</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>102,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>89,760</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>102,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>87,465</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>100,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>87,210</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>100,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>96,135</td>
<td>8,476</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>109,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>96,645</td>
<td>8,476</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>110,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>97,410</td>
<td>8,424</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>110,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>97,410</td>
<td>8,424</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>110,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2017 Community Survey Results

Each year the city of Minnetonka completes a telephone survey of 400 randomly selected city of Minnetonka residents. The following results were part of the transportation related questions in the 2017 survey:

- 21% of respondents surveyed took a bus during the past two years
- Of those who ride the bus, 17% do so at least a couple times a week
- 22% of transit riders use public transportation on a weekly or bi-weekly basis
- 66% of transit riders use public transit less than on a bi-weekly basis

Respondents communicated that the major reasons for using public transportation are:

- Attending a special event at 23%
- Attending a sporting event at 21%
- Going to the state Fair at 13%

Overall, 94% of respondents who rode the bus reported satisfaction with the bus service provided.

### EDAC Review

The Economic Development Advisory Commission reviewed the Transit Cooperative Agreement at the April 27 meeting. Commissioner Happe asked if the current Minnesota House bill that included proposed 40% reduction in funding would impact the routes in Minnetonka. Steve Mahowald, Senior Planner at Metro Transit, explained that
any route cuts would be based on ridership and would likely be across all routes in the system and extensive outreach would be done if cuts were necessary.

Chair Isaacson inquired about how the city receives feedback regarding the ridership and routes. Mr. Mahowald explained that the city publishes a ridership survey every two years. Julie Wischnack further explained that the city also conducts an annual city wide survey that asks about transit service. The results of that survey were included as part of this report. In addition, the transit information center and customer service center at Metro Transit reviews feedback to consider route restructuring. If route changes are proposed, Metro Transit will coordinate with the city on the requested changes. Mr. Mahowald noted that there is extensive outreach with the city and residents prior to any route changes or cuts.

Councilmember Wagner noted that continued communication with Metro Transit will be necessary to assist with planning for future road improvement projects that impact trails, sidewalks, and placement of bus stop shelters. In 2015, the city council discussed the possibility of public works maintaining the shelters. At the time it was found too costly for the city to assume that responsibility. Staff has coordinated with developers to purchase and maintain new bus shelters, as new development occurs. Recent examples of developer owned and maintained bus shelters include the Ridge apartments and United Health Group (UHG).

**Recommendation**

The attached draft agreement reflects the same agreement that was reviewed and approved by the Metropolitan Council and was effective on August 1, 2013, then later extended to July 31, 2017. Staff is not proposing any changes to the language of the current agreement and is requesting that the agreement be renewed through July 31, 2020. Staff believes, the LRT and bus route changes will be known by this point and the city will be able to reevaluate the agreement at that time.

Staff recommends the city council approve the Transit Cooperation Agreement. If approved, the Agreement will be reviewed by the Metropolitan Council prior to final adoption.

Submitted through:

  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director
  Merrill King, Finance Director

Originated by:

  Alisha Gray, Economic Development and Housing Manager
Additional Resources

City of Minnetonka Transit Study - 2010

Governance of Transit – Office of the Legislative Auditors – 2011
  • History of Suburban “opt out” communities: pages 24-26

City of Minnetonka Transit Study -2012

West Suburban Service Changes Final Plan - 2013

Map of Service Changes within Minnetonka (2013-2016)

June 24, 2013 City Council Report - attached

April 25, 2016 City Council Report - attached
Fall 2013: Rerouted Route 670 from Hwy. 7 to Excelsior Blvd, replacing Route 667.

Fall 2013: Routed from Plymouth Rd. to Minnetonka Blvd east of Plymouth Rd., replacing Route 667E.

Fall 2013: New weekday and Saturday route.

Fall 2013: New weekday and Saturday route. Fall 2015: Saturday service eliminated.

Fall 2013: Rerouted from Excelsior Blvd. to 11th Ave. to replace Route 665.

Fall 2013: Rerouted Route 670 from Hwy. 7 to Excelsior Blvd, replacing Route 664.

Spring 2015: Added three weekday trips.

Spring 2016: Route 46 extension replaced eliminated Route 568.

Winter 2014: Added one weekday trip.

Fall 2013: Added five weekday trips. Fall 2015: Added 13 Saturday trips.

Fall 2013: Added four weekday trips.

Fall 2013: Added four weekday trips.

Fall 2013: Added five weekday trips.

Fall 2013: Added five weekday trips.

Date: 4/26/2017
This Agreement is between the Metropolitan Council (“Council”), a public corporation and political subdivision of the State of Minnesota, and the City of Minnetonka (“Minnetonka”), a Minnesota municipal corporation.

Background

Pursuant to 2000 Minn. Laws, Ch. 493, Sec. 21, the 2000 Minnesota Legislature gave Minnetonka the authority to opt-out of the metropolitan transit system (“Metro Transit”) and participate in the transit replacement service program under Minn. Stat. §473.388. Minnetonka has exercised this option and applied to the Council for the assistance. Minnetonka has also decided that rather than operate an independent transit system, it prefers to contract with the Council to provide transit services. The parties have the authority to cooperate together pursuant to Minn. Stat. 471.59 and have negotiated the terms of a cooperative partnership to provide transit services in Minnetonka, which are set forth in this Agreement. The parties previously entered into a Transit Cooperation Agreement, dated July 25, 2002 (“Initial Agreement”), which the parties wish to replace with this new agreement to effectuate the assistance authorized by §473.388.

Therefore, the parties agree as follows:

1. Statement of Intent

As responsible regional citizens, Minnetonka and the Council recognize the value of continuing their long-term, cooperative relationship in delivering quality transit service to Minnetonka citizens and businesses. This Agreement is intended to meet Minnetonka’s transit vision of increasing transit ridership through enhanced mobility and accessibility and continue and build on the strong partnership that both parties currently enjoy. The parties agree that this Agreement terminates and replaces the Initial Agreement.

2. Term

   a. The initial length of this Agreement is for three years after the effective date. Either party may terminate the Agreement with 12 months advance, written notice.

   b. If Minnetonka chooses to terminate the Agreement, Minnetonka will be responsible for maintaining the integrity of the regional system by providing service that connects with regional services.
3. Funding

   a. At Minnetonka’s request, the Council will calculate the amount of annual operating funds that would be allocated to Minnetonka under state law and allocation formulas. The Council must provide the results of the calculation to Minnetonka within 30 days. Minnetonka will allow all such funds to remain with the Council as long as this Agreement is in effect.

   b. During the term of this Agreement, Minnetonka will not apply for any other transit capital assistance from local, state or federal sources. If requested, Minnetonka will assist the Council with securing capital funding or operating funding for transit service in Minnetonka.

4. Services

   a. The Council is responsible for all activities related to providing transit service to Minnetonka including planning, operations and capital investments.

   b. The parties agree that Minnetonka will continue to receive service commensurate with, and comparable to, other cities in accordance with regional transit service design and performance standards contained in the Council’s Transportation Policy Plan (as may be updated or amended), funding levels and Metro Transit’s regional standards for productivity. Except in the case of regional service reductions or service that does not meet regional performance standards, current service levels in Minnetonka will continue under this Agreement.

   c. Minnetonka may request a re-evaluation of the routes and service levels in its boundaries when there has been a major change in land use which may affect transit, such as construction of a light rail line or a major re-development of an area. Metro Transit agrees to promptly conduct such a re-evaluation upon Minnetonka’s request. Such a re-evaluation may not be requested more than once every three years.

   d. At Minnetonka’s request, staff from the parties will meet quarterly beginning August 1, 2013, to review the Council’s performance under this Agreement and to share concerns and future plans.

   e. If the Council anticipates a major change to transit service in Minnetonka, as defined in the attached Exhibit A, Council staff must meet and confer with Minnetonka staff at least 180 days before planned implementation of the change. If a major service change is necessary to address regional service reductions or service that does not meet regional performance standards, the Council will consult with Minnetonka to identify potential alternatives that best meet Minnetonka’s needs and will consider the City’s preferences in its decisions. No other change in service can take place without Minnetonka’s approval.

   f. The Council will annually provide to Minnetonka its plans to construct or de-activate capital improvements and infrastructure (such as park & ride sites, transit centers,
and shelters) within Minnetonka no later than January 1 of each year. The Council
must meet and confer with Minnetonka regarding the locations and plans for the
actions at least 60 days before planned implementation. Capital improvements by the
Council will be subject to all Minnetonka ordinances, including zoning regulations.

g. The Council will maintain its capital infrastructure in Minnetonka in a condition
comparable to the condition that it maintains similar infrastructure throughout the
region. In addition, the Council must correct a substandard situation within 10 days
after notice of the deficiency from Minnetonka, or such longer period as is reasonably
necessary to achieve compliance, as determined by Minnetonka.

h. Minnetonka must notify the Council when it plans public improvements that have the
potential of impacting transit service. The notification must take place when the plans
for a project have been prepared.

i. The Council will provide Minnetonka staff the opportunity to review marketing and
communication materials and distribution plans affecting Minnetonka before they are
finalized. This includes marketing campaigns, promotions, and customer
communications and outreach to residents and businesses in Minnetonka and adjacent
communities, but does not include regional materials and plans that are not
specifically focused on Minnetonka.

j. Staff contacts for notice and implementation of this Agreement are:

i. For Minnetonka: Community Development Director Julie Wischnack, 14600
Minnetonka Blvd, Minnetonka, MN 55345.

ii. For the Council: Metro Transit Service Department Director John Levine, 560
6th Avenue North, Minneapolis, MN 55411.

5. Dispute Resolution Process

a. Informal Dispute Resolution. The parties will use their best efforts to informally
resolve disputes that arise between the parties under this Agreement in a timely and
expeditious manner. The parties will first endeavor to resolve any dispute by having
staff discuss the matter. If staff cannot resolve the dispute, their respective senior
management will discuss the dispute. Senior management for purposes of this section
are the Council’s General Manager for Metro Transit and Minnetonka’s City
Manager, or such other senior managers as the respective parties designate. The
parties will acknowledge and respond to notices of dispute without undue delay.

b. Mediation. If the Informal Resolution Process is unsuccessful, the parties may
participate in good faith, non-binding mediation through the use of a mutually
acceptable neutral mediator. The parties will share equally in the cost of the mediator.
Each party will be responsible for its own costs relate to such mediation.
c. Exception to the Dispute Resolution Process. If Minnetonka notifies the Council that it considers routine maintenance of certain capital infrastructure to the substandard in comparison to other infrastructure in the region, and the Council acknowledges this fact in writing and then fails to correct the substandard condition within 10 days or such longer period as is necessary to achieve compliance as determined by the parties, Minnetonka may immediately take steps necessary to mitigate the condition without engaging in the processes set forth above. The Council will reimburse Minnetonka for its reasonable and identifiable expenses in doing so within 30 days after Minnetonka sends a written invoice to the Council.

d. Termination. A party may choose to terminate the Agreement under Section 2 even if informal dispute resolution or mediation is pending.

6. Effective Date

This Agreement is effective on _____.

CITY OF MINNETONKA

By ______________________________
Terry Schneider
Its Mayor

And ______________________________
Geralyn R. Barone
Its City Manager

Date ______________________________

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

By ______________________________
Patrick Born
Its Regional Administrator

Date ______________________________
TRANSPORTATION SERVICE CHANGES AND RESTRUCTURING

I. Policy
It is the policy of the Metropolitan Council to plan effective regional transportation services and facilities, coordinate regional transportation priorities and to invest transportation resources in a cost-effective manner. Transit and transportation planners and providers are to deliver necessary services to help implement the 2030 Regional Development Framework. Staff are expected to ensure that planning and operating of transit services are more compatible with different land use patterns and socioeconomic conditions to meet the growing and changing transit needs of the region. Staff will also coordinate transit service for all travel markets including regular route, paratransit and travel demand management. Staff will regularly evaluate the performance of the regional transportation system for purposes of policy plan updates and redirecting transportation resource investments. These policy plans will be prepared with the involvement of local officials and participation of citizens.

II. Procedure
In order for transit service is to meet the expectations of the public and the transit needs of the communities, a strong customer and community involvement process is required. Improved public feedback mechanisms, a more informed public on regional issues, local partnerships and increased advocacy for transit will bring about better designed and utilized transit, sounder decision-making, quality checks on performance and improved accountability for transit improvements. The Council’s local procedural process for solicitation and consideration of public comment and feedback is defined in Policy 2-1, Accountability to the Public. The local process is documented in procedures 2-1a Public Participation, 2-1b Public Hearings and 1-3c Ongoing Public Involvement in the Planning Process.

In addition, a public hearing is required when certain major service changes are proposed. Major service changes requiring a public hearing include:

a) One or more net decreases within a 12 month period of more than a 25% change in the daily in-service hours (minimum 3,500 annual in-service hours)

b) The elimination of a transit route without alternate fixed route service replacement

c) The restructuring of transit service throughout a sector or sub-area of the region as defined by Metro Transit

The following service changes do not necessitate a public hearing process:

a) Seasonal service changes

b) Route number or branch letter designation

c) Any change or discontinuation of a demonstration route within the first 24 months of operation
d) Service changes on special service routes, such as State Fair, sporting events and special events
e) Creation of new routes or increases in service on existing routes
f) Route changes caused by an emergency. Emergencies include, but are not limited to, inadequate fuel supplies, major road construction, major rail construction, bridge collapse and labor strikes
g) Any service change which does not meet the conditions of a major service change as defined above.

**Improved Public Feedback**

An effective transit system is important to the region not only for the service it provides but for its balanced transportation network. Continual changes and growth within the metropolitan area require transit to be adaptable. Moving from a “product-oriented” view of the transit business as providers of transit services to a “customer-oriented” perspective as providers of transportation solutions will benefit the public. Transit service must fit local needs within the framework of a regional system. The optimal level of community involvement depends on who will be involved, how and when they will be used, and what tools will be used to solve the problem or maximize the opportunity. The transit customer and the community can offer critical input in design and operation. Improved public feedback will lead to more responsive planning and delivery of transit services. Increased public feedback requires transit providers to respond to customer needs more frequently. Expanded grass-roots support can influence how to provide transit in different markets, including:

1. Major Changes - such as corridor restructuring or route elimination.
2. Minor Changes - such as schedule or bus stop adjustments.
3. Monitoring and Feedback - to insure the system continues to meet the needs of a changing environment.

The tools used to solicit community involvement are dependent on:

1. Customer Feedback - used primarily for problem identification. Tools used to gather customer feedback include customer satisfaction surveys, comment cards, Listening Post, Customer Relations Department staff, Customer Advocates and drivers. An annual “report card” in which customers rate all aspects of regional transit service should be implemented.
2. Task Forces and Advisory Committees - used primarily to develop alternatives for transit delivery options within one or more communities. Community representatives, transit customers and other interested parties would be formed to identify needs and propose preferred options.
3. Project-Specific Solicitation - used primarily for analysis and evaluation of developed alternatives. This may take the form of opinion surveys, focus groups or customer interviews.
4. Public Hearings - used to gain community and customer feedback on recommended action. This process should be designed to solicit feedback from individuals or groups which have not been part of the formalized steps above.

This more timely and responsive process which seeks input from riders, non-riders and community leaders will make service design more effective. Community planning should be consistent with local transportation goals and objectives.

**A More Informed Public**

Consumers in the 1990’s have become more educated and discerning with more options than ever before. The metropolitan area has a comparatively affluent population, with relatively little traffic congestion or parking problems. People use options which most conveniently meet their needs. Surveys indicate one in three residents have used transit at least once in the past twelve months. The
reasons cited most often by non-riders who have been transit customers are related to convenience and better options—namely cars becoming available. Thirty-eight percent of non-riders report that they might ride if the system were easier to understand. To solicit customer input and approval for service development issues, the process relies heavily on the traditional public hearing and assorted peer-review techniques. Communities must understand the relationship between concentrated land use development, transit’s effectiveness within varying types of development patterns, and the appropriate levels and types of service. Transit customers and communities need to gain a better understanding of the service evaluation process. Metropolitan Council planning, marketing and communication staff and others who deal with the public will need to provide information on these regional issues to customers, potential customers, local officials and businesses.

The public needs to understand the costs associated with providing transit service and the limited resources available. As local decision makers and riders examine transportation options, costs must be incorporated into the debate and evaluation process.

Maintaining relationships is necessary for continued involvement in the planning and operations of transit services. For transit services to remain viable beyond initial implementation, service expectations, performance results and ongoing needs should be shared among service providers, customers and communities.

**Partnerships with Communities and Local Government**

Communities must take an active role in the ownership and management of the transit system. The Metropolitan Council must be proactive in developing strong partnerships with local governments for input on transit planning as it relates to the needs of the local communities, current and future development and other issues that impact transit usage.

The composition of the community involvement team is dependent upon the type and magnitude of problems or opportunities which need to be addressed. The ultimate team will include:

1. Customers
2. Community Stakeholders
3. Employers and Businesses
4. Transit Providers
5. Metropolitan Council members, staff and other public officials

**Increased Advocacy For Transit**

Advocacy involves the community as partners and provides equity and "ownership" in the system. As a result of increased community involvement, support for transit will improve. The opportunity to incorporate community involvement can be found at several phases of the service development process:

1. Problem Identification
2. Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives
3. Recommendations
4. Implementation
5. Follow-Up Evaluation
6. Partnership
Customer input will be solicited sooner and more often in this local process, with more evaluation checkpoints throughout the course of transit planning and development.
Twin Cities region were authorized to levy a one-quarter cent sales tax, levy a $20 per motor vehicle excise tax, and form a joint-powers board to fund transit improvements and provide a reliable funding source for transit in the region. As outlined in law, CTIB must allocate grant awards only for the following transit purposes:

(i) capital improvements to transit ways, including, but not limited to, commuter rail rolling stock, light rail vehicles, and transit way buses;

(ii) capital costs for park-and-ride facilities . . . ;

(iii) feasibility studies, planning, alternatives analyses, environmental studies, engineering, property acquisition for transit way purposes, and construction of transit ways; and

(iv) operating assistance for transit ways.29

Currently, five of the seven metropolitan counties have joined CTIB (Anoka, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, and Washington). These five counties have all levied the one-quarter cent sales tax and have voting representation on the Board. The chair of the Met Council is also a voting member of the Board. CTIB has a weighted voting system that ensures representation based on both sales tax revenue and population. The two metropolitan-area counties that did not levy the sales tax, Carver and Scott counties, are nonvoting members of the Board.

By law, the Counties Transit Improvement Board must establish a Grant Evaluation and Ranking System (GEARS) committee, which must include: (1) one county commissioner from each county on CTIB, (2) one elected city representative from each county on CTIB, (3) an additional elected city representative from each county for every additional 400,000 in population, and (4) the chair of the Metropolitan Council’s Transportation Committee.30 The committee is required to evaluate grant applications according to criteria established by CTIB and make recommendations to the Board.

Suburban Transit Providers

In 1981, the Minnesota Legislature allowed certain communities that felt they were not receiving adequate transit services to “opt out” of the regional regular-route transit services on the condition that they provide alternative transit services. Twelve communities have chosen to opt out of Metro Transit’s

---

29 Minnesota Statutes 2010, 297A.992, subd. 6. “Transitways” is not defined in law, and there are different interpretations of its meaning, as further discussed in Chapter 4.

30 Minnesota Statutes 2010, 297A.992, subd. 5(c).
Six suburban transit providers serve 12 communities that have “opted out” of Metro Transit bus service.

The opt-out communities receive funding through a formula outlined in law and determine the level of transit service provided in their communities. All six of the suburban transit providers offer express bus service from their communities to downtown Minneapolis; several also offer express service to the University of Minnesota. One suburban provider, the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority, offers express bus service to downtown St. Paul and service to the Mall of America. The suburban providers also offer a range of local bus service.

GOVERNANCE RESPONSIBILITIES

The term “governance” implies a range of responsibilities. In this report, we consider the governance of transit to include the following: (1) planning for the development of transit lines, which includes identifying potential corridors for new transit; (2) developing and building transit, which includes conducting analyses to determine optimal routes and transit modes; (3) providing transit; (4) generating revenue for transit, typically through imposing a levy or tax or collecting passenger fares; (5) allocating revenue for transit; and (6) measuring the performance of transit. Table 1.5 identifies the governance responsibilities of the transit entities in the Twin Cities region.

As Table 1.5 illustrates:

- Multiple entities have overlapping responsibilities for transit governance in the Twin Cities region.

For every transit governance role outlined in Table 1.5, there are several organizations in the Twin Cities region with responsibility for that function. For example, the Counties Transit Improvement Board, the county boards, the county regional railroad authorities, the Metropolitan Council (through Metropolitan Transportation Services), the transit corridor commissions, and the Transportation Advisory Board all have a role in planning transit in the region. They each help to identify potential corridors where transit could be developed or fund the process for identifying potential transit corridors. Similarly, the region has several transit providers: the Metropolitan Council (through Metro Transit and Metropolitan Transportation Services), private contractors, and the six suburban transit providers. Notably, the Council—through Metropolitan Transportation Services—is the only entity that has responsibility for all six transit governance areas.

---

31 The six suburban transit providers and the communities they serve are: Maple Grove Transit (Maple Grove); the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority (Apple Valley, Burnsville, Eagan, Rosemount, and Savage); Plymouth Metrolink (Plymouth); Prior Lake Transit (Prior Lake); Shakopee Transit (Shakopee); and SouthWest Transit (Chanhassen, Chaska, and Eden Prairie). As permitted through one-time legislation, Minnetonka elected to have “opt-out” status in 2002. However, Minnetonka entered into a service agreement with, and continues to receive bus service from, Metro Transit. The suburban transit providers are discussed in depth in Chapter 3.
Table 1.5: Transit Governance Responsibilities in the Twin Cities Region, by Entity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Planning Transitways</th>
<th>Developing Transitways</th>
<th>Providing Transit</th>
<th>Generating Revenue</th>
<th>Allocating Funds</th>
<th>Measuring Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB)a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Boards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Regional Railroad Authorities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council – Metro Transitb</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council – Metropolitan Transportation Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Contractors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Transit Providersab</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridor Commissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Advisory Board (TAB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: “Planning Transitways” includes identifying potential corridors for new transitways. “Developing Transitways” includes building transitways and conducting or directing analyses to determine optimal corridors and transit modes. Generating revenue is typically achieved through imposing a levy or tax or collecting passenger fares.

a CTIB’s role is limited to funding the planning and development of transitways.
b Metro Transit and the suburban transit providers can be designated as the lead on components of transitway development.

SOURCE: Office of the Legislative Auditor.

HISTORY OF TRANSIT IN THE TWIN CITIES REGION

Knowing the history of transit in the Twin Cities area is important to understanding the current transit governance structure in the region. In this section, we discuss the changes that have occurred in transit and the governance of transit over the past four decades.

In 1967, the Minnesota Legislature created the Met Council and the Metropolitan Transit Commission. When they were first created, the Council and the Commission were separate entities with distinct responsibilities. As stated in the enacting law, the role of the Met Council was to “coordinate the planning and

32 *Laws of Minnesota* 1967, chapters 892 and 896.
Brief Description: Transit Cooperation Agreement

Recommendation: Approve the agreement

Background

Bus transit service has been available in Minnetonka dating back for many years. This service has been provided by Metro Transit, as a service of the Metropolitan Council. The service in Minnetonka has and continues to be focused on express route (very few stops), peak service to downtown Minneapolis and the University of Minnesota, with limited local and midday routes. Much of the transit design is directly related to the low density of the city.

In 2000, Minnetonka was granted authority, by the state, to opt-out of the Metro Transit system. In 2002, Minnetonka exercised its opt-out authority; however, it was determined to be in the best interest of the city to have Metro Transit continue providing transit service for the community. At that time, the city and the Metropolitan Council entered a Transit Cooperation Agreement for transit service. The agreement has three key points:

- The original agreement is a minimum of six years, after which negotiations, amendments, or cancellation is allowed. The original agreement is still in place at this time. The current document identifies the city's calculated transit funds and then the Metropolitan Council performs the service to the city based on that amount. The intent was to continue to work together on transit services well into the future.

- Minnetonka will receive transit service that is at least comparable to and commensurate with Metro Transit Service provided to other cities in the Metro Transit System.

- The city and Metro Transit will meet and confer each year and prepare a memorandum of understanding that describes and updates a five-year work plan.

In 2010 and 2011 the city conducted a transit study. The purpose of the study was to better understand the transit services provided to, and available to, the city; whether the city's residents and businesses were receiving transit service levels similar to other communities; and to provide an analysis of options for future transit service that will best meet the needs of the city's residents and businesses, including looking at what happens when LRT becomes operational. The study determined that the city is receiving its money's worth for transit; however, it may not be fully responsive to the
needs of the community. It was recommended that a new contract with Metro Transit/Metropolitan Council be negotiated with enhanced local service.

In 2012, Metro Transit conducted a study, in cooperation with the city. The purpose of the study was to ensure transit access to affordable housing, seniors and people with disabilities; improve local access circulation; and maintain the integrity of the regional system. The final report was presented to the city council in November 2012.

**Transit System Changes**

As a result of the Metro Transit study, several changes have been or will be made to the transit system in Minnetonka. These changes include:

- Expanded weekend service hours on Route 9—Route 9 is a local route serving eastern Minnetonka, St. Louis Park, and south Minneapolis. Two additional trips will be added each weekday. This change will be implemented August 2013.

- Expanded service hours on Route 615—Route 615 is a local route running from the Ridgedale area through Hopkins and onto St. Louis Park. The service hours will be expanded to include more evening hours. This change will be effective August 2013.

- New local route—A new local route, Route 614 (page A1), will be implemented in late August 2013. This route from Minnetonka Heights to Ridgedale will run from 6:30 a.m.-6:30 p.m. Monday-Friday and 9:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m. on Saturdays. This change will be implemented August 2013. Staff and the Metropolitan Council are already working on the marketing of this route.

- Express Bus Service—There will be minor changes to the express bus service network (outside of the I-394 corridor) beginning in August 2013.

**Transit Cooperation Agreement**

One of the recommendations from the city’s transit study conducted in 2010 and 2011 was to revise the existing agreement with the Metropolitan Council/Metro Transit. After the completion of the Metro Transit study in November 2012, the city attorney drafted a new Transit Cooperation Agreement. The details of the new agreement (pages A2-A5) have been agreed to and include the following:

- Term—The initial term is now three years, and can be terminated with 12 months’ notice. The intent is that a new or amended agreement, or a contract with a new provider, will be put into place prior to the opening of light rail transit. At that time, the city will have a better understanding of LRT operations, as well as the feeder bus network necessary to serve the LRT stations.
• Funding—All funding for operations that the city would normally receive as an opt-out community will continue to flow to the Metropolitan Council as a provider of the service. Annually, the city can request the Metropolitan Council to calculate the amount of funds that would be available to the city.

• Services—This is the majority of the agreement as it has been significantly added to since the first agreement.
  
  o Metropolitan Council will be responsible for transit service, and that Minnetonka will continue to receive service comparable to other similar cities.
  
  o The city may ask for a re-evaluation of services once every three years (similar to the process that was just completed). A major re-evaluation is already planned as part of the Southwest LRT project.
  
  o The city and Metropolitan Council will meet quarterly.
  
  o No major service changes, unless necessary because of regional service reductions or services not meeting regional performance standards, can take place without Minnetonka’s approval. The city must be notified at least 180 days before the planned implementation.
  
  o Capital transit improvements and infrastructure will be reviewed annually.
  
  o All capital infrastructure must be maintained in a comparable condition to other infrastructure throughout the region. The Metropolitan Council will have 10 days to correct any deficiencies found by the city.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the city council approve the Transit Cooperation Agreement (pages A2 to A5). The agreement was reviewed and approved by the Metropolitan Council Transportation Committee on June 10, 2013, and will be reviewed and acted on by the full Metropolitan Council on June 26, 2013. It will become effective August 1, 2013.

Submitted through:
  
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

Originated by:
  
  Elise Durbin, AICP, Community Development Supervisor
ROUTE 614
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
AND THE CITY OF MINNETONKA
RELATING TO TRANSIT COOPERATION

THIS AGREEMENT is between the Metropolitan Council ("Council"), a public corporation and political subdivision of the State of Minnesota, and the City of Minnetonka ("Minnetonka"), a Minnesota municipal corporation.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to 2000 Minn. Laws, ch. 493, § 21, the 2000 Minnesota Legislature gave Minnetonka the authority to opt-out of the metropolitan transit system ("Metro Transit") and participate in the transit replacement service program under Minn. Stat. § 473.388. Minnetonka has exercised this option and applied to the Council for the assistance. Minnetonka has also decided that rather than operate an independent transit system, it prefers to contract with the Council to provide transit services. The parties have the authority to cooperate together pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 471.59 and have negotiated the terms of a cooperative partnership to provide transit services in Minnetonka, which are set forth in this Agreement. The parties previously entered into a Transit Cooperation Agreement, dated July 25, 2002 ("Initial Agreement"), which the parties wish to replace with this new agreement to effectuate the assistance authorized by § 473.388.

THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Statement of Intent.

As responsible regional citizens, Minnetonka and the Council recognize the value of continuing their long-term, cooperative relationship in delivering quality transit service to Minnetonka citizens and businesses. This Agreement is intended to meet Minnetonka’s transit vision of increasing transit ridership through enhanced mobility and accessibility and continue and build on the strong partnership that both parties currently enjoy. The parties agree that this Agreement terminates and replaces the Initial Agreement.

2. Term.

a. The initial length of this Agreement is for three years after the effective date. Either party may terminate the Agreement with 12 months advance, written notice.

b. If Minnetonka chooses to terminate the Agreement, Minnetonka will be responsible for maintaining the integrity of the regional system by providing service that connects with regional services.
3. **Funding.**

   a. At Minnetonka’s request, the Council will calculate the amount of annual operating funds that would be allocated to Minnetonka under state law and allocation formulas. The Council must provide the results of the calculation to Minnetonka within 30 days. Minnetonka will allow all such funds to remain with the Council as long as this Agreement is in effect.

   b. During the term of this Agreement, Minnetonka will not apply for any other transit capital assistance from local, state or federal sources. If requested, Minnetonka will assist the Council with securing capital funding or operating funding for transit service in Minnetonka.

4. **Services.**

   a. The Council is responsible for all activities related to providing transit service to Minnetonka including planning, operations and capital investments.

   b. The parties agree that Minnetonka will continue to receive service commensurate with, and comparable to, other cities in accordance with regional transit service design and performance standards contained in the Council’s Transportation Policy Plan (as may be updated or amended), funding levels, and Metro Transit’s regional standards for productivity. Except in the case of regional service reductions or service that does not meet regional performance standards, current service levels in Minnetonka will continue under this Agreement.

   c. Minnetonka may request a re-evaluation of the routes and service levels in its boundaries when there has been a major change in land use which may affect transit, such as construction of a light rail line or a major re-development of an area. Metro Transit agrees to promptly conduct such a re-evaluation upon Minnetonka’s request. Such a re-evaluation may not be requested more than once every three years.

   d. At Minnetonka’s request, staff from the parties will meet quarterly beginning August 1, 2013, to review the Council’s performance under this Agreement and to share concerns and future plans.

   e. If the Council anticipates a major change to transit service in Minnetonka, as defined in the attached Exhibit A, Council staff must meet and confer with Minnetonka staff at least 180 days before planned implementation of the change. If a major service change is necessary to address regional service reductions or service that does not meet regional performance standards, the Council will consult with Minnetonka to identify potential alternatives that best meet Minnetonka’s needs and will consider the City’s preferences in its decisions. No other major change in service can take place without Minnetonka’s approval.
f. The Council will annually provide to Minnetonka its plans to construct or
de-activate capital improvements and infrastructure (such as park & ride sites, transit
centers, and shelters) within Minnetonka no later than January 1 of each year. The Council must meet and confer with Minnetonka regarding the locations and plans for the actions at least 60 days before planned implementation. Capital improvements by the Council will be subject to all Minnetonka ordinances, including zoning regulations.

g. The Council will maintain its capital infrastructure in Minnetonka in a condition comparable to the condition that it maintains similar infrastructure throughout the region. In addition, the Council agrees to keep paved and landscaped areas substantially free of weeds. The Council must correct a substandard situation within 10 days after notice of the deficiency from Minnetonka, or such longer period as is reasonably necessary to achieve compliance, as determined by Minnetonka.

h. Minnetonka must notify the Council when it plans public improvements that have the potential of impacting transit service. The notification must take place when the plans for a project have been prepared.

i. The Council will provide Minnetonka staff the opportunity to review marketing and communications materials and distribution plans affecting Minnetonka before they are finalized. This includes marketing campaigns, promotions, and customer communications and outreach to residents and businesses in Minnetonka and adjacent communities, but does not include regional materials and plans that are not specifically focused on Minnetonka.

Staff contacts for notice and implementation of this Agreement are:

i. For Minnetonka: Community Development Director Julie Wischnack, 14600 Minnetonka Blvd, Minnetonka, MN 55345.

ii. For the Council: Metro Transit Service Development Director John Levin, 560 6th Avenue North, Minneapolis, MN 55411.

5. Dispute Resolution Process.

a. Informal Dispute Resolution. The parties will use their best efforts to informally resolve disputes that arise between the parties under this Agreement in a timely and expeditious manner. The parties will first endeavor to resolve any dispute by having staff discuss the matter. If staff cannot resolve the dispute, their respective senior management will discuss the dispute. Senior management for purposes of this section are the Council’s General Manager for Metro Transit and Minnetonka’s City Manager, or such other senior managers as the respective parties designate. The parties will acknowledge and respond to notices of dispute without undue delay.
b. Mediation. If the Informal Resolution Process is unsuccessful, the parties may participate in good faith, non-binding mediation through the use of a mutually acceptable neutral mediator. The parties will share equally in the cost of the mediator. Each party will be responsible for its own costs related to such mediation.

c. Exception to the Dispute Resolution Process. If Minnetonka notifies the Council that it considers routine maintenance of certain capital infrastructure to be substandard in comparison to other infrastructure in the region, and the Council acknowledges this fact in writing and then fails to correct the substandard condition within 10 days or such longer period as is necessary to achieve compliance as determined by the parties, Minnetonka may immediately take steps necessary to mitigate the condition without engaging in the processes set forth above. The Council will reimburse Minnetonka for its reasonable and identifiable expenses in doing so within 30 days after Minnetonka sends a written invoice to the Council.

d. Termination. A party may choose to terminate the Agreement under Section 2 even if informal dispute resolution or mediation is pending.

6. Effective Date.

This Agreement is effective on August 1, 2013.

CITY OF MINNETONKA

By: ______________________________
Terry Schneider
Mayor

Date: ______________________________

By: ______________________________
Geralyn R. Barone
City Manager

Date: ______________________________

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

By: ______________________________
Patrick P. Born
Regional Administrator

Date: ______________________________
City Council Agenda Item #14
Meeting of April 25, 2016

Brief Description  Transit Cooperation Agreement Amendment

Recommendation  Approve the amendment

Background

On August 1, 2013 the City of Minnetonka entered into a Transit Cooperative Agreement with the Metropolitan Council to provide bus transit services to the city through Metro Transit. The current term of the agreement is set to expire on August 1, 2016. The proposed action extends the current agreement from August 1, 2016 until December 31, 2016.

The extension request will allow staff to gain a better understanding of LRT operations, as well as the feeder bus network changes necessary to serve the LRT stations. A major re-evaluation is already planned as part of the Southwest LRT project.

History

Bus transit service has been available in Minnetonka dating back for many years. This service has been provided by Metro Transit, as a service of the Metropolitan Council. The service in Minnetonka has and continues to be focused on express route (very few stops), peak service to downtown Minneapolis and the University of Minnesota, with limited local and midday routes. Much of the transit design is directly related to the low density of the city.

In 2000, Minnetonka was granted authority, by the state, to opt-out of the Metro Transit system. In 2002, Minnetonka exercised its opt-out authority; however, it was determined to be in the best interest of the city to have Metro Transit continue providing transit service for the community. At that time, the city and the Metropolitan Council entered a Transit Cooperation Agreement for transit service and continued that agreement until 3 years ago, when the new contract was negotiated.

In 2010 and 2011 the city conducted a transit study. The purpose of the study was to better understand the transit services provided to, and available to, the city; whether the city’s residents and businesses were receiving transit service levels similar to other communities; and to provide an analysis of options for future transit service that will best meet the needs of the city’s residents and businesses, including looking at what happens when LRT becomes operational. The study determined that the city is receiving its money’s worth for transit; however, it may not be fully responsive to the needs of the community. It was recommended that a new contract with Metro Transit/Metropolitan Council be negotiated with enhanced local service.
In 2012, Metro Transit conducted a sector study, in cooperation with the city. The purpose of the study was to ensure transit access to affordable housing, seniors and people with disabilities; improve local access circulation; and maintain the integrity of the regional system. The final report was presented to the city council in November 2012.

The current agreement (adopted in 2013) has three key points:

- The current document identifies the city’s calculated transit funds and then the Metropolitan Council performs the service to the city based on that amount.
- Minnetonka will receive transit service that is at least comparable to and commensurate with Metro Transit Service provided to other cities in the Metro Transit System.
- The city and Metro Transit will meet quarterly to review issues.

Transit System Changes

As a result of the Metro Transit study in 2012, several changes were made to the transit system in Minnetonka. Some of these changes included:

- Expanded weekend service hours on Route 9—Route 9 is a local route serving eastern Minnetonka, St. Louis Park, and south Minneapolis. Two additional round trips (4 total) were added each weekday. This change was implemented in August 2013.
- Expanded weekday service hours on Route 615—Route 615 is a local route running from the Ridgedale area through Hopkins and onto St. Louis Park. The service hours were expanded to include more evening hours. This change was effective August 2013.
- New local route— A new weekday and Sunday local route, Route 614, from Minnetonka Heights in the southwest sector of the city to Ridgedale was implemented in late August 2013. Ridership has not been strong on this route, and likely will need changes.
- Express Bus Service— There were minor changes to the express bus service network (outside of the I-394 corridor) beginning in August 2013.
- Route 568 which operated between downtown Minneapolis and Opportunity Workshop via Nicollet Avenue and 50th Street was eliminated March 19th due to low ridership. It was replaced by extending a Route 46 morning trip and
afternoon trip to Opportunity Workshop. Route 46 is a crosstown route that
operates between St. Paul’s Highland Park neighborhood and 50th Street in
Edina.

A more detailed list of changes will be included in the discussion to consider the 2017-
2019 Transit Cooperative Agreement.

Recommendation

The current agreement in effect can be found on pages A1-A8. This document was
reviewed and approved by the Metropolitan Council and was effective on August 1,
2013.

Staff recommends the city council approve the Transit Cooperation Agreement
Amendment (page A9) extending the Term of the agreement until December 31, 2016.
The extension will provide staff additional time to negotiate a new Transit Cooperation
Agreement, re-evaluate current services, and analyze the feeder bus network
necessary to serve the LRT stations.

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

Originated by:
  Alisha Gray, Economic Development and Housing Manager
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
AND THE CITY OF MINNETONKA
RELATING TO TRANSIT COOPERATION

THIS AGREEMENT is between the Metropolitan Council ("Council"), a public corporation and political subdivision of the State of Minnesota, and the City of Minnetonka ("Minnetonka"), a Minnesota municipal corporation.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to 2000 Minn. Laws, ch. 493, § 21, the 2000 Minnesota Legislature gave Minnetonka the authority to opt-out of the metropolitan transit system ("Metro Transit") and participate in the transit replacement service program under Minn. Stat. § 473.388. Minnetonka has exercised this option and applied to the Council for the assistance. Minnetonka has also decided that rather than operate an independent transit system, it prefers to contract with the Council to provide transit services. The parties have the authority to cooperate together pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 471.59 and have negotiated the terms of a cooperative partnership to provide transit services in Minnetonka, which are set forth in this Agreement. The parties previously entered into a Transit Cooperation Agreement, dated July 25, 2002 ("Initial Agreement"), which the parties wish to replace with this new agreement to effectuate the assistance authorized by § 473.388.

THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Statement of Intent.

As responsible regional citizens, Minnetonka and the Council recognize the value of continuing their long-term, cooperative relationship in delivering quality transit service to Minnetonka citizens and businesses. This Agreement is intended to meet Minnetonka's transit vision of increasing transit ridership through enhanced mobility and accessibility and continue and build on the strong partnership that both parties currently enjoy. The parties agree that this Agreement terminates and replaces the Initial Agreement.

2. Term.

   a. The initial length of this Agreement is for three years after the effective date. Either party may terminate the Agreement with 12 months advance, written notice.

   b. If Minnetonka chooses to terminate the Agreement, Minnetonka will be responsible for maintaining the integrity of the regional system by providing service that connects with regional services.
3. Funding.

a. At Minnetonka’s request, the Council will calculate the amount of annual operating funds that would be allocated to Minnetonka under state law and allocation formulas. The Council must provide the results of the calculation to Minnetonka within 30 days. Minnetonka will allow all such funds to remain with the Council as long as this Agreement is in effect.

b. During the term of this Agreement, Minnetonka will not apply for any other transit capital assistance from local, state or federal sources. If requested, Minnetonka will assist the Council with securing capital funding or operating funding for transit service in Minnetonka.

4. Services.

a. The Council is responsible for all activities related to providing transit service to Minnetonka including planning, operations and capital investments.

b. The parties agree that Minnetonka will continue to receive service commensurate with, and comparable to, other cities in accordance with regional transit service design and performance standards contained in the Council’s Transportation Policy Plan (as may be updated or amended), funding levels, and Metro Transit’s regional standards for productivity. Except in the case of regional service reductions or service that does not meet regional performance standards, current service levels in Minnetonka will continue under this Agreement.

c. Minnetonka may request a re-evaluation of the routes and service levels in its boundaries when there has been a major change in land use which may affect transit, such as construction of a light rail line or a major re-development of an area. Metro Transit agrees to promptly conduct such a re-evaluation upon Minnetonka’s request. Such a re-evaluation may not be requested more than once every three years.

d. At Minnetonka’s request, staff from the parties will meet quarterly beginning August 1, 2013, to review the Council’s performance under this Agreement and to share concerns and future plans.

e. If the Council anticipates a major change to transit service in Minnetonka, as defined in the attached Exhibit A, Council staff must meet and confer with Minnetonka staff at least 180 days before planned implementation of the change. If a major service change is necessary to address regional service reductions or service that does not meet regional performance standards, the Council will consult with Minnetonka to identify potential alternatives that best meet Minnetonka’s needs and will consider the City’s preferences in its decisions. No other major change in service can take place without Minnetonka’s approval.

f. The Council will annually provide to Minnetonka its plans to construct or de-activate capital improvements and infrastructure (such as park & ride sites, transit...
centers, and shelters) within Minnetonka no later than January 1 of each year. The Council must meet and confer with Minnetonka regarding the locations and plans for the actions at least 60 days before planned implementation. Capital improvements by the Council will be subject to all Minnetonka ordinances, including zoning regulations.

g. The Council will maintain its capital infrastructure in Minnetonka in a condition comparable to the condition that it maintains similar infrastructure throughout the region. In addition, the Council agrees to keep paved and landscaped areas substantially free of weeds. The Council must correct a substandard situation within 10 days after notice of the deficiency from Minnetonka, or such longer period as is reasonably necessary to achieve compliance, as determined by Minnetonka.

h. Minnetonka must notify the Council when it plans public improvements that have the potential of impacting transit service. The notification must take place when the plans for a project have been prepared.

i. The Council will provide Minnetonka staff the opportunity to review marketing and communications materials and distribution plans affecting Minnetonka before they are finalized. This includes marketing campaigns, promotions, and customer communications and outreach to residents and businesses in Minnetonka and adjacent communities, but does not include regional materials and plans that are not specifically focused on Minnetonka.

Staff contacts for notice and implementation of this Agreement are:

i. For Minnetonka: Community Development Director Julie Wischnack, 14600 Minnetonka Blvd, Minnetonka, MN 55345.

ii. For the Council: Metro Transit Service Development Director John Levin, 560 6th Avenue North, Minneapolis, MN 55411.

5. Dispute Resolution Process.

a. Informal Dispute Resolution. The parties will use their best efforts to informally resolve disputes that arise between the parties under this Agreement in a timely and expeditious manner. The parties will first endeavor to resolve any dispute by having staff discuss the matter. If staff cannot resolve the dispute, their respective senior management will discuss the dispute. Senior management for purposes of this section are the Council’s General Manager for Metro Transit and Minnetonka’s City Manager, or such other senior managers as the respective parties designate. The parties will acknowledge and respond to notices of dispute without undue delay.

b. Mediation. If the Informal Resolution Process is unsuccessful, the parties may participate in good faith, non-binding mediation through the use of a mutually acceptable neutral mediator. The parties will share equally in the cost of the mediator. Each party will be responsible for its own costs related to such mediation.
c. Exception to the Dispute Resolution Process. If Minnetonka notifies the Council that it considers routine maintenance of certain capital infrastructure to be substandard in comparison to other infrastructure in the region, and the Council acknowledges this fact in writing and then fails to correct the substandard condition within 10 days or such longer period as is necessary to achieve compliance as determined by the parties, Minnetonka may immediately take steps necessary to mitigate the condition without engaging in the processes set forth above. The Council will reimburse Minnetonka for its reasonable and identifiable expenses in doing so within 30 days after Minnetonka sends a written invoice to the Council.

d. Termination. A party may choose to terminate the Agreement under Section 2 even if informal dispute resolution or mediation is pending.

6. Effective Date.

This Agreement is effective on August 1, 2013.

CITY OF MINNETONKA

By: [Signature]
   Terry Schneider
   Mayor
   Date: 7/30/13

By: [Signature]
   Geralyn R. Barone
   City Manager
   Date: 7/25/13

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

By: [Signature]
   Patrick P. Born
   Regional Administrator
   Date: 8/6/2013

Intergovernmental Agreement
Between the Metropolitan Council and the City of Minnetonka
Regarding Transit Cooperation
Page 4
**TRANSPORTATION SERVICE CHANGES AND RESTRUCTURING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Number:</th>
<th>1-3-a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Responsible:</td>
<td>Metro Transit and Metropolitan Council Transportation Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>1/25/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Revision Date:</td>
<td>11/1/1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. Policy**

It is the policy of the Metropolitan Council to plan effective regional transportation services and facilities, coordinate regional transportation priorities and to invest transportation resources in a cost-effective manner. Transit and transportation planners and providers are to deliver necessary services to help implement the 2030 Regional Development Framework. Staff are expected to ensure that planning and operating of transit services are more compatible with different land use patterns and socioeconomic conditions to meet the growing and changing transit needs of the region. Staff will also coordinate transit service for all travel markets including regular route, paratransit and travel demand management. Staff will regularly evaluate the performance of the regional transportation system for purposes of policy plan updates and redirecting transportation resource investments. These policy plans will be prepared with the involvement of local officials and participation of citizens.

**II. Procedure**

In order for transit service is to meet the expectations of the public and the transit needs of the communities, a strong customer and community involvement process is required. Improved public feedback mechanisms, a more informed public on regional issues, local partnerships and increased advocacy for transit will bring about better designed and utilized transit, sounder decision-making, quality checks on performance and improved accountability for transit improvements. The Council's local procedural process for solicitation and consideration of public comment and feedback is defined in Policy 2-1, Accountability to the Public. The local process is documented in procedures 2-1a Public Participation, 2-1b Public Hearings and 1-3c Ongoing Public Involvement in the Planning Process.

In addition, a public hearing is required when certain major service changes are proposed. Major service changes requiring a public hearing include:

a) One or more net decreases within a 12 month period of more than a 25% change in the daily in-service hours (minimum 3,500 annual in-service hours)

b) The elimination of a transit route without alternate fixed route service replacement

c) The restructuring of transit service throughout a sector or sub-area of the region as defined by Metro Transit

The following service changes do not necessitate a public hearing process:

a) Seasonal service changes

b) Route number or branch letter designation

c) Any change or discontinuation of a demonstration route within the first 24 months of operation
d) Service changes on special service routes, such as State Fair, sporting events and special events

e) Creation of new routes or increases in service on existing routes

f) Route changes caused by an emergency. Emergencies include, but are not limited to, inadequate fuel supplies, major road construction, major rail construction, bridge collapse and labor strikes

g) Any service change which does not meet the conditions of a major service change as defined above.

Improved Public Feedback

An effective transit system is important to the region not only for the service it provides but for its balanced transportation network. Continual changes and growth within the metropolitan area require transit to be adaptable. Moving from a “product-oriented” view of the transit business as providers of transit services to a “customer-oriented” perspective as providers of transportation solutions will benefit the public. Transit service must fit local needs within the framework of a regional system. The optimal level of community involvement depends on who will be involved, how and when they will be used, and what tools will be used to solve the problem or maximize the opportunity. The transit customer and the community can offer critical input in design and operation. Improved public feedback will lead to more responsive planning and delivery of transit services. Increased public feedback requires transit providers to respond to customer needs more frequently. Expanded grass-roots support can influence how to provide transit in different markets, including:

1. Major Changes - such as corridor restructuring or route elimination.
2. Minor Changes - such as schedule or bus stop adjustments.
3. Monitoring and Feedback - to insure the system continues to meet the needs of a changing environment.

The tools used to solicit community involvement are dependent on:

1. Customer Feedback - used primarily for problem identification. Tools used to gather customer feedback include customer satisfaction surveys, comment cards, Listening Post, Customer Relations Department staff, Customer Advocates and drivers. An annual “report card” in which customers rate all aspects of regional transit service should be implemented.
2. Task Forces and Advisory Committees - used primarily to develop alternatives for transit delivery options within one or more communities. Community representatives, transit customers and other interested parties would be formed to identify needs and propose preferred options.
3. Project-Specific Solicitation - used primarily for analysis and evaluation of developed alternatives. This may take the form of opinion surveys, focus groups or customer interviews.
4. Public Hearings - used to gain community and customer feedback on recommended action. This process should be designed to solicit feedback from individuals or groups which have not been part of the formalized steps above.

This more timely and responsive process which seeks input from riders, non-riders and community leaders will make service design more effective. Community planning should be consistent with local transportation goals and objectives.

A More Informed Public

Consumers in the 1990’s have become more educated and discerning with more options than ever before. The metropolitan area has a comparatively affluent population, with relatively little traffic congestion or parking problems. People use options which most conveniently meet their needs. Surveys indicate one in three residents have used transit at least once in the past twelve months. The
reasons cited most often by non-riders who have been transit customers are related to convenience and better options--namely cars becoming available. Thirty-eight percent of non-riders report that they might ride if the system were easier to understand. To solicit customer input and approval for service development issues, the process relies heavily on the traditional public hearing and assorted peer-review techniques. Communities must understand the relationship between concentrated land use development, transit's effectiveness within varying types of development patterns, and the appropriate levels and types of service. Transit customers and communities need to gain a better understanding of the service evaluation process. Metropolitan Council planning, marketing and communication staff and others who deal with the public will need to provide information on these regional issues to customers, potential customers, local officials and businesses.

The public needs to understand the costs associated with providing transit service and the limited resources available. As local decision makers and riders examine transportation options, costs must be incorporated into the debate and evaluation process.

Maintaining relationships is necessary for continued involvement in the planning and operations of transit services. For transit services to remain viable beyond initial implementation, service expectations, performance results and ongoing needs should be shared among service providers, customers and communities.

**Partnerships with Communities and Local Government**

Communities must take an active role in the ownership and management of the transit system. The Metropolitan Council must be proactive in developing strong partnerships with local governments for input on transit planning as it relates to the needs of the local communities, current and future development and other issues that impact transit usage.

The composition of the community involvement team is dependent upon the type and magnitude of problems or opportunities which need to be addressed. The ultimate team will include:

1. Customers
2. Community Stakeholders
3. Employers and Businesses
4. Transit Providers
5. Metropolitan Council members, staff and other public officials

**Increased Advocacy For Transit**

Advocacy involves the community as partners and provides equity and "ownership" in the system. As a result of increased community involvement, support for transit will improve. The opportunity to incorporate community involvement can be found at several phases of the service development process:

1. Problem Identification
2. Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives
3. Recommendations
4. Implementation
5. Follow-Up Evaluation
6. Partnership
Customer input will be solicited sooner and more often in this local process, with more evaluation checkpoints throughout the course of transit planning and development.
AMENDMENT NUMBER ONE
To
Metropolitan Council Contract No. 13I032

The City of Minnetonka and the Metropolitan Council agree that the Intergovernmental Agreement between the Metropolitan Council and the City of Minnetonka Relating to Transit Cooperation entered into on August 1, 2013 is amended in the following particulars:

1. Section 2 Term is deleted and the following is inserted in its place:

   **Section 2 Term.**

   a. The term of this agreement shall run from August 1, 2013 until July 31, 2017. Either party may terminate the Agreement with 12 months advance written notice.

   b. If Minnetonka chooses to terminate the Agreement, Minnetonka will be responsible for maintain the integrity of the regional system by providing service that connects with regional services.

   IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this amendment to be executed by their duly authorized representatives.

   CITY OF MINNETONKA

   By: ____________________________

   ____________________________

   Its: Mayor ________________________

   Date: ____________________________

   METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

   By: ____________________________

   Regional Administrator

   ____________________________

   Date: ____________________________

   By: ____________________________

   City Manager

   ____________________________

   Date: ____________________________
City Council Agenda Item #14B(1)  
Meeting of June 12, 2017

**Brief Description**  
Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East.

**Action Requested**  
Discuss concept plan with the applicant. No formal action required.

---

**Background**

Earlier this year the planning commission and city council reviewed and commented on a 240 unit rental housing concept plan for Newport Midwest. The plan included market rate and affordable housing units. Comments from both planning commission and city council reviews have prompted changes to the development plan. Newport Midwest is seeking additional comments from the city council on the revised plan.

The revised plan proposes redevelopment of the same commercial properties at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East. The revised concept plan contemplates redevelopment of the existing office buildings to construct 246 units of rental housing on the 3.2 acre site. The proposed project would include 191 units at market rate and 55 units priced between $650 to $1118 per month (60 percent of the area median income). The mix of unit types range from studio to 3 bedroom units. Amenities include a roof top deck, an amenity deck, outdoor play area and additional trail connections. The major revision to the plans is the market rate housing is now on the west portion of the site and the affordable housing is located on the east portion of the site. The applicant has also revised the building architecture with a bolder and more contemporary design (see attached plans).

The site is nearly built out with the three office buildings and associated surface parking lots. Green space exists adjacent to the buildings and at the periphery of the parking lots. The site is nearly flat with little topographic change and no on-site stormwater treatment facilities in place. An existing trail extends along the northern portion of the site connecting to the broader Opus trail system. Surrounding land uses are primarily office or business warehouse oriented. The site is zoned B-2 limited business district and guided mixed use in the 2030 comprehensive plan.

Adjacent to the site is the future Green Line light rail transit extension and Opus Station. The station platform would be a short walk, 700 feet, from the proposed housing. Construction on the rail line will begin this year with operations anticipated to begin in 2021. The Opus Station area plan identifies the site and other adjacent properties in close proximity to the station as candidates for redevelopment as new housing and employment. In planning for the Green Line extension, a housing analysis was performed for each of the 15 stations to project market demand for housing within ½ mile of the

---
stations within the next 15 years. The analysis projected the market would likely demand over 11,000 housing units for the entire line from Eden Prairie to Minneapolis, of which, 600 housing units were projected for the Opus Station. (See SWLRT Housing Gaps Analysis attachments.)

Key Issues

City staff has identified the following considerations for any development of the subject properties:

- **Change of land use**: The Opus Business Park was originally designed as a large mixed use development providing the opportunity for people to live, work and play. (See attached Opus 2 brochure.) A change of land use from an employment use to housing is consistent with the vision for Opus and the need for additional housing in close proximity to the Opus Station.

- **Site Plan**: The proposed site plan shows two buildings of five and six stories. Underground parking would connect both buildings with one common access located near the west end of the surface parking lot. Access to the site is provided from Bren Road East and a common private driveway at the east property line. The previous plan included just a single access from the private driveway.

  A play area is provided for residents and is more internal to the site than the previous location along the trail. Other greenspace areas are located at the periphery of the site. Internal trails and walkways are connected to the Opus trail system in multiple locations. Comments about the size, location and level of amenity of these areas are appropriate discussion items.

- **Building Character**: Building elevations show a modern style with an organized and repeated modular arrangement of building elements. Input on building massing and desired character is important. This project could be the first redevelopment project near the Opus Station and will establish a design character for other projects to follow.

Planning Commission Review

The planning commission reviewed the project at the May 18, 2017 meeting. Meeting minutes from that meeting are attached. The commission was generally very supportive of the project noting a number of improvements over the previous plans:

- The commission was supportive of change of land use from office to high density residential for market rate and affordable units. The commission asked about the ability to support mixed use which the applicant responded by suggesting the site to the north probably had better potential.
• The commission commented that the site design was improved over the previous plan with the incorporation of two access points and better internal circulation. Other amenities like the rooftop areas and dog run were positive features.

• The commission commented that the building design was very attractive and what the area needed to bring energy to the area. The building height and massing were appropriate.

Review Process

Staff has outlined the following review process for the proposal. At this time, a formal application has not been submitted.

• **Planning Commission Concept Plan Review.** The planning commission Concept Plan Review is intended as a follow-up to the neighborhood meeting. The objective of this meeting is to identify major issues and challenges in order to inform the subsequent review and discussion. The meeting will include a presentation by the developer of conceptual sketches and ideas, but not detailed engineering or architectural drawings. No staff recommendations are provided, the public is invited to offer comments, and planning commissioners are afforded the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback without any formal motions or votes.

• **City Council Concept Plan Review.** The city council Concept Plan Review is intended as a follow-up to the planning commission Concept Plan Review. No staff recommendations are provided, the public is invited to offer comments, and council members are afforded the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback without any formal motions or votes.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the city council provide comment and feedback on the identified key issues. The discussion is intended to assist the applicant with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Through:  Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
            Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

Originator: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Next Steps

- **Formal Application.** If the developer chooses to file a formal application, notification of the application would be mailed to area property owners. Property owners are encouraged to view plans and provide feedback via the city’s website. Through recent website updates: (1) staff can provide residents with ongoing project updates, (2) residents can “follow” projects they are particularly interested in by signing up for automatic notification of project updates; (3) residents may provide project feedback on project; and (4) and staff can review resident comments.

- **Neighborhood Meeting.** Prior to the planning commission meeting and official public hearing, an additional public meeting would be held with neighbors to discuss specific engineering, architectural and other details of the project, and to solicit feedback. This extends the timing that has historically been provided in advance of the planning commission review to allow more public consideration of the project specifics.

- **Council Introduction.** The proposal would be introduced at a city council meeting. At that time, the council would be provided another opportunity to review the issues identified during the initial concept plan review meeting, and to provide direction about any refinements or additional issues they wish to be researched, and for which staff recommendations should be prepared.

- **Planning Commission Review.** The planning commission would hold an official public hearing for the development review and would subsequently recommend action to the city council.

- **City Council Action.** Based on input from the planning commission, professional staff and general public, the city council would take final action.

Roles and Responsibilities

- **Applicants.** Applicants are responsible for providing clear, complete and timely information throughout the review process. They are expected to be accessible to both the city and to the public, and to respect the integrity of the public process.

- **Public.** Neighbors and the general public will be encouraged and enabled to participate in the review process to the extent they are interested. However, effective public participation involves shared responsibilities. While the city has an obligation to provide information and feedback opportunities, interested residents are expected to accept the responsibility to educate themselves about the project
and review process, to provide constructive, timely and germane feedback, and to stay informed and involved throughout the entire process.

- **Planning Commission.** The planning commission hosts the primary forum for public input and provides clear and definitive recommendations to the city council. To serve in that role, the commission identifies and attempts to resolve development issues and concerns prior to the council’s consideration by carefully balancing the interests of applicants, neighbors, and the general public.

- **City Council.** As the ultimate decision maker, the city council must be in a position to equitably and consistently weigh all input from their staff, the general public, planning commissioners, applicants and other advisors. Accordingly, council members traditionally keep an open mind until all the facts are received. The council ensures that residents have an opportunity to effectively participate in the process.

- **City Staff.** City staff is neither an advocate for the public nor the applicant. Rather, staff provides professional advice and recommendations to all interested parties, including the city council, planning commission, applicant and residents. Staff advocates for its professional position, not a project. Staff recommendations consider neighborhood concerns, but necessarily reflect professional standards, legal requirements and broader community interests.
LOCATION MAP

Landon/Domus Group
10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
May 18, 2017

**Brief Description**  
Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East.

**Action Requested**  
Discuss concept plan with the applicant. No formal action required.

---

**Background**

Earlier this year the planning commission reviewed and commented on a 240 unit rental housing concept plan for Newport Midwest. The plan included market rate and affordable housing units. Comments from both planning commission and city council reviews have prompted changes to the development plan. Newport Midwest is seeking additional comments from the city on the revised plan.

The revised plan proposes redevelopment of the same commercial properties at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East. The revised concept plan contemplates redevelopment of the existing office buildings to construct 246 units of rental housing on the 3.2 acre site. The proposed project would include 191 units at market rate and 55 units priced between $650 to $1118 per month (60 percent of the area median income). The mix of unit types range from studio to 3 bedroom units. Amenities include a roof top deck, an amenity deck, outdoor play area and additional trail connections. The major revision to the plans is the market rate housing is now on the west portion of the site and the affordable housing is located on the east portion of the site. (See attached plans)

The site is nearly built out with the 3 office buildings and associated surface parking lots. Green space exists adjacent to the buildings and at the periphery of the parking lots. The site is nearly flat with little topographic change and no on-site storm water treatment facilities in place. An existing trail extends along the northern portion of the site connecting to the broader Opus trail system. Surrounding land uses are primarily office or business warehouse oriented. The site is zoned B-2 limited business district and guided mixed use in the 2030 comprehensive plan.

Adjacent to the site is the future Green Line light rail transit extension and Opus Station. The station platform would be a short walk, 700 feet, from the proposed housing. Construction on the rail line will begin this year with operations anticipated to begin in 2021. The Opus Station area plan identifies the site and other adjacent properties in close proximity to the station as candidates for redevelopment as new housing and employment. In planning for the Green Line extension, a housing analysis was performed for each of the 15 stations to project market demand for housing within ½ mile of the stations within the next 15 years. The analysis projected the market would likely demand over 11,000 housing units for the entire line from Eden Prairie to Minneapolis, of which,
600 housing units were projected for the Opus Station. (See SWLRT Housing Gaps Analysis attachments)

Key Issues

City staff has identified the following considerations for any development of the subject properties:

- **Change of land use**: The Opus business park was originally designed as a large mixed use development providing the opportunity for people to live, work and play. (See attached Opus 2 brochure) change of land use from an employment use to housing is consistent with the vision for Opus and the need for additional housing in close proximity to the Opus Station.

- **Site Plan**: The proposed site plan shows two buildings of 5 and 6 stories. Underground parking would connect both buildings with one common access located near the west end of the surface parking lot. Access to the site is provided from Bren Road East and a common private driveway at the east property line. The previous plan included just a single access from the private driveway. A play area is provided for residents and is more internal to the site than the previous location along the trail. Other greenspace areas are located at the periphery of the site. Internal trails and walkways are connected to the Opus trail system in multiple locations. Comments about the size, location and level of amenity of these areas are appropriate discussion items.

- **Building Character**: Building elevations show a modern style with an organized and repeated modular arrangement of building elements. Input on building massing and desired character is important. This project could be the first redevelopment project near the Opus Station and will establish a design character for other projects to follow.

Review Process

Staff has outlined the following review process for the proposal. At this time, a formal application has not been submitted.

- **Planning Commission Concept Plan Review**: The planning commission Concept Plan Review is intended as a follow-up to the neighborhood meeting. The objective of this meeting is to identify major issues and challenges in order to inform the subsequent review and discussion. The meeting will include a presentation by the developer of conceptual sketches and ideas, but not detailed engineering or architectural drawings. No staff recommendations are provided, the public is invited to offer comments, and planning commissioners are afforded the
opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback without any formal motions or votes.

- **City Council Concept Plan Review.** The city council Concept Plan Review is intended as a follow-up to the planning commission meeting and would follow the same format as the planning commission Concept Plan Review. No staff recommendations are provided, the public is invited to offer comments, and council members are afforded the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback without any formal motions or votes.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the planning commission provide comment and feedback on the identified key issues and others the planning commission deems appropriate. The discussion is intended to assist the applicant with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Originator: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Next Steps

- **Formal Application.** If the developer chooses to file a formal application, notification of the application would be mailed to area property owners. Property owners are encouraged to view plans and provide feedback via the city’s website. Through recent website updates: (1) staff can provide residents with ongoing project updates; (2) residents can “follow” projects they are particularly interested in by signing up for automatic notification of project updates; (3) residents may provide project feedback on project; and (4) and staff can review resident comments.

- **Neighborhood Meeting.** Prior to the planning commission meeting and official public hearing, an additional public meeting would be held with neighbors to discuss specific engineering, architectural and other details of the project, and to solicit feedback. This extends the timing that has historically been provided in advance of the planning commission review to allow more public consideration of the project specifics.

- **Council Introduction.** The proposal would be introduced at a city council meeting. At that time, the council would be provided another opportunity to review the issues identified during the initial concept plan review meeting, and to provide direction about any refinements or additional issues they wish to be researched, and for which staff recommendations should be prepared.

- **Planning Commission Review.** The planning commission would hold an official public hearing for the development review and would subsequently recommend action to the city council.

- **City Council Action.** Based on input from the planning commission, professional staff and general public, the city council would take final action.

Roles and Responsibilities

- **Applicants.** Applicants are responsible for providing clear, complete and timely information throughout the review process. They are expected to be accessible to both the city and to the public, and to respect the integrity of the public process.

- **Public.** Neighbors and the general public will be encouraged and enabled to participate in the review process to the extent they are interested. However, effective public participation involves shared responsibilities. While the city has an obligation to provide information and feedback opportunities, interested residents are expected to accept the responsibility to educate themselves about the project
and review process, to provide constructive, timely and germane feedback, and to stay informed and involved throughout the entire process.

- **Planning Commission.** The planning commission hosts the primary forum for public input and provides clear and definitive recommendations to the city council. To serve in that role, the commission identifies and attempts to resolve development issues and concerns prior to the council’s consideration by carefully balancing the interests of applicants, neighbors, and the general public.

- **City Council.** As the ultimate decision maker, the city council must be in a position to equitably and consistently weigh all input from their staff, the general public, planning commissioners, applicants and other advisors. Accordingly, council members traditionally keep an open mind until all the facts are received. The council ensures that residents have an opportunity to effectively participate in the process.

- **City Staff.** City staff is neither an advocate for the public nor the applicant. Rather, staff provides professional advice and recommendations to all interested parties, including the city council, planning commission, applicant and residents. Staff advocates for its professional position, not a project. Staff recommendations consider neighborhood concerns, but necessarily reflect professional standards, legal requirements and broader community interests.
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
9. **Other Business**

A. **Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500, and 10550 Bren Road East.**

Gordon reported. Staff recommends that the planning commission provide comments and feedback on the identified key issues and others the planning commission deems appropriate. The discussion is intended to assist the applicant with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Becky Landon, of Newport Midwest, applicant, stated that the dog run would be located along the trail on the north side of the property or closer to the light-rail track, depending on what information the soil borings provide. There would be separate, underground parking for each building. That would allow for two-way driving throughout the site and would assist with patrons moving in and out, deliveries, and dropping off and picking up residents.

Knight really likes the rooftop amenities. Ms. Landon said that a bridge is being considered between the two buildings as well as amenities located on several corners of both buildings. She was not sure how the roofs would be accessed. She described the options. Knight was glad the rooftop amenities would be done.

Calvert noted that this configuration would provide easier traffic access and a better traffic pattern for deliveries and emergency vehicles.

Powers likes the energy of the proposal. It would have forward-thinking architecture. He likes this so much better than the first proposal logistically and for the way it would look and feel. He applauded the developer for the concept.

Schack liked the design. It has more of an urban feel which would fit the area. The proposal would be a good draw for diversity and young people, especially since it would be near the light rail. The design is great.

Sewall asked if the elevations would match the light rail, so residents would be on the same elevation as the train. Ms. Landon stated that there would be a six-foot grade change from one side of the site to the other side.
Sewall asked if mixed uses had been considered. Ms. Landon said that the site is a little difficult to access right now to support mixed uses. The site next door would be a prime site for mixed uses. A use would be open to the public, but primarily utilized by the residents who would reside in the proposed buildings. The lobby would have a coffee shop and provide a high-energy, urban feel.

Chair Kirk felt this would be a great amenity for the light-rail station. He asked when it would be completed. Ms. Landon stated that funding is being applied for this year and the best-case scenario would allow them to start construction mid-summer of 2018 and available for occupancy in late 2019. Completion of the light rail is a huge factor in driving the project. Chair Kirk felt that the design has come a long way.

Chair Kirk noted that no one from the public was present to speak on the concept plan. He likes the affordable housing component. The use of color fits well with the design of the SWLRT. It is very exciting. People who live and work in Opus understand the traffic pattern. The site’s proximity to Highways 62 and 169 make it a prime spot for the proposed density. Between the highways and the LRT, he saw the proposal as a homerun. He likes the pop of color and the textures. He had no concern with the massing. It seems like it would fit well. The height would be appropriate. He would not want it to be taller or shorter. It is a great plan.

Calvert agreed. She is committed to meeting the city’s affordable housing goals. The proposal would be a great fit. The design is the kind of energy and modern feel that residents want. The site provides a big campus that would cause a ripple effect to the surrounding area. She is glad that it is so attractive.

Ms. Landon stated that the applicant is very aware that this proposal would set the stage. She was not in favor of beige or "unpainted white," but, other than those two colors, she would like the community to drive the choice of which colors to use. She welcomed the commission’s input for the aesthetics and colors.

Chair Kirk thought that the second and third developments for the area would have a much better shot at supporting retail. The density of the proposal would attract other amenities to the area.

Schack lived in the Cloud Nine Apartments and, because of the trail system in the Opus business park, she could walk to the Shady Oak Road side where there are quite a few amenities. If the proposal is built, then amenities will follow, but there are also enough mixed uses there now to attract residents.

Calvert was excited to see one, two, and three-bedroom apartments.
Powers thought it would be important for the developer and the city to get the project right. He wants the site to convey high energy, because he wants someone driving by to be proud of it. He wants it to look fun, interesting, and inviting. He likes the blend of affordable and market-rate components.

Knight said that he routinely drives by The Chase Apartments which look fantastic from the road. He is glad that project was done. This project has even more potential. It would be great. It would be a nice place to live and would have a play area for kids.

In response to Knight’s question, Gordon explained that the land values in Opus would probably prohibit a large sport field. Lone Lake Park is located across Shady Oak Road.

Chair Kirk thanked the applicant for her attendance.
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3. Typical Ground Floor Unit Entry
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Unique to most housing developments, the Mariner will connect a market rate building to an affordable housing building through an above grade “bridge.” All residents of The Mariner will have access to the same amenities, including rooftop deck spaces, a playground, an urban courtyard, dog run, bike repair station, bike paths and green spaces surrounding the property. Residents will be enticed outdoors by these amenities, creating the opportunity for community building among people of all ages and backgrounds. Both indoor and outdoor spaces will be open and available to residents, encouraging healthy lifestyles and positive relationships with neighbors.

Bright and inviting, the front lobby is a great space for residents to gather indoors. With plenty of seating and standing room, residents can conveniently linger to chat with neighbors or guests. Artwork on the walls, throw pillows and floor designs promote creativity while enhancing the aesthetic of the room.

First floor residents have convenient access to the outdoors through their front porches. Another example of community-building space, these porches allow residents to easily converse with one another as they enjoy the outdoors from right outside their homes. The porches add curb appeal to the development and encourage healthy living by making it easy for residents to go outdoors.
A lush, comfortable ROOF-TOP DECK invites residents to enjoy the outdoors.

The large AMENITY DECK will include areas to relax, dine, and play. All residents can enjoy this well-designed, landscaped shared space, creating a cohesive community.

Encouraging exercise, the bike path that runs along the west and north edges of the building is easily accessible to all residents.

First floor walk-up porches add to curb appeal and promote healthy living.

Vehicular access into the development below the "bridge" is designed like an urban courtyard as a way to slow traffic.

The playground for children promotes play, exercise and most of all… FUN!
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9. Other Business

A. Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500, and 10550 Bren Road East.

Chair Kirk introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Gordon reported. He recommended that the planning commissioners provide comments and feedback on the identified key issues and others the planning commission deems appropriate. The discussion is intended to assist the applicant with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Powers asked for the ratio of parking stalls to units. Gordon referred the question to the applicant.

O’Connell asked if there is a design overlay for the site. Gordon explained that there is a trip generation overlay for Opus. Wischnack noted that the SWLRT placed an overlay on the site. Chair Kirk thought that an overall design plan would be beneficial.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Wischnack explained that both sections of the SWLRT would go over Bren Road West on the south side. There would be a lot of bridge replacements with the SWLRT project. The light rail would travel underground at Feltl Road and Smetana Road.

Becky Landon, with Newport Midwest, and Pete Keeley, of Collage Architects, introduced themselves. Ms. Landon stated that she is looking for input before creating the plan for the aesthetic look of the building. She hopes to set a standard. The proposal would include 240 units of which 55 units would be affordable at 50 percent and 60 percent median-income levels. The market-rate units would be just below luxury level. The applicant is looking at two buildings which would be broken up.

Mr. Keeley said that the proposal hopes to have a lot of outdoor spaces and ways for the residents to engage with the trails and pedestrian paths. There would be a front, direct access to each unit with porches that would be set a few feet up from the grade to offset the lights from vehicles on Bren Road and the train. He explained the trail and sidewalk locations. There would be a commons area with fitness room, party room, and office spaces available to be rented. The
access would be from the one-way road system. There would be a private road to the underground parking access. The inside road would be a loop. The proposal went to great lengths to not have surface parking without a cover, but to build the building over the top of the surface parking area. There would be visibility throughout the site. Vehicles would be able to circulate under, behind the building, and back out. This would be family housing. The affordable housing would be utilized mostly for two and three-bedroom units. There would be a defined play area and family lounge. There would be a drop off access adjacent to Bren Road. He asked for comments on whether a second access would work at that location to provide a drop off. The look of the building would be a modern, contemporary building with front porches, balconies, and some animation along the train side. It would be more subdued the further it got from the SWLRT. The base being considered would be brick and stone with a fair amount of siding and metal paneling. There would be a roof deck overlooking a courtyard. The building would be broken up in different areas with two, three, and five stories. There would be bike and dog spas.

Mr. Keely stated that a one-bedroom unit would have one parking stall and two and three-bedroom units would have two parking stalls which is how the ratio ended up at 1.35 stalls per unit.

Knight asked how close a U-Haul truck could get to access the building. Mr. Keely explained that there would be an 8.5-foot area underground for a vehicle to reach the elevator. Otherwise, there would be 70 feet to the door. Stalls near the elevator would be able to be reserved for a period of time. There would be trash and recycling chutes.

Powers asked if noise reduction measures would be taken. Mr. Keely answered affirmatively. A laminated piece of glass would be added to increase the STC of the window frame. The new construction codes and energy codes would provide a 2’ x 8’ wall and a lot more insulation. The trains are actually pretty quiet. The bells and station noises would be louder than the light rail train. Vibration has not been an issue on any of the lines.

Landon noted that the units that face the light rail are the first to be rented. That has held true for family and senior housing.

Commissioners discussed the proposed parking with Mr. Keely. Mr. Keely stated that the trends are showing that vehicle ownership is dropping dramatically. He noted that there would be the availability to sign leases for off-hour use of surrounding businesses’ parking lots.
Powers asked about safety for pedestrians. Mr. Keely stated that having many eyes on the site by residents having porches and front stoops along with lighting and safe walkways would be beneficial. Wischnack noted that lighting of the Opus trails is part of the city’s capital improvement plan.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Wischnack stated that there would be a fence. The type of fence is being reviewed. Pedestrians would only be able to cross the track at the station.

Gordon confirmed with commissioners that they seemed comfortable with a change in land use from office to residential.

Chair Kirk invited anyone present to comment. There was no response.

Calvert thought that the site is ready for redevelopment. She liked the proposed high-density use. Access to the building that would provide affordable housing has some issues that may need to be resolved. She was glad there would be one, two, and three-bedroom units provided. The proposal would be a visual improvement and be an asset so close to the station.

Knight likes the look of the buildings. Gordon provided that the original plans for Opus included 700 residential units. In the 2030 comprehensive plan, the goal is to add at least 500 units. Major roadwork would be included as part of the light rail project.

Knight liked the play area for little kids. He asked if there was a designated area for older kids. Gordon noted that the trail area would connect the whole area. Shady Oak Beach, Lone Lake, or Hopkins would provide the closest teen areas. The six miles in Opus would be perfect for bikers and scooter users.

Powers thought adding a large number of affordable units and pricing the market rate units just below luxury rates would be smart.

Chair Kirk thought that an awful lot would be going on. He thought scaling it back might provide more of a comfort zone with the parking and access points. He was initially concerned with the affordable units providing a buffer to the light rail for the market-rate units. He liked the common spaces. He supported looking at connecting the site with the walkability of the surrounding area. He favored more visitor parking near the building that would provide affordable housing. He was not as concerned with the access point to the site. He thought that it would be good to have a controlled area and traffic queuing within its own space.
Calvert thought that it would be important that the project appear homogenous and not have the affordable housing building appear different than the other building.

Sewell thought that the project looks great. He favored managing the height. As the starting point for development in the area, it looks great and has a lot of great features.

This concept plan is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its meeting on March 6, 2017.
B. Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East

Gordon gave the staff report. Wischnack indicated there might be an affordable housing aspect to the proposal. This would be reviewed by the EDAC.

Allendorf said months back the council had approved the largest apartment building that had ever been approved in the city. He asked where that project was related to this development and a comparison of the height of both projects. Gordon said the RIZE at Opus was just east of this site. It was a five story building with two levels of covered parking. He said the height of the two would be fairly similar.

Becky Landon, with Newport Midwest, the plan was for around 240 units of multi-family housing with 55 units being affordable at 50 and 60 percent median income.

Pete Keeley, of Collage Architects, presented the site plans.

Wagner said parking was one of things that Keeley mentioned was challenging. He asked what the thinking was in terms of the number of stalls per unit given the proximity to the light rail. Keeley said that right now the plan was right around 1.35 per unit. The count was based on one stall per bedroom.

Wagner said the council likely would be open to the number being less given the proximity of the light rail. He said there was a great dialogue at the planning commission hearing about the affordable housing and the light rail that might make the units marketable. He noted this would be the first development at the Shady Oak Station. One of the things discussed at the community works meetings was each station having a theme or a feel and having it feel like a place. Historically Minnetonka has not been a design standard community but he thought it might be beneficial to think about what the theme or the look of the area might be.

Acomb said during her time on the council there had been a lot of developments that have had both market rate and affordable units. She never recalled any of them separating the different units but rather they have always been integrated together. She asked if there were examples of developments where the two types were separated. She also asked if there had been consideration given with this plan integrating them
together. Wischnack said a good example of a similar development was Westridge Market which has separate components. Landon said the reason the market rate and affordable units would be in separate buildings was primarily due to limitations in the types of financing that are available. The market has changed dramatically in the last six months with fewer buyers of the tax credits. She said this is something that is continually being looked at with the tax credit investors. As the developer her company would be involved in the ownership of both sides. There would be one management company and common ownership running between the two. The idea was to make it as integrated as possible.

Wiersum asked what the target market was for the two parts of the proposal. Keeley said a market study for the market rate units had just been received within the past few days. This would be a constant evaluation to try to understand what the market is. At the start of the planning the thought was it would be more family oriented. From the feedback received, it was more likely the market was people catching the train, more workers, more millennials. Wiersum said in general he thought the plan was interesting and attractive. Although there was a great trail system in the area, green space would be in short supply. Anything that could be done to enhance that would be important.

Allendorf said the units were labeled market rate and affordable because of the financing. He hoped it would be an integrated complex in terms of people not saying “that’s the affordable side…” Landon said there may be some differences in some of the interior finishes but from an exterior perspective they would be the same. Keeley said the challenge was not wanting it to look like one large project with a wall of buildings. Allendorf said he was intrigued with the townhouse part. He thought it was an innovative first level look. He said if the access issues could be figured out he thought this was a good location for this product.

Acomb said as far as the site plan and access issues she was concerned with not having any surface parking near the affordable units. She appreciated the look of the buildings and all the different outdoor spaces. She agreed with Wiersum’s comments about green space.

Schneider said the density was very warranted for this area. The city had focused on getting some high-density housing and this was truly high density housing. There had been other potential sites for high-density housing that went to institutional schools and other nonprofits. He acknowledged the challenge of not knowing what would happen to the property to the north but it would be nice to be able to tie into development of that property. A trail to the LRT station would be nice but it would be better to have a walkway with some landscaping, seating areas and
gathering spaces somewhat coordinated between the properties. This would leverage the limited amount of green space to a more urban greenway. This type of thing is enjoyed by millennials more than a big park. He suggested keeping this possibility in mind. He said he was fine with the parking ratio given the light rail. There would be a challenge with the size of vehicles that could be accommodated by the underground parking. A garbage truck or a furniture truck would not be able to be accommodated. A pull off area off of one of the streets might be important.
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INTRODUCTION

OPUS STATION WITHIN THE CORRIDOR:
A prestigious employment area connected to the station via an extensive network of trails and centered upon a walkable mixed-use core.

EMPLOYMENT The Opus station is a major employment center located near Highway 169, Highway 62, and Shady Oak Road (see Place Types discussion beginning on p. 1-19). It is the largest employment center in Minnetonka and home to many high-profile businesses including United Health Group, Comcast, and American Family Insurance. The station will be an important stop for the thousands of employees that commute to the Opus Business Park from surrounding areas.

TRAIL CONNECTIONS The area is characterized by a 6-mile trail network which gives the area a park-like feel, and a distinctive looped roadway network that links employment buildings with hotels, retail establishments, and local residential neighborhoods in the surrounding area. The trail system can be accessed off Smetana Road and Shady Oak Road at Red Circle Drive. Along with providing area employees with a space for passive recreation and exercise, the trails provide important connections to areas throughout the business park and beyond, however, it rarely connects to the front doors of the businesses.

NEIGHBORHOODS Residential areas are located within the business park in the north and east areas, including a mix of apartments, condominiums, and townhomes. Additional residential density will occur in the area over time and will generate transit ridership. While these areas are not transit-supportive in nature, they are all linked to the station via the extensive trail network.
Station Location

The Opus station is located in the center of the Opus Business Park, a major employment center with a mix of light industrial, office, housing, hotel accommodations, retail, and restaurants in the station area.

The area is characterized by its campus-like setting, circuitous one-way road network, and off-street trail system. The Opus station is anticipated to serve local businesses and residents in the area. This station has strong potential to be a transit stop for reverse commuters.

OPUS STATION AREA TODAY:

West entrance on Shady Oak Road
Existing office

Local wetland
Existing trail underpass

NOTE: 10-minute walkshed approximates the area accessible within a 10-minute walk from the station platform using only the existing sidewalk/trail network. See Glossary for walkshed assumptions and methodology.
Where Are We Today?

The following section describes the station area’s EXISTING CONDITIONS, including the local context, land uses, transit and transportation systems, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, assets, destinations, and barriers to accessing the station. This analysis of current conditions presents key issues and opportunities in the station area and informs the recommendations for future station area improvements.

NOTE: Existing conditions maps are based on data provided by Hennepin County and local municipalities. The data used to create each map is collected to varying degrees of accuracy and represents infrastructure and conditions at varying points in time. Actual conditions may vary slightly from what is shown.

Land Use

The Opus station area is an important employment center with a mix of industrial, light industrial, and office uses. These are the predominant uses in the area, however, there are other uses that will potentially benefit from LRT transit, including nearby residential, hotel, and retail/commercial uses located near Shady Oak Road and Highways 62 and 169. There is also a fair amount of park and open space located to the north of the Opus station.

FIGURE 13-2. EXISTING LAND USE
Roadway Network

The roadway network near the Opus station is a circuitous, one-way road network. It presents challenges to uninitiated motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Roadways are limited and block sizes are large. Major roadways in the area include Shady Oak Road, located about a half-mile to the west of the station, Highway 62, located about a half-mile to the south of the station, and Highway 169, located about a half-mile to the east of the station.

Transit

Existing bus service near the Opus station includes bus route #12, which runs along Bren Road West, with bus stops on Bren Road West and Bren Road East near the proposed station platform. In addition to public bus transit, some local businesses offer a circulator bus shuttle service.
Sidewalk, Trails and Bikeways

The sidewalk system in the Opus station area is extremely limited. The off-street multi-use trail system that runs throughout the Opus campus offers connections to most areas and businesses. While trail access is generally good, many businesses lack trail connections to building entries. The existing trail network in the area offers grade separation from roadways, reducing conflicts between trail users and motorists.

Existing Sanitary Sewer

Sanitary sewer infrastructure consists of a collection of gravity flow sewer mains, lift stations, and pressurized forcemains that transport sewage to a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). An efficient collection system has the capacity to accommodate all of the existing land uses within its particular sewershed. Beyond capacity, the material and age of pipes within a system can also impact a system’s effectiveness.

Sanitary sewer infrastructure within the project area is typically maintained by either the City of Minnetonka or by the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) Division. MCES maintains a series of interceptor trunk sewers which collect sewage at key locations and convey sewage across community boundaries to regional WWTPs. Wastewater from the station area is treated by the MCES Blue Lake WWTP located in Shakopee.
**Existing Water Main**

Water main distribution systems serve to supply potable water to individual properties and to support fire suppression throughout the community. A well-designed system can maintain adequate pressure to support demand of individual properties and provide high flow rates to fire hydrants/fire suppression systems in emergency situations. Because of the complexity of water distribution networks and the importance of pressure, flow, and water quality, City water system models are used to evaluate a system’s adequacy. The material and age of the system’s water mains can also be factors in system breaks, leaks, and pressure and flow degradations.

Water pressure and flow rates can be influenced by: the size of water main serving an area, proximity and elevation relative to a water tower, proximity to a trunk water main with high flow capacity, if the main creates a loop, the demand of adjacent land uses, and the condition of the main.

**Stormwater**

Opus station is located in Nine Mile Creek Watershed District. A significant portion of the drainage is directed north into wetlands and then into Nine Mile Creek. The creek is impaired by chloride and fish biology. In addition, there are numerous wetlands throughout the area, many of which receive piped stormwater. The 100-year floodplain from the creek extends into the north portion of the walk zone.

Discharging within one mile of impaired water may trigger additional National Pollution Discharge Elimination System measures which require additional stormwater management. For impaired waters with a Total Maximum Daily Load, the requirements may increase further. Zoning requirements for areas within the 100-year floodplain may limit development/renovation potential.

Any development/renovation is anticipated to improve existing drainage as a result of enforcing City and Watershed requirements.
Where Are We Going?

The plans and diagrams on the following pages illustrate a range of recommendations for infrastructure improvements, station amenities, and potential redevelopment opportunities within the station area.

The ACCESS AND CIRCULATION PLAN shown in Figure 13-9 provides a high level view of how future transit, automobile, bike, and pedestrian systems will connect to the station area and its surroundings.

Figure 13-10 illustrates the STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS that will facilitate access to and from the station and catalyze redevelopment in the station area. This includes opening day and long-term station area improvements.

Figure 13-11 focuses on OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS only. These recommendations represent the improvements necessary to enhance the efficient function of the transit station, roadways, pedestrian and bicycle connections, and transit connections on opening day in 2018.

Station Area Improvements

The discussion below outlines a range of future station area improvements. While some of the identified improvements may be constructed as part of the LRT project itself, other improvements must be funded, designed and constructed by other entities and will require coordination between the City, County, and Metro Transit as well as local stakeholder and community groups.

ROADWAYS

Opening Day Improvements:
» Rely primarily on the existing street and block network to support pedestrians and cyclists. No new roadways are anticipated for opening day.

» Select roadway changes near the LRT station (noted below as long-term improvements) could be constructed by opening day to provide better traffic flow into and out of the area. Such improvements include the reversal of traffic flow on Red Circle Drive and/or Green Oak Drive. As of December 2013, these improvements are not part of the SW LRT anticipated base project scope and are not slated for opening day implementation (subject to change).

Long-Term Improvements:
» Over time, introduce new roads near the station platform. These new roads should be organized to create smaller blocks for future development and intensification near the transit station as well as enhance connections to the stations. Consider two-way movement near the station on these new roads to calm traffic near the station.

» Other future roadway changes near the LRT station include minor realignment and routing changes to Opus Parkway, Yellow Circle Drive, Blue Circle Drive, Green Oak Drive, Red Circle Drive, Bren Road East and Bren Road West, based upon a recent Opus Area Traffic Study prepared for the City of Minnetonka by WSB & Associates.

PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS

Opening Day Improvements:
» Extend the path connections from bus stops, Park and Ride, and Kiss and Ride locations to the proposed LRT station platform.

» Develop a new grade-separated crossing of Bren Road East leading to and from the north end of the station platform.

» Locate wayfinding signage at the station and key decision making points along the path network away from the station to direct people to area businesses, homes, and other destinations.

» Initiate path improvements throughout the network (as shown in Figure 13-9) including pedestrian-oriented lighting and underpass improvements.

Multi-use path connections
WHERE ARE WE GOING?

TRANSIT CONNECTIONS

Opening Day Improvements:
» Provide new bus facilities near the station platform for connecting bus routes.
» Develop a place for an employer-operated shuttle pick-up and drop-off.

BIKE CONNECTIONS

Opening Day Improvements:
» Provide bike parking to the east of the northern entrance to the platform where it is easily accessible to trail users and is highly visible.
» Explore the potential for bike share facilities at the station and key destinations away from the station to support riding to work from the station.

KISS AND RIDE

Opening Day Improvements:
» Develop a Kiss and Ride / Shuttle loop near the station platform.

PARK AND RIDE

Opening Day Improvements:
» Develop a small temporary Park and Ride facility to the northeast of the station with the intent of redeveloping the site over time.

STATION AMENITIES (Beyond SW LRT Base Project Scope)

Opening Day Improvements:
» Wayfinding – include signage and wayfinding near the station area platform, the Park and Ride/Kiss and Ride facility, and along trails near the station.
» Seating – provide comfortable and durable seating near the station platform and at the Park and Ride facility.

» Lighting – provide adequate lighting for the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists near the station platform, at the Park and Ride facility, and near the Kiss and Ride/shuttle drop-off.
» Plaza – provide a public plaza area near the station platform to provide transit users with a paved queue area to wait for LRT trains, gather, and move about the station area.
» Bike Facilities – provide bicycle parking, lockers, and bike share facilities in a highly visible area near the station platform.
» Public Art – provide public art in the station area.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Long-Term Improvements:
» See the “Development Potential” discussion on page 13-16 for more on long-term development opportunities.

UTILITIES

» See the “Station Area Utility Plan” beginning on page 13-18 for all utility recommendations.
FIGURE 13.9. ACCESS + CIRCULATION PLAN

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

This illustration includes both existing and proposed facilities to show the full network of future bike, pedestrian, automobile, and transit connections.

LRT PLATFORM

LRT LINE

BUS STOP

PARK AND RIDE

FREIGHT LINE

NEW ROADWAY

KISS AND RIDE

EXISTING PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION

EXISTING BIKE CONNECTION

EXISTING MULTI USE CONNECTION

EXISTING WALKSHED

FUTURE WALKSHED (WITH TSAAP IMPROVEMENTS)

NOTE: Existing walkshed approximates the area accessible within a 10-minute walk from the station platform using only the existing sidewalk/trail network. Future walkshed incorporates all proposed improvements to the sidewalk/trail network. Walksheds are based on GIS modeling and available sidewalk/trail information— and may not reflect exact on-the-ground conditions. See Glossary for detailed explanation of walkshed assumptions and methodology.
FIGURE 13-10. STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

SOUTH WEST CORRIDOR INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK - TRANSITIONAL STATION AREA ACTION PLANS
FIGURE 13-11. OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS
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Opening Day Improvements

The following tables and diagrams outline the proposed improvements to be implemented in advance of SW LRT’s opening day in 2018. Table 13-1 and Figure 13-12 show opening day improvements that are part of the SW LRT anticipated base project scope; these improvements will be part of the overall project cost for construction of the LRT line. Table 13-2 and Figure 13-13 include opening day improvements that are recommended as part of the Southwest Corridor Investment Framework and are beyond SW LRT’s anticipated base project scope.

### TABLE 13-1. SOUTHWEST LRT ANTICIPATED BASE PROJECT SCOPE - OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN KEY</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT LOCATION</th>
<th>PROJECT NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>LRT Platform</td>
<td>Along the east side of Bren Rd. E.</td>
<td>Includes related LRT infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>Northeast of station platform</td>
<td>Approx. 90 stall surface lot, leased (includes private shuttle stop/turnaround)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kiss and Ride</td>
<td>Northeast of station platform</td>
<td>Dropoff area and turnaround within Park and Ride lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bus Facilities</td>
<td>Bren Rd. W., north of park and ride</td>
<td>New bus bay on Bren Rd. W. for 2 bus routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>Intersection of Bren Rd. E and Bren Rd. W.</td>
<td>Realigned left turn lane from Bren Rd. W. to Bren Rd. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Trail</td>
<td>Bren Rd. E., west of LRT station platform</td>
<td>Grade separated trail crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Trail</td>
<td>Bren Rd. W., north of park and ride</td>
<td>ADA access ramp to existing grade separated trail crossing of Bren Rd. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Bike Facilities</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Allowance for bike storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Water*</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>New water service and fire hydrant to station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Utilities*</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Adjustment of existing utilities w/in project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Stormwater management*</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anticipated Southwest LRT Base Project Scope as of December 2013 (subject to change)
* Improvement not symbolized on opening day figures (exact location to be determined as part of the base project scope)

### TABLE 13-2. SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK (TSAAP) - OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN KEY</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT LOCATION</th>
<th>PROJECT NOTES</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>Northeast of station platform</td>
<td>Enhanced planting areas/trees</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>Red Circle Drive Reversal</td>
<td>New connections associated with reversing the traffic flow.</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Trail</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Multi-use trails to complete gaps in trail system w/in 10 min walkshed</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intersection Enhancement</td>
<td>Bren Rd. E. and Yellow Circle Dr., southeast of station platform</td>
<td>Grade separated crossings</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bike Facilities</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Bike parking, lockers, pump station and bike share facilities (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>Near station platform and park and ride</td>
<td>Signage and wayfinding (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stormwater management</td>
<td>Near station platform and park and ride</td>
<td>Green infrastructure (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>Near station platform and park and ride</td>
<td>Public art (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Public Plaza</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Public plaza with paving, seating, plantings, lighting, and signage (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Upsize existing 8-inch sanitary sewer to 10-inch minimum in conjunction with LRT rail construction</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Potential

OVERVIEW
Key factors at the Opus station that present opportunities for future redevelopment include the presence of older, low-rise, light industrial buildings near the proposed station platform that may be ripe for redevelopment into more intense, mixed-use. The land uses in the Opus station area include a mix of office, light industrial, commercial/retail, residential, hotel, and park/open space uses. Several underutilized industrial sites present opportunities for future redevelopment in the area. The property directly east of and adjacent to the proposed station platform presents an opportunity for higher density and mixed land uses.

Key challenges that should be addressed to facilitate development potential include land uses, additional roadways and existing roadway improvements, smaller block sizes near the station, trail connectivity in the station area, and wayfinding.

LAND USES
Development potential for the Opus station area could include a mix of office, light industrial, residential, hotel, and retail uses.

PLANNING STRATEGIES
Strategies that should be considered to facilitate future development in the station area include the introduction of a finer grain of streets and block sizes to enhance station mobility and set up a framework for higher density development near the station. Streetscape and trail improvements connecting the station area with potential development sites, local destinations, neighborhoods, and bus transit facilities will enhance development potential in the area.

FIGURE 13-14. POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

FUTURE LAND USE:
- RETAIL & OTHER COMMERCIAL
- OFFICE
Key Considerations for Change and Development Over Time

Development within the station area should focus on increasing density and mix of uses and creating a walkable street and block network within the Bren Road loop that can connect pedestrians via paths to more remote offices throughout station area. Key considerations should include:

**BUILT FORM AND LAND USE**

» Introduce higher density office, hotel, and commercial development with active street level uses facing the station and key pedestrian routes leading to and from the station.

» Design new buildings in the Bren Road loop to enhance pedestrian access by orienting them towards the street and locating them as close to the street line as possible.

» In employment buildings with manufacturing uses, locate the office components adjacent to pedestrian paths, streets and/or open spaces where they can contribute to street life and promote more “eyes on the street”.

» Should the Merchandise Mart site be redeveloped, ensure new development establishes a new east-west pedestrian connection linking the southern end of the station platform with areas to the east.

» Design and size the Park and Ride facility so that it has the potential to be redeveloped with higher density uses over time.

» Design parking structures to reflect the characteristics of more active building types by screening diagonal ramps, screening parked cars from view, and when next to a street incorporating active uses at street level.

**PUBLIC REALM**

» Restrict outdoor storage within the station area so that it does not detract from the image of the area or discourage new higher density employment uses.

» Initiate pathway improvements including pedestrian-oriented lighting, underpass enhancements, and wayfinding at key decision-making points along all paths leading to and from the station.

**MOBILITY**

» Develop a new walkable street and block pattern on the lands within the Bren Road loop including a new two-way street system connecting Bren Road East with Bren Road West to create an address for new development.

» Extend the existing multi-use path network into the Bren Road Circle from all sides and connect the path extensions to the LRT platform.

» Minimize the impact of parking and circulation on pedestrians by locating parking in structures or to the rear or side of new buildings, and consolidating access and service drives.

» Parking access, loading, and servicing elements should be shielded and located to the rear of the building.

» Limit vehicular access points along Bren Road.

Office development that fronts the street

Shielded loaded bays to the rear of the building

Pedestrian path through development
Station Area Utility Plan

OVERVIEW
The station area utility plan and strategies recommended below were developed by considering future transit-oriented development within the station area, as depicted by the Station Area Improvements Plan (Figure 13-10). Minnetonka will need to apply these localized recommendations to the city wide system to ensure that the potential development/redevelopment will not be limited by larger system constraints. Existing models or other methods can be used to check for system constraints in the station areas.

Minnetonka should also consider reviewing the condition of their existing utilities in the station development area. The station construction would provide Minnetonka an opportunity to address any utilities needing repairs. Once the larger system has been reviewed for system constraints, Minnetonka will be able to accurately plan for necessary utility improvements in their city Capital Improvement Program (CIP). All utilities located beneath the proposed LRT rail or station platform should be encased prior to the construction of these facilities. The cost associated with encasing these facilities is assumed to be a project cost and is not included in potential improvements identified for the City of Minnetonka CIP.

APPROACH
Utility improvement strategies are outlined in this report for the ultimate station area development (2030), as well as improvements which should be considered prior to opening day anticipated in 2018. Although recommendations are categorized in one of these two timeframes, Minnetonka should weigh the benefits of completing more or less of these improvements as land becomes available for future development. Minnetonka should take the utility analysis a level further and model future utilities in their city utility system models.

The proposed development and redevelopment areas were evaluated based on Metropolitan Commission Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) usage rates and estimated flows. Estimated flows for one possible development scenario in this area indicate that internal to the station area, no more than eight inch pipe are necessary to serve the mix of proposed and existing development. Each utility system should still be reviewed to identify capacity and demand constraints to the larger system associated with increase in flows from the proposed developments and existing developments in the area. Minnetonka should anticipate the construction of new municipal utilities in conjunction with new or realigned roadways.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS - SANITARY SEWER
Sanitary sewer recommendations for station area improvements include opportunities for Minnetonka to improve the existing sanitary sewer network, without necessarily replacing existing sewers. When recommendations for “improving” existing sanitary sewer are noted, Minnetonka should consider the level to which each specific sewer should be improved.

Methods of improvement could include: lining the existing sewer, pipe joint repair, sewer manhole repair, relocation, and complete replacement.

The following items should be evaluated prior to opening day of the station, although action may not be required until necessary for development:

» Televising existing sewer mains in the station area and proposed development area to determine the condition of the sewer mains, susceptibility for backups or other issues and evaluate for infiltration and Inflow (I&I).

» Locations of known I&I. If previous sewer televising records, city maintenance records, or an I&I study have shown problems, the city should consider taking measures to address the problem.

» The age and material of existing gravity and/or forcemain sanitary sewer in the identified station area. If the lines are older than the material’s typical design life or materials which are susceptible to corrosion relative to soils in the area, the city should consider repairing, lining or replacing the mains.

» Locations of known capacity constraints or areas where city sewer models indicate capacity issues. If there are known limitations, the city should further evaluate the benefit of increasing pipe sizes.

» City sewer system models (existing and future). A review of these models with future development would assist Minnetonka in determining if sewers in the project area should be increased to meet existing or future city system needs.

» Existing sewer pipes should be relocated or encased in areas where they cross or are immediately adjacent to the LRT line/station.
GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS - WATER MAIN

Water main recommendations for station area improvements also include opportunities for Minnetonka to improve the existing water system network. Creating loops in the network can help prevent stagnant water from accumulating along water main stubs, and creating loops of similar sized water main provides the city a level of redundancy in their water network. Redundancy helps reduce the impacts to the community during system repairs, and also helps stabilize the pressure in the network.

The following items should be evaluated prior to opening day of the station, although action may not be required until necessary for development:

» The age and material of the existing mains in the identified station area. If the mains are older than the materials typical design life or materials which are susceptible to corrosion relative to soils in the area, the city should consider replacing the main.

» Locations of previous water main breaks. If water main breaks repeatedly occur in specific areas, the city should consider replacing or repairing the main.

» Locations with known water pressure issues or areas where city models indicate low pressure. If there are known limitations (for either fire suppression or domestic uses), the city should further evaluate the benefit of increasing main sizes.

» Locations with known or potential water quality issues. If there are mains known to be affecting the water quality (color, taste, odor, etc.) of their system, Minnetonka should consider taking measures to address the problem affecting water quality.

» City water system models (existing and future). A review of these models with future development would assist Minnetonka in determining if mains in the project area should be improved to meet existing or future city system needs based on demand constraints.

» Existing water main pipes should be relocated or encased in areas where they cross or are immediately adjacent to the LRT line/station.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS — STORM SEWER

Local storm sewer improvements are recommended to be completed in conjunction with other improvements in the station area. Improvements which will likely require storm sewer modifications include: roadway realignments, roadway extensions, and pedestrian sidewalk/street scape improvements. Storm sewer improvements may consist of: storm sewer construction, manhole reconstruction, drain tile extensions, storm sewer relocation, and complete replacement. These local storm sewer improvements are included as part of the overall cost of roadway and streetscape improvements recommended in this plan. Where roadway/streetscape improvements are part of the SW LRT anticipated base project scope, associated storm sewer improvements are assumed to be a project cost. Minnetonka should also consider coordinating with the local watershed district and other agencies to review the condition of and capacity of existing trunk storm sewer systems serving more regional surface water needs.

STORMWATER BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

There are numerous stormwater best management practices (BMPs) that can be used to address stormwater quality and quantity. As part of this project, BMP guides were developed for four stations (Royalston, Blake, Shady Oak, and Mitchell) which exemplify the range of development intensity and character in the urbanized environment along the Southwest LRT Corridor. The recommendations and practices identified in each of the four BMP guides are applicable to various stations along the corridor.

Potential stormwater management strategies for this station area may be similar to those shown in the BMP guide for the Shady Oak station (see p. 12–28). Minnetonka should consider implementing applicable best management practices similar to those in the Shady Oak Station BMP guide. Stormwater management recommendations should be constructed in conjunction with public and private improvements and future development/ redevelopment in the station area.
Station Area Utility Plan (Continued)

STATION AREA UTILITY RECOMMENDATIONS

Utility recommendations (illustrated in Figure 13-15) are based on a localized analysis of proposed development. It is recommended that the City of Minnetonka take this analysis a step further and review system constraints to the existing and future sanitary sewer and water main systems using existing sewer CAD or water CAD models, or other methods of modeling these systems.

Opening Day Recommendations:
1. Encase existing sanitary sewer crossing the LRT rail construction.
2. Encase existing water main crossing the LRT rail construction.
3. Consider upsizing existing 8-inch sanitary sewer crossing Bren Road E. to 10-inch minimum in conjunction with LRT rail construction (confirm with City model).

Long-Term Recommendations:
1. Construct 8-inch minimum sanitary sewer in conjunction with roadway construction of new streets east of the station.
2. Construct 8-inch minimum water main in conjunction with roadway reconstruction/construction of new streets east of the station.
NEW LIFE IN THE RAW FRONTIER

In the early 1800's, Minnesota was a vast tract of land inhabited only by various bands of Chippewa and Sioux Indians. Around the middle of the century things started to change. Settlers arrived in increasing numbers at St. Paul Landing, the recently designated political capitol for the large expanse of land between the St. Croix and Missouri Rivers.

After a short stay in St. Paul, many of the settlers moved further up river to the smaller village of St. Anthony, the sawmill town by the falls. St. Paul and St. Anthony, both raw frontier communities, offered the excitement, hustle and bustle characteristic of newly created boom towns.

The trail to points west led from these fledgling cities past Lake Calhoun, Lake Harriet, paralleled Minnehaha Creek and eventually ended in the rich farm land surrounding Lake Minnetonka. Those here for the purpose of homesteading or farming followed this trail westward in search of fertile land.

The area comprising Hopkins, Minnetonka, Edina and Eden Prairie soon was settled with families. Civilization had come to this newly instituted Territory of Minnesota. The areas that were populated by these pioneers eventually became towns and villages that still exist today.
The Township of Eden Prairie and Minnetonka came into existence in 1858. Eden Prairie's name was bestowed on it by Elizabeth Ellet, an author of national fame. She was impressed with the beautiful rolling prairies and likened them to her conception of the Garden of Eden. Others must have agreed with her as the township was officially chartered under the name of Eden Prairie in 1858.

About the same time, the Township of Minnetonka was officially chartered, taking its name from the large lake close by. The lake was originally named Peninsula Lake by Calvin Tuttle and Simon Stevens, earlier pioneers. Governor Alexander Ramsey later renamed it Minnetonka, a Sioux word meaning big water.

Hopkins, then a part of Minnetonka Township, had its beginning roughly around 1870. The Minneapolis and St. Louis Railway purchased right-of-ways across farmers' land for their line to St. Louis, Missouri. Once the line was completed, a station was constructed opposite the home of Harley Hopkins and was given the name of Hopkins. With the added growth brought by the railroad, Hopkins became an entity in its own right and in 1887 the village was formally incorporated and separated from Minnetonka Township.

In 1888, Edina followed suit, electing to make their settlement a separate village from that of Richfield. Andrew and John Craik, immigrants from the Old World and pioneers in the new Territory, had come to Minnesota from Edinburgh, Scotland. They opened a flour mill and named it Edina in honor of their homeland. It is from the Craik brothers' Edina flour mill that the village of Edina took its name.

From their first perilous foothold, these four cities grew and prospered. Today, they offer Minnesota a heritage rich in determination, vision and progress, a history as much a part of the present and future as it is of the past.

At the convergence of these four progressive communities, a new pioneering effort has begun. 410 acres of small truck farms and private estates that once belonged to the Minnesota Pioneers has been acquired by Rauenhorst Corporation. The land, located in Minnetonka, Edina, and Eden Prairie, and bordered by Hopkins, will be the site of a new innovative community geared to our modern way of working and living.
There has long been a need for a new approach to community planning, especially on a large scale. Major cities, unlike smaller communities, are decades behind in responding to our present needs, work habits and life styles. Traffic systems and patterns can no longer handle the growing number of commuters. Present day transportation is producing a pollution problem that was undreamed of back in the 1950’s and early 60’s. Today’s major cities are no longer people oriented.

Mr. Rauenhorst, aware of the direction community planning has taken in the last twenty years and of the problems that have resulted, devised an entirely new approach, one that was people oriented. He called it Opus 2.

Opus 2 combines the history of the past, needs of the present and the projected requirements of the future into a self-contained working/living center offering 95% of what is essential to life. It coordinates office, industrial, commercial and residential areas into an integral working/living environment able to provide jobs, recreation, housing, shopping, medical and cultural facilities. It is self-sustaining, making it profitable for companies to locate there, and it is convenient for commuting. Opus, which means creation, is an appropriate name to apply to this unusual approach to community planning.
Opus 2 went from concept to reality when Data 100 approached Rauenhorst Corporation to build new Corporate Headquarters, an office and plant facility. Rauenhorst was asked to find a suitable site within a designated area. Twenty-five acres were eventually located west of the Twin Cities bordered by Shady Oak Road, County Road 18 and Crosstown Highway 62. While in the process of acquiring the land for Data 100, Rauenhorst noticed that the adjoining acreage was also available. The area was ideal for the Opus 2 concept. The most important criteria were there: Proximity to the surrounding communities, existing access through roads and freeways and over 400 acres of undeveloped land in a suburban location. Rauenhorst Corporation decided to use this opportunity to implement Opus 2.
Much in-depth research was required concerning the environmental aspects of Opus 2’s impact on the area. Independent studies were initiated to determine the feasibility of the automobile primary road system and the pedestrian traffic secondary road system concept as it related to the land use pattern. An environmental assessment was performed. Informal meetings were held with several different agencies, councils, commissions, and governments at the staff level including: the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District, the Environmental Quality Control Council, the Metropolitan Council, the Hennepin County Highway Department, the planning and engineering staffs of Edina, Eden Prairie, Hopkins, and Minnetonka, the Hennepin County Conservation Department and the Metropolitan Transit Commission.

Input received from these groups helped to determine the strength of each element of the Opus 2 concept and how well it would work with other elements of the plan. One of the main elements Rauenhorst Corporation considered during planning was preservation of the area’s natural amenities. Rather than redesign the topography to fit the needs of Opus 2, Opus 2 has been designed to coordinate with the environment that already exists. Great care is being taken to preserve ecosystems such as wooded sections, marshes, knolls, valleys and natural water retention areas that enrich and enhance the environmental setting. It is this care and concern for the unspoiled beauty of the land that makes Opus 2 unique.
WORKING IN OPUS 2

Opus 2 is a staged development, taking an estimated ten years for completion. The industrial and office portions of Opus 2, consisting of 2 million square feet, are presently being developed. These will be coordinated with the 55,000 square foot neighborhood convenience shopping center, some residential housing and the 300,000 square foot multi-purpose service center.

Designed to fit today's working/living needs, Opus 2 offers many advantages not found elsewhere. Opus 2's location is nearly perfect for the businessman. Services such as restaurants, hotels, shopping centers, and some of the Twin Cities' greatest recreational facilities are located either in Opus 2 or are just moments away. Opus 2 is serviced by one of the metropolitan area's major arteries, Crosstown Highway 62, which puts the office, commercial and industrial areas of downtown Minneapolis, downtown St. Paul, the suburbs that circle the metropolitan area and the Minneapolis/St. Paul International Airport within minutes of the busy executive. Opus 2 is situated in the heart of the blue and white collar labor markets and is surrounded by four executive residential communities.

Added to this, buildings constructed in Opus 2 are architecturally designed to meld with the environment, avoiding visual congestion and enhancing the natural scenic amenities.

As Opus 2 was being engineered, much thought was given to controlling traffic peaks, thus avoiding rush hour traffic jams. The result is a dual roadway system.
that intra-connects Opus 2. It consists of a one-way primary roadway for standard automobiles and a two-way secondary roadway for pedestrian, bicycle traffic and electric vehicles. The two systems are totally separate and are bridged wherever they intersect. Traffic from the primary system can't cross over or interfere with traffic on the secondary system. Counter-rotating traffic circles and the use of one-way streets in the primary system enable 50,000 vehicles to move in and out of Opus 2 daily without ever encountering oncoming vehicles, traffic signals or stop signs. This transportation system permits easy employee and customer access to all areas of Opus 2 in a continuous and uninterrupted fashion.

Opus 2 is in an ideal location for eventually connecting with mass transportation systems of the surrounding communities of Hopkins, Edina, Eden Prairie, Minnetonka, Minneapolis and St. Paul. Although Opus 2 is presently only minutes from these office, commercial and industrial areas, interconnected mass transportation will further tie Opus 2 into the Metropolitan business community.
LIVING IN OPUS 2

The central feature that blends the office, commercial and industrial portion of Opus 2 with the residential areas is the focal point of the working/living community, the multi-purpose service center. This structure, intended to serve Opus 2 and the surrounding area, will combine a number of uses on the same site. Proposed are high-value specialty shops, cultural facilities such as a community theater, an ecumenical chapel, dining establishments, police, fire and medical auxiliary services, all combined and located in a uniquely designed building.

Situated within casual walking distance of the multi-purpose service center will be a number of neighborhoods, each with its own architectural style and individual characteristics. They will be serviced by the same primary and secondary roadway system that intra-connects the office, commercial and industrial portions of Opus 2.

The treatment of the residential areas will reflect the Rauenhorst Corporation commitment to preserve and enhance the natural environment. Exquisitely manicured grounds will accent the aesthetically designed buildings.

Each neighborhood will vary in density and will be convenient to the office, commercial and industrial portions of Opus 2, as well as to the surrounding services, communities, mass transportation systems, parks and recreational areas. The housing will range from rental units to condominiums, providing a way of life that is both distinctive and elegant. Residents will enjoy comfort, beauty, quality and peace of mind living.

Opus 2 living is designed for the discriminating. The over one thousand units planned will provide the ultimate in modern living, offering a new vista in housing experience.
EXCITING CHALLENGES

Numerous challenges are presented by the Opus 2 project; corporate headquarters with adjacent housing, mixed professional, commercial, office, and research facilities, industrial condominiums, preservation of natural amenities, aesthetically designed buildings, new techniques of crime prevention through internal security systems, experimentation with energy supply, the primary/secondary roadway concept, mass transit systems and people movers. These are just a few of the exciting developments planned for Opus 2.

Intense research is presently underway concerning the last category, people movers. Proposed are electric vehicles. They would be advantageous to residents as they would adapt to the dual roadway concept, would cost a fraction of the present sub-compact car, both to purchase and to operate, and they would be non-polluting.

RAUENHORST CORPORATION AND OPUS 2

Opus 2 originated from Mr. Rauenhorst's deep-seated conviction that he and his firm have a responsibility to society to research and create new methods and ideas for living and working. These new ideas are then implemented through the Rauenhorst Corporation concept of Total Responsibility which includes: site selection, architectural design, financing, development, engineering, construction, leasing, management and maintenance—all under one unified contract. As applied to Opus 2, the Total Responsibility concept has played a major role in helping to create a compatible working/living environment, developed and maintained along stringent standards, that will provide 95% of what is essential to life as well as ensure steadily increasing property values for your firm’s investment. Therefore, Opus 2 isn’t just another development.

It's a singular working/living experience at the crossroad of what was, and what ought to be.

OPUS 2—CROSSROADS OF TOMORROW, TODAY.
THE CITY OF MINNETONKA

Critical to the development of an enterprise such as Opus 2 is the understanding, and support of local governmental bodies during the planning, programming, and construction phases. We have been fortunate indeed to have had a cooperative endeavor emerge with a number of such governmental groups, but especially with the City of Minnetonka. Even as we wrote our Opus 2 brochure, events were moving forward with gratifying rapidity. Zoning of our industrial park and commercial areas was obtained, concept plan approval for the housing area of the plan was granted, and an industrial revenue bond issue providing for the timely completion of the industrial/commercial areas was authorized by the City Council.

We at Rauenhorst Corporation extend special thanks and appreciation to the Council, Planning Commission, and Staff of Minnetonka for their assistance in making the promise of Opus 2 a reality today.

Gerald Rauenhorst
September 1, 2014

Ms. Kerri Pearce Ruch  
Principal Planning Analyst  
Hennepin County Housing, Community Works & Transit  
701 4th Avenue South, Suite 400  
Minneapolis, MN  55415

Dear Ms. Pearce Ruch:

We are pleased to present the accompanying Housing Gaps Analysis for the SWLRT corridor. This analysis and related recommendations are based on our review of prior research and data assembly, supplemented by our own primary research and expertise derived through analysis of market conditions, stakeholder interviews, and a detailed review of individual station area land use, development trends, and market conditions. This report contains an assessment of the potential for future residential development for the ½ mile corridor as a whole, and is segmented by station area and by product type. As well, we provide an analysis and discussion of market inefficiencies and expected demand-supply gaps, and strategies for mitigating barriers to development of various housing products along SWLRT over time. Our recommendations are intended to guide future planning and policy related to the corridor-wide housing strategy, development planning, and public investment around each station area in a way that will help to “set the stage” for quality residential and mixed use development which constitutes an optimal mix of housing choices in these areas.

We remain available to answer any questions and for discussion following your review of the document and look forward to finishing our work with you on this important project in the coming weeks.

Sincerely,

MARQUETTE ADVISORS

Louis W. Frillman     Brent E. Wittenberg  
President      Vice President

Marquette Advisors Offices:  
Minneapolis Office: 50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1370, Minneapolis, MN  55402  
Phone: 612-335-8888; Fax: 612-334-3022  
Seattle Office: 2723 California Avenue SW, Seattle, WA 98116  
Phone: 425-392-7482; Fax: 425-392-7330  
Washington DC Office: 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington DC  20036  
Phone:  202-331-0226; Fax 612-334-3022
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INTRODUCTION

Marquette Advisors was retained by the Family Housing Fund as the fiscal agent on behalf of Southwest LRT Community Works, Twin Cities LISC, and the partner cities of Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Hopkins, Edina, Minnetonka and Eden Prairie to provide a “Housing Gaps Analysis” in reference to the planned Southwest Light Rail Transit (“SWLRT”) Corridor. SWLRT will span approximately 15 miles, with 17 planned stations in Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Hopkins, Minnetonka and Eden Prairie. The Housing Gaps Analysis is a critical component in developing a corridor-wide housing strategy, the goals and principles of which are outlined below.

SWLRT Community Works Goals:

- Economic competitiveness and job growth
- Promoting opportunities for business and employment growth
- Housing choices
- Positioning the Southwest LRT communities as a place for all to live
- Quality neighborhoods
- Creating unique, vibrant, safe, beautiful, and walkable station areas
- Critical connections
- Improving affordable regional mobility for all users

SWLRT Community Works Guiding Principles for Investment:

- Partner for Effective Planning and Implementation
- Create Great Quality Transit Oriented Development and Achieve Unique, Vibrant Places
- Stimulate Employment and Economic Development
- Provide a full Range of Housing Choices
- Strengthen Communities through Connections and Access to Opportunity
- Maintain and Improve Natural Systems
- Build Healthy Communities
- Enhance Tax Base

The Housing Gaps Analysis utilizes prior research, notably the SW Community Works Housing Inventory, along with station-area plans, maps and related data and research compiled to date through the SW Community Works Corridor Investment Framework.
The primary objectives of the Housing Gaps Analysis are as follows:

The Housing Gaps Analysis provides a review of existing conditions and interprets prior studies, building upon complementary research and data, and engaging a full range of stakeholders in the analysis of the corridor, demographics, land use, growth patterns, and housing market conditions. The Gaps Analysis provides a forward-looking analysis regarding the potential for residential development within the SWLRT corridor, and future housing supply gaps, answering the following key questions:

**Work Scope Key Questions**

- Who will want to live here, and why?
- How many households would choose to reside in TOD housing within the SWLRT Corridor?
- What are the characteristics of those households, particularly with respect to age, income, household size and employment status?
- What types of housing are needed to accommodate this level of growth?
- Furthermore, what are expected future supply gaps, comparing what the market is expected to produce with a “full range” of housing choices by affordability level?
- What are market inefficiencies and barriers to development (and/or preservation) of a full range of housing choices within the Corridor? And what are some specific strategies, policies and tools to mitigate those barriers?
- What is the impact of SWLRT upon the existing housing stock and resident base? (i.e. what are risks associated with gentrification?)
- What tools, policies and strategies are appropriate in order to set the stage for quality development and the provision of a full range of housing choices for the SWLRT corridor?

“Corridor” Definition: For this Housing Gaps Analysis, the SWLRT Corridor is defined as that area comprising a ½ mile radius around each of the planned LRT stations.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section describes, in brief, key findings and recommendations derived from the Housing Gaps Analysis. The information presented in this section are meant as a summary of, not a substitute for the body of the report, which contains additional information and detail critical to a full understanding of the analysis, the recommendations provided, and the context within which they were formulated.

Background & Context

Marquette Advisors was retained to provide a Housing Gaps Analysis related to the SWLRT Corridor. The “Corridor” as defined for purposes of this analysis comprises a ½ mile radius surrounding each of the planned LRT stations. The Housing Gaps Analysis is a critical component in the development of a corridor-wide housing strategy by SWLRT Community Works, along with its partner communities (Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Edina, Hopkins, Minnetonka and Eden Prairie), and a full range of stakeholders. To date, considerable research and planning has already been done, inclusive of the SW Community Works Corridor Housing Inventory and the Investment Framework. The Housing Gaps Analysis interprets and builds upon these work elements and provides further research and analysis, culminating in recommendations intended to guide future planning that will “set the stage” for a “full range of housing choices” within the corridor.
The Housing Gaps Analysis provides recommendations for new residential development for the corridor as a whole, and for individual station areas, and identifies future supply gaps. The report discusses market inefficiencies and addresses the need for creative public/private partnerships that will help to facilitate the provision of a full range of housing choices in the corridor over the long-term.

Demographics -- Key Findings:

The SWLRT corridor is home to 37,000 residents and 19,000 households. The majority (about 2/3) are renters. Trend is likely to continue, based on demographics, lifestyle, and market factors.

The Twin Cities Metro Area is expected to grow by 11,000 to 13,000 households/year through 2030. 80% of growth is expected to be households without children, and nearly 1/3 of regional growth expected to be single-person households.

Millenials and Baby Boomers are having a major impact on Twin Cities housing market. Both segments are drawn to high-density multifamily housing products which feature “efficiency in living,” and connectivity to work, goods/services, public facilities, and entertainment/amenities. We expect that TOD housing products and SWLRT will appeal to both market segments.
Corridor Employment – Key Findings:

107,000 workers in corridor -- The corridor features a strong corporate presence, with a deep and diverse economic base. The corridor provides a “full range” of jobs, ranging from entry-level part time positions up to high-level management and executive positions in a wide range of industries.

Corridor workers a target for new TOD housing -- Less than 4% of the corridor’s 107,000 workers also reside within ½ mile of SWLRT presently. New housing products near SWLRT are expected to appeal to corridor workers.

Earnings & housing affordability -- Importantly, we note that a full 20% of the corridor employee-base earns less than $1,250 per month. A household with a single wage-earner at this level could afford a monthly housing payment of just $375 per month. Two workers at this level could afford a monthly housing cost of about $750. Worker earnings were a key factor considered by Marquette Advisors in developing recommendations for housing construction & preservation in the corridor.

Educational Facilities – Key Findings:

Expect modest impact of housing development upon local schools – Considering demographic trends and expected development patterns, fueled by growth from single-persons households and households without children, TOD housing developments along SWLRT are not expected to have a substantial impact on enrollment at any one educational facility within the corridor.

TOD may boost open enrollment – The development of SWLRT will improve connectivity of residents with schools and, thus, will create opportunities for open enrollment, with students utilizing SWLRT to commute to/from their place of residence to school.

SWLRT housing will likely appeal to school teachers and other staff – The development of new workforce and market rate rental housing, as well as entry-level for sale housing, may in fact be attractive to teachers and other school staff who presently commute longer distances due to an affordability gap between current salaries and corridor housing costs.

Residential Development Outlook – Key Findings:

Market demand = 13,000  Outlook – Key Fin (2015-2030). This represents a gap between existing housing inventory and the number of households who will want to live along the corridor.

Recommended Development Goal = 11,000 new units. Tempered to reflect development constraints: land availability, land use factors, development cost factors, etc. However, at least 20% of these units still not feasible but for public/private partnerships and gap financing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>0-30% AMI</th>
<th>30-60% AMI</th>
<th>60-80% AMI</th>
<th>80-100% AMI</th>
<th>100% of AMI+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Entry-Level</th>
<th>Mid-Mkt</th>
<th>High-End</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Rd.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Hopkins</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Town Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>6,402</td>
<td>9,922</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>11,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future development potential for 21st St. Station Area to be determined.

Source: Marquette Advisors
New unit mix - 90% rental, 10% home ownership -- Why? Considers demographics, economics and lifestyle factors. Regional and corridor growth dominated by small households. Market preference for efficient and convenience in housing, with strong connectivity to jobs and “urban” amenities. Approximately 1/3 of new construction recommended affordable up to 100% of AMI.

- 12% (1,300 units) - <60% AMI
- 9% (1,000 units) - 61% to 80% AMI
- 12% (1,300 units) - 61% to 80% AMI

Station Area recommendations for new construction take into account the following factors:

- Current housing inventory, demographic composition and economic base
- Land availability - ownership of undeveloped and/or under-utilized parcels
- Characteristics of surrounding land use (as-is and future expectations)
- Proximity to jobs, types of jobs & incomes levels, proximity to goods/services, public and educational facilities and other modes of transit

Mixed-income residential development a “best practice” related to inclusionary housing in the corridor -- Publicly owned sites present the best short-term opportunity for this type of development.

Housing Preservation – Key Findings:

Affordable housing is a primary asset within the corridor presently – Corridor features an estimated 7,700 units which are affordable to households earning <60% of AMI, representing almost ½ of the existing rental stock.

Limited risk of gentrification – Existing supply includes older product mix (1960’s/70’s vintage). Rents in many cases are well below 60% of AMI target. Age/quality and market obsolescence limits potential for major rent increases.

Housing preservation far less expensive than construction of new units – Providing new housing at levels which are affordable to households earning <60% of AMI, even up to 80-100% of AMI, is a significant challenge due to cost factors. Barriers to development are significant. Thus, particular focus should be given to preserving and improving the existing housing stock.
Corridor Strengths – Key Findings:

**Strong demographics and high-quality real estate** – The SW corridor features some of the region’s highest-quality and highest-valued real estate. High-quality housing stock, stable neighborhoods, close to parks and recreational opportunities, shopping and restaurants

**Strong corporate presence and jobs base** -- There corridor features depth and diversity in its employment base, with 107,000 jobs in the corridor. Proximity of the station areas to major employment nodes bodes well for connectivity and desirability of future TOD housing.

**City staff are experienced and familiar with development tools** – Our analysis and interviews indicates that city planning staff and administration have a firm grasp of redevelopment “tools” and experience in the types of public/private partnerships which will be required to achieve corridor housing goals.

Key Development Challenges:

**Limited vacant land supply and shortage of publicly-owned sites** – Much of the corridor is already built-out. The limited supply of developable land, paired with expected strong market demand for housing (and commercial forms of development) results in escalating land values. This poses the single-most significant barrier to the development of a full range of housing choices in many station areas.

**Land use issues reduce redevelopment potential** - Private ownership; highest and best use issues. Redevelopment is complicated and costly. It requires substantial investment or sale by private land/property owners. The objectives and risk tolerance of current property owners varies substantially.

**Auto-oriented areas, lacking pedestrian/bike friendly amenities & connectivity** – Several of the station areas are presently auto-oriented. Considerable investment in pedestrian/bike connectivity and public realm elements will be required in order to create the type of lifestyle environment preferred by prospective TOD residents.

**Many stations lack street “vibrancy” and supporting commercial/restaurant nodes and public amenities** – The region’s population base has shown a strong preference for housing in mixed-use neighborhoods which provide walkability and easy access to a variety of amenities – shops, restaurants, parks, trails, and recreational features, and entertainment. These elements should be incorporated in station area planning.
**Recommendations & Next Steps:**

**Consensus, “buy-in” and commitment are critical to success** – Joint powers agreements and representation of all corridor communities and stakeholder groups will be paramount to achieving The housing goals set forth by SWLRT Community Works.

**Housing preservation strategy needed to invest in quality and sustainability of existing affordable housing stock** – The strategy and investment model(s) should include the following elements:

- **Deploys capital which invests in the quality, sustainability and long-term affordability of this aging housing stock.** This will require dedicated funds and creative partnerships with private owners and non-profit development/management partners.

- **Match services with the resident base** -- fostering upward mobility within the community’s economy and housing market. Partnerships involving the public sector and varied advocate groups with corporate partners and educational institutions should be developed in order to provide services such as job/life skills education and household economics/financial advisory services and counseling.

**Develop “branding” and promotions strategy for SWLRT lifestyle** – What is TOD? And what kind of lifestyle will TOD housing and SWLRT provide? Promote market awareness of the benefits to TOD living in SW corridor.

**Station area master planning** -- Focus on stations with significant public land ownership and near-term development opportunities. This presents an opportunity for a “signature” development on SWLRT which demonstrates all desired “lifestyle” elements and provides a “full range” of housing choices. Success is critical in short-term developments, and sets the stage for future success in other station areas. To ensure success, the master planning process must engage a full range of stakeholders, both public and private. The Corridor Development Initiative (CDI) model is a best-practice and should be an integral component of future station area planning, as it provides a framework for collaboration and consensus building around quality planning.

**Develop consensus and adopt housing policy goals** – The partner communities should work together to build consensus around the concept of “full housing choice” and preservation and production goals. We suggest the creation of a coordinated SWLRT Housing Policy Overlay Zone, for the area within ½ mile of each LRT station. This area should be established for application of housing goals, policy and oversight. The structure and composition of which should be determined by the stakeholders, as buy-in from all corridor cities is key to success. We recommend that cities maintain development review/approval authority, utilizing their own “toolbox” and strategies which promote housing development and preservation which is consistent with the goals established within the SWLRT housing strategy.
Establish a $200m+ TOD Affordable Housing Fund -- Why? Existing tools/strategies are not enough to have impact at major scale. A dedicated funding source is needed to support construction of 1,300 new units at <60% of AMI and to preserve/improve 7,700 existing units affordable at <60% of AMI.

**Fund Structure:**
- Independently financed pool of funds that provides a return to investors
- More risk tolerant than traditional financing
- Patient financing with longer term payback

**Possible Capitalization:**
- Local foundations & intermediaries
- Family funds and partnerships
- Corporate interests (e.g. major businesses in SW corridor)
- Traditional institutional investment sources (insurance companies, etc)

While Marquette Advisors believes a program which provides a return to investors and generates cash flow for re-investment is the preferred structure, some type of public/private alignment might work under certain governing circumstances. While not a charge of this engagement, Marquette believes that some form of overarching authority driving the Fund would enhance achievement of housing policy and development/preservation goals.

A $200 million fund, properly designed and leveraged, should be able to provide key (and currently missing) capital to drive development and preservation which meets stated housing production and preservation goals.
ASSESSMENT OF PRIOR RESEARCH

A primary objective of this assignment is to answer the following key question: What housing types and values are missing from the corridor to capture future market demand? The following points summarize the varied data elements and trends considered in developing our analysis and estimates regarding the potential for housing development (and preservation) within the SWLRT ½ mile corridor. This is followed by a summary of our findings and estimates of household growth and housing development potential for the corridor as a whole and for each individual station area.

Data Sources and Research Considered

We have reviewed and utilized the SW Community Works Housing Inventory, completed in 2013, which contains extensive data on the existing housing stock, resident and employment base for the corridor. More recently, we were able to review a June 2014 report entitled “Twin Cities Metropolitan Council Area Trends, Preferences, and Opportunities: 2010 to 2020, 2030 and 2040,” prepared for the Met Council Community Development Committee by Arthur C. Nelson, Ph.D., FAICP. This study presents a timely analysis of demographic trends and household characteristics at the metro level and relates these trends to future housing needs in light of changes ongoing relative to our population base and how future households will live and work in the region. Numerous other research, documents and planning studies were reviewed by Marquette Advisors as part of this engagement and are accordingly referenced throughout this report where relevant.

In assessing the potential for housing development (and preservation) within the corridor, Marquette Advisors has considered all relevant data and market factors, such as economic and demographic data and forecasts by the Met Council and ESRI, a nationally recognized econometric forecasting firm. Importantly, we have analyzed the current economic base and employment conditions within the corridor and metro-wide, together with growth forecasts by industry and occupation from sources including the Met Council and MN-DEED.

As well, we have reviewed land use, commuting patterns, and current residential market conditions in the southwest metro area, utilizing Marquette Advisors proprietary multi-family database along with published data and reporting on Twin Cities housing market conditions. We have also utilized prior research such as the SW Community Works Housing Inventory (2013), The Space Between Report (2013), and all station area planning and studies compiled to date, notably the SW Community Works Corridor Investment Framework (“Investment Framework”) and related Transitional Station Area Action Plans (“TSAAP”) from 2013.

Based on our review of the Investment Framework planning documents and our own field research and analysis we have taken into consideration current land use, land availability and cost, and the “ripeness” of sites for development (and/or change in use) in each station area. Our recommendations take into consideration Investment Framework recommendations regarding future land use and housing within the context of other uses, inclusive of retail, office,
industrial, recreational and institutional components, together with our own assessment relative to market and land use trends.

We have also evaluated TOD development trends throughout the Twin Cities and in other markets such as Seattle, Charlotte, Denver, Washington DC and Dallas. We have analyzed housing construction trends along both the Blue Line (Hiawatha) and the Green Line (Central Corridor). We have evaluated national TOD trends through sources such as the Center for Transit Oriented Development and publications and interviews with TOD analysts and policy experts in other markets, including those at the National Housing Conference, Center for Housing Policy, and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

**Current Resident Base**

The ½ mile corridor is home to approximately 37,000 residents and 19,000 households. The table on the following page, taken from the *SW Community Works Housing Inventory*, shows the population and household composition within ½ mile of each station site.

**Key findings are as follows:**

- The majority of corridor residents are renters, with 12,425 renter households (66%) and 6,400 homeowners (34%). By comparison, for the Twin Cities Metro Area as a whole, an estimated 70% of households own their homes.

- Approximately 1.3% of Twin Cities Metro Area households reside in the corridor presently. The corridor grew by an estimated 6,800 persons and 3,600 households between 2000 and 2012, capturing only about 3.2% of Metro Area household growth during this timeframe.

- Interestingly, the corridor at this time is somewhat younger, on average, compared to the region as a whole, as 52% of the resident base is under the age of 35, with a relatively large group of persons between the ages of 25 and 34. As well, the corridor features a relatively high concentration of renters, as 66% of corridor households were renters, compared to 36% throughout Hennepin County.
## Housing Gaps Analysis

### POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD GROWTH TRENDS

**SWLRT Stations Half-Mile Radius 2000-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>3,964</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>-203</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>-214</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>3,902</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Road</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>5,322</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>-115</td>
<td>-168</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>-171</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.P. Town Center</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>230.8</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>-107</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>-104</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29,951</td>
<td>36,787</td>
<td>36,730</td>
<td>6,836</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>-117</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Road</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.P. Town Center</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>2082.8</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15,193</td>
<td>18,834</td>
<td>19,176</td>
<td>3,641</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau; ESRI; Maxfield Research, Inc.

---

**Metropolitan Council Regional Forecast to 2040**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,850,000</td>
<td>3,102,000</td>
<td>3,381,000</td>
<td>3,674,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>1,118,000</td>
<td>1,257,000</td>
<td>1,386,000</td>
<td>1,509,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1,548,000</td>
<td>1,819,000</td>
<td>1,953,000</td>
<td>2,097,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Twin Cities Metropolitan Council
Twin Cities Population & Household Growth Forecasts

We have considered growth forecasts by both the Met Council and ESRI, and data regarding the composition of the population/household base, in developing estimates of future household growth potential for the SWLRT corridor. It is important to understand not only the pace of growth, but also changes in the composition of the area’s population base over time.

Long-term forecasts by the Met Council predict that the Twin Cities Metro Area (7 counties) will grow by an average of about 13,000 households per year over the next 20 years. By comparison, short-term forecasts by national econometric forecasting firm ESRI suggest that the region will grow by around 11,000 households per year in the between 2014 and 2019. The ESRI (short-term) and Met Council (long-term) forecasts are complementary and integral to our analysis and recommendations. The forecasts indicate that the pace of household growth will likely increase over the long-term. Meanwhile, the short-term projections by ESRI provide significant detail and segmentation by household income, size, type and tenure which we have used in providing detailed development recommendations for specific station areas in the short-term.

An analysis of short-term household growth by age cohort is presented on the following page. The table depicts projected household growth for the seven-county metro area between 2013 and 2018, according to short term forecasts by ESRI. It is interesting to note where the growth is expected to occur, by age cohort, and the aging of the population base. The “Millenials” (a.k.a. Generation Y or “Gen Y”) is having a major impact upon our society, economy and housing markets, as the size of this generation is considerably larger compared to those preceding it. This group was born between the late 1970s and about 2000. Millenials, also known as the “echo boomers” (children of baby boomers), have generated strong demand for apartments throughout the nation and in the Twin Cities market, and this trend continues to date.
### Twin Cities Metro Area

#### Projected 5-Yr Growth Trend -- Households by Age and Income, 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households by Age of Householder</th>
<th>&lt;25</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
<th>Metro Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>47,954</td>
<td>201,626</td>
<td>210,297</td>
<td>242,995</td>
<td>216,170</td>
<td>120,338</td>
<td>101,134</td>
<td>1,140,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. Metro Household Base</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>$29,358</td>
<td>$58,660</td>
<td>$77,524</td>
<td>$84,842</td>
<td>$74,705</td>
<td>$54,940</td>
<td>$31,117</td>
<td>$63,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HH Income</td>
<td>$38,991</td>
<td>$73,087</td>
<td>$97,129</td>
<td>$108,645</td>
<td>$99,136</td>
<td>$74,806</td>
<td>$44,933</td>
<td>$86,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>46,625</td>
<td>204,433</td>
<td>219,975</td>
<td>225,952</td>
<td>233,125</td>
<td>153,026</td>
<td>112,378</td>
<td>1,195,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. Metro Household Base</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>$32,096</td>
<td>$72,389</td>
<td>$94,126</td>
<td>$102,896</td>
<td>$92,720</td>
<td>$67,172</td>
<td>$36,103</td>
<td>$79,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HH Income</td>
<td>$43,503</td>
<td>$88,429</td>
<td>$116,433</td>
<td>$127,892</td>
<td>$120,099</td>
<td>$92,585</td>
<td>$55,450</td>
<td>$103,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Projected Growth by Age Cohort, 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change, 2013-2018</th>
<th>&lt;25</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
<th>Metro Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>-1,329</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>9,678</td>
<td>-17,043</td>
<td>16,955</td>
<td>32,688</td>
<td>11,244</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** ESRI Business Information Solutions; Marquette Advisors

---

**Impact of Millenials and Baby Boomers on Housing Choice & Development Trends**

**Millenials…**

Young renters (i.e. mid-20’s to early 30’s) have shown a strong positive response to multifamily housing products in recent years, particularly in urban neighborhoods and well-sited suburban locations, showing a preference for small, but efficient units in close proximity to their place of employment, with strong “walkability” and connectivity elements and good access to urban amenities (recreational, cultural and shops/restaurants in particular).

It is interesting to note the aging of Millenials and the impact of this trend upon the overall Twin Cities resident composition. Between 2013 and 2018 (and beyond), many of these households will be aging into their mid-30’s and 40’s. **We expect that TOD (SWLRT included) will appeal to many of these same households who may have recently demonstrated a preference for more urban living (Downtown or Uptown Minneapolis neighborhoods for example, which have seen a major increase in upscale apartment developments).**
In the near future, many of these same renters will consider alternative housing that is no longer in the “middle of the action” but still provides good access (via LRT) to those same urban amenities. As well, as the demand and price of the Downtown and Uptown submarkets continues to rise ($2.10-$2.30+ psf today and rising) (generally $1,200-$2,500+ per unit), we expect that more price sensitive renters (and buyers) will seek “urban” housing opportunities outside the Downtown and Uptown markets.

**Boomers…**

At the same time, we note the aging of the large Baby Boom generation and this impact on housing needs. Senior housing and care needs are expected to be significant, particularly in the long-term (10-20 yrs), as large numbers of Twin Cities residents age into their 70s and beyond. Meanwhile, already in the short-term, we expect that older adults and “empty nesters” (many in the age 55-64 cohort) will consider alternative housing arrangements. Many Baby Boomers currently reside in single family homes and will seek out somewhat more “efficient” living arrangements, often times smaller, less maintenance intensive, well-located multifamily housing products in locations which afford them convenient access to amenities and employment. TOD housing products, then, must be sensitive to this trend and the potential to accommodate these groups. As well, the development of new housing products for this group (and seniors over the long term) will also provide opportunities for home-ownership among younger groups (note the growing age 35-44 group, for example) who will purchase the homes of older adults and seniors.

**Key Growth Segments: Households without Children & Single-Person Households**

We have also analyzed data and forecasting regarding the size and type of household growth expected to occur in the Twin Cities Metro Area. The table on the following page is extracted from that report, and shows household growth and composition (with children, without children, and persons living alone) for the 2010 to 2020 and 2010 to 2030 timeframes.

According to the Met Council, households without children are expected to account for approximately 80% of the household growth in the Twin Cities Metro Area between 2010 and 2020. The majority of household growth is expected to be comprised of single persons and couples without children. In fact, 34% of metro area household growth is expected to be single-person households. In the central counties (Hennepin and Ramsey) single-person households are expected to comprise an even greater share of household growth, at 42%.

These trends have a major implication with respect to required housing products in the region during this timeframe, and through 2030. In fact, the Arthur Nelson report concludes that these growth segments will show a strong preference for urban housing, and primarily high-density multifamily residential configurations. From our analysis of demographic data paired with review of housing supply and demand factors, we concur.
### Change in Households by Type, 2010-2020, 2030 and 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Metro Council</th>
<th>Central Counties</th>
<th>Non-Central Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Baseline 2010</td>
<td>116,045</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Children</td>
<td>34,814</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs without Children</td>
<td>82,131</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone</td>
<td>31,264</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change in Households by Type, 2010-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Metro Council</th>
<th>Central Counties</th>
<th>Non-Central Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Growth</td>
<td>130,556</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Children</td>
<td>30,837</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs without Children</td>
<td>83,699</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone</td>
<td>37,773</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change in Households by Type, 2030-2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Metro Council</th>
<th>Central Counties</th>
<th>Non-Central Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Growth</td>
<td>143,232</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Children</td>
<td>38,368</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs without Children</td>
<td>104,874</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone</td>
<td>45,299</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public and Private Educational Facilities

We evaluated educational facilities in order to a) determine the potential impact of these facilities upon housing demand in the corridor, and b) assess the possible impact of new housing developments in the corridor upon these facilities, particularly in terms of enrollment.

The SWLRT corridor spans five K-12 school districts, including Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Edina, Hopkins, and Eden Prairie. According to the SW Community Works Housing Inventory, there are 38 public schools located within the 2-mile corridor. However, only four public schools are located within ½ mile of SWLRT stations, including two in Minneapolis (Bryn Mawr Elementary and Anwatin Middle School) and two in St. Louis Park (Park Spanish Immersion Elementary and St. Louis Park High School). Notably, there are 18 private and charter schools located within ½ mile of SWLRT station sites, including several within a 10-minute “walk-shed” which will be easily accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.

Four post-secondary institutions are located within the two-mile corridor. This includes two schools within a ½ mile of stations: Dunwoody College of Technology (Minneapolis) and Minneapolis Community and Technical College. Others within two miles include Hennepin Technical College and ITT Technical Institute, both in Eden Prairie.

The following are key findings from our research:

The proximity of educational facilities within close range of the LRT stations is without question appealing and compatible with residential and mixed-use development nearby. However, considering household growth trends as discussed herein, the composition of household growth (smaller household sizes and predominately households without children), and the suggested housing product mix presented later in this report, we do not expect that TOD housing within ½ mile of the SWLRT stations will have a substantial impact upon student enrollment within any school district or upon any individual school. The development of SWLRT could provide additional opportunities for open enrollment based upon new access by others due to LRT; however, we do not expect that LRT will have a significant impact upon enrollment in any one district or any specific educational facility in the corridor.

Interestingly, we have learned our market research, interviews and assessment of school staffing and salaries, that teachers and school support staff represent a significant potential market for TOD housing in the corridor. By comparing teacher salaries with the cost of housing in the various communities, we note a considerable affordability gap, particularly for younger teachers. From our interviews we are aware that teachers often commute considerable distances to schools in Edina, Minnetonka and Eden Prairie in particular, because they are not able to afford housing in close proximity to their place of employment. Because of this, we expect that workforce and market-rate apartment products, as well as entry-level priced for-sale housing units will appeal to teachers and other school staff working in the SWLRT corridor.
Corridor Employment

There is a strong corporate presence along the corridor, with a deep and diverse mix of jobs. According to U.S. Census data, total employment within ½ mile of SWLRT is estimated at 107,000 workers, comprising approximately 6.7% of total employment (by place of work) in the 7-county Twin Cities Metro Area.

It is also interesting to note that, according to the SW Community Works Housing Inventory, only 3.7% of the 107,000 workers within ½ mile of SWLRT also reside within this same area. This presents a significant opportunity. It is reasonable to expect that a considerably larger share of persons currently employed at businesses located within ½ mile of the line would consider new TOD housing options here in the future. We expect that many of these workers would utilize SWLRT to travel to-from their place of employment. This assumes, however, that an adequate supply of attractive and appropriately-priced housing products are developed within proximity of SWLRT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Employed in Station Area</th>
<th>Total Living in Station Area</th>
<th>Net Job Inflow (+) or Outflow (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living and Employed in Station Area</td>
<td>Employed in Station Area but Living Outside</td>
<td>Living and Employed in Station Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Royalston</strong></td>
<td>10,208 No. 32 Pct. 0.3%</td>
<td>10,176 No. 99.7%</td>
<td>1,371 No. 32 Pct. 2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Van White</strong></td>
<td>1,550 No. 6 Pct. 0.4%</td>
<td>1,544 No. 99.6%</td>
<td>524 No. 6 Pct. 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penn</strong></td>
<td>513 No. 3 Pct. 0.6%</td>
<td>510 No. 99.4%</td>
<td>1,391 No. 3 Pct. 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21st Street</strong></td>
<td>211 No. 0 Pct. 0.0%</td>
<td>211 No. 100.0%</td>
<td>832 No. 0 Pct. 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Lake</strong></td>
<td>2,426 No. 36 Pct. 1.5%</td>
<td>2,390 No. 98.5%</td>
<td>2,285 No. 36 Pct. 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beltline</strong></td>
<td>3,155 No. 33 Pct. 1.0%</td>
<td>3,122 No. 99.0%</td>
<td>2,547 No. 33 Pct. 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wooddale</strong></td>
<td>2,973 No. 39 Pct. 1.3%</td>
<td>2,934 No. 98.7%</td>
<td>1,163 No. 39 Pct. 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louisiana</strong></td>
<td>8,469 No. 77 Pct. 0.9%</td>
<td>8,392 No. 99.1%</td>
<td>1,400 No. 77 Pct. 5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blake</strong></td>
<td>1,808 No. 30 Pct. 1.7%</td>
<td>1,778 No. 98.3%</td>
<td>1,838 No. 30 Pct. 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hopkins</strong></td>
<td>5,386 No. 79 Pct. 1.5%</td>
<td>5,307 No. 98.5%</td>
<td>1,729 No. 79 Pct. 4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shady Oak</strong></td>
<td>3,058 No. 18 Pct. 0.6%</td>
<td>3,040 No. 99.4%</td>
<td>623 No. 18 Pct. 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opus</strong></td>
<td>3,018 No. 0 Pct. 0.0%</td>
<td>3,018 No. 100.0%</td>
<td>95 No. 0 Pct. 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City West</strong></td>
<td>7,629 No. 5 Pct. 0.1%</td>
<td>7,624 No. 99.9%</td>
<td>286 No. 5 Pct. 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Golden Triangle</strong></td>
<td>5,649 No. 3 Pct. 0.1%</td>
<td>5,646 No. 99.9%</td>
<td>100 No. 3 Pct. 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.P. Town Center</strong></td>
<td>5,438 No. 1 Pct. 0.0%</td>
<td>5,437 No. 100.0%</td>
<td>23 No. 1 Pct. 4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest</strong></td>
<td>2,885 No. 10 Pct. 0.3%</td>
<td>2,875 No. 99.7%</td>
<td>875 No. 10 Pct. 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitchell</strong></td>
<td>3,080 No. 1 Pct. 0.0%</td>
<td>3,079 No. 100.0%</td>
<td>99 No. 1 Pct. 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor</strong></td>
<td>107,236 No. 3,975 Pct. 3.7%</td>
<td>103,261 No. 96.3%</td>
<td>24,240 No. 3,975 Pct. 16.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Graphic taken from *SW Community Works Housing Inventory*
- “Corridor” as defined for purposes of the *SW Community Works Housing Inventory* comprises the full ½ mile corridor, including ½ mile from each station area, plus all other areas lying ½ mile from any point along the LRT line.

**Sources:** US Census; Maxfield Research Inc.
We have also completed an analysis of the types of jobs and employee earnings in the corridor and throughout the region. The SWLRT corridor features a heavy concentration of well-paying jobs in the information, finance, and professional services sectors (often referred to as “knowledge”-based jobs). As shown below, according to data from the U.S. Census, 15,312 workers are employed within ½ mile of SWLRT in the Professional, Scientific and Technical Services Sector, representing a full 14% of employment within ½ mile of the line. By comparison, this sector accounts for just 7% of employment region-wide.

**CORRIDOR-WIDE WORKER PROFILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor-Wide Worker Profile</th>
<th>Half-Mile</th>
<th>One-Mile</th>
<th>Hennepin County</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,236 100%</td>
<td>243,385 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Earnings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,083 21%</td>
<td>38,498 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 or Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,937 27%</td>
<td>58,736 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 to $3,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,216 52%</td>
<td>146,151 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Ages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,827 24%</td>
<td>54,453 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 29 or Younger</td>
<td>93,518 87%</td>
<td>211,481 87%</td>
<td>716,604 86%</td>
<td>1,368,014 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30 to 54</td>
<td>6,225 6%</td>
<td>14,913 6%</td>
<td>59,178 7%</td>
<td>93,194 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55 or Older</td>
<td>478 0%</td>
<td>1,043 0%</td>
<td>4,535 1%</td>
<td>6,196 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,733 5%</td>
<td>12,309 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>93,518 87%</td>
<td>211,481 87%</td>
<td>716,604 86%</td>
<td>1,368,014 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>6,225 6%</td>
<td>14,913 6%</td>
<td>59,178 7%</td>
<td>93,194 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska</td>
<td>478 0%</td>
<td>1,043 0%</td>
<td>4,535 1%</td>
<td>6,196 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5,733 5%</td>
<td>12,309 5%</td>
<td>43,355 5%</td>
<td>78,017 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other</td>
<td>58 0%</td>
<td>145 0%</td>
<td>631 0%</td>
<td>1,101 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race Groups</td>
<td>1,224 1%</td>
<td>2,864 1%</td>
<td>10,152 1%</td>
<td>17,678 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>103,877 97%</td>
<td>236,292 97%</td>
<td>804,638 96%</td>
<td>1,510,577 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3,359 3%</td>
<td>7,093 3%</td>
<td>29,767 4%</td>
<td>55,623 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,922 5%</td>
<td>9,614 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>17,736 17%</td>
<td>36,389 15%</td>
<td>140,388 17%</td>
<td>276,930 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Equivalent, No College</td>
<td>25,937 24%</td>
<td>57,224 24%</td>
<td>200,036 24%</td>
<td>384,984 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or Associate Degree</td>
<td>32,814 31%</td>
<td>65,705 35%</td>
<td>249,722 30%</td>
<td>445,602 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree or Advanced Degree</td>
<td>25,827 24%</td>
<td>54,453 22%</td>
<td>205,217 25%</td>
<td>384,595 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs by NAICS Industry Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 0%</td>
<td>13 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>2 0%</td>
<td>4 0%</td>
<td>213 0%</td>
<td>416 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>5,962 6%</td>
<td>9,968 2%</td>
<td>6,863 1%</td>
<td>8,125 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1,721 2%</td>
<td>3,490 1%</td>
<td>18,642 2%</td>
<td>46,507 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>12,277 11%</td>
<td>16,487 7%</td>
<td>71,975 9%</td>
<td>160,590 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>8,622 8%</td>
<td>11,153 5%</td>
<td>51,584 6%</td>
<td>86,770 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>7,508 7%</td>
<td>14,024 6%</td>
<td>76,925 9%</td>
<td>152,341 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>1,816 2%</td>
<td>2,338 1%</td>
<td>13,240 2%</td>
<td>35,661 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3,121 3%</td>
<td>13,016 5%</td>
<td>23,119 3%</td>
<td>41,037 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>5,817 5%</td>
<td>39,365 16%</td>
<td>68,732 8%</td>
<td>97,031 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>2,093 2%</td>
<td>8,914 4%</td>
<td>20,517 2%</td>
<td>32,046 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>15,312 14%</td>
<td>33,031 14%</td>
<td>71,397 9%</td>
<td>104,141 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>2,084 2%</td>
<td>17,876 7%</td>
<td>56,819 7%</td>
<td>88,240 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Support, Waste Mgmt and Remediation</td>
<td>4,837 5%</td>
<td>11,213 5%</td>
<td>51,802 6%</td>
<td>90,255 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>3,956 4%</td>
<td>9,094 4%</td>
<td>68,480 8%</td>
<td>143,082 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>13,262 12%</td>
<td>20,496 8%</td>
<td>113,667 14%</td>
<td>241,759 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>6,115 6%</td>
<td>7,756 3%</td>
<td>13,222 2%</td>
<td>25,965 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>7,621 7%</td>
<td>13,762 6%</td>
<td>60,290 7%</td>
<td>116,833 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (excluding Public Administration)</td>
<td>3,514 3%</td>
<td>7,069 3%</td>
<td>27,149 3%</td>
<td>54,710 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>1,589 1%</td>
<td>8,386 3%</td>
<td>18,704 2%</td>
<td>61,276 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau; Maxfield Research, Inc.*

Note: graphic taken from SW Community Works Housing Inventory
The Health Care and Social Assistance sector is also an important sector within the corridor, accounting for 12% of employment within ½ mile of SWLRT. Manufacturing accounts for 11% of corridor employment, also similar to the Metro Area employment distribution. Our analysis indicates that the SWLRT corridor includes a diverse mix of public and private-sector employment, with workers employed in many industries and at a full range of pay levels.

According to U.S. Census data, the distribution of jobs by monthly earnings within ½ mile of SWLRT is similar to that of the Metro Area as a whole. However, it is interesting to note that the larger 1-mile corridor features a somewhat higher concentration of well-paying jobs, as more than 60% of workers within the 1-mile corridor earned more than $3,333 per month ($40,000+ per year), compared to 52% at the ½ mile buffer and 47% Metro-wide.

Our housing recommendations for the SWLRT corridor, both in aggregate and for individual station areas, are based in part on our examination of both household income data and also the business mix, employment counts and employee earnings. The graphic below and on the following pages shows the number of workers by income level (monthly earnings) for a ½ and 1 mile radii surrounding each station area, and for a ½ and 1 mile buffer surrounding the line for 2005 and 2010. Data is from the U.S. Census.

### Employment by Earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Half-Mile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>20,034</td>
<td>15,526</td>
<td>-4,508</td>
<td>-22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>-115</td>
<td>-28.8%</td>
<td>5,714</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>-1,794</td>
<td>-31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Station</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>-661</td>
<td>-41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>-213</td>
<td>-13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>-331</td>
<td>-31.5%</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>-343</td>
<td>-18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-Mile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>40,144</td>
<td>26,696</td>
<td>-13,448</td>
<td>-33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>-256</td>
<td>-41.6%</td>
<td>5,732</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>-728</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Station</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>-1,285</td>
<td>-46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>-356</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Madfield Research, Inc.

Note: graphic taken from SW Community Works Housing Inventory
## EMPLOYMENT BY EARNINGS

**SWLRT STATIONS -- 1/2 and 1 Mile from SWLRT**

### 2005 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beltline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-186</td>
<td>-21.9%</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>-1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251-$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>-298</td>
<td>-25.2%</td>
<td>7,162</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>-2,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>-282</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>13,521</td>
<td>9,275</td>
<td>-4,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Wooddale** | | | | | | | |
| $1,250/mo. or less | 1,810 | 772 | -1,038 | -57.3% | 5,053 | 3,273 | -1,780 | -35.2% |
| $1,251-$3,333/mo. | 1,624 | 978 | -646 | -39.8% | 7,162 | 4,828 | -2,334 | -32.6% |
| More than $3,333/mo. | 1,333 | 1,223 | -110 | -8.3% | 8,069 | 8,167 | 98 | 1.2% |
| **Total** | 4,767 | 2,973 | -1,794 | -37.6% | 20,856 | 17,804 | -3,052 | -14.6% |

| **Louisiana** | | | | | | | |
| $1,250/mo. or less | 1,172 | 793 | -379 | -32.3% | 3,583 | 2,337 | -1,246 | -34.8% |
| $1,251-$3,333/mo. | 3,125 | 3,144 | 19 | 0.6% | 5,487 | 5,016 | -471 | -8.6% |
| More than $3,333/mo. | 3,773 | 4,532 | 759 | 20.1% | 8,069 | 8,167 | 98 | 1.2% |
| **Total** | 8,070 | 8,469 | 399 | 4.9% | 14,924 | 13,678 | -1,246 | -8.3% |

| **Blake** | | | | | | | |
| $1,250/mo. or less | 1,145 | 460 | -685 | -59.8% | 2,286 | 1,915 | -371 | -16.2% |
| $1,251-$3,333/mo. | 1,019 | 656 | -363 | -35.6% | 2,758 | 2,374 | -384 | -13.9% |
| More than $3,333/mo. | 483 | 692 | 209 | 43.3% | 1,896 | 2,243 | 347 | 18.3% |
| **Total** | 2,647 | 1,808 | -839 | -31.7% | 6,940 | 6,532 | -408 | -5.9% |

| **Hopkins** | | | | | | | |
| $1,250/mo. or less | 2,365 | 2,138 | -227 | -9.6% | 4,128 | 3,456 | -672 | -16.3% |
| $1,251-$3,333/mo. | 1,688 | 1,743 | 55 | 3.3% | 3,808 | 3,410 | -398 | -10.5% |
| More than $3,333/mo. | 1,891 | 1,325 | -566 | -29.9% | 4,320 | 4,128 | -192 | -4.4% |
| **Total** | 5,944 | 5,386 | -558 | -9.4% | 12,924 | 10,994 | -1,930 | -15.3% |

| **Shady Oak** | | | | | | | |
| $1,250/mo. or less | 1,926 | 530 | -1,396 | -72.5% | 3,894 | 3,247 | -647 | -16.6% |
| $1,251-$3,333/mo. | 1,848 | 1,021 | -827 | -44.8% | 3,664 | 3,367 | -297 | -8.1% |
| More than $3,333/mo. | 1,865 | 1,507 | -358 | -19.2% | 3,946 | 3,999 | 53 | 1.3% |
| **Total** | 5,639 | 3,058 | -2,581 | -45.8% | 11,504 | 10,613 | -891 | -7.7% |

| **Opus** | | | | | | | |
| $1,250/mo. or less | 269 | 214 | -55 | -20.4% | 1,821 | 2,478 | 657 | 134.9% |
| $1,251-$3,333/mo. | 1,031 | 465 | -566 | -54.9% | 6,127 | 5,904 | -223 | -3.6% |
| More than $3,333/mo. | 3,248 | 2,339 | -909 | -28.0% | 12,034 | 16,969 | 4,935 | 30.6% |
| **Total** | 4,548 | 3,018 | -1,530 | -33.6% | 19,982 | 29,151 | 9,169 | 45.9% |

| **City West** | | | | | | | |
| $1,250/mo. or less | 523 | 2,595 | 2,072 | 396.2% | 2,052 | 4,315 | 2,263 | 110.3% |
| $1,251-$3,333/mo. | 1,225 | 1,751 | 526 | 42.9% | 7,320 | 6,283 | -1,037 | -14.2% |
| More than $3,333/mo. | 2,353 | 3,283 | 930 | 39.5% | 13,244 | 19,621 | 6,377 | 48.2% |
| **Total** | 4,101 | 7,629 | 3,528 | 86.0% | 22,616 | 30,219 | 7,603 | 33.6% |

| **Golden Triangle** | | | | | | | |
| $1,250/mo. or less | 607 | 507 | -100 | -16.5% | 2,416 | 3,806 | 1,390 | 57.5% |
| $1,251-$3,333/mo. | 2,337 | 1,518 | -819 | -35.0% | 5,739 | 4,786 | -953 | -16.6% |
| More than $3,333/mo. | 2,929 | 3,624 | 695 | 23.7% | 8,498 | 10,478 | 1,980 | 23.3% |
| **Total** | 5,873 | 5,649 | -224 | -3.8% | 16,653 | 19,070 | 2,417 | 14.5% |

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau; Maxfield Research, Inc.

*Note: graphic taken from SW Community Works Housing Inventory*
The base of employees working near each of the planned SWLRT stations varies considerably throughout the corridor, not only in terms of the number of workers, but also by type of job and by level of earnings. While there are large concentrations of high-paying jobs in several of the station areas, notably the various Eden Prairie station areas, as well as Louisiana (Methodist Hospital, for example) and Royalston (Downtown Mpls), in these areas and throughout the corridor there is also considerable employment in lower paying positions. This includes entry-level support, clerical and maintenance positions, as well as lower-level service workers which service the various businesses along the corridor (e.g. office cleaning, grounds maintenance, and retail/restaurant workers who serve the businesses which serve area employees and residents).

As well, it is important to remember the connectivity enhancement that SWLRT will provide, linking workers in all industries and all occupations with jobs throughout the corridor and in primary job centers such as the Downtown Minneapolis CBD and even beyond, by way of an integrated LRT network (with connectivity to the Hiawatha and Central Corridors, and other modes of transit). As such, we do not suggest that high-end housing products be situated only near those station areas which feature a high concentration of upper-income employment. Rather, the connectivity and lifestyle efficiencies that SWLRT will provide are expected to create strong market demand for a full range of housing product types at all affordability levels, at various stations along SWLRT. We note that while we expect that
housing affordable at <60% of AMI will garner a strong positive market response at any/all LRT station areas, the economic viability of constructing such units will be a challenge in all station areas due to development costs. This will be particularly challenging in station areas with a limited land supply and/or high land costs. In fact, the provision of housing products affordable at or below 100% of income will in many cases require public subsidy for this same reason.

Presented below is an analysis of worker earnings for persons employed within ½ mile of SWLRT. The table shows the number of workers by monthly earnings (according to 2010 US Census data), as well as estimates of monthly housing costs affordable to them. Note the calculations show the “affordability range” based on 1 or 2 workers per household. Our analysis of demographic data indicates that the majority of corridor households feature just a single worker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs by Monthly Income - 1/2 Mile from SWLRT line</th>
<th># of Workers</th>
<th>% of Workers</th>
<th>Monthly Housing Cost Affordability Range (based on # of workers per household)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>22,083</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>$0-$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>28,937</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>$375-$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>56,216</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>$1,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107,236</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$0-$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Affordable monthly housing cost based on 30% of monthly income.

Sources: US Census (employment data); Marquette Advisors (housing affordability calculations)

**Key Point** -- A full 20% of persons presently employed within ½ mile of SWLRT would require housing priced at $750 per month or less, based on their current monthly earnings. (This assumes up to 2 workers per household with a similar job, with each of those workers earning less than $1,250 per month).

The Family Housing Fund (FHF) has also conducted considerable research in the areas of housing cost, employee wages and housing affordability. The graphic on the following page, published by FHF in May 2014 effectively demonstrates the gap in housing affordability and worker earnings for a number of key essential employment positions in the Twin Cities region. The table shows the median wage by type of position, and their maximum monthly housing cost at 30% of income, along with the % of income required to rent an average two-bedroom apartment or purchase a median-priced home. In the case of all workplace positions shown, a single-earner household would have considerable “excess housing cost burden,” in contributing well in excess of 30% of their income toward housing cost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Position</th>
<th>Median Yearly Salary for Full-Time Worker</th>
<th>Monthly Amount Can Afford for Housing</th>
<th>Percentage of Income Required to Rent 2-BR Apartment</th>
<th>Percentage of Income Required to Own a House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Worker</td>
<td>$31,054</td>
<td>$776</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>$19,635</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Worker</td>
<td>$22,152</td>
<td>$554</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter &amp; Rental Clerk</td>
<td>$20,696</td>
<td>$517</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Cleaner</td>
<td>$26,582</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Clerk</td>
<td>$29,037</td>
<td>$726</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Aide</td>
<td>$23,816</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host/Hostess</td>
<td>$18,158</td>
<td>$454</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor, Cleaner</td>
<td>$24,003</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaper/Groundskeeper</td>
<td>$27,997</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maid/Housekeeping Cleaner</td>
<td>$21,882</td>
<td>$547</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Assistant</td>
<td>$28,891</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Attendant</td>
<td>$21,902</td>
<td>$548</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>$29,786</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Cook</td>
<td>$22,838</td>
<td>$571</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson, Retail</td>
<td>$20,717</td>
<td>$518</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus Driver</td>
<td>$33,779</td>
<td>$844</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Driver</td>
<td>$26,562</td>
<td>$664</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Assistant</td>
<td>$30,201</td>
<td>$755</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemarketer</td>
<td>$27,726</td>
<td>$693</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller</td>
<td>$25,605</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: MN Dept. of Employment & Economic Development

2 Based on 30% of income

3 Based on 1st Quarter 2014 Marquette Advisors average rent of $1,083 for two-bedroom apartment in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

4 Based on Minneapolis Area Association of Realtors Median Sale Price of $185,000 for a single family home sold in the Twin Cities metropolitan area for the year-to-date 2014 (as of March).

Source: "Working Doesn't Always Pay for a Home" -- Family Housing Fund, Public Education Initiative, updated May 2014.
Review of SW Community Works Corridor Investment Framework & Key Findings

We have reviewed the Investment Framework, finalized in 2013, in regards to the development/redevelopment potential for land surrounding each of the planned 17 stations. **Based on our review of Investment Framework planning documents and our own field research and analysis, we find that the supply of land (and cost) will be a primary challenge with respect to the provision of full and optimal housing choice along the line going forward.** This varies by station area, of course. However, we note from our work that in the case of many stations there is a very limited supply of developable land.

**Further, many of the parcels identified through the Investment Framework for potential future development/redevelopment are privately held and in many cases currently in a productive use, other than housing.** Development of housing at SWLRT station areas will in many cases require a change in land use, and it is likely that in many cases housing will simply not be the highest-and-best use due to land value/cost, as continuation in current use or more intensive commercial uses become viable.

Still, we believe there are significant opportunities for housing near multiple stations along SWLRT. However, the residential development potential as identified herein has been tempered due to the issues noted related to land availability, land cost, redevelopment complexity, and highest-best-use challenges.

Based on our analysis to date, we believe there will be a very strong positive market response to new housing products along SWLRT over the next several years. Market economics continue to improve, and infill development is already starting to occur within several of the SWLRT corridor communities. Much of our region’s housing development recently and ongoing is comprised of luxury apartments being constructed in Downtown and Uptown Minneapolis. Suburban development deals are just starting to “pencil out” from a feasibility standpoint, in some locations, due to increasing market demand and rising rental rates. New apartments completed recently or in development now in the corridor communities generally feature rents in the $1.60-$1.90 psf range ($900-$1,900+), compared to $2.10-$2.30+ psf in Downtown Minneapolis ($1,200-$2,500+), which is presently the most active construction market in the Twin Cities region, and one of the busiest in the Midwest region.

**From our analysis and expertise, we expect that SWLRT housing will appeal to a diverse group of both renters and home buyers in the future.**

- **“Gen Y” and empty nesters are likely short-term demand drivers,** although we believe “aging” Gen Y renters and Gen X singles, couples and young families also provide substantive target markets in the near term – we note that far fewer new housing options are being provided at the present time for these groups in the region.

- **Senior housing demand will also be significant, particularly in the long-term** (10-15+ years out) as more of the Baby Boomers age into their late 70s and 80s.
SWLRT CORRIDOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OUTLOOK

Based on this analysis and our professional experience we have developed estimates of “pure market demand” for new housing units within ½ mile of the planned station areas over the long-term (approximately 15 years). The “pure market demand” estimate is the number of units that would be marketable within ½ mile of the LRT stations, prior to consideration of issues such as land availability, land use and highest and best use factors, and development cost constraints.

Next, we developed “suggested residential development goals” for the SWLRT corridor (comprising ½ mile surrounding each station). The development goals are tempered to reflect our detailed analysis of each station area in terms of land availability, land ownership and current use structure, and development cost factors. It is important to note that while the suggested residential development scenarios do account for development/redevelopment challenges, the creation of these unit totals will still require a “heavy lift,” inclusive of significant public subsidy and creative public/private partnerships.

Our discussion and estimates of “pure market demand” and “suggested residential development goals” is presented as follows:

**Pure market demand:** 13,000 – 15,000 units. Based on our review of demographic/economic factors, growth forecasts, and our assessment of housing market conditions, we believe that it is very reasonable to expect that there will be market demand for between 13,000 and 15,000 units (or more) within the SWLRT corridor by 2030. This represents about 7% to 8% of projected Metro Area household growth over the next 15 years; which we believe to be a reasonable capture rate based on all factors analyzed. The SWLRT corridor benefits from strong underlying demographics and market dynamics, a deep and diverse economic base, quality public facilities and schools. Further, the connectivity and lifestyle features resulting from development of SWLRT greatly enhance the appeal of housing near the planned stations.

However, while this potential exists, there are significant challenges and barriers to the development of housing along SWLRT and therefore have developed tempered housing development targets for SWLRT station areas.

**Suggested residential development goal:** 11,000 units. We have completed an analysis of each submarket and station area. The following section provides detailed recommendations regarding new housing construction within ½ mile of each station area over the next 15 years. This includes recommendations for new units by product type, affordability level, and approximate timing. Note that the recommended unit count at 11,000 assumes that sufficient gap financing will be available to support a full range of housing products. We estimate a need for at least $65 million in gap financing to support 1,300 new housing units as suggested at price points affordable households earning <60% of AMI. Another $20 million in gap financing could be required to support the recommended new unit inventory affordable to households earning between 60%-100% of AMI. We also opine on the strengths and challenges of each of station area from a housing standpoint and offer suggestions for investment in public realm elements which will enhance livability and the appeal of these locations for housing.
Presented on table on the following page are suggestions regarding a market-appropriate housing product mix by station area. This is followed by a discussion of each station area. For purposes of this analysis we have segmented our product type recommendations by product type and affordability level as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Range</th>
<th>Max. Monthly Housing Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% to 30% of AMI</td>
<td>&lt; $19,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 60% of AMI</td>
<td>$19,921 - $39,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 80% of AMI</td>
<td>$39,841 - $51,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% to 100% of AMI</td>
<td>$51,151 - $66,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of AMI +</td>
<td>&gt; $66,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MN Housing Finance Agency

Our recommendations include a mix of rental housing by affordability range, inclusive of general occupancy and senior rentals, along with homeownership products including for-sale condos, townhomes (including row homes) and single-family “Pocket Neighborhood” product types, which are suggested in the case of multiple station areas.
### SW LRT Corridor -- Projected Phased Residential Development Potential by Station Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>Short Term (3-5 Yrs)</th>
<th>Mid-Term (6-10 Yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10+ Yrs)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st St.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>** (to be considered)**</td>
<td>** (to be considered)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minneapolis Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,880</strong></td>
<td><strong>940</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,220</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,040</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Louis Park Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,120</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Hopkins</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hopkins Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>950</strong></td>
<td><strong>404</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,424</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minnetonka Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>340</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Town Center</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eden Prairie Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>532</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,772</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW LRT Corridor Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,622</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,684</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,930</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,236</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Marquette Advisors*
Opus Station Area

![Locator Map of Opus Station Area](image)

*SW Community Works Corridor Investment Framework, 2013*
Current Housing Supply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>0%-30%</th>
<th>30%-60%</th>
<th>60%-80%</th>
<th>80%-100%</th>
<th>100%+</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SWLRT Housing Inventory; Marquette Advisors

Strengths:

- 402 units within ½ mile which are affordable to households earning 30-60% of AMI, and another 365 units affordable at 60-100% of AMI.
- The Opus Station Area is situated within the Opus Business Park. This area is a major employment center, with more than 3,000 jobs based at businesses within ½ mile of the station and 12,000 within 1 mile. Employment in the area has a strong “white collar” office orientation based in real estate, medical device, health care and technology industries. Major employers in the area include Opus, United Health Group, American Medical Systems and Comcast.
- More than six miles of pedestrian and bike trails in the area.
- Proximity to neighborhood commercial development and restaurants.

Development Challenges:

- Private and fractured ownership limits redevelopment potential, as does high value of land at this location. Very few presently under-utilized sites in this area. The neighboring “Merchandise Mart” site is one possible exception which presents an opportunity for future redevelopment.
- Commercial nature of this area makes change in use to residential unlikely. Future development is more likely to include primarily corporate and multi-tenant office buildings and commercial development.
- Large block size and circuitous street network.
- Pedestrian environment in some portions of the Station Area could use strengthening
Residential Development Recommendations – Opus Station Area:

Marquette Advisors estimates that approximately **500 to 600 new units** of multifamily housing are viable near Opus Station, likely over the mid- to long-term. Development will depend largely upon land availability and change in use over time in this area. We recommend a mix of housing products approximately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type/Affordability Range</th>
<th>Short Term (3-5 Yrs)</th>
<th>Mid-Term (6-10 Yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10-15 Yrs)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental &lt;30% of AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental 30-60% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental 60-80% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental 80-100% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental 100%+ AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Sale (entry level-mid market)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Sale (high-end)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Marquette Advisors*

We understand that the “Merchandise Mart” property (industrial facility constructed in 1977) may become available for redevelopment, immediately east of the planned Station. This property contains approximately 15 acres of developable land and should be considered for residential along with complementary commercial uses, including office and retail/restaurant concepts. Given the value of land in this area (subject site last traded in 1995 for $12.7 million), future redevelopment must exhibit considerable increase in density/intensity in use and would most likely contain significant commercial components along with housing.
SWLRT Corridor
Housing Gaps Analysis
September 1, 2014

Investment in Public Realm:

- Work to improve connection of existing trail system in the business park to the planned station area.

- Consider development of circulator transit bus which will help connect area residents and commuters with local businesses and the LRT station.

- Should land become available, construct park & ride facility just north of the LRT platform, as planned, inclusive of a public plaza and gathering area.

Merchandise Mart property – approximately 15 acres developable. Possible future redevelopment site.
City Council Agenda Item #14B(2)
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description
Resolution identifying the need for Livable Communities Demonstration Account – Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Funding and authorizing an application for grant funds

Recommendation
Adopt the resolution

Background
The Metropolitan Council solicits annually for its Livable Communities Demonstration Account (LCDA) programs, which provides grants to cities. The LCDA program, one of four programs available through the Livable Communities Grant programs, grants funds for activities that support innovative development and redevelopment that links housing, jobs, and services and demonstrates efficient and cost-effective use of land and infrastructure. Additionally, LCDA – TOD grants are awarded to projects if they are located within a one-half mile of LRT, BRT, commuter rail, or high frequency bus station and are within walking distance of major transit stops.

There are five types of projects that can be funded with the LCDA-TOD grant funds, including: site investigation for contaminated redevelopment sites, contamination cleanup funds (similar to the funds received for the former Cattle Company site), pre-development funds, zoning implementation, and funds for development/redevelopment of a specific project.

Staff is coordinating with the developer, Newport Midwest, to submit an application for LCDA-TOD Development funding (due June 29, 2017). This grant is intended for projects that are ready to begin development or redevelopment and the land and/or infrastructure necessary to support the project. Funding can include site acquisition and site preparation. Staff has prepared a preliminary application and is requesting a total of $1,876,500 to assist with site acquisition, demolition, new sidewalks, and storm water management. Since the LCA-TOD funds are solicited only one time per year, city staff and the developer’s team are preparing an application during the 2017 round to assist in the redevelopment, subject to city approvals which will occur at a later time. The funding awards for the 2017 grant cycle will be announced in November.

Recommendation
Staff recommends the council adopt the resolution identifying the need for Livable Communities Demonstration Account – Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Funding and authorizing an application for grant funds.

Submitted through:
Geralyn Barone, City Manager
Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

Originated by:
Alisha Gray, EDFP, Economic Development and Housing Manager
Resolution identifying the need for Livable Communities Demonstration Account – Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Funding and Authorizing an application for grant funds

Be it resolved by the city council of the city of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The city of Minnetonka is a participant in the Livable Communities Act’s Housing Incentives Program for 2017 as determined by the Metropolitan Council, and is therefore eligible to apply for Livable Communities Demonstration Account – TOD funds.

1.02. The city has identified a proposed project within the city that meets the Demonstration Account’s purposes and criteria and is consistent with and promotes the purposes of the Metropolitan Livable Communities Act and the policies of the Metropolitan Council’s adopted metropolitan development guide.

1.03. The city has the institutional, managerial and financial capability to ensure adequate project administration.

1.04. The city certifies that it will comply with all applicable laws and regulations as stated in the grant agreement.

1.05. The city acknowledges Livable Communities Demonstration Account grants are intended to fund projects or project components that can serve as models, examples or prototypes for development or redevelopment projects elsewhere in the region, and therefore represents that the proposed project or key components of the proposed project can be replicated in other metropolitan-area communities.

1.06. Only a limited amount of grant funding is available through the Metropolitan Council’s Livable Communities Demonstration Account during each funding cycle and the Metropolitan Council has determined it is appropriate to allocate those scarce grant funds only to eligible projects that would not occur without the availability of Demonstration Account grant funding.

Section 2. Council action.

2.01. After appropriate examination and due consideration, the Minnetonka City Council:

1. Finds that it is in the best interests of the city’s development goals and priorities for the proposed project to occur at this particular site and at this particular time.

2. Finds that the project component(s) for which Livable Communities Demonstration Account – TOD funding is sought:

(a) will not occur solely through private or other public investment within the reasonably foreseeable future; and
(b) will occur within three years after a grant award only if Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding is made available for this project at this time.

2.02. Represents that the city has undertaken reasonable and good faith efforts to procure funding for the project component for which Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding is sought but was not able to find or secure from other sources funding that is necessary for project component completion within three years and states that this representation is based on the following reasons and supporting facts:

1. LCDA-TOD is a primary funding source for the uses requested in the application. The requested elements may not be of the quality or demonstration value possible, without an award of LCDA funds.

2.03. Authorizes its Mayor and City Manager to submit on behalf of the City an application for Metropolitan Council Livable Communities TOD grant funds for the project component(s) identified in the application, and to execute such agreements as may be necessary to implement the TOD project on behalf of the City.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

__________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

**Action on this resolution:**

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

__________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
City Council Agenda Item #14B(3)
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description
Resolution supporting a tax credit application related to Newport Midwest “The Mariner”

Recommendation
Adopt the resolution

Background

On February 16 and March 6, 2017 the planning commission and city council discussed the initial concept plan from Newport Midwest that is proposing the redevelopment of existing commercial properties at 10400, 10500, and 10550 Bren Road East. The concept plan contemplates redevelopment of the existing office buildings to construct 240 units of rental housing on the 3.2 acre site. The proposed housing will provide a mix of unit types from studio to three-bedroom units for a range of income levels. Plans include common-space amenities, outdoor recreational space, underground parking and a small surface parking lot.

The developer is proposing that one building will be entirely workforce housing consisting of 55 of the units available to households earning 60 percent AMI ($54,240 for a family of four or less). The adjacent building is proposed to have 191 market rate units. The developer is anticipating separate ownership entities for each building due to the structure of the financing.

Both the planning commission and the city council discussed the density of the proposed building as well as the design, and generally commented that a multi-family development in this location is appropriate based on the comprehensive plan and the proximity to the proposed Southwest Light Rail station to the northwest of the property.

Since the concept plan review, the developer has been refining the concept plans, is working toward securing financing, and finalizing construction cost estimates. At this time, no formal land use application has been submitted; however, the developer recently requested a deferred loan to assist with the development of affordable units on the site. Staff felt it was appropriate to have an EDAC subcommittee review and comment on the request prior to negotiation, development of a redevelopment contract, and formal land use submittal.

Current Concept and Financing Request

The developer is in the process of redesigning the proposed building and working on finalizing all needed applications for city approvals. As noted above, 55 units of the development are available to households earning 60 percent of the AMI or less and 191 units are proposed to be market rate apartments. The developer anticipates making an application to Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) on June 15 for 9% housing
tax credits. If tax credits are awarded, the developer foresees that there will still be a gap in the financing and has approached staff about potential funding to assist with the workforce housing component of the project.

It was brought to staff’s attention that MHFA is requiring more specific information regarding what they will accept as a “city commitment for assistance”. As part of the MHFA application, the city is now required to adopt a resolution that includes the potential range of city assistance and the terms and conditions of the financing as part of the submittal of the application for tax credits. In order to facilitate this request, staff is requesting that the EDAC and city council consider the request for financial assistance prior to reviewing the draft contract for private development, in order to meet the June 15 MHFA application deadline. If the developer was unable to negotiate the contract for private development or could not secure additional financing to move the project forward, the city could rescind the support resolution and would have no further obligation to fulfill the request for assistance.

The developer is requesting assistance of up to $556,179 from the city’s TIF Pooling Fund. Staff is proposing that the assistance be structured as a note with a 4% interest rate, repayable over 14 years, as a source to fill the remaining development gap. The note would be repayable with any excess cash flow each year over the 14 year term. If a capital improvement was necessary during the 14 year term, the developer could access the cash flow to make any necessary improvements. Additional information regarding this request is included in the attached memo from Ehlers Associates.

In addition to the request for city funding, the developer applied for funding through Hennepin County for AHIF or HOME Funding, and was recently awarded $200,000. The developer will also submit an application for the Metropolitan Council’s Livable Communities Demonstration Account TOD Program in partnership with assistance from the city at the end of June. The awards for the LCDA grant will be announced in November 2017.

After detailed review of the development proposal, establishment of a TIF district for this project does not seem to be appropriate because of the scale of the affordability in this project. Instead, staff believes use of TIF pooling funds is more appropriate. As noted in the city’s 2016 TIF Management Report, by 2021, a total of $6 million in TIF pooling funds will be available for tax-credit eligible affordable housing developments. To date, $1.025 million has been used for The Ridge project and $500,000 was committed to the Music Barn project. The Music Barn project is no longer moving forward so the $500,000 commitment is no longer needed. The attached Council Policy 2.14, provides further guidance on the use of TIF pooling funds. Uses of the funds are intended to be strategically allocated to projects that provide affordable housing.
EDAC Subcommittee Review and May 25 EDAC Review

On May 15, EDAC Commissioners Isaacson, Yunker, and Jacobsohn met as a subcommittee to review the assistance request, using Council Policy 2.14 on TIF pooling as a guide. The EDAC subcommittee expressed that the request for assistance was reasonable and concluded that it met the following criteria:

- The project is compatible with the Comprehensive Guide Plan as a proposed mixed-use development;
- The project would not occur “but for” the assistance;
- The project is in a high priority “village area” as identified in the Comprehensive Guide Plan;
- The project includes affordable housing units, which meets the city’s affordable housing standards;
- The proposed project amenities will benefit a larger area than identified in the development; and
- The project will maximize and leverage the use of other financial resources.

In addition, the EDAC subcommittee provided feedback on items to consider including in the contract for private development. The commissioners suggested capping the assistance as a percentage of the total development costs. If the total development costs came in lower, the city assistance would be lower, proportionately. In addition, the commissioners advised to secure the cash flow note in second position after the first mortgage and add a deadline for use of the city assistance in the event that the project does not begin on schedule.

At the EDAC meeting on May 25, 2017 the commissioners recommended that the city council adopt the resolution of support committing up to $556,179 in TIF pooling assistance to support the MHFA tax credit application due June 15. The city assistance would be considered “gap assistance” and the last source of funding into the project.

Recommendation

The project concept by Newport Midwest will help meet the city’s affordable housing goals outlined in the 2008 Comprehensive Guide Plan, the city’s 2011-2020 affordable housing goals, and new housing construction needs identified in the Southwest Corridor Housing Strategy. Staff recommends the city council adopt the resolution, committing up to $556,179 in TIF assistance, to support the tax credit application for Newport Midwest.

If the city council adopts the resolution supporting the tax credit applications, the next step in the process will consist of working with the developer to draft a Contract for Private Redevelopment, which will come back to the EDAC and city council later this year.
Submitted through:  
Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director  
Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
Merrill King, Finance Director

Originated by:  
Alisha Gray, EDFP, Economic Development and Housing Manager

Additional Information

Memo from Ehlers

TIF Pooling Policy 2.14

History of Affordability and Assistance

Minnetonka Housing Action Plan (2011-2020 Affordable Housing Goals)

March 6, 2017 City Council Staff Report

February 16, 2017 Planning Commission Report

Southwest LRT Corridor Housing Strategy

Southwest LRT Housing Gaps Analysis
LOCATION MAP

Landon/Domus Group
10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East
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Memo

To: Alisha Gray, Economic Development and Housing Manager
From: Stacie Kvivang & James Leinhoff - Ehlers
Date: May 10, 2017
Subject: The Mariner Affordable Housing Project

The City of Minnetonka requested Ehlers to review the development pro forma and $556,179 funding request from Newport Midwest, LLC for their proposal to construct a new 55-unit affordable housing project called The Mariner.

They are submitting a funding application to the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) in June 2017 to compete for an allocation of 9% Low-income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), which would provide nearly 64% of the project’s funding needs. The applicant is requesting financial support from the City to close a financial gap and increase their competitiveness for a LIHTC allocation from MHFA. Locally committed funds make funding applications more competitive for MHFA’s limited and highly competitive 9% LIHTC resources.

We have reviewed the project based on general industry standards for construction, land, and project costs; affordable rental rates and operating expenses; developer fees; available funding sources; underwriting criteria; and, project cash flow. Based on the submitted project information, the development pro forma assumptions are reasonable and within industry standards. The applicant has maximized the potential private mortgage, 9% tax credits and is seeking out other sources of funding. However, a demonstrated financial gap remains.

The Developer has requested $556,179 from the City of Minnetonka to help fill the project funding gap. If the City chooses to fund this project, Ehlers recommends structuring the $556,179 as a cash flow note with a 4% interest rate (based upon the maximum interfund loan rate the City can charge). The project would repay the principle and interest to the City from 100% of available cash flow after operating expenses and debt service on the first mortgage. Based on current projections, the cash flow note may be repaid to the City in approximately 14 years, with the City receiving approximately $203,000 in interest payments during that period. The cash flow note structure helps the developer to have a competitive application and fill the funding gap while returning proceeds to the City over time that can be utilized for other affordable housing projects.

Please contact me at 651-697-8506 with any questions.
Policy Number 2.14
Tax Increment Financing Pooling Funds

Purpose of Policy: This policy establishes evaluation criteria that guide the city council in consideration of use of tax increment financing pooling funds

Introduction

Under the Minnesota Statutes Chapter 469, at least 75 percent of tax increment in a redevelopment tax increment financing (TIF) district must be spent on eligible activities within the district, leaving up to 25 percent of the funds to be pooled and therefore eligible to be spent outside of the district, but within the project area.

An exception to the pooling funds is for affordable rental housing. The city may allow the pooling allowance to be increased to 35 percent, which can then go to finance certain affordable housing projects. The project may be located anywhere in the city, and not limited to the project area. Each financed project must be rental housing that is eligible for federal low income housing tax credits. The amount of the assistance is also limited to any amount that satisfies tax credit rules.

The council is aware that use of such TIF pooled funds may be of benefit to the city and will consider requests for pooled funds subject to this council policy. The council considers the use of these funds to be a privilege, not a right.

It is the judgment of the council that TIF pooled funds is to be used on a selective basis. It is the applicant’s responsibility to demonstrate the benefit to the city, and that they should understand that although approval may have been granted previously by the city TIF pooled funds for a similar project, the council is not bound by that earlier approval.

Evaluation Criteria

The city will use the following criteria when evaluating a development proposal requesting the use of TIF pooled funds:

- The project supports reinvestment in an identified village center and addresses the goals set out in the comprehensive plan for that center.

- Priority will be provided for projects that are within a “regional” village center or support transit areas.

- Weight will be given when the proportion of affordability is greater than what is customary in other tax increment financed projects in the city, overall affordability of 20% of units (usually at 60% AMI for rental).

- The project may request both tax increment financing and pooling dollars as long as the project has provided data that “but for” the additional pooling dollars, this project would not occur.
• If the project is receiving funds from other sources, the pooled dollars would be the last source utilized unless it impacts other sources.

Other Provisions
• A project will not normally be given financing approval until all city planning and zoning requirements have been met. Planning and zoning matters may be considered simultaneously with preliminary approval of the financing.

• The city is to be reimbursed and held harmless for any out-of-pocket expenses related to the TIF pooling funds, but not limited to, legal fees, financial analyst fees, bond counsel fees, and the city’s administrative expenses in connection with the application. The applicant must execute a letter to the city undertaking to pay all such expenses.

• The applicant will be required to enter into a development agreement with the city outlining the terms of the use of TIF pooled funds.

Adopted by Resolution No. 2011-039
Council Meeting of May 16, 2011
## ASSISTANCE TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Number of Affordable Units</th>
<th>Total Assistance</th>
<th>Years of Affordability</th>
<th>Assistance per Unit per Year</th>
<th>Affordability Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newport Partners (Mariner)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$556,179 (est)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$337</td>
<td>60% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Corporation (Pending)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonka on the Creek</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$2,283,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$3,805</td>
<td>50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Point Townhomes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$512,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3,792</td>
<td>50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Lake (St. Therese, Exchange)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$3,721</td>
<td>60% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgebury</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$3,243,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1,930</td>
<td>Initially--80% AMI Now—No income limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Hill (apartments)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$2,484,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$1,602</td>
<td>50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ridge Market (Crown Ridge, Boulevard Gardens, Gables, West Ridge)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>$8,514,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1,534</td>
<td>Crown Ridge—60% AMI Boulevard Gardens—60% AMI Gables—initially 80% AMI, now no income limit West Ridge—50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ridge</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$673</td>
<td>60% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes Within Reach (2004-2012 grant years)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$1,740,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$502</td>
<td>80% AMI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINNETONKA HOUSING ACTION PLAN
FOR THE YEARS 2011-2020
METROPOLITAN LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ACT

Introduction

In 1995, the Minnesota Legislature created the Livable Communities Act (LCA) to address the affordable and life-cycle housing needs in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. When the LCA was established, Minnetonka was one of the communities to sign up to participate in the program, negotiating a series of affordable and lifecycle housing goals with the Metropolitan Council for 1996-2010.

In August 2010, the Minnetonka City Council passed a resolution electing to continue participating in the LCA for the years 2011-2020. As part of that resolution, the city agreed to the following affordable and lifecycle housing goals:

| New Affordable Units (rental and ownership) | 246 to 378 |
| New Lifecycle Units                        | 375 to 800 |

The purpose of this Housing Action Plan is to outline the steps and tools that the city may use between the years 2011-2020 to help meet its LCA goals.

Overview of Minnetonka Housing Trends

Development Conditions

Minnetonka is a desirable community in which to live. Its natural environment, good schools, and homes on large lots contribute to the attraction of Minnetonka as a great place to live, work and play. As such, the demand for these community attributes has led to increased home values that have risen to the point that most single-family homes, despite their age, are not affordable to low and moderate income families. Land values, in particular, have increased substantially, making it difficult for developers to build affordable and mid-priced single-family homes.

Additionally, Minnetonka is a fully developed city with little vacant or underdeveloped land available for new housing development. With the combination of increasing land values and little developable land, most of the affordable homes in the community are rental units and for-sale condominiums and townhomes.

Aging of the Population

One of the biggest demographic shifts affecting this nation is the aging of the “baby boomer” generation (the large generation of people born between 1946 and 1964). This trend is already apparent in Minnetonka, where the median age in 2007 was 52 years old and 44% of the households were age 55 and older. As the population continues to
age, housing location, types, and proximity to public transit or transit alternatives will become increasingly important.

**Preservation and Rehabilitation of the Existing Housing Stock**

Much of Minnetonka’s single-family housing stock was built between 1950 and 1970 while most multi-family housing was built in the 1970s and 1980s. As the housing stock continues to age, additional maintenance and repairs will be needed in order to keep homes in adequate condition and to preserve neighborhood character. Older homes may need to be updated in order to attract younger families to the community. Also, as both Minnetonka’s population and housing age, older residents may require increased support through funding and in-kind service programs that will help them to maintain and make necessary repairs to ensure that their homes are safe, accessible, energy efficient, and habitable.

While not all older homes are affordable, older homes tend to be the more affordable housing stock in Minnetonka. The preservation of these homes is critical to providing homeownership opportunities for those who could normally not afford to live in the community.

**Current Housing Conditions**

In 2007, there were approximately 22,500 housing units in Minnetonka, of which 76.6% are owner-occupied. The housing stock includes a mix of the following types:

- 57% single-family
- 20% condominium/townhome
- 18% general-occupancy rental
- 5% senior (including independent and assisted living facilities)

Land values in Minnetonka continue to greatly influence the cost of housing. In Minnetonka, land accounts for about one-third of a home’s total value, thus making up a large proportion of the home value. For a single-family home, the median value is $326,850, with only about 1% of the single-family homes valued under $200,000. The median value of Minnetonka’s multi-family for-sale homes (i.e. condominiums and townhomes) in 2007 was $200,000. Multi-family homes contribute to the bulk of the city’s affordable for-sale housing stock because they are generally more affordable than Minnetonka’s single-family detached homes.

The average monthly rents at Minnetonka’s market-rate multi-family apartments are much higher than other market-rate apartments in the metropolitan area. In the 1st Quarter 2007, Minnetonka’s average apartment rents were $1,106 compared to the metropolitan area’s average apartment rental rate of $876. Additionally, only about 20% of Minnetonka rental units are considered affordable under the Metropolitan Council’s definition.
**Housing Goals**

In addition to the city’s agreement to add new affordable and lifecycle housing units as set out in the 2011-2020 affordable and lifecycle housing goals with the Metropolitan Council, the city’s 2008 Comprehensive Plan update also provides a series of housing goals that the city will be working towards achieving. These goals include:

1. Preserve existing owner-occupied housing stock.
2. Add new development through infill and redevelopment opportunities.
3. Encourage rehabilitation and affordability of existing rental housing and encourage new rental housing with affordability where possible.
4. Work to increase and diversify senior housing options.
5. Continue working towards adding affordable housing and maintaining its affordability.
6. Link housing with jobs, transit and support services.

More details on these goals as well as action steps are provided in the 2008 City of Minnetonka Comprehensive Plan Update.

**Tools and Implementation Efforts to Provide Affordable and Lifecycle Housing**

**Housing Assistance Programs**

The purpose of housing assistance programs is to provide renters or homeowners help in obtaining a housing unit. These programs can be federal, state, or local programs. For the years 2011-2020, Minnetonka anticipates the following programs will be available to Minnetonka residents.

**Section 8 Voucher Program**
The Section 8 Voucher Program is funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and administered by the Metro HRA on behalf of the city. The program provides vouchers to low income households wishing to rent existing housing units. The number of people anticipated to be served depends on the number of voucher holders wishing to locate in Minnetonka as well as the number of landlords wishing to accept the vouchers.

**Shelter Plus Care**
The Shelter Plus Care program is another federal program administered by the Metropolitan Council and sometimes the City of St. Louis Park. This program provides rental assistance and support services to those who are homeless with disabilities. There are a small number of these units (less than 10) in the city currently, and it is unlikely there will be any more added.

**Minnesota Housing Finance Agency Programs**
The Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) offers the Minnesota Mortgage Program and the Homeownership Assistance Fund for people wishing to purchase a
home in Minnetonka. The Minnesota Mortgage Program offers a below market rate home mortgage option, while the Homeownership Assistance Fund provides downpayment and closing cost assistance. It is unknown how many people are likely to use these services as it seems to depend on what the market conditions are.

Homes Within Reach
Homes Within Reach, the local non-profit community land trust, acquires both new construction and existing properties for their program to provide affordable housing in the city. Using a ground lease, it allows the land to be owned by Homes Within Reach and ensures long-term affordability. Additionally, if rehabilitation is needed on a home, Homes Within Reach will rehabilitate the home before selling the property to a qualified buyer (at or less than 80% area median income). It is anticipated that approximately three to five homes per year will be acquired in Minnetonka as part of this program.

City of Minnetonka First Time Homebuyer Assistance Program
In 2010, the city levied for funds to begin a first time homebuyer assistance program. The program is anticipated to begin in 2011. General program details include funds for downpayment and closing costs of up to $10,000, which would be structured as a 30 year loan and available to those at incomes up to 115% of area median income or those that can afford up to a $300,000 loan. The number of households to be assisted depends on the amount of funding available for the program. Currently, this program is anticipated to be funded with HRA levy funds.

Employer Assisted Housing
Through employer assisted housing initiatives, Minnetonka employers can help provide their employees with affordable rental or home ownership opportunities. There are several options that employers can use to both increase the supply of affordable housing, as well as to provide their employees with direct assistance by:

- Providing direct down payment and closing cost assistance
- Providing secondary gap financing
- Providing rent subsidies

No employer assisted housing programs have been set up to date; however, it is a tool that the city has identified in the past as an opportunity for those who work in Minnetonka to live in Minnetonka.

Housing Development Programs

Housing development programs provide tools in the construction of new affordable housing units—both for owner-occupied units as well as rental units.

Public Housing
There are currently 10 public housing units, located in two rental communities, which offer affordable housing options for renters at incomes less than 30% of area median income. The Metropolitan Council and Minneapolis Public Housing Authority administer
the public housing program on behalf of the city. It is not anticipated that more public housing units will be added to the city.

HOME Program
HOME funds are provided through Hennepin County through a competitive application process. The city regularly supports applications by private and non-profit developers that wish to apply for such funds. Homes Within Reach has been successful in the past in obtaining HOME funds for work in Minnetonka and suburban Hennepin County.

Other Federal Programs
The city does not submit applications for other federal funding programs such as Section 202 for the elderly or Section 811 for the handicapped. However, the city will provide a letter of support for applications to these programs.

Minnesota Housing Finance Agency Programs
The Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) offers a variety of financing programs, mainly for the development of affordable rental housing. Similar to federal programs, the city does not usually submit applications directly to MHFA; however, it will provide letters of support for applications to the programs.

Metropolitan Council Programs
The Metropolitan Council, through participation in the LCA, offers the Local Housing Incentives Account and Livable Communities Demonstration Account programs to add to the city’s affordable housing stock. Over the past 15 years, the city has received nearly $2 million in funds from these programs, and will continue to seek funding for projects that fit into the criterion of the programs.

Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity
The Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity chapter has had a presence in Minnetonka in the past, completing four affordable housing units. At this time there are no projects planned for Minnetonka, as land prices make it significantly challenging unless the land is donated. The city is willing to consider projects with Habitat for Humanity in the future to assist those with incomes at or below 50% of area median income.

Tax Increment Financing
Minnetonka has used tax increment financing (TIF) to offset costs to developers of providing affordable housing in their development projects. The city will continue to use TIF financing, as permitted by law, to encourage affordable housing opportunities. Unless the state statutes provide for a stricter income and rental limit, the city uses the Metropolitan Council’s definition of affordable for housing units.

Housing Revenue Bonds
The City has used housing revenue bonds for eight rental projects since 1985. Housing revenue bonds provide tax exempt financing for multi-family rental housing. The bond program requires that 20 percent of the units have affordable rents to low and moderate income persons. The city will continue to use housing revenue bonds for projects that
meet housing goals and provide affordable units meeting the Metropolitan Council’s guidelines.

**Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) Levy**
By law, the city’s Economic Development Authority (EDA) has both the powers of an economic development authority and a housing and redevelopment authority (HRA). It can use these powers to levy taxes to provide funding for HRA activities, including housing and redevelopment. The city first passed an HRA levy in 2009 to support Homes Within Reach, and now uses the funds to support its own housing rehabilitation and homeownership activities for those at 100-115% of area median income.

**Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds**
CDBG funds are allocated to the city by HUD each year. Based upon the needs, priorities, and benefits to the community, CDBG activities are developed and the division of funding is determined at a local level. CDBG funds are available to help fund affordable housing.

**Livable Communities Fund**
In 1997, special legislation was approved allowing the City to use funds remaining from Housing TIF District No. 1 for affordable housing and Livable Communities Act purposes. The city can use these funds to help achieve its affordable housing goals.

**Housing Maintenance and Rehabilitation**
As the city’s housing stock continues to age, a number of programs are already in place to help keep up the properties.

**Minnesota Housing Finance Agency Programs--Rental**
The Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) offers a variety of financing programs, for the rehabilitation of affordable rental housing. The city does not submit applications for these programs as the city does not own any rental housing; however, it will provide letters of support for those wishing to apply.

**Minnesota Fix-up Fund**
The Minnesota Housing Fix-Up Fund allows homeowners to make energy efficiency, and accessibility improvements through a low-interest loan. Funded by MHFA, and administered by the Center for Energy and Environment, the program is available to those at about 100% of area median income.

**Community Fix-up Fund**
The Community Fix-Up Fund, offered through Minnesota Housing, is similar to the Fix-Up Fund, but eligibility is targeted with certain criteria. In the city, Community Fix-Up Fund loans are available to Homes Within Reach homeowners, since community land trust properties cannot access the Fix-Up Fund due to the ground lease associated with their property.
Home Energy Loan
The Center for Energy and Environment offer a home energy loan for any resident, regardless of income, wishing to make energy efficiency improvements on their home.

Emergency Repair Loan
Established in 2005, the City's Emergency Repair Loan program provides a deferred loan without interest or monthly payments for qualifying households to make emergency repairs to their home. The amount of the loan is repaid only if the homeowner sells their home, transfers or conveys title, or moves from the property within 10 years of receiving the loan. After 10 years, the loan is completely forgiven. This loan is funded through the City’s federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds in order to preserve the more affordable single-family housing stock by providing needed maintenance and energy efficiency improvements. The program is available to households with incomes at or below 80% of area median income. On average, 10 to 15 loans are completed each year.

City of Minnetonka Home Renovation Program
In 2010, the city levied for funds to begin a home renovation program. The program is anticipated to begin in 2011. This program would be similar to the existing federal community development block program (CDBG) rehabilitation program. The challenge with CDBG funding involves the maximum qualifying household income of 80% of AMI, Use of HRA funds, would allow the City of Minnetonka Home Renovation Program more flexibility to include households up to 115% AMI, which equates to 82% of all Minnetonka households. The program would be geared toward maintenance, green related investments and mechanical improvements. Low interest loans would be offered up to $7,500 with a five year term.

H.O.M.E. program
The H.O.M.E. program is a homemaker and maintenance program that is designed to assist the elderly. The H.O.M.E. program assists those who are age 60 and older, or those with disabilities with such services as: house cleaning, food preparation, grocery shopping, window washing, lawn care, and other maintenance and homemaker services. Anyone meeting the age limits can participate; however, fees are based on a sliding fee scale. Nearly 100 residents per year are served by this program.

Home Remodeling Fair
For the past 17 years, the city has been a participant in a home remodeling fair with other local communities. All residents are invited to attend this one day event to talk to over 100 contractors about their remodeling or rehabilitation needs. Additionally, each city has a booth to discuss various programs that are available for residents. Approximately 1,200 to 1,500 residents attend each year.
Local Official Controls and Approvals

The city recognizes that there are many land use and zoning tools that can be utilized to increase the supply of affordable housing and decrease development costs. However, with less than two percent of the land currently vacant in the city, most new projects will be in the form of redevelopment or development of under-utilized land. New infill development and redevelopment is typically categorized as a planned unit development (PUD), which is given great flexibility under the current zoning ordinance.

Density Bonus
Residential projects have the opportunity to be developed at the higher end of the density range within a given land use designation. For example, a developer proposing a market rate townhouse development for six units/acre on a site guided for mid-density (4.1-12 units/acre) could work with city staff to see if higher density housing, such as eight units/acre, would work just as well on the site as six units/acre. This is done on a case by case basis rather than as a mandatory requirement, based on individual site constraints.

Planned Unit Developments
The use of cluster-design site planning and zero-lot-line approaches, within a planned unit development, may enable more affordable townhome or single-family cluster developments to be built. Setback requirements, street width design, and parking requirements that allow for more dense development, without sacrificing the quality of the development or adversely impacting surrounding uses, can be considered when the development review process is underway.

Mixed Use
Mixed-use developments that include two or more different uses such as residential, commercial, office, and manufacturing or with residential uses of different densities provide potential for the inclusion of affordable housing opportunities.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
TOD can be used to build more compact development (residential and commercial) within easy walking distance (typically a half mile) of public transit stations and stops. TODs generally contain a mix of uses such as housing, retail, office, restaurants, and entertainment. TODs provides households of all ages and incomes with more affordable transportation and housing choices (such as townhomes, apartments, live-work spaces, and lofts) as well as convenience to goods and services.

Authority for Providing Housing Programs

The City of Minnetonka has the legal authority to implement housing-related programs, as set out by state law, through its Economic Development Authority (EDA). The EDA was formed in 1988; however, prior to that time, the city had a Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA).
Resolution No. 2017-____

Resolution supporting a tax credit application for a multifamily housing project 10400, 10500, and 10550 Bren Road East

Be it resolved by the City Council (the "Council") of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota (the "City") as follows:

Section 1. Recitals.

1.01. Newport Midwest LLC, a Minnesota limited liability company, or an affiliate or successor thereof (the "Developer"), has proposed to construct a multifamily housing development consisting of approximately 55 affordable units (the "Development") in the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota (the "City") at 10400, 10500, and 10550 Bren Road East.

1.02. The Developer has presented the proposed Development to the Council and has received support of the Council.

1.03. The success of the tax credit application is predicated on local support of the proposal.

Section 2. Findings and Approval.

2.01. The Council supports the application for the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency tax credits for the Development.

2.02. The Council supports the use of tax increment financing pooling funds for the Development in the approximate amount not to exceed $556,179; however, the Council must complete all of the legally required proceedings set forth in Minnesota Statutes, Sections 469.174 through 469.1794, as amended.
Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota this ____ day of June 12, 2017.

______________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on May ____, 2017.

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
City Council Agenda Item #14C  
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description  
Resolution regarding participation in the Hennepin County CDBG program, and Joint Cooperation Agreement for the Urban Hennepin County Community Block Grant Program in Fiscal Years 2018-2020

Recommendation  
Adopt the resolution and approve the agreement

Background

From 1975 to 2005, Minnetonka participated in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG Program. This arrangement allowed the city to receive federal CDBG funds via Hennepin County based on a formula established by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In 2005, the county began charging a 13 percent administrative charge for cities with populations over 50,000, including Minnetonka. At that time, Minnetonka along with Eden Prairie, Bloomington, Plymouth and Minneapolis, elected to become entitlement communities to administer CDBG directly with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in order to use the allocated funds more efficiently. Staff is requesting that the council consider changing its CDBG election to participate in the Urban Hennepin County Program to increase staff capacity that could be spent more effectively on other programs and projects.

Every three years, HUD requires that Hennepin County notify the city of its past status and current election choices and the city must determine how it will participate in the CDBG Program for the next three program years. The city has three options for 2018-2020:

1. Defer the city’s metropolitan city status and participate in the Urban County CDBG Program (proposed election)
2. Exercise the city’s option to be a metropolitan city defined as any city located in whole or in part in Hennepin County which is certified by HUD to have a population of 50,000 or more people (current election)
3. Become a joint recipient with Hennepin County

Minnetonka can now elect to join the Hennepin County program (first option), thereby making more staff time available for other projects. Staff is proposing that the council consider deferring the city’s metropolitan city status to participate in the Urban County CDBG Program for program years 2018-2020. The attached draft agreement proposes that the city elects to defer the city’s Metropolitan city status to participate in the Urban County CDBG Program.
Under the Urban County CDBG program, the city is notified annually by Hennepin County of its CDBG allocation based on a formula used by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the yearly grant dollars directed into the national CDBG program. The distribution formula is based on population, individuals with incomes at or below the poverty level, and the number of overcrowded housing units. This relationship is established through a Joint Cooperation Agreement between the county and the city, which allows the county to administer the grant dollars and ensure federal compliance.

The advantages of participating in the Urban County CDBG Program include:

- The city would not have to submit its own annual Action Plan or certifications
- The county handles most or all IDIS software activity reporting
- The county completes environmental reviews
- The city would not need to individually meet spend-down timeliness tests (the tests would instead be applied across the entire county program)
- The county would coordinate fair housing activities
- The county would conduct monitoring of the public service agency recipients

**CDBG Program Administration**

Under the Urban County CDBG Program, the county would retain 13% of the total CDBG allocation for administrative purposes in 2018, but as much as 15% if deemed necessary for future administration of the program. Over the past three years, Minnetonka staff time charged back to CDBG averaged $7,277 out of the $10,000 budgeted per year for administration expenses. Under the Urban County CDBG Program, the county would receive approximately $20,000 for the overall management of the program (based on 2016 CDBG allocation).

**Housing Rehabilitation Loans**

The majority of Minnetonka’s CDBG funds ($124,188 based on the 2016 CDBG allocation) are allocated to single-family housing rehabilitation. These are small loans of $5,000 or less for low-income residents to make necessary or emergency repairs to their home. Historically, the program has been extremely popular, especially with older residents on fixed incomes. In 2016, the city received 75 pre-applications for the loan program and was able to fund approximately 25 loans with the CDBG funding the city received.

Under the proposed Urban County CDBG election, the county would take over the administration of the Small Projects Rehabilitation Program. Residents would be able to contact city staff to inquire about the program and obtain an application; however, the full administration of the program would be transferred to county staff. The county fee to administer the rehabilitation program is an additional 12% of the rehab allocation (approximately $15,000 based on the 2016 allocations). This is the same administration fee charged for the Welcome to Minnetonka and Minnetonka Home Enhancement Programs by a different program manager.
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Subject: CDBG

Public Services

In 2016, five public services organizations were provided grants through Minnetonka’s CDBG funds, totaling approximately $24,000 (based on the 2016 allocation). Under the Urban County CDBG election, the city would continue to annually solicit non-profit funding requests for local non-profit agencies. The county would take over disbursement of the funding to those agencies and all monitoring and reporting responsibilities.

The county is currently considering an option to streamline public service funding to agencies that receive funding from multiple cities. Under the proposed process, 15% of the county-wide CDBG allocation would be allocated to public service funding with a single competitive application process. An RFP would be issued in November/December each year. Public service organizations would submit applications directly to the county. Applications may be for county-wide activities or activities of a limited geography (i.e. one or a handful of cities). Applications would be scored and funding decisions made by a “selection committee” comprised of staff from cities in the county program (one member from each “direct allocation” city that wants to participate, plus one or two from the “consolidated pool” group of cities). If the group chose to award less than the full 15%, any un-awarded funds would be distributed back to the cities to allocate to general CDBG activities as they wish.

This new approach to public service funding would significantly cut down on the public service agency staff time that is required to apply for funding from multiple cities. Under the new approach, public services agencies would submit a single application to the county through the public service RFP process.

Fair Housing

To fulfill the fair housing component that HUD requires, the city is currently a member of the Hennepin Housing Consortium and receives the benefits that the consortium provides, including inclusion in Hennepin County’s Consolidated Plan. By electing to participate in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG program, the city would still be a member of the Hennepin Housing Consortium, and receive the benefits the consortium provides for housing programs. The city’s fair housing expenditures, from CDBG, would remain the same.

Timeliness/Expenditure of Funds

HUD requires that all grantees spend down a percentage of their funding by May 1 of the program year. Under the current election as an entitlement community, if a grantee does not spend the required amount then their future allocations will be reduced.

In 2005, due to timeliness issues in the spending the funds, Hennepin County added an additional requirement for cities participating in their program. This new requirement, which continues today, stipulates that each city is required to completely expend funds
within 18 months, and any unspent funds will be redistributed through a competitive county-wide process. If Minnetonka remains an entitlement city, this provision would not apply; rather the city is required to spend a percentage of their funds by a certain point every year.

**Future of CDBG**

Minnetonka’s CDBG allocations have been relatively stable over the past five years, but have decreased overall in the past 10 years. Due to the overall reduction in funds, the city has changed the requirements for its single-family rehabilitation loan program and implemented a new emergency loan program to make more efficient use of the CDBG funds the city receives. With the new administrative fee Hennepin County will take to administer the CDBG program, this would leave the city with less funding to implement programs. However, it would free up staff time to work on other initiatives such as business development, other housing programs, and light rail transit planning.

The 2017 allocations have not been released from HUD at this time. In previous years, the allocations were known by February or March. The President’s proposed budget calls for the elimination of CDBG funding entirely, but it is not known yet what the final budget will include.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends council adopt a resolution and approve the agreement authorizing the city to elect to participate in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG program and relinquishing entitlement city status to receive CDBG funds directly from HUD for program years 2018-2020.

Submitted through:
- Geralyn Barone, City Manager
- Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director
- Merrill King, Finance Director

Originated by:
- Alisha Gray, Economic Development and Housing Manager
Additional Information

City Council Report - May 9, 2005
THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into by and between the COUNTY OF HENNEPIN, State of Minnesota, hereinafter referred to as "COUNTY," A-2400 Government Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55487, and the cities executing this Master Agreement, each hereinafter respectively referred to as "COOPERATING UNIT," said parties to this Agreement each being governmental units of the State of Minnesota, and made pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 471.59.

W ITNESSETH:

COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY agree that it is desirable and in the interests of their citizens that COOPERATING UNIT shares its authority to carry out essential community development and housing activities with COUNTY in order to permit COUNTY to secure and administer Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership funds as an Urban County within the provisions of the Act as herein defined and, therefore, in consideration of the mutual covenants and promises contained in this Agreement, the parties mutually agree to the following terms and conditions.

COOPERATING UNIT acknowledges that by the execution of this Agreement that it understands that it:

1. May not also apply for grants under the State CDBG Program from appropriations for fiscal years during which it is participating in the Urban County Program; and

2. May not participate in a HOME Consortium except through the Urban County.

3. May not receive a formula allocation under the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program except through the Urban County.

DEF N NS

The definitions contained in 42 U.S.C. 5302 of the Act and 24 CFR §570.3 of the Regulations are incorporated herein by reference and made a part hereof, and the terms defined in this section have the meanings given them:

A. "Act" means Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).

B. "Activity" means a CDBG-funded activity eligible under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended. Example: single family rehab activity.

C. "Annual Program" means those combined activities submitted by cooperating units to COUNTY for CDBG funding as part of the Consolidated Plan.

D. "Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice" or "AI" means an assessment of how laws,
regulations, policies and procedures affect the location, availability, and accessibility of housing, and how conditions, both private and public, affect fair housing choice. All HUD grantees must certify that they will affirmatively further fair housing, which means conducting an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI), taking appropriate actions to overcome the effects of any impediments identified through that analysis, and keeping records of these actions.

E. "Consolidated Plan" means the document bearing that title or similarly required statements or documents submitted to HUD for authorization to expend the annual grant amount and which is developed by the COUNTY in conjunction with COOPERATING UNITS as part of the Community Development Block Grant Program.

F. "Cooperating Unit(s)" means any city or town in Hennepin County that has entered into a cooperation agreement that is identical to this Agreement, as well as Hennepin County, which is a party to each Agreement.

G. "HUD" means the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

H. "Metropolitan City" means any city located in whole or in part in Hennepin County which is certified by HUD to have a population of 50,000 or more people, or which has previously been granted Metropolitan City status by HUD.

I. “Program” means the HUD Community Development Block Grant Program as defined under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

J. “Program Income” means gross income received by the recipient or a subrecipient directly generated from the use of CDBG.

K. “Public service activities” means the provision of public services described in 24 CFR 570.201(e).

L. "Regulations" means the rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to the Act, including but not limited to 24 CFR Part 570.

M. “Urban County” means the entitlement jurisdiction within the provisions of the Act and includes the suburban Hennepin County municipalities which are signatories to this Agreement.

**P R P SE**

The purpose of this Agreement is to authorize COUNTY and COOPERATING UNIT to cooperate to undertake, or assist in undertaking, community renewal and lower income housing assistance activities and authorizes COUNTY to carry out these and other eligible activities for the benefit of eligible recipients who reside within the corporate limits of the COOPERATING UNIT which will be funded from annual Community Development Block Grant, Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Programs and HOME appropriations for the Federal Fiscal Years 2018, 2019 and 2020 and from any program income generated from the expenditure of such funds.

**G R E E M E N**

The initial term of this Agreement is for a period commencing on October 1, 2017 and terminating no sooner than the end of the program year covered by the Consolidated Plan for the basic grant amount for the Fiscal Year 2020, as authorized by HUD, and for such additional time as may be required for the expenditure of funds granted to the County for such period. Prior to the end of the initial term and the end of each subsequent qualification
period, the COUNTY, as the lead agency of the URBAN HENNEPIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM, shall provide a written notice to the COOPERATING UNIT of their right not to participate in a subsequent qualification period. The written notice will provide the COOPERATING UNIT a minimum thirty (30) day period to submit a written withdrawal. If the COOPERATING UNIT does not submit to the COUNTY a written withdrawal during the notice period, this Agreement shall be automatically extended for a subsequent three-year qualifying period.

This Agreement must be amended by written agreement of all parties to incorporate any future changes necessary to meet the requirements for cooperation agreements set forth in the Urban County Qualification Notice applicable for the year in which the next qualification of the County is scheduled. Failure by either party to adopt such an amendment to the Agreement shall automatically terminate the Agreement following the expenditure of all CDBG and HOME funds allocated for use in the COOPERATING UNIT’s jurisdiction.

This Agreement shall remain in effect until the CDBG, HOME and ESG funds and program income received (with respect to activities carried out during the three-year qualification period, and any successive qualification periods under agreements that provide for automatic renewals) are expended and the funded activities completed. COUNTY and COOPERATING UNIT cannot terminate or withdraw from this Agreement while it remains in effect.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, this Agreement may be terminated at the end of the program period during which HUD withdraws its designation of the COUNTY as an Urban County under the Act.

This Agreement shall be executed by the appropriate officers of COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY pursuant to authority granted them by their respective governing bodies, and a copy of the authorizing resolution and executed Agreement shall be filed promptly by the COOPERATING UNIT in the Hennepin County Department of Housing, Community Works and Transit so that the Agreement can be submitted to HUD by July 24, 2017.

COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY shall take all actions necessary to assure compliance with the urban county’s certifications required by Section 104(b) of the Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the Fair Housing Act, and affirmatively furthering fair housing. COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY shall also take all actions necessary to assure compliance with Section 109 of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (which incorporates Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975), and other applicable laws.

C O O R D I N A T I O N

COOPERATING UNIT agrees that awarded grant funds will be used to undertake and carry out, within the terms of this Agreement, certain activities eligible for funding under the Act. The COUNTY agrees and will assist COOPERATING UNIT in the undertaking of such essential activities by providing the services specified in this Agreement. The parties mutually agree to comply with all applicable requirements of the Act and the Regulations and other relevant Federal and/or Minnesota statutes or regulations in the use of basic grant amounts. Nothing in this Article shall be construed to lessen or abrogate the COUNTY's responsibility to assume all obligations of an applicant under the Act, including the development of the Consolidated Plan, pursuant to 24 CFR Part 91.

COOPERATING UNIT further specifically agrees as follows:
A. COOPERATING UNIT will, in accord with a COUNTY-established schedule, prepare and provide to the COUNTY, in a prescribed form, requests for the use of Community Development Block Grant Funds consistent with this Agreement, program regulations and the Urban Hennepin County Consolidated Plan.

B. COOPERATING UNIT acknowledges that, pursuant to 24 CFR §570.501 (b), it is subject to the same requirements applicable to subrecipients, including the requirement for a written Subrecipient Agreement set forth in 24 CFR §570.503. The Subrecipient Agreement will cover the implementation requirements for each activity funded pursuant to this Agreement and shall be duly executed with and in a form prescribed by the COUNTY.

C. COOPERATING UNIT acknowledges that it is subject to the same subrecipient requirements stated in paragraph B above in instances where an agency other than itself is undertaking an activity pursuant to this Agreement on behalf of COOPERATING UNIT. In such instances, a written Third Party Agreement shall be duly executed between the agency and COOPERATING UNIT in a form prescribed by COUNTY.

D. COOPERATING UNITS shall expend all funds annually allocated to activities pursuant to the Subrecipient Agreement.

1. All funds not expended pursuant to the terms of the Subrecipient Agreement will be relinquished to the COUNTY and will be transferred to a separate account for reallocation on a competitive request for proposal basis at the discretion of the COUNTY where total of such funds is $100,000 or greater. Amounts less than $100,000 shall be allocated by COUNTY to other existing activities consistent with timeliness requirements and Consolidated Plan goals.

E. COUNTY and COOPERATING UNITS shall expend all program income pursuant to this Agreement as provided below:

1. Program income from housing rehabilitation activities administered by the COUNTY will be incorporated into a pool at the discretion of the COUNTY. The pool will be administered by COUNTY and will be used for housing rehabilitation projects located throughout the entire Urban County. When possible, COUNTY will give priority to funding housing rehabilitation projects within the COOPERATING UNIT where the program income was generated. Funds expended in this manner would be secured by a Repayment Agreement/Mortgage running in favor of the COUNTY. Program income generated by METROPOLITAN CITY COOPERATING UNITS that administer their own housing rehabilitation activities may be retained by the COOPERATING UNIT at its discretion.

2. COUNTY reserves the option to recapture program income generated by non-housing rehabilitation activities if said funds have not been expended within twelve (12) months of being generated. These funds shall be transferred to a separate account for reallocation on a competitive request for proposal basis administered by COUNTY or, where the total of such funds does not exceed $100,000, shall be reallocated by COUNTY to other existing activities consistent with timeliness requirements and Consolidated Plan goals.

F. COOPERATING UNITS are encouraged to undertake joint activities involving the sharing of funding when such action furthers the goals of the Consolidated Plan and meets the expenditure goals.
G. If COUNTY is notified by HUD that it has not met the performance standard for the timely expenditure of funds at 24 CFR 570.902(a) and the COUNTY entitlement grant is reduced by HUD according to its policy on corrective actions, then the basic grant amount to any COOPERATING UNIT that has not met its expenditure goal shall be reduced accordingly.

H. COOPERATING UNIT will take actions necessary to assist in accomplishing the community development program and housing goals, as contained in the Urban Hennepin County Consolidated Plan, and will comply with COUNTY’s direction to redirect the use of funds when necessary to accomplish said goals.

I. COOPERATING UNIT shall ensure that all activities funded, in part or in full by grant funds received pursuant to this Agreement, shall be undertaken affirmatively with regard to fair housing, employment and business opportunities for minorities and women. It shall, in implementing all programs and/or activities funded by the basic grant amount, comply with all applicable Federal and Minnesota Laws, statutes, rules and regulations with regard to civil rights, affirmative action and equal employment opportunities and Administrative Rule issued by the COUNTY.

J. COOPERATING UNIT acknowledges the recommendations set forth in the current Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. COOPERATING UNIT that does not affirmatively further fair housing within its own jurisdiction or that impedes action by COUNTY to comply with its certifications to HUD may be prohibited from receiving part or all CDBG funding for its activities, and may be required to reimburse COUNTY for part or all of funds it has received.

K. COOPERATING UNIT shall participate in the citizen participation process, as established by COUNTY, in compliance with the requirements of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

L. COOPERATING UNIT shall reimburse COUNTY for any expenditure determined by HUD or COUNTY to be ineligible.

M. COOPERATING UNIT shall prepare, execute, and cause to be filed all documents protecting the interests of the parties hereto or any other party of interest as may be designated by the COUNTY.

N. COOPERATING UNIT has adopted and is enforcing:

1. A policy prohibiting the use of excessive force by law enforcement agencies within its jurisdiction against any individuals engaged in nonviolent civil rights demonstrations; and

2. A policy of enforcing applicable State and local laws against physically barring entrance to or exit from a facility or location which is the subject of such nonviolent civil rights demonstrations within its jurisdiction.

O. COOPERATING UNIT shall not sell, trade, or otherwise transfer all or any portion of grant funds to another metropolitan city, urban county, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe, or insular area that directly or indirectly receives CDBG funds in exchange for any other funds, credits or non-Federal considerations, but must use such funds for activities eligible under Title I of the Act.

COUNTY further specifically agrees as follows:
A. COUNTY shall prepare and submit to HUD and appropriate reviewing agencies, on an annual basis, all plans, statements and program documents necessary for receipt of a basic grant amount under the Act.

B. COUNTY shall provide, to the maximum extent feasible, technical assistance and coordinating services to COOPERATING UNIT in the preparation and submission of a request for funding.

C. COUNTY shall provide ongoing technical assistance to COOPERATING UNIT to aid COUNTY in fulfilling its responsibility to HUD for accomplishment of the community development program and housing goals.

D. COUNTY shall, upon official request by COOPERATING UNIT, agree to administer local housing rehabilitation activities funded pursuant to the Agreement, provided that COUNTY shall receive Twelve percent (12%) of the allocation by COOPERATING UNIT to the activity as reimbursement for costs associated with the administration of COOPERATING UNIT activity.

E. COUNTY may, at its discretion and upon official request by COOPERATING UNIT, agree to administer, for a possible fee, other activities funded pursuant to this Agreement on behalf of COOPERATING UNIT.

F. COUNTY may, as necessary for clarification and coordination of program administration, develop and implement Administrative Rules consistent with the Act, Regulations, HUD administrative directives, and administrative requirements of COUNTY; and COOPERATING UNIT shall comply with said Administrative Rules.

V. ALLOCATION OF BASIC GRANT AMOUNTS

Basic grant amounts received by the COUNTY under Section 106 of the Act shall be allocated as follows:

A. Planning and administration costs are capped to 20 percent of the sum of the basic grant amount plus program income that is received during the program year. During the term of this Agreement the COUNTY will receive a planning and administrative retainage of up to fifteen percent (15%) of the basic grant amount included in this administrative amount is funding for county-wide Fair Housing activities.

B. Funding for public service activities are capped to 15 percent of the sum of the basic grant amount plus program income that is received during the previous program year. During the term of this Agreement the COUNTY will retain up to 15% of the basic grant amount for allocation to public service activities county-wide. Funds retained for public service activities will be awarded in a manner determined by COUNTY on a competitive request for proposal basis.

C. The balance of the basic grant amount shall be made available by COUNTY to COOPERATING UNITS in accordance with the formula stated in part D and the procedure stated in part E of this section utilizing U.S. Census Bureau data. The allocation is for planning purposes only and is not a guarantee of funding.

D. Allocation of funding will be based upon a formula using U.S. Census Bureau data that bears the same ratio to the balance of the basic grant amount as the average of the ratios between:

1. The population of COOPERATING UNIT and the population of all COOPERATING UNITS.
2. The extent of poverty in COOPERATING UNIT and the extent of poverty in all COOPERATING UNITS.

3. The extent of overcrowded housing by units in COOPERATING UNIT and the extent of overcrowded housing by units in all COOPERATING UNITS.

4. In determining the average of the above ratios, the ratio involving the extent of poverty shall be counted twice.

E. Funds will be made available to communities utilizing the formula specified in C of this Section in the following manner:

1. All COOPERATING UNITS which are also METROPOLITAN CITIES will receive funding allocations in accordance with the COUNTY formula allocations.

2. All COOPERATING UNITS with aggregate formula percentages of greater than five percent (5%) of the total using the procedure in part D. of this section will receive funding allocations in accordance with the COUNTY formula allocations, unless the resulting allocation would total less than One Hundred Thousand Dollars ($100,000.00).

3. COOPERATING UNITS with aggregate formula percentages of five percent (5%) or less of the total using the procedure in part D. of this section or with funding allocations of less than One Hundred Thousand Dollars ($100,000.00) will have their funds consolidated into a pool for award in a manner determined by COUNTY on a competitive request for proposal basis. Only the COUNTY and COOPERATING UNITS whose funding has been pooled will be eligible to compete for these funds.

4. COOPERATING UNITS shall have the option to opt-in to the consolidated pool specified in item 3. of this part by providing written notice to COUNTY by November 15th annually.

F. The COUNTY shall develop these ratios based upon data to be furnished by the U.S. Census Bureau. The COUNTY assumes no duty to gather such data independently and assumes no liability for any errors in the data.

G. In the event COOPERATING UNIT does not request a funding allocation, or a portion thereof, the amount not requested shall be made available to other participating communities, in a manner determined by COUNTY.

ME R P N C ES

Any metropolitan city executing this Agreement shall defer their entitlement status and become part of Urban Hennepin County.

This agreement can be voided if the COOPERATING UNIT is advised by HUD, prior to the completion of the re-qualification process for fiscal years 2018-2020, that it is newly eligible to become a metropolitan city and the COOPERATING UNIT elects to take its entitlement status. If the agreement is not voided on the basis of the COOPERATING UNIT’s eligibility as a metropolitan city prior to July 16, 2017, the COOPERATING UNIT must remain a part of the COUNTY program for the entire three-year period of the COUNTY qualification.
The undersigned, on behalf of the Hennepin County Attorney, having reviewed this Agreement, hereby opines that the terms and provisions of the Agreement are fully authorized under State and local law and that the COOPERATING UNIT has full legal authority to undertake or assist in undertaking essential community development and housing assistance activities, specifically urban renewal and publicly-assisted housing.

________________________________________
Assistant County Attorney
The Hennepin County Board of Commissioners having duly approved this Agreement on ____________, 2017, and pursuant to such approval and the proper County official having signed this Agreement, the COUNTY agrees to be bound by the provisions herein set forth.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant County Attorney
Date: ____________________

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN, STATE OF MINNESOTA

By: ________________________________
Chair of its County Board

Attest: ________________________________
Deputy Clerk of the County Board

Date: ________________________________

By: ________________________________
County Administrator
Date: ________________________________

By: ________________________________
Assistant County Administrator – Public Works
Date: ________________________________

Recommended for Approval:

______________________________
Director, Community Works

Date: ________________________________
COOPERATING UNIT, having signed this Agreement, and the COOPERATING UNIT'S governing body having duly approved this Agreement on ____________, 2017, and pursuant to such approval and the proper city official having signed this Agreement, COOPERATING UNIT agrees to be bound by the provisions of this Joint Cooperation Agreement.

CITY OF

By: __________________________________________

Its Mayor

And: __________________________________________

Its City Manager

ATTEST: _______________________________________

CITY MUST CHECK ONE:
The City is organized pursuant to:

___ Plan A  ___ Plan B  ___ Charter
City Council Agenda Item #10-
Meeting of May 9, 2005

**Brief Description:** Resolution regarding participation in the CDBG program, authorizing a Joint Cooperation Agreement for the Hennepin Housing Consortium and authorizing a Joint Powers Agreement with the City of Eden Prairie.

**Recommended Action:** Adopt the resolution.

**Background**
Since 1975, Minnetonka has participated in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG Program. This arrangement has allowed the city to receive federal CDBG funds via Hennepin County. However, the county previously waived its 13 percent administrative charge for Minnetonka, Eden Prairie, and other cities having populations over 50,000, as an incentive to remain with the Hennepin County program, but is no longer willing to do so. Minnetonka and Eden Prairie have jointly studied the amount of work necessary to administer CDBG directly with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and believe the cities can do this work for about half the cost of the county charges. Staff proposes the council approve such an arrangement, with Minnetonka taking the lead and Eden Prairie reimbursing for work done on their behalf.

Minnetonka’s participation in the CDBG program has occurred through a joint cooperation agreement, which comes up for renewal every three years. Under the agreement, Minnetonka and other Hennepin County cities (except Minneapolis, Bloomington, and Plymouth) join together through Hennepin County to apply for and receive CDBG funds. Minneapolis, Bloomington, and Plymouth are entitlement cities and choose to work through HUD individually for their CDBG funds. Minnetonka and Eden Prairie are eligible to become entitlement cities as well, and receive CDBG funds directly from HUD; however, in the past both cities have opted to forego this status and continue to work through Hennepin County.

Hennepin County has drafted a new CDBG joint cooperation agreement for 2006-2008. There are major changes to the new joint cooperation agreement, including:

- **New calculation of allocations.** Under the 2002-2005 joint cooperation agreement, Minnetonka, Eden Prairie, and Brooklyn Park were not charged an administrative fee. The new joint cooperation agreement will take a 13 percent administrative fee from Minnetonka’s total allocation. Using the current year allocation, this equates to $28,807. For Eden Prairie this amounts to $38,595.

- **Expenditure of funds.** The 2002-2005 joint cooperation agreement required CDBG funds committed within 18 months. However, because of timeliness issues in spending the funds, the new agreement calls for all funds to be
committed and completely expended within 18 months, and if they are not expended they will be recaptured by the county and redistributed through a competitive county-wide process.

Recently, the city has seen a decrease in the allocation of CDBG funds it receives. Due to the reduction in funds, the city has changed the requirements for its single-family rehabilitation loan program and implemented a new emergency loan program to make more efficient use of the CDBG funds the city receives. With the new 13 percent administrative fee Hennepin County will take to administer the CDBG program, this again leaves the city with less funding to implement programs.

The City of Eden Prairie, like Minnetonka, is eligible for entitlement city status and does not have to participate in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG program to receive federal CDBG funds. Staff from both cities have met to discuss whether it is feasible for the cities to not participate in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG program and instead take entitlement city status. In the past, both cities have opted not to take entitlement city status because the county was administering the program with no charge to the cities. However, with the new 13 percent administrative fee the county will be taking out, staff believes it will be more efficient for Eden Prairie and Minnetonka each to take entitlement city status and collaborate together to administer the programs.

By being a part of the Urban Hennepin County CDBG program, the city is automatically a member of the Hennepin Housing Consortium and the benefits that the consortium provides, including inclusion in Hennepin County’s Consolidated Plan and the ability to apply for federal HOME funds from the county rather than the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency. By electing not to participate in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG program, the city can still be a member of the Hennepin Housing Consortium, and receive the benefits the consortium provides for housing programs.

Recommendation
Staff recommends council adopt a resolution:

• Electing not to participate in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG program and taking entitlement city status to receive CDBG funds directly from HUD.
• Electing to become a member of the Hennepin Housing Consortium and authorizing the Hennepin Housing Consortium Joint Cooperation Agreement.
• Authorizing a Joint Powers Agreement with the City of Eden Prairie to collaboratively administer each city’s CDBG program.

Submitted through:
John Gunyou, City Manager
Ron Rankin, Community Development Director

Originated by:
Elise Souders, Community Development Coordinator
RESOLUTION NO. 2005-044

RESOLUTION REGARDING PARTICIPATION IN THE FEDERAL CDBG PROGRAM AND AUTHORIZING A JOINT COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR THE HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM AND AUTHORIZING A JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF EDEN PRAIRIE

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. Minnetonka has, for many years, participated in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG Program in order to obtain federal funds for community development and housing programs and projects.

1.02. Minnetonka and Eden Prairie qualify as entitlement cities for purposes of obtaining federal CDBG funds themselves, and are therefore not required to participate in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG Program.

1.03. Minnetonka and Eden Prairie wish to collaborate in the administration of federal CDBG funds allocated to each city, and expect to thereby lower their cost of administering the funds.

1.04. Minnetonka wishes to participate in the Hennepin Housing Consortium in order to be eligible to apply for federal HOME funds.

Section 2. Approval and Authorization.

2.01. The City Council hereby elects to not continue to participate in the Urban Hennepin County CDBG Program.

2.02. The City Council hereby approves the Hennepin Housing Consortium Joint Cooperation Agreement between Hennepin County and the cities of Minnetonka, Eden Prairie, Bloomington, and Plymouth.

2.03. The City Council hereby approves a Joint Powers Agreement between the cities of Minnetonka and Eden Prairie to collaboratively administer federal CDBG funds.

2.04. The Mayor and City Manager are authorized to execute such letters, agreements, and other documents as may be necessary to implement these actions.
Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on May 9, 2005.

Motion for adoption: Wagner
Seconded by: Wiersum
Voted in favor of: Thomas, Wagner, Wiersum, Callison, Schneider
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent: Ellingson, Anderson
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on May 9, 2005.

Kathleen A. Magrew, City Clerk
JOINT COOPERATION AGREEMENT
HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM

THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into by and between the COUNTY OF HENNEPIN, State of Minnesota, hereinafter referred to as “COUNTY,” and the cities executing this Master Agreement, each hereinafter referred to as “COOPERATING UNIT,” said parties to this Agreement each being general governmental units of the State of Minnesota, and is made pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 471.59.

For the purposes of this Agreement, COUNTY shall act for and be limited in area to Urban Hennepin County as so qualified by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development under the provisions of the Community Development Block Grant Program, Title I. of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

WITNESSETH:

COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY agree that it is desirable and in the interests of their citizens to secure status as a PARTICIPATING JURISDICTION under the Home Investment in Affordable Housing Program created through Title II, HOME Investment Partnership Act, of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, as amended, hereinafter referred to as “ACT,” said PARTICIPATING JURISDICTION to be a CONSORTIUM of those general local governmental units executing this AGREEMENT and replicas thereof.

I. DEFINITIONS

The definitions contained in 24 CFR Part 92, Subpart A., paragraph 92.2 are incorporated herein by reference and made a part hereof, and the terms defined in this section have the meanings given them:

A. "Act" means Title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Pub. L. 101-625), (42 U.S.C. 3535 (d.) et. seq.).

B. “HOME Program” means a procedure established for the use of funds made available from HUD through the ACT to carry out multi-year housing strategies through acquisition, rehabilitation and new construction of housing, and tenant-based rental assistance.

C. “HUD” means the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

D. “Consolidated Plan” means the document bearing that title or similarly required statements or documents submitted to HUD for authorization to access the HOME, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) and any other HUD programs, pursuant to 24 CFR Parts 91 and 92. The Consolidated Plan is developed by the COUNTY in conjunction with the COOPERATING UNIT.

E. “Regulations” mean 24 CFR Part 92 Home Investment in Affordable Housing Implementing Regulations as issued by HUD.
II. PURPOSE

This Agreement is to form a CONSORTIUM of units of general local government geographically contiguous to Urban Hennepin County for designation as a PARTICIPATING JURISDICTION under the ACT, said PARTICIPATING JURISDICTION to be known and hereinafter may be referred to as, HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM.

III. AGREEMENT

A. The initial term of this Agreement is for a period commencing on October 1, 2005, and terminating no sooner than the end of the 2008 federal fiscal year, and for such additional time as may be required for the expenditure of HOME funds granted to the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM for such period. As required by 24 CFR 92.101(c), neither the COUNTY nor the COOPERATING UNIT may withdraw from the Agreement while the period remains in effect.

B. Prior to the end of the initial term and the end of each subsequent qualification period, the COUNTY, as the lead agency of the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM, shall provide a written notice to the COOPERATING UNIT of their right not to participate in a subsequent qualification period. The written notice will provide the COOPERATING UNIT a minimum thirty (30) day period to submit a written withdrawal. If the COOPERATING UNIT does not submit to the COUNTY a written withdrawal during the notice period, this Agreement shall be automatically extended for a subsequent three-year qualifying period. The COUNTY and the COOPERATING UNIT agree to adopt any amendments to the Agreement that incorporate future changes necessary to meet any HUD requirements for consortia agreements in subsequent qualification periods.

C. This Agreement shall be executed by the appropriate officers of COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY pursuant to authority granted them by their governing bodies, and a copy of the authorizing resolution and executed Agreement shall be filed promptly by the COOPERATING UNIT in the Hennepin County Department of Housing, Community Works and Transit, and in any event no later than June 30, 2005.

D. COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY mutually agree that COUNTY as the lead entity shall act in a representative capacity for all members of the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM for the purposes of the ACT.

E. COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY mutually agree that COUNTY shall assume overall responsibility for ensuring that the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM’s HOME Program is carried out in compliance with the requirements of the ACT, including the Consolidated Plan.

F. COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY shall participate jointly in the development of the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM’s HOME Program and will undertake or assist in the undertaking of housing assistance activities. The Program will define a strategy in sufficient detail to accommodate the collective and individual needs and priorities of all and any of the COOPERATING UNITS constituting the HENNEPIN HOUSING
CONSORTIUM. COOPERATING UNIT shall have the opportunity to comment on any Program changes prior to implementation by the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM.

G. COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY mutually agree that the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM’s HOME Program will provide fair and ample opportunity for each COOPERATING UNIT to access the funding available through the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM. COOPERATING UNIT shall be given ample opportunity to comment on the distribution of all funding available through the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM.

H. COOPERATING UNIT agrees to fully participate with COUNTY in the development and preparation of the Consolidated Plan and to prepare and provide those elements specifically pertaining to COOPERATING UNIT.

I. COOPERATING UNIT agrees to comply with all program Regulations and HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM’s HOME Program features and requirements.

J. COOPERATING UNIT and COUNTY agree to affirmatively further fair housing.

K. The program year start date for the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM will be July 1 for the federal fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008. All HUD programs covered by the Consolidated Plan, whether allocated to the COOPERATING UNIT or COUNTY, shall have this same start date.

L. COUNTY, after obtaining the COOPERATING UNIT’s written concurrence, is authorized to amend this Agreement on behalf of the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM to add new members to the Consortium.

IV. OPINION OF COUNSEL

The undersigned, on behalf of the Hennepin County Attorney, having reviewed this Agreement, hereby opines that the terms and provisions of the Agreement are fully authorized under state and local law and that the Agreement provides full legal authority for the HENNEPIN HOUSING CONSORTIUM to undertake or assist in undertaking housing assistance activities for the HOME Program.

___________________________________________
Assistant County Attorney
V. HENNEPIN COUNTY EXECUTION

The Hennepin County Board of Commissioners having duly approved this Agreement on __________, 2005, and pursuant to such approval and the proper County official having signed this Agreement, the COUNTY agrees to be bound by the provisions herein set forth.

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA

By: ____________________________________________
Chair of its County Board

And: ___________________________________________
Assistant/Deputy/County Administrator

Attest: _________________________________________
Deputy/Clerk of the County Board

And: ___________________________________________
Assistant County Administrator, Public Works

APPROVED AS TO FORM
Assistant County Attorney
Date: __________________________

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL
Director, Housing, Community Works and Transit Department
Date: __________________________

APPROVED AS TO EXECUTION
Assistant County Attorney
Date: __________________________
VI. COOPERATING UNIT EXECUTION

COOPERATING UNIT, having signed this Agreement, and the COOPERATING UNIT'S governing body having duly approved this Agreement on _________________, 2005, and pursuant to such approval and the proper city official having signed this Agreement, COOPERATING UNIT agrees to be bound by the provisions herein set forth.

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

By: ____________________________________________
   Its Mayor

And: ____________________________________________
   Its City Manager

ATTEST: _______________________________________

CITY MUST CHECK ONE:
The City is organized pursuant to:
   ______ Plan A    ______ Plan B    ______ Charter
VI. COOPERATING UNIT EXECUTION

COOPERATING UNIT, having signed this Agreement, and the COOPERATING UNIT'S governing body having duly approved this Agreement on ________________, 2005, and pursuant to such approval and the proper city official having signed this Agreement, COOPERATING UNIT agrees to be bound by the provisions herein set forth.

CITY OF PLYMOUTH

By: __________________________________________
    Its Mayor

And: __________________________________________
    Its City Manager

ATTEST: _______________________________________

CITY MUST CHECK ONE:
The City is organized pursuant to:
    ______ Plan A    ______ Plan B    ______ Charter
VI. COOPERATING UNIT EXECUTION

COOPERATING UNIT, having signed this Agreement, and the COOPERATING UNIT'S governing body having duly approved this Agreement on ________________, 2005, and pursuant to such approval and the proper city official having signed this Agreement, COOPERATING UNIT agrees to be bound by the provisions herein set forth.

CITY OF MINNETONKA

By: __________________________________________
    Its Mayor

And: __________________________________________
    Its City Manager

ATTEST: ______________________________________

CITY MUST CHECK ONE:
The City is organized pursuant to:

________ Plan A _______ Plan B _______ Charter
VI. COOPERATING UNIT EXECUTION

COOPERATING UNIT, having signed this Agreement, and the COOPERATING UNIT'S governing body having duly approved this Agreement on ___________________, 2005, and pursuant to such approval and the proper city official having signed this Agreement, COOPERATING UNIT agrees to be bound by the provisions herein set forth.

CITY OF EDEN PRAIRIE

By: ______________________________________
   Its Mayor

And: ______________________________________
   Its City Manager

ATTEST: __________________________________

CITY MUST CHECK ONE:
The City is organized pursuant to:
   ______ Plan A   ______ Plan B   ______ Charter
JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT
FOR CDBG SERVICES

This agreement is between the city of Minnetonka ("Minnetonka") and the city of Eden Prairie ("Eden Prairie"), both of which are Minnesota municipal corporations with the power to cooperatively exercise municipal powers pursuant to Minn. Stat. §471.59.

1. **Purpose.** Each of the cities has the authority to receive Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds directly from the federal government and to administer those funds according to federal requirements. They wish to collaborate in administering CDBG funds on behalf of both cities, with Minnetonka exercising the lead responsibility in doing so.

2. **Provision of Services.** Minnetonka will provide all of the personnel, office space, and supplies necessary to administer CDBG funds on behalf of Eden Prairie, except those tasks Eden Prairie decides to exercise on its own after consultation with Minnetonka.

3. **Fees.** Minnetonka will bill Eden Prairie for the time, materials, and supplies that it devotes to Eden Prairie matters. The personnel time will be billed on an hourly basis, recorded to the nearest one-tenth of an hour. The rate used will be the employee’s salary calculated as an hourly rate, plus 25% for benefits and overhead. Time spent on matters that benefit both cities will be billed at one-half of the person’s time. Materials and supplies will be billed at Minnetonka’s actual cost.

4. **Term.** This agreement will begin October 1, 2005, and remain in effect until terminated under paragraph 5 below.

5. **Termination.** Either city may terminate this agreement at any time by giving 90 days advance written notice of termination to the other party.

6. **Exchange of Data.** Each city will provide all information, data, and reports necessary for the services to be provided under this agreement. The parties will cooperate with each other in every way possible to assist in the provision of these services.

7. **Confidentiality.** Each city will maintain the confidentiality and privacy of documents the other provides, in accordance with the Minnesota Data Practices Act.

8. **Amendment.** This agreement may be amended only in writing signed by all of the parties.
9. **Notices.** All notices required or permitted in this agreement and required to be in writing must be given by first class mail addressed to the relevant city manager at the relevant city hall.

Date: ____________

CITY OF MINNETONKA

By __________________________

Its Mayor

And __________________________

Its City Manager

Date: ____________

CITY OF EDEN PRAIRIE

By __________________________

Its Mayor

And __________________________

Its City Manager
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution authorizing the execution of a joint cooperation agreement between the city of Minnetonka and Hennepin County for participation in the Urban Hennepin County Community Development Block Grant Program for fiscal years 2018 - 2020

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01 The city of Minnetonka and Hennepin County are recipients of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds through the Community Development Block Grant program.

1.02 The city of Minnetonka elects to become a joint recipient of Community Development Block Grant funds with Hennepin County, for the purpose of improving administrative efficiency.

1.03 The city of Minnetonka, Minnesota and the County of Hennepin wish to execute a Joint Cooperation Agreement for purposes of qualifying as an Urban County under the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program, and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Programs.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01 The city council approves a Joint Cooperation Agreement between the city and county effective October 1, 2017.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota on June 12, 2017.

______________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
David Maeda, City Clerk
ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

______________________________
Davie Maeda, City Clerk
City Council Agenda Item #14D
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description

Items concerning Ridgedale Festival:

1) Amendment to the existing sign plan; and

2) Amendment to the existing master development plan for façade changes.

Recommendation

Adopt the resolution denying the requests

Background

On May 1, 2017, the city council considered a major amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan. The amendment would allow for façade changes, including an increase in height, of the tenant space formerly occupied by Golfsmith. Staff recommended denial of the request noting:

1. The proposed 37-foot façade would appear disproportionately large relative to the adjacent, existing 18-foot and 25-foot facades.

2. The proposed façade would appear disproportionately large relative to allowable signage. An approved, disproportionately large façade may then result in request for increased signage in order to “correct” the façade/signage disparity.

The city council was disinclined to consider the request prior to tenant signage being identified. Meeting minutes are attached.

Current Request

KIR Minnetonka, LLC, on behalf of Total Wine, has now submitted a request to amend the existing Ridgedale Festival sign plan and a revised façade plan request.

1. Sign Plan Amendment. Under the existing Ridgedale Festival sign plan, anchor tenants are permitted wall signs a maximum five feet in height, 50 feet in length, and 250 square feet in area. Total Wine is requesting that the sign plan be amended to allow a maximum 8.5 feet in height and 300 square feet in area. As proposed, the additional height and square footage would allow for the stacked display of both “Total Wine” copy and logo and a “Spirits Beer and More” tag line.

2. Revised Façade Plan. As proposed in May, the new tenant façade would have a parapet height of 36 feet 4 inches. The revised sign plan reduces the proposed Total Wine façade to 35 feet. This would be similar to the roughly 42-foot façade of the Toys R Us/Babies R Us tenant space.
ANALYSIS

1. Sign Plan Amendment. Staff does not support the applicant’s requested sign plan amendment for both general and specific reasons:

   Generally:
   
   • Sign regulations within Minnetonka are intended to “establish a comprehensive and balanced system of sign control that accommodates the need for a well-maintained, safe, and attractive community, and the need for effective communications including business identification. It would be difficult to argue that the requested additional height and square footage is required to “accommodate effective business identification.” Ridgedale Festival is located at the interchange of two freeways. Existing signs on the retail building are clearly visible from both roadways.

   • Staff acknowledges the general premise that the height or size of a sign is proportional to the attention/advertising achieved by that sign and that this greater attention/advertising may have a real or perceived positive impact on a business. However, staff cannot support increasing allowable sign height and size with the sole justification that such increase would afford greater attention/advertising. If this were a reasonable justification, the city would undoubtedly receive many similar requests for sign plans or sign variances in the future as businesses tried to increase attention/advertising.

   Specifically:

   • The existing Ridgedale Festival sign plan already permits anchor tenants wall signage taller than would be allowed under the sign ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allowed by Ordinance</th>
<th>Allowed by Ridgedale Festival Sign Plan</th>
<th>Proposed by Total Wine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>36 inches</td>
<td>60 inches</td>
<td>96 inches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   • The proposed sign would be three feet taller and larger in total area than the existing signs displayed by the much larger Toys R Us/Babies R Us tenant.

   • The requirements of the sign plan could be met by displaying only “Total Wine” copy and logo and eliminating the “Spirits Beer and More” tag line.
2. Façade Plan. Staff does not support the requested increase in sign height/size and, therefore, does not support the proposed façade changes. Acknowledging that aesthetics are subjective, in staff’s opinion the façade continues to be disproportional to allowable signage.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the city council adopt the resolution denying the requested amendments to the Ridgedale Festival sign plan and master development plan. However, if the council is inclined to approve the request, staff recommends the council direct staff to prepare appropriate resolutions for review and approval at the council’s June 26 meeting.

Through: Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director  
Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
Supporting Information

With Minnetonka, walls signs are regulated in one of three ways: (1) under the non-conforming use ordinance; (2) under the sign ordinance – which regulates commercial walls sign based on the number of tenants in the commercial building; and (3) by sign plans/covenants that have been approved by the city. These three different mechanisms have resulted in a wide assortment of walls signage within the I-394 corridor between Plymouth Road and I-494.

Staff evaluated twelve separate commercial buildings within this corridor. (See attached.)

- Eleven of the twelve were constructed prior to adoption of the 1991 sign ordinance, which established current height and size restrictions. In many cases, current signs on these buildings are replacements of previous, non-conforming signs. Ridgedale Festival is the only commercial building in the area constructed after 1991.

- Nine of the twelve are classified as limited tenant buildings under the sign ordinance. Height of signs not restricted; rather, total square footage is restricted.

- Three of the twelve are regulated by sign plans/covenants: Ridgheaven Mall, Ridgedale Festival, and Fairfield Mall (CorePower Yoga building). These sign plans/covenants, as they pertain to anchor tenants, are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN PLANS</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Height</th>
<th>Total Sign Area</th>
<th>Tenant Square footage</th>
<th>Sign Area to Tenant Area**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridgehaven Mall</td>
<td>Lunds/Byerly's</td>
<td>13 feet stacked logo/name</td>
<td>325 sq.ft.*</td>
<td>77,250 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnes/Noble</td>
<td>7 feet stacked name/tagline</td>
<td>210 sq.ft.</td>
<td>25,000 sq.ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>16 feet stacked logo/name</td>
<td>362 sq.ft.</td>
<td>127,170 sq.ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Festival</td>
<td>Toys R Us Babies R Us</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
<td>228 sq.ft.</td>
<td>61,369 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Wine</td>
<td>8.5 feet</td>
<td>300 sq.ft.</td>
<td>25,775 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Mall</td>
<td>Under the sign plan approve in 1987, tenant signage is limited by large sign cabinets installed on the façade during building construction. Both type and total square footage of signage at the building are non-conforming under the sign ordinance. As such, even had no sign plan been approved, the use of the sign areas is allowed under the non-conforming use ordinance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This total signage area was a negotiated reduction from the 542 sq.ft. installed at Byerly’s at the time of its construction in the early 1980s.

** 1 sq.ft of sign area to X sq.ft. of tenant building area.
Location Map

Project: Kimco Realty  
Applicant: Patrick McCune  
Address: 14200 Wayzata Blvd  
Project No. 88085.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
SIGN PLAN AMENDMENT
CODE INFO

JURISDICTION:
MINNETONKA, MN

NUMBER OF SIGNS:
1 PER PRIMARY FRONTAGE
MAXIMUM LETTER HEIGHT OF 60" & 300 SF OF SIGN AREA

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:
BANNERS NOT TO EXCEED 30 SQUARE FEET ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING:
1) MAXIMUM 30 DAY DISPLAY PERIOD TO COINCIDE WITH THE GRAND OPENING OF A BUSINESS
2) A BUSINESS MAY DISPLAY A BANNER ON TWO OCCASIONS PER CALENDAR YEAR WITH A MAXIMUM 10 DAY DISPLAY PERIOD FOR EACH OCCASION

LANDLORD CRITERIA:
ALL SIGNS SHALL BE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED INDIVIDUAL LETTER TYPE.
THE LENGTH OF THE TENANT’S FASCIA SIGN SHALL NOT EXCEED 2/3RD (66%) OF THE TENANT’S STOREFRONT LENGTH.
THIS DESIGN IS THE PROPERTY OF ADVANCE SIGN GROUP. NEITHER THE DRAWINGS NOR THE DESIGN MAY BE USED OR DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT APPROVAL OF ADVANCE SIGN GROUP.

INSTALLATION NOTES: ONE DEDICATED (1) 120VAC CIRCUIT BY OTHERS REQUIRED WITHIN 5' OF CENTER OF SIGN THIS SIGN IS INTENDED TO BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ARTICLE 600 OF THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND/OR OTHER APPLICABLE CODES. THIS INCLUDES PROPER GROUNDING AND BONDING.
ILLUMINATED CHANNEL LETTERS - OPT A

SCALE 3/16" = 1'-0"

NOTE: NOT TO EXCEED 66% OF THE APPLICABLE FASCIA AREA WIDTH

SIGNAGE COLOR SPECIFICATIONS

- SG279 O RED ACRYLIC
- 3M 3630-55 CARDINAL RED
- 3M 3630-128 PLUM PURPLE
- 3M 3630-106 BRILLIANT GREEN
- 3M 3630-246 TEAL GREEN
- 3M 3630-22 BLACK

CORPORATE COLOR SPECIFICATION

- PMS 032C
- PMS 2582C
- PMS 361C
- PMS 329C

SIGN DETAILS

1. 5" DEEP - .040" ALUMINUM RETURNS - PPS-040-BW
   OUTSIDE BLACK/INSIDE WHITE
2. .040" ALUMINUM BACKS - PPS-040-WW
   OUTSIDE WHITE/INSIDE WHITE
3. 3/16" 279 RED ACRYLIC FACES
4. 3/16" 7328 WHITE ACRYLIC FACES W/ 3630-106 BRILLIANT GREEN PSV ON FRONT SURFACE
5. 3/16" 7328 WHITE ACRYLIC FACES W/ 3630-128 PLUM PURPLE PSV ON FRONT SURFACE
6. 3/16" 7328 WHITE ACRYLIC FACES W/ 3630-246 TEAL GREEN PSV ON FRONT SURFACE
7. 3/16" 7328 WHITE ACRYLIC FACES W/ 3630-22 BLACK PSV ON FRONT SURFACE
8. 1" BLACK JEWELITE TRIM CAP
9. RED LED ILLUMINATION (QTY & PLACEMENT DETERMINED BY SIGN SIZE)
10. WHITE LED ILLUMINATION (QTY & PLACEMENT DETERMINED BY SIGN SIZE)
11. REMOTE 120/277V POWER SUPPLIES MOUNTED INSIDE UL LISTED/RECOGNIZED BOX
12. UL LISTED/RECOGNIZED 18 AWG/2FLC WIRING AND FIXTURES GOING TO POWER SUPPLIES
13. SIGN TO HAVE AN 8"-0" WHIP, INSTALLER TO SPECIFY IF SPECIFIC LENGTH IS REQUIRED
14. THRU BOLT W/ SPACERS CUT TO LENGTH IN FIELD
15. EPS OVER MASONRY BLOCK WALL

REVISIONS

- 2/18/17
- 5/18/17

ENGINEERING DRAWING/DATE OF LAST CHANGE: 5/18/17

THIS DRAWING SUPERCEDES ALL OTHER DOCUMENTS PROVIDED CONCERNING THE FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION OF THIS DESIGN. A SIGNATURE ANYWHERE ON THE DRAWING WILL BE TAKEN AS APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN AND SPECIFICATIONS AS NOTED.

CONSULTANT: A. WASSERSTROM
PROJECT MANAGER: S. HUGHES
DESIGNER: S. HUGHES

REVISIONS: CHANGED ELEVATION DRAWING

SIGNATURES:

CONSULTANT: A. WASSERSTROM
PROJECT MANAGER: S. HUGHES
DESIGNER: S. HUGHES

APPROVALS:

ENGINEERING DRAWING/DATE OF LAST CHANGE: 5/18/17

THIS DRAWING SUPERCEDES ALL OTHER DOCUMENTS PROVIDED CONCERNING THE FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION OF THIS DESIGN. A SIGNATURE ANYWHERE ON THE DRAWING WILL BE TAKEN AS APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN AND SPECIFICATIONS AS NOTED.

CONSULTANT: A. WASSERSTROM
PROJECT MANAGER: S. HUGHES
DESIGNER: S. HUGHES

REVISIONS: CHANGED ELEVATION DRAWING

SIGNATURES:

CONSULTANT: A. WASSERSTROM
PROJECT MANAGER: S. HUGHES
DESIGNER: S. HUGHES

APPROVALS:

ENGINEERING DRAWING/DATE OF LAST CHANGE: 5/18/17

THIS DRAWING SUPERCEDES ALL OTHER DOCUMENTS PROVIDED CONCERNING THE FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION OF THIS DESIGN. A SIGNATURE ANYWHERE ON THE DRAWING WILL BE TAKEN AS APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN AND SPECIFICATIONS AS NOTED.

CONSULTANT: A. WASSERSTROM
PROJECT MANAGER: S. HUGHES
DESIGNER: S. HUGHES

REVISIONS: CHANGED ELEVATION DRAWING

SIGNATURES:

CONSULTANT: A. WASSERSTROM
PROJECT MANAGER: S. HUGHES
DESIGNER: S. HUGHES

APPROVALS:
CONSULTANT: A. WASSERSTROM
PROJECT MANAGER: S. HUGHES
DESIGNER: STACEY COX

SCALE 1" = 1'-0"

TEMPORARY BANNERS
(2) TWO REQUIRED FOR FRONT ELEVATION

SIGN DETAILS
1. WHITE BANNER MATERIAL
2. REINFORCED SEAMS & GROMMETS AS REQUIRED
3. FULL-COLOR DIGITALLY PRINTED GRAPHICS
4. BANNER TO BE INSTALLED AT TIME OF WALL SIGN INSTALLATION

TOTAL WINE & MORE
COMING SOON

NOW OPEN
TOTAL WINE & MORE

CORPORATE COLORS
- PMS 032C
- PMS 2582C
- PMS 361C
- PMS 329C

SIGNAGE COLORS
- 2793 RED ACRYLIC
- 3M 3630-53 CARDINAL RED
- 3M 3630-128 PLUM PURPLE
- 3M 3630-106 BRILLIANT GREEN
- 3630-246 TEAL GREEN
- 3630-22 BLACK

THIS DESIGN IS THE PROPERTY OF ADVANCE SIGN GROUP. NEITHER THE DRAWINGS NOR THE DESIGN MAY BE USED OR DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT APPROVAL OF ADVANCE SIGN GROUP.

ONE DEDICATED (1) 120VAC CIRCUIT BY OTHERS REQUIRED WITHIN 5' OF CENTER OF SIGN

THIS SIGN IS INTENDED TO BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ARTICLE 600 OF THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND/OR OTHER APPLICABLE CODES. THIS INCLUDES PROPER GROUNDING AND BONDING.

THIS DRAWING SUPERcedes ALL OTHER DOCUMENTS PROVIDED CONCERNING THE FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION OF THIS DESIGN. A SIGNATURE ANYWHERE ON THE DRAWING WILL BE TAKEN AS APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN AND SPECIFICATIONS AS NOTED.

INSTALLATION NOTES:
- ONE DEDICATED (1) 120VAC CIRCUIT BY OTHERS REQUIRED WITHIN 5' OF CENTER OF SIGN
- THIS SIGN IS INTENDED TO BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ARTICLE 600 OF THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND/OR OTHER APPLICABLE CODES. THIS INCLUDES PROPER GROUNDING AND BONDING.

SIGNATURES
A. WASSERSTROM
STACEY COX

DATE OF APPROVALS
5/18/17
5/18/17
5/18/17
5/18/17
5/18/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN</th>
<th>GRAPHIC</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SQ FT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1A.0 | ![Total Wine](image) | - STOREFRONT ELEVATION  
- (1) ONE LED FACE LIT CHANNEL LETTERS  
- 5” DEEP  
- FLUSH MOUNT | 249.11 |
| 2.0  | ![Coming Soon](image) ![Now Open](image) | - (2) TWO TEMPORARY STOREFRONT BANNERS | 15 EA |
Storefront Image Submission

When taking pictures of your storefront, we request three images. A straight-on picture, one from the left and one from the right. See below for an example of these images.

DO NOT USE A CELL PHONE to take these images! Your DM should have access to a camera for you to use for this purpose.

Ideal Conditions:
> Sun behind clouds
> Within 1 hour of dawn
> Within 1 hour of dusk

Try to Avoid:
> Trees blocking the storefront
> Cars blocking the storefront
> Construction equipment
> Editing the images

The best time of day to take storefront images is early morning (within an hour of dawn) or late afternoon (within an hour of dusk). This prevents harsh shadows from the daytime sun. The absolute best conditions for pictures is when the sun is behind clouds.

DO NOT EDIT THE IMAGES in any way. Its best to send us original files so that alterations can be made if needed.

Examples of Unacceptable Images:
- Taken midday, very harsh shadow
- Shadow from sun makes sign hard to read
- Tree blocking sign
- Shadow from sun makes sign hard to read, too far away

From Left:

From Right:

Straight-on:

This drawing supercedes all other documents provided concerning the fabrication and installation of this design. A signature anywhere on the drawing will be taken as approval of the design and specifications as noted.
REVISED FACADE
Brief Description  Amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan for façade changes

Recommendation  Adopt the resolution denying the request

Proposal

KIR Minnetonka, LLP, the owner of Ridgedale Festival, is requesting an amendment to the shopping center’s existing master development plan. The amendment would allow changes to a 25,775 square foot tenant space most recently occupied by Golfsmith. As proposed, the existing 40-foot wide by 28-foot tall storefront would be increased to 80-foot wide by 37-foot tall. New pillar structures would be constructed to create a covered, outdoor cart storage area. New building materials would be incorporated into the façade and pillars, including stone veneer and exterior insulation and finish system (EIFS) in two different colors and textures. The owner has indicated that the proposed façade improvements are not contingent on any specific future tenant and has specifically noted that the current request does not include signage.

Planning Commission Hearing

The planning commission considered the proposal on April 20, 2017. The commission report and associated plans are attached. Staff recommended denial of the request noting:

1. The proposed 37-foot façade would appear disproportionately large relative to the adjacent, existing 18-foot and 25-foot facades.

2. The proposed façade would appear disproportionately large relative to allowable signage. An approved disproportionately large façade may then result in a request for increased signage in order to “correct” the façade/signage disparity.

A public hearing was opened to take comment, but no comments were received. The commission discussed the request. While all commissioners indicated that the viability of the retail center was important, they had differing opinion on whether the size of the proposed size was appropriate.

Planning Commission Recommendation

On a 3-2 vote, the commission recommended the city council deny the request
Since Planning Commission Hearing

There have been no changes to the proposal or recommendation since the planning commission hearing.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the city council adopt the resolution denying an amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan for façade changes

Through: Geralyn Barone, City Manager
        Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director
        Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
Brief Description  Amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan for façade changes

Recommendation  Adopt the resolution denying the request

Background

It is the current practice of the city to adopt ordinances or resolutions to outline conditions of a development’s approval. However, this was not always the case. Throughout the 1980s and mid-1990s, instead of ordinances or resolutions, the city frequently used legal agreements that were jointly signed by a project’s developer and city representatives. A property owner may request a change or amendment to conditions of such agreements. While the city is generally not obligated to approve requested changes, the city is obligated to consider and act upon such requests.

In 1989, the city council approved development of Ridgedale Festival, a roughly 130,000 square foot shopping center located at the I-394/I-494 interchange. The approval, which included a master development plan referencing specific façade plans, was outlined in a signed development agreement.

In 2011, the city council approved an amendment to Ridgedale Festival master development plan. The amendment: (1) approved combination of two anchor tenant spaces and façade improvements for a Toys R’ Us / Babies R’ Us superstore; (2) and removed conditions that were considered “more strict” than requirements outlined in current ordinance.

Proposal

KIR Minnetonka, LLP, the owner of Ridgedale Festival, is now requesting an additional amendment to the existing master development plan. The amendment would allow changes to a 25,775 square foot tenant space most recently occupied by Golfsmith. As proposed, the existing 40-foot wide by 28-foot tall storefront would be increased to 80-foot wide by 37-foot tall. New pillar structures would be constructed to create a covered, outdoor cart storage area. New building materials would be incorporated into the façade and pillars, including stone veneer and exterior insulation and finish system (EIFS) in two different colors and textures. The owner indicates that the proposed façade improvements are not contingent on any specific future tenant. Nevertheless, the submitted façade plans and recent liquor license application suggest Total Wine as a possible, near-term tenant. The owner has specifically noted that the current request does not include signage. (See attachments.)
Staff Analysis

Ridgedale Festival was constructed in the 1990s. Staff recognizes that architectural design standards and tenant desires have changed over the last 25+ years. Staff generally supports upgrading façade design and materials on older commercial buildings. However, staff does not support the applicant's specific request.

1. **Disproportionality to Surrounding Facades.** As proposed, the new façade would be 37 feet tall. The applicant has correctly noted that this would be similar to – in fact 4 feet less than – that of the existing Toys R’ Us / Babies R’ Us façade. However, in staff’s opinion, the context of the proposed storefront and The Toys R’ Us / Babies facades are quite different. The proposed improvement would be significantly taller, 12 to 19 feet, than the adjacent facades. Conversely, the 41-foot Toys R’ Us / Babies R’ Us façade is just 7 feet taller than adjacent façades. The proposed façade improvement is disproportional to the facades in this segment of the building. (See attached.)

2. **Disproportionality to Signage.** The property owner has chosen to separate the façade request from any future signage requests. However, staff finds that at Ridgedale Festival façades and signage cannot be independently evaluated. Signage at Ridgedale Festival is regulated by a sign covenant, not the city’s sign ordinance. Under this covenant, anchor tenants are permitted to display a wall sign 5 feet in height and 250 square feet in total area. In staff’s opinion, the proposed façade appears disproportionately large compared to the allowed wall signage. (See attached.) If the façade were approved as proposed, staff anticipates a future request would be made to amend the sign covenant allowing for larger signage. Staff further anticipates that the argument for the increased signage would be that the allowable 5-foot tall, 250 square foot sign would appear disproportionally small compared to the recently approved larger façade. In fact, the Total Wine sign illustrated on the façade plans, but not part of this current application, is roughly 9.5 feet in height and 340 square feet in total area. (See attached.)

The square footage of the proposed storefront would be similar in size to the Toys R’ Us / Babies R’ Us façade. However, in staff’s opinion, the design of the two storefronts is notably different. The Toys R’ Us / Babies R’ Us façade includes a significant amount of glass, visually reducing the area on which the retailer’s sign is displayed. Conversely, the proposed façade includes a large amount of EIFS providing a visually larger area on which a sign could be displayed. (See attached.)

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution denying an amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan for façade changes

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
Supporting Information

Surrounding Uses

North: Single-family homes, zoned R-1
East: Goodwill, zoned PID
South: I-394, office buildings beyond
West: I-494, Carlson Center beyond

Planning

Guide Plan designation: Commercial
Zoning: PID, Planned I-394 District

Total Wine

Total Wine recently submitted an application for an off-sale liquor license at the tenant space for which façade improvements are proposed. The city council conducted the first of a required two public hearings on the licensee request on March 6, 2017. The second hearing will be held on May 1, 2017.

From a zoning perspective, a liquor store is considered a commercial land uses. The zoning ordinance does not differentiate between types of stores; in other words, under the ordinance, a liquor store, department store, sporting goods store, and shoe store are all considered equal. Commercial retailers, which by code definition “primarily involve(s) the sale of goods or merchandise to the general public for personal or household consumption,” are permitted uses within buildings on a property designated for commercial use. Given this, it is not within the planning commission’s purview to determine whether Total Wine is – or is not – an appropriate tenant at Ridgedale Center.

SBP Standards

When reviewing changes to existing commercial buildings, specifically changes that require an amendment to an existing master development plan, the city generally evaluates the changes for consistency with site and building plans standards outlined in City Code §300.27 Subd. 5:

1. Consistency with the elements and objectives of the city's development guides, including the comprehensive plan and water resources management plan;

2. Consistency with the ordinance;

3. Preservation of the site in its natural state to the extent practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal and designing grade changes to be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed or developing
4. Creation of a harmonious relationship of buildings and open spaces with natural site features and with existing and future buildings having a visual relationship to the development;

5. Creation of a functional and harmonious design for structures and site features, with special attention to the following:
   
a) an internal sense of order for the buildings and uses on the site and provision of a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community;

b) the amount and location of open space and landscaping;

c) materials, textures, colors and details of construction as an expression of the design concept and the compatibility of the same with the adjacent and neighboring structures and uses; and

d) vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking in terms of location and number of access points to the public streets, width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and arrangement and amount of parking.

6. Promotion of energy conservation through design, location, orientation and elevation of structures, the use and location of glass in structures and the use of landscape materials and site grading; and

7. Protection of adjacent and neighboring properties through reasonable provision for surface water drainage, sound and sight buffers, preservation of views, light and air and those aspects of design not adequately covered by other regulations which may have substantial effects on neighboring land uses.

**FINDINGS:** The proposed façade changes would not create a functional and harmonious design for structures and site
features. The proposed façade would appear disproportionately large relative to allowed signage.

**Neighborhood Concerns**

During the 2011 amendment review, some area residents raised concerns about: (1) a gate on site that in not being appropriately use; and (2) activities occurring on the site outside of allowable hours. At that time, staff met with representatives of the police department and building ownership to discuss the issues. A condition of the 2011 approval required that the gate leading to the rear delivery area remain closed between 9:30 p.m. – 7:00 a.m. daily. Upon notification of the current application, area residents expressed that this condition is not being met. Unfortunately, this was the first time since the 2011 approval that planning staff has been contacted regarding the gate/activity issue. The city is not in a position to take action if it is unaware of an issue. Neither, from staff’s perspective, is the city in a position to deny a current application based on the suggestion that conditions of approval have been violated without report and evidence of such violation. Staff encourages residents to report violations to planning staff if they occur during business hours and to the police department if the violations occur outside of business hours.

**Pyramid of Discretion**

**Motion Options**

The planning commission has several options:

1. Concur with the staff recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council adopt the resolution denying the request.

2. Disagree with the staff recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made to recommend the city council approve the proposal. This motion should include a statement as to why the proposal is approved.
3. Table the request. In this case, a motion should be made to table the item. The motion should include a statement as to why the request is being tabled with direction to staff, the applicant, or both.

Voting Requirement
The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council. A recommendation to approve the applicant’s request requires an affirmative vote a simple majority. At the city council, approval of the applicant’s request similarly requires an affirmative vote a simple majority.

Neighborhood Comments
The city sent notice to 48 area property owners and has no written comments to date.

Deadline for Action
June 26, 2017
Location Map

Project: Kimco Realty
Applicant: Patrick McCune
Address: 14200 Wayzata Blvd
Project No. 88085.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
1989 FACADE PLAN
07 March, 2017

Loren Gordon – City Planner, AICP
City of Minnetonka – Planning & Zoning
14600 Minnetonka Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55345

RE: Proposed Exterior Elevation Improvements @ 14200 Wayzata Blvd – Former Golfsmith Retail Outlet

Dear Mr. Gordon,

The property management group, KIR Minnetonka, L.P., is proposing to modify the exterior elevation at the corner entrance location to the former Golfsmith retail outlet. The prospective future tenant has requested that the exterior entryway be improved to enhance the visibility of the location & to more closely match their current branding.

The dimensions of the current storefront are 40'-2" wide x 28'-0" tall. The proposed improvements will increase the size of the storefront to 80'-10" wide X 37'-0" tall. Part of this increase in size will allow for an area to protect customer shopping carts under a new open canopy, immediately to the East of the customer entry area.

It is the intention of the landlord to move forward with these improvements & they will not be contingent upon any particular tenant signing a lease in the near future. The signage indicated on the enlarged edifice is currently included for reference purposes only. We are not looking for signage approval at this time as we are limiting this requested review to have you only evaluate the exterior building modifications.

Truly,

Welsh Architecture, LLC

Thomas (Tom) G. Winterer
Senior Project Manager

KIR Minnetonka, L.P.

Patrick A. McCune
Authorized Agent

Welsh Architecture, Suite 400, 3450 Baker Road, Minnetonka, Minnesota 55343-8695
Elevation Remodeling Study for:
Current Golfsmith Premises at
Ridgedale Festival - 14200 Wayzata Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55305

Demo Plan & Floor Plan
Elevation Remodeling Study for:
Current Golfsmith Premises at
Ridgedale Festival - 14200 Wayzata Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55305

Exterior Elevations

ALLOWABLE SIGNAGE

SPRITS - BEER & MORE
The next planning commission meeting will be May 4, 2017.

6. Report from Planning Commission Members: None

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda: None

8. Public Hearings

A. Amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan for façade changes.

Chair Kirk introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Thomas reported. She recommended denial of the request based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Knight asked what would happen if tenants adjacent to the proposal would want a façade similar to the current proposal. Thomas stated that that application would be reviewed by the planning commission at that time.

Chair Kirk asked if the adjacent façades extend to the height of the roof line. Thomas referred the question to the applicant. Gordon noted that the roof heights increase from the west to east and get taller nearer to the Toys R Us site. The roof heights are equal in proportion to the parapet heights.

Chair Kirk asked if there is a correlation between a store’s square footage and the size restriction of a sign. Thomas answered affirmatively. There is a sign covenant that allows an anchor store to have a 5-foot tall, 250-square-foot sign.

Calvert asked if any of the other signs for the building would be improved. Mr. Gibson stated that a canopy is being considered for the adjacent facades.

Dan Gibson, representing Kimco Realty Corporation, part owner of the building and applicant, stated that Kimco Realty is the largest owner of open-aired shopping centers in the country. The goal is to be sensitive to communities, but be driven by what retailers need. The applicant wants to make the 25,000-square-foot space viable again. One vacancy can cause a prolonged vacancy. The proposal would help the situation. It would not feel out of place. The small tenants want an anchor that will attract customers to the site.

Chair Kirk asked for the square footage of the Total Hockey site. Mr. Gibson answered 8,700 square feet.
Powers asked where the proposal has worked in other locations. Mr. Gibson responded “everywhere.” The location at Arbor Lakes in Maple Grove is an example. The tenant would apply for sign approval. He added that limited signage is a deterrent to retail.

Tom Winter, of Welsh Architecture, representing the applicant, explained that the façade plans would create a cohesive unit. The proposal would be four feet lower than the Toys R Us façade. The width of the proposed façade was increased to identify the space as an anchor tenant. The tower helps to balance the other two anchor tenants.

The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

In response to Schack’s question, Mr. Winter explained that from the top of the Toys R Us parapet, it drops 7 feet to the next level and 10 feet to the lowest level.

Schack wants malls and retailers to be viable, but the proposal does seem like a lot.

Powers likes the proposal. It is a commercial area. He likes the variation in heights. It is a strong-looking structure. He supports the proposal, but he would still like to see other areas that have done the proposal successfully.

Knight agreed with Powers. He likes the idea of varying the heights of the building. He did not like the idea of having a large amount of space above the doors and windows compared to Toys R Us. He supports the proposal.

Chair Kirk thought the proposal would be too big. What exists now is too low, but he would prefer something in between. The proposal would have a lot of blank space. He was frustrated that the sign plan would not be reviewed at the same time as the canvas. He preferred decreasing the height four or five feet.

Calvert was also conflicted. She still did not like the very large “Macy's” letters on Ridgedale Center. It is a commercial area and she wants the businesses to be viable, but she was not convinced that a façade so much higher than the store on the west would be attractive. She was concerned with the size of the canvas looking like a billboard.
Powers noted that outdoor retail centers are not doing well. He did not know if the height would be appropriate, but a retailer has to be visible. He would like additional pictures of existing similar signs.

Schack agreed that some increase would be appropriate, but the west side of the proposal seems really extreme.

Calvert understood the need to draw attention to a store, but there are reasons for sign regulations. The height differential between the top of the façade and the western most store front would be too extreme.

**Powers moved, second by Calvert, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution denying an amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan for façade changes.**

*Calvert, Schack, and Kirk voted yes. Knight and Powers voted no. Sewall and O’Connell were absent. Motion passed.*

**B. Items concerning Ridgedale restaurants at 12415 Wayzata Boulevard.**

Chair Kirk introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Gordon reported. He recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Calvert asked how four restaurants on one pad would impact the master development plan. Gordon explained the history of the site. The style of restaurants is changing.

Chair Kirk asked if the site would have walkability. Gordon pointed out proposed sidewalks on the site plan. The site would be much more walkable than it is now.

Powers asked if the sidewalks would be handicap accessible. Gordon answered in the affirmative.

Ben Freeman, representing General Growth Properties, applicant, thanked the commissioners for their consideration. He appreciated staff’s input. The proposal is an opportunity to invest in and improve Ridgedale Center. The company is proud of how far the center has come and excited to continue the momentum with the current proposal. There has been an evolution in restaurant demand. He envisioned pads two and three being used by single users. He looked forward to
location. Allendorf, Wiersum, Bergstedt, Wagner and Schneider voted "yes." Ellingson and Acomb voted "no." Motion carried.

14. Other Business:

A. Amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan for façade changes

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Schneider said he wasn’t exactly sure what the right widths, heights, and proportions were at this time. He really didn’t want to think about that until it was known it could be combined with an actual signage application. For him, this was what was missing. There were too many assumptions. Now that there was an approved use, Total Wine with its own specific sign. He thought it was premature to approve just a façade and suggested continuing the item and sending it back to the owner of the building and Total Wine to work with staff to come up with a plan that made sense.

Bergstedt agreed. The only options were to continue the item or deny the proposed amendment. It was hard to make a good decision with only half the information.

Wiersum also agreed and said the city does not have a façade ordinance but rather it has a sign ordinance. He supported tabling the item.

Allendorf asked for clarification of staff’s comments about massing. Gordon said he was trying to convey that the relationship between the parts of the parapet that were changing more greatly than what happened with Toys R Us caused almost an exaggeration of height.

Wagner said he agreed with the idea of continuing the item to allow more work to be done to come up with a completed package.

Dan Gibson, representing Kimco Realty Corporation, the owner of the building, said he was excited to have Total Wine coming in. Not only would they add traffic to the area, which would help the retail node, and help fill vacancies in the area. From an adapting perspective a lot has changed since the center was approved in 1990. The Toys R Us was modified around 2010 and even more has changed since then. Adapting the façade was just a natural progression of what retailers will and will not accept in terms of their prototype. He said he met with staff last week and wasn’t in a position to show the signage and the façade together which was what everybody needed to see. He was now prepared to do that.
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution denying an amendment to the existing Ridgedale Festival master development plan for sign and façade changes

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01 In 1989, the city council approved development of Ridgedale Festival, a roughly 130,000 square foot shopping center located at the I-394/I-494 interchange. The approval, which included a master development plan referencing specific façade plans, was outlined in PID Agreement 88085.

1.02 Ridgedale Festival is located at 14200 Wayzata Boulevard. It is legally described on Exhibit A of this resolution.

1.03 KIR Minnetonka, LLP, the owner of Ridgedale Festival, and on behalf of Total Wine, is requesting the following:

1. Sign Plan Amendment. Under the existing Ridgedale Festival sign plan, anchor tenants are permitted wall signs a maximum five feet in height, 50 feet in length, and 250 square feet in area. Total Wine is requesting that the sign plan be amendment to allow a maximum 8.5 feet in height and 300 square feet in area. As proposed, the additional height and square footage would allow for the stacked display of both “Total Wine” copy and logo and a “Spirits Beer and More” tagline.

2. Master Development Plan Amendment. The amendment would allow changes to a 25,775 square foot tenant space. As proposed, the existing 40-foot wide by 28-foot tall storefront would be increased to 82-foot wide by 35-foot tall storefront. New façade materials would include stone veneer and exterior insulation and finish system (EIFS) in two different colors and textures.
Section 2. Standards.

2.01 By City Code §300.31 Subd.7(a)(b), signs within developments with approved master development plans are restricted to those signs permitted in a sign plan approved by the city and are regulated by permanent covenants that can be enforced by the city.

2.02 By City Code §325.06 Subd. 6, a sign plan with requirements different than those of the sign ordinance may be approved within planned unit and planned I-394 districts.

2.03 By City Code §325.05 Subd.5, the city may enforce, in the same manner as the requirements of sign ordinance, the terms of a sign plan or sign covenants that it has approved.

2.04 City Code §300.27 Subd. 5, outlines several items that must be considered in the evaluation of site and building plans.

1. Consistency with the elements and objectives of the city's development guides, including the comprehensive plan and water resources management plan;

2. Consistency with the ordinance;

3. Preservation of the site in its natural state to the extent practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal and designing grade changes to be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed or developing areas;

4. Creation of a harmonious relationship of buildings and open spaces with natural site features and with existing and future buildings having a visual relationship to the development;

5. Creation of a functional and harmonious design for structures and site features, with special attention to the following:

   a) an internal sense of order for the buildings and uses on the site and provision of a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community;

   b) the amount and location of open space and landscaping;

   c) materials, textures, colors and details of construction as an expression of the design concept and the compatibility of the
same with the adjacent and neighboring structures and uses; and

d) vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking in terms of location and number of access points to the public streets, width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and arrangement and amount of parking.

6. Promotion of energy conservation through design, location, orientation and elevation of structures, the use and location of glass in structures and the use of landscape materials and site grading; and

7. Protection of adjacent and neighboring properties through reasonable provision for surface water drainage, sound and sight buffers, preservation of views, light and air and those aspects of design not adequately covered by other regulations which may have substantial effects on neighboring land uses.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 The requested sign plan amendment is not appropriate:

1. Ridgedale Festival is located at the interchange of two freeways. Existing signs on the retail building are clearly visible from both roadways. Additional height and square footage is not necessary to accommodate effective business identification.

2. The existing Ridgedale Festival sign plan already permits anchor tenant wall signage taller than would be allowed under the sign ordinance.

3. The proposed sign would be three feet taller and larger in total area than the existing signs displayed by the much larger Toys R Us/Babies R Us tenant.

4. The requirements of the existing sign plan could be met by displaying only “Total Wine” copy and logo and eliminating the “Spirits Beer and More” tag line.

3.02 The requested master development plan amendment would not meet the site and building plan standards as outlined City Code §300.27 Subd. 5, as
the façade changes would not create a functional and harmonious design.

1. The proposed 35-foot façade would appear disproportionately large relative to the adjacent, existing 18-foot and 25-foot facades.

2. The proposed façade would appear disproportionately large relative to allowable signage.

3.03 Though the height and square footage of the proposed façade would be similar in size to an existing anchor tenant façade located to the east, the design of the two storefronts is notably different. The exiting anchor tenant façade includes a significant amount of glass, visually reducing the area on which the existing retailer’s sign is displayed. Conversely, the proposed façade would include a large amount of EIFS, providing a visually larger area on which a sign could be displayed.


4.01 The requested amendments to the existing Ridgedale Festival sign plan and master development plan, as described in section 1 of this resolution, are hereby denied.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.
I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on June 12, 2017.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
EXHIBIT A

All that part of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 3, Township 117, Range 22, lying East of the West 600 feet thereof, lying Southerly of the Southerly line of the plat of Knollway, on file and of record in the Office of the Register of Deeds in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and lying Easterly and Northeasterly of the line of taking by the State of Minnesota for Trunk Highway purposes as described in that certain Lis Pendens recorded in Book 3514 of Mortgages, Page 349;

Also,

All that part of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 3, lying Westerly of a line drawn from a point on the South line of said Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter distant 945 feet West of the Southeast corner of said Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, when measured along said South line, and drawn parallel with the West line of Horn Drive as said Horn Drive is described in that certain deed recorded in Book 2337 of Deeds, Page 577, Office of the Register of Deeds, and lying Southerly of the Southerly line of said plat in Knollway, and Northerly of the line of taking by the State of Minnesota for Trunk Highway purposes as described in that certain Lis Pendens recorded in Book 3163 of Mortgages, Page 333.

Together with a permanent easement for highway purposes over and across a 50 foot strip of land lying Northerly of a line drawn parallel with and 50 feet South of and at right angles to the Southerly line of said plat of Knollway and extending from the West line of Horn Drive as described in Book 2337 of Deeds, Page 577, to the East line of that part of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 3, above described.
City Council Agenda Item #14E
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description: 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution

Background

As stewards of the city of Minnetonka’s assets, our core responsibilities include ensuring that we preserve what we have – our streets, utilities, parks, facilities and equipment – and be the community of choice where people live, work, play and conduct business in a naturally beautiful environment – our Strategic Vision. The Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is the city’s plan to provide and maintain facilities, infrastructure and major equipment toward realizing our community’s desires as expressed during Imagine Minnetonka for Connections, Character and Citizenry within constraints of limited resources.

Similar to the annual operating budget, the CIP is a policy document. While it details capital expenditures in the city of Minnetonka over the next five years, changes in the city’s priorities and available resources require that the plan be reevaluated on an annual basis. The recommended CIP continues to be consistent with the city’s capital improvement policy, which establishes funding priorities for projects that: (1) contribute to the public health and safety, (2) maintain an existing system or make it more efficient, and (3) expand public services.

What the CIP funds

The recommended 2018-22 CIP funds $149.4 million of capital projects over the next five years. The single most significant increase reflects costs to replace the city’s central fire station along with updating and expanding the city’s police facility. Excluding these two combined construction projects, the five-year plan is 7.4 percent higher than last year’s CIP, and reflects the city’s ongoing commitment to needed road and storm sewer infrastructure improvements and the replacement requirements of our aging water and sewer utility systems. The plan also includes the city’s continuing efforts to meet citizen expectations for Connections through its trails system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP ($000’s)</th>
<th>2015-19</th>
<th>2016-20</th>
<th>2017-21</th>
<th>2018-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
<td>$45,793</td>
<td>$49,545</td>
<td>$44,382</td>
<td>$45,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sewer &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>33,805</td>
<td>34,131</td>
<td>37,367</td>
<td>38,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Rec &amp; Trails</td>
<td>7,265</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>12,687</td>
<td>14,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>16,258</td>
<td>16,411</td>
<td>15,938</td>
<td>15,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>3,488</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>34,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CIP</td>
<td>$105,828</td>
<td>$111,590</td>
<td>$114,449</td>
<td>$149,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Streets continue to be the largest city investment, still accounting for over a third of the total five-year CIP. Nonetheless, since 2015, water, sewer and storm water infrastructure has become the other most significant outlay within the capital program. The utility infrastructure costs account for over one quarter of the total plan. Annual street improvement funding and much of the major water, sewer and storm water expenditures vary with project scheduling. Projects in 2018 include: Woodhill Road, water/sewer utility and storm sewer improvements; mill and overlay of Ford Road and Williston Road (Hwy 7 to Minnetonka Blvd); Light Rail Transit (LRT) street improvements for both Shady Oak and Opus areas in 2017 thru 2020; and significant investments in the roads and utilities of Ridgedale Drive are programmed in 2019.
Police and Fire Facilities

At public meetings held in September 2016, January of this year and at the capital budget study session in April, the city council reviewed the capital facility requirements of both our fire and police services. Staff presented the results of a comprehensive study, which included analysis of a variety of options to address current deficiencies and to accommodate future service needs. Council generally supported the continued concept development of a project to be built by remodeling and constructing into the current central police and fire stations for the police upgrades and constructing a new fire station on the Civic Center Campus. Staff reported that the two combined facilities will cost around $25 million, and the council directed staff to initiate a robust public process and communications plan to ensure public support of this major undertaking.

Public safety needs. As has been stated in a number of forums, it has been 30 years since the Minnetonka Police Station was constructed and even longer (45 years) since the Minnetonka Central Fire Station was built. In the decades since, both departments have evolved to address Minnetonka’s safety and security needs. While the current facilities have served Minnetonka well throughout these changes, it is necessary to ensure both departments and their facilities are well-positioned into the future.

Since the current facilities’ construction, the fire department has more than doubled, the police force has grown by 20 percent with female employment up 25 percent, annual police calls have risen from 25,000 in 1989 to more than 42,000 in 2016, and annual fire service calls have risen from 200 in 1975 to more than 3,000 in 2016.

The proposed facilities will meet service demands of today and the future by:

- Improving safety and response
- Accommodating growth and a changing workforce
- Protecting investments in equipment

Calendar. The 2018-22 CIP anticipates the following project timeline:

**Needs Analysis and Concept Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Q4 2016</td>
<td>City analyzed current space and identified need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1-Q2 2017</td>
<td>City council reviews space study and considers options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3-Q4 2017</td>
<td>If council approves, staff directs architects to begin designing new facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1-Q2 2018</td>
<td>Well modification is constructed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Authorization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Q3 2018</td>
<td>2019-23 CIP statutory public process for bond issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3-Q4 2018</td>
<td>City council reviews and authorizes architects’ plans and specifications; staff begins preparing construction contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018-22 Capital Improvements Program

Q1 2019  Construction contract bidding begins and bonds sold
Q2 2019  Contract awarded

Project Commencement

Q2 2019-Q4 2020  Fire station construction begins, followed by police remodel
Q1 2020  Debt service begins

As previously discussed, the presence of Well 16B, which lies in the proposed fire building footprint, continues to encumber its current design. The project architect and city’s water engineers discussed moving the well with the Minnesota Departments of Health and Natural Resources and found that the high costs required to incorporate the well into the building while meeting health and safety regulations would preclude that design. Therefore, it will be necessary to relocate Well 16B and the watermain that connects the well to Water Treatment Plant 16. The estimated cost is $2 million from the Utility Fund, and the 2018-22 CIP currently anticipates this subproject in 2018 in order to meet the anticipated project construction schedule. Staff and the city’s consultants will be meeting with the MDH and DNR this summer to further discuss project details.

Financing. At the last study session, council generally indicated its agreement in concept with staff’s recommendation to use statutory authority to use Minnesota Statutes 475.521 to sell General Obligation (G.O.) capital improvement bonds for these purposes. Significant public facilities such as this could also be publicly financed via other methods, such as lease financing or public referenda. The 2018-20 costs for the project are included in the proposed capital plan.

The 2016 amended capital budget included $75,000 for the initial costs of a facility space needs study as conducted and presented to council by Wold Architects and Engineers. Architectural design to begin this year will cost up to $1.513 million, and staff will present a contract for those costs to be considered by council later this evening.

The 2018-22 CIP anticipates sale of approximately $25 million in G.O. bonds in March 2019, which includes the costs for the aforementioned architectural services. Thirty years of debt service on the new bonds would wrap around in a timely fashion the retirement of debt for all but the last issuance of the city’s parks and open space referendum bonds. Using this debt service structure, current estimates indicate that an increase in the property tax levy of less than one percent for 2020 would be required to accommodate the debt on the proposed new bonds.

Public process. The Imagine Minnetonka process recommended the city enhance Connections and Citizenry – “Proactively engage and communicate with residents using best practices across multiple platforms.” The public process to attain that goal as it relates to the proposed police and fire facilities include the following components:

- a transparent review of the stated operational needs,
- land use review for the considered site,
• details of financial modeling for the project when more specifics are known, and
• an approvals process indicating decision-making milestones (including land use and permitting).

Staff has already begun to inform residents about the city’s need for the project and have ongoing communications plans to continue to solicit resident input using a variety of methods, such as the Minnetonka Memo, city’s website, social media, and email notifications. As an attachment to this letter, staff has included public written comments regarding the project received to date.

Along with tonight’s public discussion, other outreach methods will include conducting facility tours, hosting town hall meetings or open houses, promoting the project at city events like Summer Festival, Farmers Market, Fire Fun Day and Fire Department/City Open House, and discussing the project as part of the biennial Citizens Academy.

**Trail Connections.**

Far and away the most popular request from residents through Imagine Minnetonka was related to expanding the city’s trail system and making sidewalks and streets safer for pedestrians. The feedback came from all age groups, and from active mountain bikers as well as retirees who want more transportation options and Connections to the city’s village centers, our parks and other trail systems. These results are consistent with annual community survey responses. As a result, several of the Imagine Minnetonka key recommendations touched on this important goal:

• Address Character needs by creating a visionary city-wide goal to connect all residents to woods and wetlands; and
• Attend to Citizen needs by developing a multimodal transportation plan that will safely connect major pedestrian areas and all bike and hike trails.

Although past council discussions indicated a preference for a “pay-as-you-go” strategy to construct unfunded missing link connections, the council is currently discussing funding methods and other requirements to increase city efforts to fill the community’s aspirations. The council may choose to incorporate recommendations arising from these new discussions as an amendment to the CIP in the fall, when the city adopts the 2018 budget and levies. For now, the recommended 2018-22 CIP herein accommodates construction of three smaller trail projects in conjunction with road projects and two other major projects (Plymouth Road and Excelsior Blvd.) independent of road reconstruction.

The proposed CIP recommends 4.7 miles of new trail segments funded over the next five years at a cost of over $6 million as a part of this capital program. Plymouth Road (CR 60) would be constructed partially in 2018 (from Amy Lane to Hilloway Road) and in 2019 (Minnetonka Blvd to Amy Lane) in order to take advantage of partnership funds with Hennepin County. A feasibility study process would commence in 2020 to plan the
missing trail segments near the SWLRT route along Excelsior Blvd (CR 3) from the Glen Lake Area (Glenview Drive) to Shady Oak Road (CR 61) to be built in 2021 and 2022. As with our road projects, staff will work with impacted property owners to address their concerns and the challenges they will experience due to construction and living in proximity to the new trails.

Staff has added a new appendix to the CIP document this year, which provides specific information on each trail segment in the city’s $16.5 million to $58.9 million in Unscheduled and Unfunded Trail Segments. There is a single page for each trail segment that includes:

1) A color-coded map of the segment;
2) A description of the trail’s Connection to community amenities, Village Centers and/or other transportation infrastructure; and
3) How the individual segment has been rated in priority using a carefully developed set of criteria as presented to the council in prior study sessions.

The 2018 proposed capital budget also includes $130,000 to construct mountain biking trails, for which the city recently received a community contribution of $5,000 towards a feasibility study. The proposed trail expansion plan includes dedicated mountain bike trails constructed in Big Willow Park, along the I-494 corridor and in Civic Center Park. As part of the Imagine Minnetonka process participants expressed a keen interest in dedicated mountain bike trails, and the park board has requested a feasibility study and public process related to this project.

Major road and transportation projects

Pivotal to all of these road improvements is the expressed community concern for Connection and Character, alignment with the Imagine Minnetonka recommendation – “Use best practices in suburban redevelopment to strengthen the city’s village centers and develop the new Shady Oak Road and Opus light rail transit areas.” Plans will incorporate expansion of the city’s pedestrian and bikeway trails system as well as green preservation and natural amenities. When possible, electrical utility lines will be buried to enhance aesthetics.

Ridgedale area. In support of a long-term transformation of the Ridgedale area, the city has and is dedicating significant efforts and funding in its capital program. In 2014, the city completed construction of a new westbound I-394 on-ramp. The 2016 and 2017 capital budgets included safety improvements at the I-394 ramp intersections with Plymouth Road and Ridgehaven Lane, for which we recently learned the city has been awarded a federal contribution of $4.5 million. Ridgedale Drive improvements are now slated for construction in 2019 for which water and sewer utilities and storm water utility infrastructure costs are anticipated to be extensive, currently estimated at $2.7 million. Previously unfunded, the capital program now provides an additional $500,000 in 2019-20
for **Ridgedale Area Park amenities**. And, the 2018-22 CIP also includes $2.3 million for **trail system improvements to Plymouth Road**.

**SWLRT – Green Line Extension.** The 2018-22 capital budget includes local matching funds required for road infrastructure, trail connections, and utility improvements related to the total Southwest Light Rail Transit (SWLRT) – Green Line Extension project. $720,000 set aside for the Shady Oak Station area includes funding for electrical burial needs, water/sewer and storm water system needs. Funding for the 17th Street extension leading to the new station was also included in the 2017 capital budget. The budget allocates another $2.5 million in 2018-20 from the Street Improvement, Storm Water and Electric Franchise funds and the Housing Redevelopment Authority (HRA) levy. These funds will support costs for locally requested design work including fencing, walls and storm sewer casings plus the city’s required contribution to the project.

**Opus Area improvements.** As discussed in a number of forums by the city council, capital improvements to the entire Opus Area will be pivotal to preserve and maintain existing street assets, in readiness to support redevelopment and intensification of the area in conjunction with and following SWLRT construction. The current estimated total cost of construction is $11.6 million. The project began last year with an approved budget of $1 million, another $3.9 million was budgeted this year in 2017, and the remaining $6.7 million is programmed for 2018-20 in this proposed CIP. The state has not yet finalized its financial planning work this year, and therefore, Minnetonka does not yet know whether it will receive its request for $3 million of financial support from Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT) bridge funds, which would bring total costs for the area project to $14.6 million.

Trail segments and pedestrian improvements across the entire development area to provide connections to the SWLRT platform are scheduled for 2018 and 2020, to coincide with the final stages of road reconstruction in this important corridor. A more detailed engineering study will refine the estimated costs for project-related water and sewer system ($2 million) and storm water ($630,000) improvements that are currently included. In addition, staff is currently studying the available land use concepts that would provide for a green corridor and logical park use in the Opus area. Funding of $1 million has been designated in 2020 for this purpose.

**Utilities & Local Street Projects.**

In 2015, the city adopted a long-range **water and sanitary sewer infrastructure plan** along with an associated financing plan for critical maintenance and replacement as needed of our $500 million water and sewer system assets. Last year, the city sold $17.5 million in bonds and has now adopted two years of increases in customer rates to support the first significant costs associated with these plans since Minnetonka does not specially assess residents for street, storm water and utility replacement expenses. Later this year, staff will analyze project progress and cash flow requirements to determine whether the
next bond issuance needs to occur at the end of 2017 or the beginning of 2018. With either option, customer rates will only increase modestly in 2018 as previously planned.

As a reminder, utility replacement priority is targeted for areas of the city experiencing the highest frequency of water main breaks and known areas of pipe failure. Also the CIP continues to fund other required capital costs for the system, including necessary and expensive sewer force main lining, key sustainability improvements recommended by our consultant, and storm water infrastructure improvements identified through the city’s risk assessment program.

The current CIP funds significant local road reconstruction, rehabilitation and preservation as well as targeted reconstruction, storm water system construction and water system replacement for Crosby Road and Ridgehaven Lane. The 2018-22 CIP funds the work for Woodhill Road in 2018, Parkers Lake Road and Twelve Oaks Center Drive in 2020, and the larger projects of the Groveland-Bay area in 2021 along with the first half of the Tonka-Woodcroft area in 2022. The second half of the Tonka-Woodcroft area is scheduled in 2023. Costs for these projects are substantial. Over the five years of this CIP, the city will spend over $33.1 million for this effort.

At a cost of over $9 million, the proposed 2018-22 CIP also continues the city’s road preservation program using both outside contractors and in-house staff. Funding covers four categories of this work: 1) mill and overlay, 2) overlay only, 3) maintenance thin overlay, and 4) neighborhood refurbishment, which includes crack filling and patching. The schedule plan for the projects over the five-year period are illustrated on the enclosed 2018-22 Proposed Local Street Construction Map.

The proposed capital budget also includes a schedule by streets and road areas of storm water system improvements other than those associated with the previously discussed specific road projects. These storm system projects are based upon a risk assessment process established last year to proactively identify and score pipe segments with a higher likelihood of failure weighted with an estimate of potential damage if such failure was to occur.

Other 2018-22 CIP Highlights

Additional public safety projects. The proposed capital budget also includes funding for other crucial public safety equipment needs. After several years of more significant investment in repairs and maintenance of the city’s other four satellite fire stations, the 2018-22 CIP contains $335,000 in funding to meet a schedule of ongoing facility maintenance and improvements over the next five-year period. It also incorporates a total five-year cost of nearly $2 million for the fire department’s regular program of ongoing replacement and refurbishment of front line emergency vehicles.
As included in the previous capital plan, the proposed 2018-22 CIP provides funding for the purchase of **body camera technology**. Although the estimated cost of purchasing this equipment in 2019 is not significant, the impact of this mandate to operating costs will likely be substantial. Therefore, financial forecasts incorporated with the CIP anticipate the city will require additional operating resources in congruence with this purchase.

**Natural Resources.** The Minnetonka community consistently prioritizes our natural amenities, and the **Imagine Minnetonka** vision affirmed these principles in defining our Character as parks, open spaces, trees, woods, lakes, wetlands, and green preservation. Following up on council discussions at its March 20 study session, the 2018-22 CIP includes a new program with annual investments for improving water quality and city financial participation in qualified **lake and pond management** efforts. The proposed capital budget also continues the city’s annual dedication of funds to the **Emerald Ash Borer program**, which cumulatively allocates $800,000 to the project over the five years.

**Recreational Facilities.** Recreational amenities to fulfill the needs of all current residents and to attract and retain future residents as articulated in the city’s Strategic Vision are key to meeting the Citizen feedback voiced in **Imagine Minnetonka**. In addition to trails and the previously mentioned Ridgedale area park improvements, a number of projects related to recreational facilities are incorporated within the proposed capital plan. The proposed 2018-22 CIP includes funding for construction of eight permanent **pickleball courts** in 2018, construction of a **mini-park in the Robinwood Neighborhood** in 2020, and a five-year agreement with **Bennet Family Park** for improvements to their athletic fields. The proposed CIP also includes a study in 2019 to examine how Minnetonka might accommodate **unmet recreational programming space needs** of the community.

**City Hall.** On the heels of many years of maintenance and limited alterations since current offices spaces were configured 35 years ago, the city initiated a more comprehensive space planning and office refurbishment analysis for city hall last year. Staff retained consultant services to evaluate the efficiencies of employee work areas, to analyze future growth needs in departments, and to prepare for the requirements of an already changing workforce. The final goal is to develop and realize a plan to meet appropriately the needs of serving the public, organizational management and the city’s workforce, all within the current building footprint. Recruitment, retention and employee engagement are key to maintaining the vitality of our organization.

Over a series of iterative meetings, staff pared down a more significant reconstruction overhaul to a plan that will meet only the more core changes required. The proposed budget for this project is contained in multiple years of the CIP beginning in 2016 and continuing until 2019. In 2017, the project is entering its detailed plan design phase. Staff anticipates that Phase I of a multi-phase improvement project will begin next year and the entire project will be completed in 2019. Preparations are being made to relocate employees during the time that refurbishment will take place while still meeting customer service demands. At this time, the proposed CIP leaves unfunded substantial costs for a major HVAC overhaul.
At a total budget of $4.5 million from 2017 through 2019, the Capital Replacement Fund (CRF) is the source of funding for the city hall project, and revenues to the fund are supplemented with positive balances transferred from the General Fund, which has been standard practice in prior years. Staff also proposes a one-year augmentation of the levy for the CRF along with an equal one-year decrease in the levy for the Street Improvement Fund to ensure that there will be little impact to property tax payers because of this project.

CIP funding

Over forty percent of the recommended 2018-22 CIP is financed with property taxes, and the next most significant proportion of support is financed by user fees, including water, sewer and storm drainage fees, which has become more important with the city's aggressive improvement of capital utility infrastructure. Local taxes traditionally support investments in streets, parks and trails, public buildings and equipment. Other city funds include the public safety facility bond proceeds, city franchise fees, grants and forfeiture and seizure revenue. Non-city funds are from the city's allocation of the state fuel sales tax, along with the city of Hopkins, Hennepin County, state grants and Hopkins School District partnerships.

**Funding pressures.** The city's long-term financial plan is to enact the city's Strategic Vision to protect city assets by avoiding the higher costs of deferred maintenance on essential operating equipment and ensuring ongoing transportation system integrity. Each year, staff reviews needed capital in light of these goals and seeks to balance those needs against its limited resources by extending service lives, effectively using the different sources that are available and leaving some requests unfunded. Nonetheless, some big ticket items are on the horizon as presented within the 2018-22 capital plan, including
unfunded trail segments (as much almost $60 million in 2017 dollars) and Big Willow Park enhancements (currently programmed at $3.5 million).

**General Fund balance.** Because the city budgets responsibly, since 2008 a conservative strategy has been employed whereby a portion of the resources funding the CIP includes monies transferred over the five years from the General Fund (GF) balance. Per Council Policy 2.13 for determining adequate fund balances, a “Budget Stabilization Reserve” must be kept to cover the following year’s operating budget and uncertainties such as changes in state law or unforeseen natural disasters. In accordance with the policy, amounts in the balance of this reserve above forty percent of the following year’s operating budget may be considered available to be transferred and appropriated by the council for capital needs.

This methodology is a key to ensuring the city’s ongoing fiscal resiliency. In any year, should the city not realize a positive ending increase in fund balance, the city is thereby well positioned to restructure its five-year plan into the future.

Fiscal Year 2016 ended again with a positive balance, and therefore, by the end of 2017, the GF fund balance is projected to have around $5.4 million in funds above the minimum required to meet the forty-percent threshold. *This includes funds above the threshold realized in past years.* The 2018-22 CIP anticipates transferring those funds for capital expenditures over the five years. Any additional funds realized at the end of 2017 and in future years will be used to ensure there is adequate fund balance to meet needs over that period for projected rising operating costs in the General Fund itself.

**Property taxes.** The proposed 2018-22 CIP would require a first-year increase in property taxes of less than 1.2 percent for capital in 2018. With less than 0.5 percent increases in property taxes for capital anticipated in years 2019 and 2020 (excluding the previously mentioned debt service levy increase in 2020 for the police and fire facilities), the remaining two years of the proposed capital plan would be flat.

Franchise fees. “Other City” revenue as indicated on the previous pie chart includes income from franchise fees, which by themselves support 4.9 percent of the total five-year
The city’s current franchise fees on customer cable service bills fund a majority of communication technology and electronic infrastructure plus operating costs associated with public communications. The city’s franchise fees on customer electric utility bills is limited to funding our program to bury utility lines along major roadways and to retrofit city street lights with energy-efficient technology. In the 2018-22 CIP, this revenue is also proposed to assist in the costs for high-priority trails by undergrounding electric utility lines along those same streets when applicable.

As proposed, fees realized under the current franchise agreement do not smoothly support cash flow for costs of the electrical infrastructure improvements within the proposed capital program over the five-year planning period. Realistic, costly estimates of burying the overhead electrical lines along Woodhill Road in conjunction with its reconstruction are the primary cause of this funding difficulty. An interfund loan as high as $1.5 million in 2019 will likely be required to cover cash needs of the fund until 2022, when the fund is estimated to become structurally balanced again. Because of uncertainty around the timing of light rail related projects, actual cash flow requirements may be different, and staff will request council approval of a temporary interfund loan for only the amount required as more information becomes available.

Council should note that the Minnesota State Legislature considered a bill in its last session to more closely regulate the use and negotiation of franchise fees by cities. If such legislation was to pass next year, it may impact the renewal of our electric franchise agreement with Xcel that is due to expire in 2018 by requiring a more transparent approval process. As proposed, it would also impact the negotiation of any new franchise agreements.

**Park Dedication fees.** Per state statute authorities and city ordinance, the city may require land or in lieu, charge a park dedication fee for new developments and redevelopments related to the added demands and expectations for park, recreation, trails, open space and natural amenities and public betterments in the city that will be produced by the projects. When fees are required, they are deposited in the Park and Trails Fund. These revenues are used only for the acquisition, development and improvement of such amenities. When appropriate opportunities arise, the city may effectively use its discretion to require developers to construct or provide the improvements in lieu of city-administered construction or direct city purchase and thereby get portions of the fees credited for their documented contributions.

During the last two fiscal years, Minnetonka has experienced unprecedented revenue from park dedication fees. Historical experience has varied from $15,000 in 2009, $25,000 in 2014 and a high of $375,000 in 2012. In 2015 and 2016, however, several housing projects contributed over $1.7 million in park dedication fees that are now available to fund the 2018-22 CIP. Forecasted revenues from this source beyond the current year is responsibly based upon known and finalized development plans as well as the previously mentioned historical experience.
The city realizes actual park dedication revenues that are directly related to the residential density and distinct characteristics of the projects in any given year. Additional information on actual revenues may be available later this year for discussion during the 2018 budget deliberations, and at that time, the council may amend the CIP to reflect the added amenities or additional revenue to fund currently unfunded projects identified herein. Further, in preparing the city’s 30-year comprehensive plan, which will begin this year, the resulting document will include park, recreation, trail and natural amenities to help guide city consideration of using park dedication fee revenue and developer contributions in the future.

Recommendation

As always, the proposed CIP reflects previous council direction, and addresses the capital priorities of the city of Minnetonka in a prudent and cost-effective manner. The proposed five-year capital program aligns with our community’s expressed desires for Connection, concerns for current and future Citizens, and preservation of Character. Our responsible approach preserves the city’s outstanding financial condition, as reflected in the Aaa bond rating and reasonable tax and utility rates. Staff recommends approval of the resolution adopting the 2018-22 Capital Improvements Program.

Submitted through:
   Geralyn Barone, City Manager
   Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager

Originated by:
   Merrill King, Finance Director
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution Adopting the 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The preliminary 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program was presented for consideration to and discussed by the City Council on April 17, 2017.

1.02. As a result of those deliberations, it was concluded that the Capital Improvements Program attached to the agenda packet of the City Council meeting of June 12, 2017 provides for an effective and orderly allocation of resources for the community’s needs.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. That the 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program as discussed, amended and attached to the agenda packet of the City Council meeting of June 12, 2017 is hereby adopted.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

______________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on June 12, 2017.

________________________________________

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Hello again:

Thank you for your quick response to my email. I am impressed with the work that fire and police do in the community - never doubted it. However, the tax bill remains the same; very high. In my case it is an average actual increase of about 16% per year - every year for 25 years. This bill has kept me from needed repairs and upgrades to my home, not to mention niceties like summer vacations, etc. Thank you for sharing this info with the city council. Not everyone is wealthy in Minnetonka and that is my point.

Scott Ewald

---

From: "Perry Vetter" <pvetter@eminnetonka.com>
To: "CenturyLink Customer" >
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 3:22:43 PM
Subject: RE: Proposed Fire/Police Upgrades

Hello Mr. Ewald,

In acknowledging your email I want to assure you that city staff would not be recommending to the city council the necessity for facility upgrades in order to brag about how nice they are. The reasons to improve facilities are to improve safety and response, accommodate growth and protect the investments in equipment. Fire personnel do more than just fight fires, they respond to medical calls, vehicle accidents, rescues and other service calls. Those incidents have increased from 200 when the facility was constructed to over 3,000 today. Similar growth has occurred in police calls, from 25,000 in 1989 to over 42,000 today.

As far as property taxes, the formula is complex and contains many factors. It is unfortunate that you have not seen the benefit of city services besides road reconstruction. The feedback is traditionally very high when it comes to the variety of services provided by the city, especially police and fire protection, the many parks, trails and natural areas and even snow and ice control.

Your email will be shared with the city council.

Regards,

-Perry

Perry Vetter
Assistant City Manager - Director of Administrative Services

City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, MN 55345
pvetter@eminnetonka.com
Hello:
In response to the Minnetonka Memo article describing the need for upgraded facilities at police and fire. I have been a resident here for nearly 25 years. I designed and built my own house on a one-half acre lot in 1993. At that time my property taxes were just over $2,000. Now they are pushing $9,000. THAT IS A 400% INCREASE!!!! Salaries and wages have not increased by 400% over that same time period. Each year we are told that there will only be a very small 1% or so increase in taxes - the least in the metro area. Each year my taxes increase substantially more than that. My tax bill each month is greater than my mortgage and utilities bills combined! While the taxes have increased 400% over the years, my average family income has decreased by 30% and I will soon have college tuition to pay for, as well. LET'S GET REAL!! Other than a re-build of neighborhood streets, I have seen no personal return for these exorbitant taxes. But I have seen the city campus grow and grow over time. I have no doubt there is a need to revamp some facilities. However, is there really a substantial increase in fires these days? Has the criminal element really over run our streets to warrant a greater police facility? Or would it just be "nice" to have the latest and greatest facilities to brag about to others? I personally think an increased property tax to improve facilities is way off the mark! Live within your budget - I have to . . .
Scott Ewald
Thanks for the info. Appreciate it.
Jerry Bich

From: Perry Vetter
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 4:30 PM
To: 'Linda Bich'
Subject: RE: question regarding the Minnetonka Police Dept

Hello Mr. Bich,

Service calls encompass things like downed power lines after a storm, carbon monoxide alarms or natural gas leaks. Good intent are reported calls that turn out to be non-threats or perceived emergencies, but still different than a false alarm.

Firefighters are all certified Emergency Medical Technicians and city response is part of a tiered system relayed by the 911 dispatcher that may or may not include an ambulance. Both police and fire personnel are trained to respond to medical emergencies, but based on the type and severity of the situation, one or both departments would be dispatched. Minnetonka does not operate ambulance service. Either Hennepin County Medical or North Memorial provides that service depending on the geographic (North/South) area of our city the incident occurs. The ambulances do however park outside city facilities when on standby, so often times they appear or are assumed a part of city operations.

Sincerely,

-Perry

Perry Vetter
Assistant City Manager - Director of Administrative Services
City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, MN 55345
pvetter@eminnetonka.com

find us: eminnetonka.com
follow us: @MinnetonkaMN

From: Linda Bich
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 12:11 PM
To: Perry Vetter <pvetter@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Re: question regarding the Minnetonka Police Dept

Thanks for the info. appreciate it.

How do you define service call and good intent?

Does Minnetonka now respond to all medical emergencies with fire personnel in addition to the county or city or hospital ambulances that respond?

Jerry Bich

From: Perry Vetter
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 11:35 AM
To: pvetter@eminnetonka.com
Subject: RE: question regarding the Minnetonka Police Dept

Mr. Bich,

As a follow-up to your inquiry for additional Minnetonka Police and Fire metrics, please find the requested information below.

Fire Service Calls (2016):

Emergency Medical Service: 1804
False Alarm: 285
Hazardous Condition: 134
Service Call: 412
Good Intent: 96
Fire: 47
Rescue: 34
Motor Vehicle Accident: 34
Other: 124

Police Staffing Levels:

2016
78 employees
57 Sworn (10 female)
21 Civilian (16 female)

1989
63 employees
44 Sworn (4 female)
19 Civilian (14 female)

(These staffing numbers do not include those individuals that serve as volunteers, part-time employees, student interns, explorer program or police reserves)

I hope this information fulfills your request.
Regards,

‐Perry

Perry Vetter
Assistant City Manager - Director of Administrative Services

City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, MN 55345
pvetter@eminnetonka.com

find us: eminnetonka.com
follow us: @MinnetonkaMN

From: Linda Bich >
Date: May 25, 2017 at 4:40:32 PM CDT
To: <sboerboom@eminnetonka.com>  
Subject: question regarding the Minnetonka Police Dept

I am a 38 yr resident of Minnetonka and in the latest edition of Minnetonka Memo I read that the police force has grown by 20% since 1989 and female employment is up 25%.

As an engineer, I find that percentages are pretty meaningless.

I am interested in knowing what the department staffing level is: sworn officers and non-sworn employees. What was the number in 1989? Female employment is up 25%. Up 25% since when, and what is the quantitative number.

I think the police department does a fine job but when you put out information to the public you need to be sure it has meaning. Percentages rarely have real meaning. Quantitative numbers have real meaning.

Thanks in advance for your response.

From: Linda Bich >
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 4:33 PM
To: John Vance <jvance@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Question regarding Minnetonka Fire Dept

I am a 38 yr resident of Minnetonka. I read in the latest Minnetonka Memo that the fire department had more than 3000 fire service calls in 2016. I find it difficult to believe that we had an average of more than 8 fires each and every day of the year 2016. Was that a misprint? Do fire service calls include non-fire items like inspections etc? How many actual
fires were there in Minnetonka during 2016. I assume I can get this info via a freedom of information act request but thought I would ask you directly for the info.

Jerry Bich
Hello Mary,

I’m proud to say Yes! Two of the paid-on-call firefighters also take on the role of public education. I would be remiss to not credit them, Sara Alquist and Jim Lundeen. They take their show on the road and facilitate at schools in both districts that have buildings in Minnetonka as well as opportunities like the baby sitting classes, senior services programs that are conducted here at the community center and even to business’s within the city. I even personally learned the “staying alive” theme from them. They also teach cooking safety for kids, evaluate homes for aging individuals by recommending shower grab bars, eliminating area rugs, etc.

You are very welcome and I’m always available for inquiries.

Sincerely,

Perry

Perry Vetter
Assistant City Manager - Director of Administrative Services

City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, MN 55345
pvetter@eminnetonka.com

Impressive! Thank you for taking the time to response and answer my inquiry, Mr. Vetter!!

As long as I’m at it, I read that there is a very low heart attack fatalities rate in Denmark and it was credited to school children having been taught the simple heart attack response - “Staying Alive” theme- I wonder if our police/fire staff go into Mika elementary/high schools to teach this? Even as a retire person, I always try to take advantage of this instruction when I see it being offered at the library and community offerings.

Thanks again!
On May 26, 2017, at 3:37 PM, Perry Vetter <pvetter@eminnetonka.com> wrote:

Hello Mary,

Thank you for your email on the need for updating police and fire facilities.

Not to speak for the police and fire chief, but they have actually done many of the items you have mentioned. The fire department still utilizes a paid-on-call fire department with only 7 of the 87 firefighters are full-time. However, a unique service model was introduced that moved to a duty crew model to reduce the number of call outs to those POC firefighters, saving resources and providing better service. This way, 3-4 firefighters are on staff and can handle the many responses instead of paging out a full station. The police department has increased the use of civilian staff, police explorers and reserve positions. However, there are many things that are required under licensing and statute that necessitate the need for police officers. The amount and variety of training, in addition to 24 hour staffing make many things unachievable to non-sworn personnel. I’m proud to say that our fire and police chiefs are very engaged on topics trends and service delivery models. Those two are always looking to provide the best services that meet the needs of our residents.

Minnetonka has completed a Public Safety Management and Operations Study a few years ago and has been implementing many of those recommendations ever since. In addition, a facility study was conducted to review how services are affected by the current facilities.

I will certainly share your email with the city council.

Regards,

-Perry

Perry Vetter
Assistant City Manager - Director of Administrative Services

City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, MN 55345
pvetter@eminnetonka.com

find us: eminnetonka.com
follow us: @MinnetonkaMN

From: Mary Mckee [redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 2:53 PM
To: Perry Vetter <pvetter@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Bob Ellingson <bellingson@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Reassessing police/fire needs

May 26, 2017
Perry Vetter-

I am contacting you in regards to the Minnetonka Memo article about the need for updating police/fire facilities.

I am a long time resident of Minnetonka on Baker Road. Since the early 80s, I have noticed the large increase of 40% hiring of Minka City police officers over the years.

This made me curious as when I read the local police reports there doesn’t seem to be an increase of actual crimes. I notice that the article said that there have been an increase of police service calls, but does that data translate to actual police action for crimes?

Are these police service calls something that a community representative could handle versus a trained police officer? Like an medical Urgent Care versus a fully staff hospital for handling situations, has anyone looked at the data and evaluated what is really needed?

I fully appreciate the Minnetonka Police staff, but question if the current system and staffing is meeting the real needs and requests of Minnetonka citizens. Having and using a different level of expertise might be able to interact better with less serious situations and be a cost savings for our city.

In addition, splitting the personnel staff to address police CALLS, versus actual crimes, might have an impact of future police/fire facilities. I would like to suggest a future needs study be done on not just the facilities but also real security needs of our city….along with the current Imagine study, which I have attended several meetings.

Thank you.

Mary McKee
3842 Baker Road
Minnetonka
Hello Maret,

Thank you for your email in support of a new fire and remodeled police facility. I will be certain to share it with the city council. If you haven't yet done so, we have established a project page with all of the information related to this proposal for public review and an option to sign up for emails specifically about the project. We will only use that email list to provide updated information relevant to the topic, so we don't fill up your inbox.

Again, thank you for contacting and providing your support.

-Perry

Perry Vetter
Assistant City Manager - Director of Administrative Services

City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, MN 55345
Direct: 952.939.8216 . Main: 952.939.8200 . Fax: 952.939.8244 pvetter@eminnetonka.com

find us: eminnetonka.com
follow us: @MinnetonkaMN

-----Original Message-----
From: Maret2
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 3:32 PM
To: Perry Vetter <pvetter@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: New Fire & Police Facilities

I think the city Council should go ahead with new fire and police facilities. As a resident of Minnetonka for over 25 years, I think it's in our best interest to make sure our facilities provide for the needs of our community. Our police and fire departments provide excellent service for us and for that to continue, we need to stay ahead of the curve. I urge you to give serious consideration to this.

Maret Ryan
4737 Eastwood Road
Minnetonka, MN 55346
Police and Fire Facility Improvements – Call Log:

May 24, 2017
Lucy Taylor – Ward 2
Supports the police and fire facility project and is interested in a role as a citizen advisor if possible.

May 30, 2017
James Raun
Identified as former Hennepin County sheriff’s deputy – inquired on service calls, staffing levels and facility information. No position taken at this time.
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Capital Improvements Policy

The Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is the city’s five-year plan to provide and maintain public facilities for the citizens and businesses of Minnetonka, balanced against the constraint of available resources.

Funding Priorities

Reinvestment for the replacement, maintenance or increased efficiency of existing systems will have priority over the expansion of existing systems or the provision of new facilities and services. Priority rankings include:

1. Projects necessary for public health and safety, or to meet legal mandates.
2. Projects which help maintain or make existing systems more efficient. Cost-benefits and coordination with related projects will be considered.
3. Projects expanding existing systems, providing new services, or for general community betterment.

Planning Principles

- The CIP will support achievement of the city’s long-term Strategic Goals.
- The CIP will be updated annually to reflect changing capital needs for new construction and maintenance of the city’s substantial investments in streets, utilities, parks, buildings and equipment.
- Development of the CIP will be consistent with the annual operating budget. Future operating costs associated with new capital improvements will be projected and included in operating budget forecasts.
- Fund balance guidelines will be established for each capital fund, and will reflect the type of fund, subsequent-year budget needs, annual cash flow requirements, replacement reserves and potential contingencies. The guidelines will be used to responsibly manage balances over the five-year planning horizon.
## Table I

### Capital Improvements Program

#### 2018-2022

**EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM CATEGORY & METHOD OF FINANCING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>$4,247,000</td>
<td>$27,860,000</td>
<td>$1,270,000</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td>$34,987,000</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>1,254,500</td>
<td>1,224,500</td>
<td>819,500</td>
<td>745,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>$4,583,500</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Trails and Open Space</td>
<td>1,065,000</td>
<td>3,650,000</td>
<td>2,292,000</td>
<td>2,560,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>$9,977,000</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Equipment</td>
<td>3,841,300</td>
<td>3,312,600</td>
<td>2,778,800</td>
<td>3,433,400</td>
<td>2,581,400</td>
<td>$15,947,500</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements*</td>
<td>11,878,000</td>
<td>12,019,000</td>
<td>5,789,000</td>
<td>6,974,000</td>
<td>8,385,000</td>
<td>$45,045,000</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drainage Improvements*</td>
<td>1,710,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>$7,710,000</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer System Imp*</td>
<td>10,147,000</td>
<td>10,350,000</td>
<td>2,846,000</td>
<td>4,193,000</td>
<td>3,640,000</td>
<td>$31,176,000</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**                     | **$34,142,800** | **$59,416,100** | **$16,895,300** | **$20,185,400** | **$18,786,400** | **$149,426,000** | **100.0%** |

Hennepin County Road Projects              | $100,000    | $300,000    | $0          | $0          | $0          | $400,000    |         |

**Method of Financing**

### City Funding

| Property Taxes †                         | $14,334,700 | $13,545,400 | $10,822,700 | $12,862,200 | $11,310,100 | $62,875,100 | 42.1%   |
| User Fees                                | 15,502,500  | 12,025,100  | 4,331,100   | 6,116,700   | 6,713,000   | 44,688,400  | 29.9%   |
| Community Investment Fund                | 500,000     | 300,000     | 350,000     | 250,000     | 50,000      | 1,450,000   | 1.0%    |
| Other **                                 | 2,876,400   | 27,767,000  | 1,008,000   | 614,500     | 303,100     | 32,569,000  | 21.8%   |

**Subtotal City Funding**                  | **$33,213,600** | **$53,637,500** | **$16,511,800** | **$19,843,400** | **$18,376,200** | **$141,582,500** | **94.8%** |

### Other Funding

| Municipal State Aid                      | $750,000    | $5,325,000  | $225,000    | $200,000    | $260,000    | $6,760,000  | 4.5%    |
| Other ***                                | 179,200     | 453,600     | 158,500     | 142,000     | 150,200     | 1,083,500   | 0.7%    |

**Subtotal Other Funding**                 | **$929,200** | **$5,778,600** | **$383,500** | **$342,000** | **$410,200** | **$7,843,500** | **5.2%** |

**Total Method of Financing**              | **$34,142,800** | **$59,416,100** | **$16,895,300** | **$20,185,400** | **$18,786,400** | **$149,426,000** | **100.0%** |

† Amounts are budgeted costs, not levy levels, and include HRA levy proceeds.
* Includes city portions of Hennepin County road projects.
** Includes franchise fees, Grants, HRA, forfeiture/seizure fines and Public Safety Facility bond proceeds.
*** Includes funds from the City of Hopkins, Minnetonka School District, Hennepin County, TOD grant funds and Hopkins School District.
## Table II

### CAPITAL REPLACEMENT FUND

#### Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$2,045,000</td>
<td>$3,045,000</td>
<td>$2,045,000</td>
<td>$2,045,000</td>
<td>$2,045,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In/Out</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction Proceeds</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$3,295,000</td>
<td>$4,295,000</td>
<td>$3,295,000</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td>$2,095,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Expenditures                           |           |           |           |           |           |
|----------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| **Municipal Buildings**                |           |           |           |           |
| Energy Conservation Measures           | $15,000   | $10,000   |           | $20,000   |
| Miscellaneous Building Components     | 100,000   | 40,000    | $150,000  | $150,000  | 150,000   |
| Building Roof Replacements             | 200,000   | 150,000   | 150,000   | 265,000   | 200,000   |
| Life Safety Reporting Upgrades         | 30,000    | 30,000    | 30,000    | 30,000    | 50,000    |
| Building Automation Replacement        | 37,000    | 150,000   | 75,000    | 70,000    | 110,000   |
| Civic Center Improvements              | 1,650,000 | 2,360,000 | 750,000   | 175,000   | 175,000   | $1,200,000|
| Fire Station Refurbishment             | 75,000    | 65,000    | 65,000    | 65,000    | 65,000    | 120,000   |
| Salt Dome Panels                       | 50,000    |           |           |           |           |
| **Total Expenditures**                 | $3,355,700| $4,307,700| $2,721,500| $2,478,200| $2,006,900| $1,320,000|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Facilities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh Center Improvements</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Arena Improvements</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dump/Plow Truck Replacements</td>
<td>$266,300</td>
<td>$548,600</td>
<td>$300,100</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Vehicles</td>
<td>604,600</td>
<td>459,500</td>
<td>690,800</td>
<td>1,056,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidsteer</td>
<td>78,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Trail Maintenance Vehicle</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial Bucket Truck</td>
<td>167,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Pump &amp; Leak Detection Replacement</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Blower</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Flusher Truck</td>
<td>183,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Ice Resurfacer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$3,355,700</td>
<td>$4,307,700</td>
<td>$2,721,500</td>
<td>$2,478,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures | $(60,700)  | $(12,700) | $(573,500) | $(28,200) | $88,100   |

| Estimated Beginning Fund Balance       | 95,065     | 34,365     | 21,665     | 595,165   | 566,965   |

| Estimated Ending Fund Balance          | $34,365    | $21,665    | $595,165   | $566,965  | $655,065  |

| Fund Balance Guideline                 | $1,076,900 | $680,400   | $619,600   | $501,700  | $743,500  |
### Table III
CIP 2018-2022
PUBLIC SAFETY FUND
Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tax-related Revenue *</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$752,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$751,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$754,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Equipment</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumper Truck Replacement</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballistic Tactical Vests</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Imaging Cameras</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwave Radios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Mhz Radio Infrastructure</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Technology Updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air 2 Refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police In-Car Video System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparatus Refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout Gear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Truck Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hose Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police In-Car Video System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; Command Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$891,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$478,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$540,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$850,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$320,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources  | ($)241,000  | $171,500   | $212,000   | ($98,500)  | $434,500   |          |
| over (under) expenditures                |            |            |            |            |            |          |

| Estimated Beginning Fund Balance         | 69,164     | (171,836)  | (336)      | 211,664    | 113,164    |          |

| Estimated Ending Fund Balance            | ($171,836) | ($336)     | $211,664   | $113,164   | $547,664   |          |

| Fund Balance Guideline                   | $358,900   | $405,000   | $637,500   | $240,000   | $461,900   |          |

* $100,000 per year in property tax-related revenue is from an annual source that will no longer be available after 2022.
### Table IV
#### CIP 2018-2022
#### COMMUNITY INVESTMENT FUND
#### Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue*</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$307,500</td>
<td>$332,500</td>
<td>$357,500</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects of General Public Benefit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Arena Improvements</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Open Space Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Willow Park Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures | ($192,500) | $32,500 | $7,500 | $13,000 | $213,000 |           |

| Estimated Beginning Fund Balance** | 20,057,102 | 19,864,602 | 19,897,102 | 19,904,602 | 19,917,602 |           |

| Estimated Ending Fund Balance | $19,864,602 | $19,897,102 | $19,904,602 | $19,917,602 | $20,130,602 |           |

| Required Fund Balance | 19,875,678 | 19,889,678 | 19,907,178 | 19,927,178 | 19,947,178 |           |

| Available Ending Fund Balance | ($11,076) | $7,424 | ($2,576) | ($9,576) | $183,424 |           |

* Other Revenue is $63,000 annually transferred in from the General Fund until the year 2048 for ownership conveyance of the Arts Center on 7 to the Minnetonka Independent School District in 2010 (a cumulative $2.4 million total cost beginning 2009); and $94,500 annually from the Williston Center Fund over ten years ending 2021 for repayment of a portion of the Williston Center improvement project constructed in 2010-11.

** Estimated beginning fund balance excludes $833,000 previously appropriated by the city council in the 2013-16 CIPs for the Minnehaha Creek Corridor that had not been expended prior to 2017.
### Table V

**CIP 2018-2022**

**WILLISTON CENTER FUND**

**Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Fees</td>
<td>$1,591,000</td>
<td>$1,591,000</td>
<td>$1,710,300</td>
<td>$1,710,300</td>
<td>$1,710,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court Fees</td>
<td>682,500</td>
<td>716,600</td>
<td>716,600</td>
<td>716,600</td>
<td>716,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,686,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,742,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,862,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,862,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,862,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,862,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| **Expenditures** |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Operating Expenditures |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Operating Expenses | $2,126,800 | $2,197,000 | $2,269,600 | $2,344,500 | $2,421,900 |            |
| Transfers Out - Indirect Costs | 87,600 | 90,500 | 93,500 | 96,600 | 99,800 |            |
| **Subtotal Operating Expenditures** | **$2,214,400** | **$2,287,500** | **$2,363,100** | **$2,441,100** | **$2,521,700** |            |
| Capital Expenditures |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Williston Center Improvements | $409,500 | $424,500 | $219,500 | $295,000 | $265,000 |            |
| **Subtotal Capital Expenditures** | **$409,500** | **$424,500** | **$219,500** | **$295,000** | **$265,000** |            |
| **Total Expenditures** | **$2,623,900** | **$2,712,000** | **$2,582,600** | **$2,736,100** | **$2,786,700** |            |
| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures | $62,600 | $30,600 | $280,300 | $126,800 | $76,200 |            |
| **Estimated Beginning Cash Reserve** | 1,455,886 | 1,518,486 | 1,549,086 | 1,829,386 | 1,956,186 |            |
| **Estimated Ending Cash Reserve** | **$1,518,486** | **$1,549,086** | **$1,829,386** | **$1,956,186** | **$2,032,386** |            |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Reserve Target - 20% Accumulated Depreciation &amp; 3 mos. WC</td>
<td>$1,438,900</td>
<td>$1,517,000</td>
<td>$1,595,700</td>
<td>$1,675,100</td>
<td>$1,755,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Target Achieved</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table VI
CIP 2018-2022
PARK & TRAIL IMPROVEMENT FUND
Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

#### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income (includes Field Fees)</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>309,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Dedication Fees</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$959,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,509,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$649,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$652,600</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>(\text{Total Expenditures})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burwell House/City Housing</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>(\text{$856,800})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Investment Plan</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$2,303,400})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Improvement Plan</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>(\text{$2,165,500})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Rehabilitation</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(\text{$2,400,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Trail Connections</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$266,800})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Field Improvements</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(\text{$62,540,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak Beach Improvements</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>(\text{$2,500,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Family Park Improvements</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(\text{$2,500,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Automation Replacement</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$1,000,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Biking Trails</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure (trails)</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation Measures</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facility &amp; Programming Space Study</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Drive improvements</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purgatory Park Improvements</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgevale Area Park Improvements</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinwood Park Development</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area Park Investments</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Segments - Unscheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{$61,150,000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$856,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,303,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,165,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,400,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$266,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,540,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th><strong>Unfunded</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>3,857,239</td>
<td>3,960,039</td>
<td>3,166,239</td>
<td>1,650,339</td>
<td>(99,061)</td>
<td>(\text{$286,739})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td><strong>$3,960,039</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,166,239</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,650,339</strong></td>
<td><strong>(99,061)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$286,739</strong></td>
<td>(\text{$286,739})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reserve for Athletic Field Capital Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th><strong>Available Ending Fund Balance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Athletic Field Capital Maintenance</td>
<td>82,656</td>
<td>92,256</td>
<td>101,856</td>
<td>111,456</td>
<td>121,056</td>
<td><strong>$3,877,383</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Available Ending Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th><strong>Fund Balance Guideline</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td><strong>$3,877,383</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,073,983</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,548,483</strong></td>
<td><strong>($210,517)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,683</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,090,122</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1\] Available balance excludes $250,000 reserved cash for Gray's Bay Causeway, which will not be expended until 2017 or later.
### Table VII

**CIP 2018-2022**  
**FORESTRY FUND**  
**Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funding Sources**  
$65,000  
$65,000  
$90,000  
$90,000  
$105,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Ash Borer Program</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**  
$160,000  
$160,000  
$160,000  
$160,000  
$160,000

Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources  
over (under) expenditures  
($95,000)  
($95,000)  
($70,000)  
($70,000)  
($55,000)

**Estimated Beginning Fund Balance**  
778,043  
683,043  
588,043  
518,043  
448,043

**Estimated Ending Fund Balance**  
$683,043  
$588,043  
$518,043  
$448,043  
$393,043

Fund Balance Guideline - Monies not expended in any fiscal year remains in the Forestry Fund balance for the anticipated arrival of the Emerald Ash Borer to Minnetonka.
### Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

#### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Allotment</th>
<th>Total Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,981,025</td>
<td>$1,981,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$2,043,275</td>
<td>$2,043,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,930,059</td>
<td>$1,930,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$1,901,750</td>
<td>$1,901,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1,957,100</td>
<td>$1,957,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capital Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flashing Yellow Conversion</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Drive Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Road (61) - Cedar Lake to Hilloway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Crossroad (73) - Cedar Lake to I-394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Major Road Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$5,325,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MSA Bond Debt Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$164,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$184,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$173,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$162,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$914,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$5,509,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$398,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$373,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$422,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,066,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>($3,466,250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,531,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$1,528,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1,535,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Beginning Available Allotment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>(1,165,559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>(99,309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>(3,565,559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>(2,034,309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>(505,559)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Ending Available Allotment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>($99,309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>($3,565,559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>($2,034,309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>($505,559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1,029,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

† A portion of the city's state allotment is designated as "maintenance," which is deposited annually to the General Fund and Electric Franchise Fee Fund.

* MSA bond debt service is for Shady Oak Road (Bren to Excelsior) project. Final payment for the $5.8 million project is due in 2024.

** Actual cash balances vary significantly from Available Allotment relative to timing of projects and state reimbursements.
### Table IX
CIP 2018-2022

**STREET IMPROVEMENT FUND**

**Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$6,315,000</td>
<td>$5,530,000</td>
<td>$7,040,000</td>
<td>$6,540,000</td>
<td>$6,530,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Management Study</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Preservation</td>
<td>1,720,000</td>
<td>1,770,000</td>
<td>1,775,000</td>
<td>1,830,000</td>
<td>1,830,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Rehabilitation</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>4,600,000</td>
<td>6,200,000</td>
<td>5,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City LRT Infrastructure</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Drive Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd/CR 61 (Cedar Lk Rd to Hilloway Rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Crossroads/CR 73 (Cedar Lk Rd to I-394)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$8,413,000</td>
<td>$4,064,000</td>
<td>$4,479,000</td>
<td>$6,474,000</td>
<td>$8,075,000</td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</td>
<td>($2,098,000)</td>
<td>$1,466,000</td>
<td>$2,561,000</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>($1,545,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>1,972,661</td>
<td>(125,339)</td>
<td>1,340,661</td>
<td>3,901,661</td>
<td>3,967,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>($125,339)</td>
<td>$1,340,661</td>
<td>$3,901,661</td>
<td>$3,967,661</td>
<td>$2,422,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance Guideline</td>
<td>$1,016,000</td>
<td>$1,119,750</td>
<td>$1,618,500</td>
<td>$2,018,750</td>
<td>$1,575,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table X
CIP 2018-2022
ELECTRIC FRANCHISE FEES FUND
Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fees</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA Maintenance Funds</td>
<td>197,235</td>
<td>124,985</td>
<td>228,201</td>
<td>256,510</td>
<td>201,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,042,235</strong></td>
<td><strong>$949,985</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,053,201</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,081,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,026,160</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Light Installations</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Systems Enhancements</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City LRT Infrastructure</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Drive Improvements</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,490,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,380,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$710,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,390,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$720,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$310,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures | ($1,457,765) | ($1,440,015) | $333,201  | $771,510  | $966,160  |

| Estimated Beginning Fund Balance       | 1,385,378 | (72,387)   | (1,512,402)| (1,179,201)| (407,691) |
| Estimated Ending Fund Balance          | ($72,387) | ($1,512,402)| ($1,179,201)| ($407,691) | ($558,469) |

| Fund Balance Guideline                 | $597,500  | $180,000  | $77,500   | $409,000  | $299,000  |
### Table XI

**STORM WATER FUND**

**Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer Utility Fees</td>
<td>$2,614,700</td>
<td>$2,702,300</td>
<td>$2,792,800</td>
<td>$2,886,300</td>
<td>$2,983,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Funding Sources</th>
<th>$2,616,700</th>
<th>$2,703,300</th>
<th>$2,797,800</th>
<th>$2,896,300</th>
<th>$2,985,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Expenditures

**Operating Expenditures**

| Operating Expenses                     | $888,100 | $917,300 | $947,600 | $978,900 | $1,011,200 |
| Transfers                               | 180,600  | 186,600  | 192,800  | 199,200  | 205,800   |

**Subtotal Operating Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>$1,068,700</th>
<th>$1,103,900</th>
<th>$1,140,400</th>
<th>$1,178,100</th>
<th>$1,217,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Capital Expenditures**

| Local Street Rehabilitation             | $950,000  | $600,000  | $700,000  | $1,100,000 | $2,000,000 |
| Storm Sewer Risk Assessment             | 200,000   | 200,000   | 200,000   | 200,000    | 300,000    |
| Water Quality                           | 100,000   | 100,000   | 100,000   | 100,000    | 100,000    |
| City LRT Infrastructure                  | 180,000   | 140,000   | 100,000   |            |            |
| Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure           | 250,000   | 80,000    |            |            |            |
| Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure      | 30,000    | 20,000    |            |            |            |
| Street Sweeper                          | 205,000   |            |            |            |            |
| Vacuum Sewer Cleaner                     | 282,200   |            |            |            |            |

**Subtotal Capital Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Capital Expenditures</th>
<th>$2,197,200</th>
<th>$1,797,400</th>
<th>$1,100,000</th>
<th>$1,500,000</th>
<th>$2,400,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>$3,265,900</th>
<th>$2,901,300</th>
<th>$2,240,400</th>
<th>$2,678,100</th>
<th>$3,617,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources**

| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures | ($649,200) | ($198,000) | $557,400 | $218,200 | ($632,000) |

**Estimated Beginning Fund Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>2,595,077</th>
<th>1,945,877</th>
<th>1,747,877</th>
<th>2,305,277</th>
<th>2,523,477</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Estimated Ending Fund Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>$1,945,877</th>
<th>$1,747,877</th>
<th>$2,305,277</th>
<th>$2,523,477</th>
<th>$1,891,477</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cash Reserve Target**

- 5% accumulated depreciation & 3 mos. WC
  - Cash Reserve Target - 5% accumulated depreciation & 3 mos. WC
    - $1,774,400
    - $1,727,300
    - $1,606,000
    - $1,759,500
    - $2,038,200

- Percent target achieved
  - 109.7%
  - 101.2%
  - 143.5%
  - 143.4%
  - 92.8%
### Table XII
CIP 2018-2022
UTILITY FUND
Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sales &amp; Sewer Services</td>
<td>14,300,000</td>
<td>15,060,000</td>
<td>15,855,000</td>
<td>16,700,000</td>
<td>17,570,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>100,500</td>
<td>101,800</td>
<td>108,900</td>
<td>132,700</td>
<td>110,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hookup Fees</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>144,200</td>
<td>148,500</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>157,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>404,400</td>
<td>411,700</td>
<td>419,300</td>
<td>427,200</td>
<td>435,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$24,944,900</td>
<td>$24,717,700</td>
<td>$21,531,700</td>
<td>$17,412,900</td>
<td>$24,273,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$5,325,400</td>
<td>$5,467,900</td>
<td>$5,614,500</td>
<td>$5,765,300</td>
<td>$5,920,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Service Charge</td>
<td>4,464,200</td>
<td>4,732,000</td>
<td>5,016,000</td>
<td>5,317,000</td>
<td>5,634,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,241,844</td>
<td>2,369,462</td>
<td>3,330,456</td>
<td>3,512,553</td>
<td>3,510,903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>1,100,500</td>
<td>1,133,500</td>
<td>1,167,500</td>
<td>1,202,500</td>
<td>1,238,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Non-capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$12,131,944</td>
<td>$13,702,862</td>
<td>$15,128,456</td>
<td>$15,797,353</td>
<td>$16,304,003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Piping &amp; Improvements</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Tower Maintenance</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water System Sustainability Imp.</td>
<td>2,332,000</td>
<td>3,035,000</td>
<td>196,000</td>
<td>1,013,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hydrant Program</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Facility Improvements</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Excavated Materials</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Station Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infiltration and Inflow Reduction Program</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Forecmain Lining</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-related Utility Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Preservation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Drive Improvements</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Roof Replacements</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Vehicles</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>153,200</td>
<td>115,600</td>
<td>103,700</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial Bucket Truck</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Jetter</td>
<td>169,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Warning Sirens</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Utility Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$12,880,800</td>
<td>$9,803,200</td>
<td>$3,001,600</td>
<td>$4,321,700</td>
<td>$4,048,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$25,012,744</td>
<td>$23,506,062</td>
<td>$18,130,056</td>
<td>$20,119,053</td>
<td>$20,352,003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</td>
<td>($67,844)</td>
<td>$1,211,638</td>
<td>$3,401,644</td>
<td>($2,706,153)</td>
<td>$3,921,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Beginning Cash Reserve</td>
<td>13,569,312</td>
<td>13,501,468</td>
<td>14,713,106</td>
<td>18,114,750</td>
<td>15,408,597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Ending Cash Reserve</strong></td>
<td>$13,501,468</td>
<td>$14,713,106</td>
<td>$18,114,750</td>
<td>$15,408,597</td>
<td>$19,329,794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating Reserve Target (6 mos. WC + debt svc) | $7,264,300 | $8,430,400 | $8,827,800 | $9,052,100 | $9,589,800 |
| Capital Reserve Target (10% accumulated deprec) | 8,734,800 | 8,734,800 | 8,734,800 | 8,734,800 | 8,734,800 |
| **Total Cash Reserve Target**             | $15,999,100 | $17,165,200 | $17,562,600 | $17,786,900 | $18,324,600 |
| % target achieved                        | 84.4%      | 85.7%      | 103.1%     | 86.6%      | 105.5%     |
### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fee</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Educ &amp; Govt (PEG) Fee</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$958,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$960,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$962,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$963,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$963,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

#### Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>$661,000</td>
<td>$682,900</td>
<td>$705,500</td>
<td>$728,800</td>
<td>$752,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$693,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$716,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$740,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$764,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$790,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capital Expenditures

| Audio/Visual Equipment Replacement  | $61,400   | $66,000   | $73,000   | $114,500  | $53,100  |
| Public Educ & Govt (PEG) Expenses  | 100,000   | 100,000   | 100,000   | 100,000   | 100,000   |
| Technology Infrastructure           | 100,000   | 100,000   | 100,000   | 100,000   |
| Public Access Technology            | 25,000    |           |           |           |
| **Subtotal Capital Expenditures**   | **$261,400** | **$291,000** | **$173,000** | **$314,500** | **$253,100** |

### Total Expenditures

| **Total Expenditures**             | **$955,000** | **$1,007,600** | **$913,400** | **$1,079,400** | **$1,043,300** |

#### Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>($47,100)</td>
<td>$49,100</td>
<td>($115,900)</td>
<td>($79,800)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Beginning Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,833,162</td>
<td>1,836,662</td>
<td>1,789,562</td>
<td>1,838,662</td>
<td>1,722,762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Ending Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,836,662</td>
<td>1,789,562</td>
<td>1,838,662</td>
<td>1,722,762</td>
<td>1,642,962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dedicated Future Transition Reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Future Transition Reserve*</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>907,600</td>
<td>913,400</td>
<td>979,400</td>
<td>943,300</td>
<td>977,729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Ending Available Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$929,062</td>
<td>$876,162</td>
<td>$859,262</td>
<td>$779,462</td>
<td>$665,233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reserve equates to one subsequent year of operating and ongoing capital costs.
### Table XIV

**TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT FUND**

Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$581,000</td>
<td>$581,000</td>
<td>$580,500</td>
<td>$581,000</td>
<td>$581,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| **Expenditures**     |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| Office Equipment     | $128,100 | $56,500 | $49,000 | $99,300 | $24,500 |          |
| Technology Purchases/Upgrades | 362,100 | 810,000 | 361,200 | 341,900 | 375,600 |          |
| Security Equipment   | 68,000  | 65,300  | 64,000  | 58,800  | 81,300  |          |
| **Total Expenditures** | $558,200 | $931,800 | $474,200 | $500,000 | $481,400 | $0       |

|                      |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures | $22,800 | ($350,800) | $106,300 | $81,000 | $99,600 |          |

|                      |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| Estimated Beginning Fund Balance | 175,338 | 198,138 | (152,662) | (46,362) | 34,638 |          |

|                      |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| Estimated Ending Fund Balance | **$198,138** | **($152,662)** | **($46,362)** | **$34,638** | **$134,238** |          |

|                      |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| Fund Balance Guideline | $232,950 | $118,550 | $125,000 | $144,600 | $147,300 |          |
Project Category: Municipal Buildings
Project Title: Life Safety Reporting Upgrades
Total Estimated Cost: $170,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S18108

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Replacement Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

A number of the city’s building fire panels and associated emergency detectors (smoke, fire, duress, and duct) are in need of replacement because they have reached the end of their useful life or are completely lacking.

The city’s fiber system (backbone) sends all alarms to police dispatch for 24-hour monitoring. The backbone connections to the various city buildings is nearly complete and the improvement focus will now be shifted to upgrading the detectors located in each building that signal an emergency.

Scheduling and Project Status:

In 2012, staff began the design of an electronic reporting backbone for the city’s major buildings. A demonstration project was designed that connected the Glen Lake Activity Center and Fire #2 to dispatch using the city’s fiber system. In 2014, public works and city hall were connected to the system and now Fire stations 3, 4 and 5 are connected to the system. The schedule for detector replacement is:

- 2018: Ice Arena B
- 2019: Ice Arena A
- 2020: Williston Center
- 2021: Community Center
- 2022: Fire Stations 3, 4 & 5

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

The project is consistent with current technology and the policy of maintaining the city’s infrastructure.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

This project does not increase annual operating costs.

Description:

This item funds the improvement of life safety, duress, sprinkler and fire panel alarms that are located in the city’s buildings.
**Project Category:** Municipal Buildings

**Project Title:** Energy Conservation and Sustainability Improvements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $110,000

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** 4101.XXXX.S18106

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Trail Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Bay Fund</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

Electric rate increases of 4 to 9% have been sought by Xcel Energy from the Public Utilities Commission on an intermittent schedule. While fuel and natural gas are enjoying a period of lower rates, electric prices continue to drive return on investment for energy saving projects.

The city has a comprehensive list of energy-saving improvements and implements those with the shortest payback first and progresses to those items with a longer payback.

LED lighting, energy efficient motors, variable air volume HVAC equipment and building computer controls are becoming more mainstream and are supported by life cycle-costing and rate of return analyses.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

Projects are undertaken such that those deriving the shortest payback of investment are completed first as well as lighting that has reached the end of its useful life.

2018: City Hall air handlers & roof-top compressors
      Grays Bay Marina lighting (Phase I)
2019: Park Shelter Restroom lighting
2020: Grays Bay Marina lighting (Phase II)
2021: Utility Building Lighting and hot water heaters
2022: Water conservation plumbing initiatives

**Description:**

This item provides for the continued upgrade/replacement of energy consuming equipment such as light fixtures, ballasts, occupancy sensors, insulation, weather stripping, setback thermostat programming and similar equipment that will save energy expense.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

LED lighting generally saves 30 to 40% of current demand (per fixture). At current electric rates, we are finding an internal rate of return of under 3 years.

Current strategy is to replace fluorescent lighting three or more year’s old, failed lighting, or lighting that is operating over eight hours per working day with LED fixtures.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Resources spent in this area should have a return on investment of 5 years or less.
Project Category: Municipal Buildings
Project Title: Misc. Building Components
Total Estimated Cost: $590,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4111.XXXX.S18102

Source of Project Funding | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Capital Replacement Fund | $100,000 | $40,000 | $150,000 | $150,000 | $150,000

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled replacement or emergency repair of various major building components including: life safety equipment, heating, ventilation or cooling equipment, fire sprinkler systems, building envelope & sub-systems and structural repair.

Justification:
This item provides funding for individual department work space initiatives, deferred maintenance items, emergency repairs and the following specific scheduled repairs/replacements:

Scheduling and Project Status:
2018: Meadow Park furnace
   Clean community center building ducts
   Public Works exhaust sensors
   City Hall server room sprinkler detectors
2019: Public Works make-up air units 5 & 6
2020: Fleet Services epoxy floor re-coat
   Public Works make-up air units 1, 2 & 3
2021: City Hall air handling units
   City Hall masonry repairs
2022: Community Center masonry and window repairs

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the policy of maintaining the city's infrastructure.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This item generally does not affect operating costs except for projects that replace building components with energy efficient replacements.
Project Category: Municipal Building

Project Title: Building Automation Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: $477,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S18104

Description:
This project funds the ongoing replacement of the computer controlled system that monitors and remotely controls the heating, ventilating and air conditioning as well as other systems that can be connected and controlled in each of the city’s buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Trails Fund</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Building automation is the automatic centralized control of a building's heating, ventilation and air conditioning, lighting and other systems through a Building Automation System (BAS). The objectives of building automation are improved occupant comfort, efficient and rapid operation, reduction in energy consumption & operating costs and improved equipment life cycles.

The current building automation system is no longer vendor supported and replacement parts are difficult to obtain. Original building designs utilized pneumatic systems to command actuators and thermostats by air pressure from compressors.

Both compressor maintenance and pneumatic controls rely on professional building labor for continued operations. The conversion from pneumatic to digital (electronic) controls reduces maintenance, and increases environmental control.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Each year’s improvement project would be initiated and completed in the year of funding.

2018: Ice Arenas A & B, program weather sensors
2019: Satellite fire stations & Glen Lake Act Center
2020: Various HVAC office Improvements
        System Wide variable air volume (VAV) installations
2021: Software and JACE computer upgrades
2022: Civic Center exhaust fans and lighting points

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The project is consistent with maintaining the city’s infrastructure. As the building automation system becomes more robust, so does the capability and redundancy of the building system controls.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
These projects decrease annual operational costs by eliminating labor costs for air compressor maintenance, parts searches, and call backs. It also allows quicker response to comfort control adjustments. Energy efficiencies are anticipated to increase as 24/7 building temperature setbacks are expanded.

The automation replacement increases costs for new software licenses and software modules.
**Project Category:** Municipal Buildings

**Project Title:** Building Roof Replacements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,145,000

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** 4101.XXXX.S18109 5110.XXXX.S18109

---

**Description:**
This item provides for the scheduled replacement of roof systems for major community and utility buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification:**
Roofing systems have a life expectancy that varies depending on the type of roof system. Rubber and adhered rubber have increased life expectancies and are considered good alternatives if the City’s preferred built-up roof standard is not economically feasible. Re-roofing provides an opportunity to evaluate insulation and make upgrades for energy savings. All roof insulating capabilities are evaluated during replacement of each roof system. Flashing systems, coping, gutters and snow guards, parapet walls are also considered part of the roof system and are repaired if found to be deficient.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
All roofs were assessed in 2011 and program development and follow up has met all targeted roofs. Project specifications are developed by a consulting firm specializing in roof systems. The projects are bid in the funding year and completed during the warm weather months.

2018  Community Center sky lights
      Ice Rink A roof analysis
      Well #11

2019  Park and Trail buildings and shelter roofs
      Well #3

2020  Burwell House
      WTP #16

2021  Public Works Sections B & C

2022  Ice Arena B
      Tower Hill Booster

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
These projects are consistent with the policy of maintaining the city's infrastructure.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Added insulation during re-roofing will decrease heating and cooling expenses.
Project Category: Municipal Building
Project Title: Fire Station Refurbishment
Total Estimated Cost: $455,000 Total Cost
                    120,000 Unfunded
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S18111

Description:
This item provides for the repair and ongoing refurbishment of fire stations. Anticipated repairs include flooring, cabinets, garage doors, epoxy flooring painting, truck exhaust systems, hot water heaters and miscellaneous painting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The city’s satellite fire stations were constructed between 1972 and 1991. Significant roofing, siding, grounds and flooring projects are complete in a majority of the stations.

Exterior doors, select mechanical & plumbing replacements and apparatus bay/operational facility improvements are identified.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Improvements will be scheduled and undertaken in the year of project funding.

2018: Signage, flooring, cabinets, garage doors-4, apparatus floor epoxy-5
2019: Air evac-2, RTU-3, truck wash/paint-4
2020: RTU-3, air evac-4
2022: Bay doors-4 & 5, rear door-2. Flooring-3, water heater-3

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These smaller upgrades follow major upgrades to Fire Stations #2, 3, 4 and 5.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Repairs generally will not increase operating costs. Energy conservation items such as doors and water heaters will decrease heat energy expenses.
Project Category: Municipal Building
Project Title: Salt Dome Panels
Total Estimated Cost: $50,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The road salt storage facility was constructed in 2005. Its roof is constructed of fabric panels that have a useful life of approximately 15 years. Minor defects are starting to occur presently and these are being patched.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Replacement of the fabric panels will occur in the summer/fall of the funding year.

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the fabric panels that cover the salt storage facility.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The project is consistent with the city's policy of maintaining the city’s infrastructure.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will decrease maintenance costs by approximately $500 per year.
Project Category: Municipal Buildings
Project Title: Civic Center Improvements
Total Estimated Cost: $6,310,000 Total Cost  
1,200,000 Unfunded
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S18105

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>$2,360,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
City Hall was built in 1971 and the community center in 1987. Both buildings have received life cycle cosmetic replacements, roofs, and select equipment to operate efficiently.

Both a service delivery assessment and building assessment are necessary to create a comprehensive plan for the next decade(s) of operation. Technology, energy, and employee work space improvements are priorities and driving forces for a comprehensive facilities improvement plan.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Projects will include enhancements to the furnishings, lighting, building comfort, and security.

City Hall Projects
2017: Phase 1 – City Hall space plan project
2018: Phase 2 – City Hall space plan project
City Hall HVAC replacement (unfunded)
2019: Phase 3 – City Hall space plan project and CC/City Hall link window replacement
2020: Community Center HVAC project
2021: Room refurbishment, floor coverings
2022: Community Center/City Hall corridor window replacement
Meeting room refurbishment

Description:
This project provides for the funding of major improvement, maintenance and service delivery projects at city hall and community center, which include meeting rooms, banquet facilities, employee areas and public spaces.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The city began implementation of the Civic Center Master Plan in 2005 and 2006 through upgrades of the Civic Center roadway, parking lots, landscaping and recreational facilities. The City Hall courtyard was refurbished in 2016 with the installation of stamped concrete, retaining walls, lighting, yard furniture and landscaping.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Facility improvements will help to provide a quality facility that can be marketed to outside groups and organizations at competitive rates that could potentially increase revenues.
**Project Category:** Municipal Buildings

**Project Title:** Public Safety Facility Improvements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $27,000,000

**Funding Priority:** 3

**Account Number:** NA

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Safety Facility GO Bonds – Fire</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Safety Facility GO Bonds – Police</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:

Fire Station #1 was built in 1975 and the Police Station was completed in 1989. The departments are located at the Civic Center Campus on the east side of the complex. The Fire Department was originally designed and occupied with mostly volunteers and without 24-hour a day staffing. Since then, a duty crew model has been implemented to better serve the city and the needs of the fire staff.

Several issues affect the operation of the department currently: inefficient station layout, lack of sufficient gender specific locker room space, office space, storage, laundry, barrier free accessibility and training facilities.

Similar to Fire, the Police Department lacks adequate space for investigations as well as training facilities. Also, police squad cars containing temperature sensitive and high-tech equipment sit outside in an unsecured area.

The project supports shared areas for meeting and training space which can be utilized for both police and fire staffs.

### Scheduling and Project Status:

The 2016 Public Safety Facilities Study was presented to council at the January 30, 2017 council study session. At that meeting the council indicated that additional planning should be done in order to accomplish the remodeling of the police and fire station space for police expansion and the construction of the new fire station to meet the future needs of the fire service.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

The item is consistent with the policy of maintaining the city’s infrastructure and making improvements to facilitate a paid-on-call/duty crew staffing system.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

It is anticipated that annual operating and maintenance costs would increase with the additional fire building and the tempered parking area for police. Installation of energy efficient heating, lighting and construction materials would help to minimize operational cost of the expanded facilities.

### Description:

This project implements the findings of the 2016 Public Safety Facilities Study. Improvements are planned for both the police and fire departments.
**Project Category:** Recreational Facilities  
**Project Title:** Lindbergh Center Improvements  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $261,000 City Cost  
$900,000 Total Cost  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** 4123.6530.S18103

**Description:**

Constructed in 1996, the Lindbergh Center is jointly owned and operated by the City of Minnetonka and the Hopkins School District. The facility has five regulation basketball courts, seven volleyball courts, competitive running track, walking & jogging track and an exercise and conditioning room.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins School District</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

The joint agreement between the City of Minnetonka and the Hopkins School District provides for the sharing of the operating and capital expenses of the Lindbergh Center. The facility is instrumental to the joint recreation division’s ability to offer high demand youth and adult community programs. In 2016, the city’s 29% share of operating costs totaled $103,020.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

Due to the Hopkins School District capital bond referendum, the renovation of certain items may be completed at different times than expected. The city will still adhere to its funding schedule. Projects are regularly put into the CIP to spread the cost of equipment replacement over a number of years rather than replace a large amount of equipment at one time. The city would be responsible for 29% of the following improvements:

- **2008-17:** Walking/jogging track surface, cardiovascular equipment, HVAC upgrades, divider curtains, basket cable system, facility lighting, weight equipment, scoreboards, bleacher addition (east wall)
- **2018:** Replace exterior concrete ramp and stairs
- **2019:** Walking/jogging track, synthetic court surface
- **2020:** Portable bleacher replacement
- **2021:** Volleyball standards, basketball backboards
- **2022:** Cardiovascular equipment

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

These improvements are in keeping with efforts to provide and maintain a quality and efficiently operated facility.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Lindbergh Center rental revenues collected by the school district off-set total operating costs.

Preventative maintenance costs tend to rise as equipment ages. A consistent replacement schedule of older equipment will allow operating costs to be maintained.
**Project Category:** Recreational Facilities  
**Project Title:** Williston Center Improvements  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,330,000 Net Cost  
**Funding Priority:** 2-3  
**Account Number:** 5410.6530.S18107, 4200. XXXX.S18107  

### Description:
These projects preserve the future usefulness of the facility for its traditional functions, including both a reasonably-priced fitness facility serving 6,800 Minnetonka resident members and 35,900 daily users annually, and also as a cost-effective location to host 70 Recreation Services programs.

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Williston Center Fund</th>
<th>Community Investment Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$409,500 ($94,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$424,500 ($94,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$219,500 ($94,500)</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:
Williston Center underwent a significant renovation in 2011. Items on this page reflect work that was not included in the 2011 project.

HVAC replacement projects include the pool unit (will be 9 years old with a 10-year useful life) and two 15 year old roof top units that were not replaced during the 2011 renovation.

The tennis building roof is original to the building and is approximately 40 years old. The project included in 2019 will make necessary repairs to maintain the integrity of the roof for many years to come. This roofing project was not part of the facility renovation completed in 2011.

Pool heaters will be 11 years old and at the end of their useful life when replaced. A whirlpool UV disinfectant system is planned to be installed and is the same type of system that was installed in the lap pool.

Cardiovascular equipment (treadmills, ellipticals, and bikes) scheduled to be replaced will be five years old and at the end of its useful life.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The roofing project, cardiovascular equipment replacement and remaining projects are necessary to maintain a quality facility that provides recreation and fitness opportunities to residents at a reasonable cost.

### Scheduling and Project Status:

**2010-12:** Total renovation project ($4.47 million, of which $945,000 at $94,500 per year financed by the Williston Center over ten years through 2020).

**2014:** Pool roof walls repaired
**2015:** Pool roof replaced
**2016:** Flat roof over locker rooms replaced, UV pool disinfectant system installed, pool deck resurfaced, weight/cardiovascular equipment replaced
**2017:** Replace Treehouse features
**2018:** Pool HVAC unit ($150,000), batting cage drainage improvements ($20,000), replace south wall siding of tennis building ($70,000), replace carpet ($15,000), replace splash pool features ($10,000), miscellaneous building components ($50,000)

**2019:** Repair tennis building roof ($280,000), miscellaneous building components ($50,000)
**2020:** Paint tennis building interior ($55,000), replace pool heaters ($20,000), miscellaneous building components ($50,000)

**2021:** Replace cardiovascular equipment ($160,000), replace HVAC RTU 5 & 6 ($75,000), tennis court resurface ($10,000), miscellaneous building components ($50,000)

**2022:** Install whirlpool UV disinfectant system ($15,000), install generator ($200,000), miscellaneous building components ($50,000)

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
The projects listed above will not affect annual costs, but will protect the investments made within the building over the past few years.
**Project Category:** Recreational Facilities

**Project Title:** Shady Oak Beach Improvements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $ 90,500 City Cost 135,000 Total Cost

**Funding Priority:**

**Account Number:** 4701.XXXX.S18112

---

**Source of Project Funding** | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Park and Trail Improvement Fund | $16,800 | $23,400 | $33,500 |  | $16,800
City of Hopkins | 8,200 | 11,600 | 16,500 |  | 8,200

**Justification:**

The joint agreement between the City of Minnetonka and City of Hopkins provides for the sharing of the operating and capital expenses of Shady Oak Beach. These expenses are split 67% City of Minnetonka and 33% City of Hopkins.

The beach has had two floating docks and the permanent high-dive dock in the swimming area for many years. While the docks are popular, integrating new amenities such as water play inflatables will continue to provide a variety of fun, quality experiences for beachgoers.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

2016-17: Landscape improvements, patio tables and chairs, entrance monument sign
2018: Water play inflatable amenities ($25,000)
2019: Replacement of lifeguard building cabinets ($5,000), windows/screens ($10,000), exterior and interior lighting ($15,000), irrigation improvements ($5,000)
2020: Water play inflatable amenities ($50,000)
2022: Miscellaneous building components ($25,000)

**Description:**

Shady Oak Beach is jointly operated by the cities of Hopkins and Minnetonka. The facility is open from June – August each summer with the revenues generated from season pass sales and daily admissions. Seasonal attendance ranges from 30,000 – 40,000 annually. The facility was most recently renovated in 1998.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

These improvements are in keeping with the efforts to maintain a quality facility.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Maintenance costs tend to rise as facilities age. A consistent replacement schedule of older items will allow operating costs to be maintained. These capital projects will not have an effect on the facility’s annual operating costs or revenues long-term.

**Examples of possible inflatables**
**Project Category:** Recreational Facilities  
**Project Title:** Community Facility & Programming Space Study  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $75,000  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** NA

### Description:
A Community Facility & Programming Space Study will help evaluate current and future community needs. This study will encompass community needs, Recreation department needs, and current facility physical conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:
Staff has identified current and future needs for programming space. An external facility & programming space study is necessary to tie the recreation department’s findings with the community needs while assessing current facility conditions.

The Community Center and Williston Center are two facilities that are operating at a max capacity. Programs are currently running in spaces that aren’t meant for programming and staff is unable to create new programming due to the lack of space. Also facilities like the Glen Lake Activity Center are in need of major improvements and have operating maintenance costs increasing annually.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This study will identify and give direction to staff so we can continue to provide and maintain quality programs and facilities.

### Scheduling and Project Status:
**2013/2014:** Staff completed a programming space needs assessment with results showing a significant shortage of indoor programming space.

**2015:** Contracted with an outside consultant to complete a feasibility study to determine if the current GLAC site could support a community recreational facility. Council reviewed the study and requested that an alternative building with reduced programming and activity space be examined.

**2019:** Contract with an outside consultant to complete a Community Facility & Programming Space Study.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Long-term implications include reducing maintenance costs on aging buildings and reduced fees paid by the city to the school districts for program rental space.
**Project Category:** Recreational Facilities  
**Project Title:** Ice Arena Improvements  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,860,000 Total Cost  
**Funding Priority:** 1 & 3  
**Account Number:** NA

**Description:**

Ice Arena A was constructed in 1970 by volunteers and has been under the city's ownership since 1975. Ice Arena B was constructed as a permanent facility in 1989 after operating as an air structure for 16 years. As aging facilities that still are in demand, primarily during prime skating season, ongoing preventative maintenance and equipment replacement are vital to providing safe and efficient facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund – payback</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

Replacement of the 40+ year old direct refrigeration system and the aging 20+ year old dasher board system was replaced in 2015. The dasher boards and glass incorporated advanced safety measures now featured in dasher board production to reduce participant injury.

Dasher boards and glass are scheduled to be replaced in Rink B in 2018 to upgrade to the advanced boards and glass that are now available to reduce participant injury (similar to what was installed in Rink A).

Flooring in common areas, restrooms and locker rooms of Rink A is scheduled to be replaced in 2019. Current flooring will be 22 years old and is deteriorating.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

2010-15: Rink B public use safety flooring replacement; Electric ice resurfacer (2011); renovation of concession stand; replacement of Rink A refrigeration system, rink floor and dasher board system. The project cost budgeted at $1.7 million, came in under budget at $1.45 million.

2018-20: Inter-fund loan payback from the Community Investment Fund (CIF) to the Special Assessment Construction Fund as adopted in the 2015 Budget and pending formal public hearings for use of the CIF.

2018: Replace Rink B dasher boards and glass ($220,000)  
2019: Replace Rink A flooring in common areas, locker rooms and restrooms ($190,000)

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

These improvements are in keeping with efforts to provide and maintain a safe and efficient facility.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

The projects listed in 2018-22 will not affect annual operating costs.

Maintenance costs on the refrigeration system installed in 2015 will continue to be reduced due to better energy efficiency and the elimination of expensive R22 refrigerant. The project is expected to reduce Ice Arena expenditures by an estimated $33,000 annually due to energy efficiency, the elimination of R22 refrigerant, and reduced mechanical breakdowns.
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Space  
Project Title: Emerald Ash Borer Program  
Total Estimated Cost: $800,000  
Funding Priority: 3  
Account Number: 4510.XXXX.S18209

Description:
This program funds asset-related costs associated with the arrival of the Emerald ash borer (EAB) insect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Fund</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The Emerald Ash Borer is an insect now present in the metropolitan area that will eventually kill all native ash trees. As a result, the city is pro-actively designing a management program that deals with the anticipated costs of the infestation. These costs include tree removal, stump grinding, reforestation and chemical treatments.

Scheduling and Project Status:
In 2014, the city initiated a program that began to address the anticipated effects of infestation. Additional staff has been hired, as needed, to assist with the development of work plans for both public and private trees. 2015 was the first full year of the program, and the annual amounts indicated for the remaining years through 2022 are projected costs assuming infestation has not yet been detected.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This program is being coordinated with other forestry programs.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
The costs above reflect only the capital budget portion of the program. The program will also increase operating costs of the city. The first full year of operating costs for the program are estimated to be approximately $200,000 annually beginning 2015.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails and Open Space  
**Project Title:** Park and Open Space Purchase  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $600,000 - Unfunded  
**Funding Priority:** 3  
**Account Number:** NA

**Description:**

The city's open space preservation implementation strategy calls for the preservation of open space that meets certain criteria. In addition, the Park Board has identified certain parcels that would expand existing parkland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

The Minnetonka Park Board developed a property acquisition list that identifies desirable parcels for purchase by the city. The list is updated on a regular basis and includes properties within the Minnehaha Creek Preserve and properties that are adjacent to existing city park land to serve in expanding the city’s parks. This funding provides resources to purchase land identified by the Park Board.

In addition, in 2001 Minnetonka voters approved a $15,000,000 bond referendum for parks renewal and open space preservation. About half of these funds were used for open space preservation.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

As parcels from the prioritization list become available, they will be acquired or preserved by other means (e.g., conservation easements) based on funding availability and City Council approval. Parcels classified as urgent and high priority for open space preservation will be actively pursued.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

This project is consistent with the Council Policy on an Open Space Preservation Program and the Management of Natural Resources.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Costs related to additional land stewardship are expected to increase dependent upon the size and environmental features of parcels acquired.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space

Project Title: Athletic Field Improvements

Total Estimated Cost: $510,000 Total Cost
140,000 Unfunded

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4701.XXXX.S18207

Source of Project Funding | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Park and Trail fund- City Facilities | $20,000 | $270,000 | $40,000 | $20,000 | $20,000
Unfunded – Park & Trail Fund | 140,000 | | | | 

Justification:
With a lack of available city property for athletic field expansion, the lighting of existing fields, along with partnerships with local school districts, provides the best opportunities to expand access to community fields. This program also funds major upgrades to dedicated city owned athletic fields to maintain acceptable playing standards.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2018: $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields. $140,000 is included as an unfunded request for the lighting of the two existing fields at Lone Lake Park.
2019: $270,000 is allocated to replace the lighting on the softball fields at Big Willow Park.
2020: $40,000 is allocated to replace fencing on the softball fields at Big Willow Park.
2021 and 2022: $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields each year.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The City of Minnetonka has a history of partnerships with the Minnetonka and Hopkins School Districts to provide quality community facilities, most notably, the Lindbergh Center, Arts Center on 7 and athletic improvements at Hopkins West Junior High.

1998: The city provided $100,000 for the redevelopment of fields at Hopkins West Junior High with the Hopkins School District.
2008 – 2010: The city provided $250,000 towards the $3.5 Million construction of Minnetonka School Districts Veterans Field (baseball/football fields).
2009: The city provided $95,000 towards the $1.2 Million construction of Legacy Fields (four youth softball fields) with Minnetonka School District.
2010: The city provided $50,000 towards a $250,000 upgrade of an existing multi-purpose field at Bennett Family Park.
2014: $20,000 is allocated for field renovations at city owned athletic fields and $65,000 for Phase I safety improvements (foul ball netting) at Big Willow Park.
2016: $85,000 is allocated for Phase II safety improvements (spectator and bleacher protection) at Big Willow Park. Hennepin County Youth Sports grant application will be submitted for the 2017 cycle.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Under the terms of the partnership agreements in place for previous improvements completed on school district property, the school districts are responsible for all operational and capital replacement costs. Increased energy costs due to field lighting will be recouped through field use fees.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space
Project Title: Burwell House Investments
Total Estimated Cost: $195,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 4732.XXXX.S18202

Description:
This project provides for maintenance and improvements to the Burwell House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Major maintenance projects are necessary at the Burwell House and other structures to keep the city's investment in good repair.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Staff will pursue grant opportunities to assist with improvements that will be needed in the future.

2018: $20,000 for the upgrade of the building automation software that controls the HVAC system.
2020: $90,000 for scheduled window replacement.
2022: $10,000 to evaluate the exterior of the buildings and develop a budget for painting/repairs to be completed in 2023.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These projects are necessary to ensure these facilities meet the standards for public health and protect the investment of the city for the long term. Painting of the Burwell House and a roofing condition study was completed in 2012, for replacement in 2016.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
None.
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Space

Project Title: Park Investment Plan

Total Estimated Cost: $570,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4701.62XX-63XX

Source of Project Funding | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Park and Trail Improvement Fund | | $145,000 | $175,000 | $125,000 | $125,000

Justification:

An implementation schedule was created for the park and trail system on a 30 year basis. Improvements will be made upon final evaluation of the listed amenity in order to maintain the park and trail infrastructure. As we move toward 2020, five playgrounds replaced as part of park renewal will reach 17 years old.

Scheduling and Project Status:

Staff has created a 30-year schedule guideline.

2019: Install card access at the 9 park buildings with bathrooms and warming houses; replace the upper bathroom building at Big Willow Park

2020: Playground equipment and surfacing replacement – Meadow and McKenzie

2021: Playground equipment and safety surfacing replacement – Ford and Mini-Tonka

2022: Playground equipment and safety surfacing replacement – Linner and Sunrise Ridge.

2023-2025: Future $450,000

- Playground equipment and safety surfacing replacement – Gro Tonka and Pioneer.
- Playground Equipment Replacement – Orchard, Covington, Glen-Moor, and Woodgate Parks
- Tot Lot Safety Surface Improvements

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

The Park Board has adopted a goal of renewing and maintaining the parks and trails. This plan will meet the objective to implement the long-term capital funding plan for ensuring the long-term vitality of parks. This project is in keeping with the city’s policy of maintaining its infrastructure in a quality condition.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

This rehabilitation will not increase annual maintenance costs.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space
Project Title: Pickleball Court Investment
Total Estimated Cost: $310,000
Funding Priority: 
Account Number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
In an effort to meet the growing demands of the sport, resident pickleball players have asked the park board to consider the addition of dedicated pickleball courts in the city's park system. Pickleball is one of the fastest growing sports both locally and nationally.

Justification:
Pickleball is one of the fastest growing sports both locally and nationally. Since 2012, our park system has provided four non-dedicated pickleball courts which overlap the two existing tennis courts at Meadow Park. In addition, four practice courts were added to one of the two existing paved hockey rinks at Meadow Park.

This project proposes the addition of up to eight permanent courts in the park system by way of adding a new amenity or converting existing tennis courts for dedicated pickleball use. The city currently maintains 27 tennis courts at 12 different park locations. An additional 26 tennis courts are provided on school district properties within the city.

Due to the high demand for pickleball, it is recommended that any expansion of the sport be planned in a community park or through a partnership using school district property where adequate parking and support amenities exist.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2012: Markings for four pickleball courts added to two existing tennis courts at Meadow Park.
2014: Six pickleball court lines added to one of the two paved outdoor ice rinks at Meadow Park
2016 - 2017: Park Board conducted community meetings to develop a plan for the addition of permanent courts.
2018: New permanent courts to be constructed and available for play at Lone Lake Park.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These improvements are in keeping with the park board’s goals to provide and maintain quality recreational amenities, and to respond to needs not previously identified.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
New courts would require annual maintenance costs of approximately $1,000. Additional future capital costs will be needed to address maintenance needs as a result of extensive use and aging infrastructure.
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Space
Project Title: Trail Improvement Plan
Total Estimated Cost: $6,025,000 Total Cost
1,250,000 Unfunded
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: 4701.XXXX.S18206

Description:
The Trail Improvement Plan is a multi-year plan created to maintain and enhance the city's trail and sidewalk system within the city. New trails and walks added to the system provide connections between existing trails, parks, schools and village center points of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund (PTF)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Funds (HC)/Other*</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park And Trail Improvement Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Trail Funding</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Length in Miles</th>
<th>Estimated PTF Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Woodhill Road – Atrium Way to Hwy 7 Trail wayfinding and navigation signage Plymouth Rd (CR 61) – Amy Lane to Hilloway Road</td>
<td>Strt Improv PTF PTF/HC</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Plymouth Rd (CR 61) – Minnetonka Blvd to Amy Lane Smetana Rd - Westbrooke Way to Sanibel Dr</td>
<td>PTF/Other PTF PTF</td>
<td>1.4 0.2</td>
<td>$1,800,000 $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Parkers Lake Rd - Twelve Oaks Dr to Plymouth limits Feasibility Study CR 3 – Glenview to Shady Oak/CR 61</td>
<td>PTF PTF</td>
<td>0.5 0.9</td>
<td>$150,000 $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Excelsior Blvd (CR 3) – Glenview to Caribou (IHM)</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Excelsior Blvd (CR 3) – Baker to Shady Oak/CR 61</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
There is strong community support for the Minnetonka Trail System as evidenced by the heavy use of the completed trail segments and inquiries received about opportunities for extensions. When completed, these trails and walkways will connect five community parks, adjacent communities, and allow users to travel throughout the city on trails physically separated from motorized vehicles.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The Opus Area Infrastructure Improvements page additionally designates $250,000 to construct trail connections to the new Light Rail Transit platform and the Ridgedale Drive Improvements page additionally designates $100,000 for trail enhancements, both from the Park and Trail Improvement Fund.

Staff conducted an educational and community dialogue for missing trail links to assist the Park Board and City Council in recommending projects to be constructed. In 2016 the city’s internal trails team updated the feasibility score and reprioritized unscheduled segments.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This is an integral part of the Parks, Open Space and Trail System and the Comprehensive Guide Plans to construct the Minnetonka Trail for walkers, joggers and bicyclists.

The vision for trail segments uses a feasibility score updated in 2016 made up of Community Access (40%), Nature of Use (40%), Cost Effectiveness (10%) and Degree of Construction Difficulty (10%).

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Maintenance costs will increase by approximately $1,500/mile.
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Space - Unfunded

Project Title: Trail Segments - Unscheduled

Total Estimated Cost: $16,479,000 to $58,854,000 Unfunded

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number: N/A

Description:
This project involves the construction of the trails described in the table on the following page. A map of potential trail locations is included for reference in the document appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,479,000 to $58,854,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
There is strong community support for the Minnetonka Trail System as evidenced by the heavy use of the completed trail segments and inquiries received about opportunities for extensions. Cost projections are based on trail construction at the time of a road project (low range) to construction independent of a road construction project (high range).

Scheduling and Project Status:
These projects are currently unscheduled. Some trail segments may qualify for funding from outside sources. Staff conducted an educational and community dialogue for missing trail links to assist the Park Board and City Council in recommending projects to be constructed. In 2016 the city’s internal trails team updated the feasibility score and reprioritized unscheduled segments.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This is an integral part of the Parks, Open Space and Trail System and Comprehensive Guide Plans to construct the Minnetonka Trail System for walkers, joggers, and bicyclists. When completed, these trails and walkways will connect five community parks, adjacent communities, and allow users to travel throughout the city on trails and walkways physically separated from motorized vehicles.

Trails are evaluated by using a feasibility score updated in 2016 made up of Community Access (40%), Cost Effectiveness (10%), Degree of Difficulty (10%) and Nature of Use (40%).

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Although this project is currently unfunded, proposed funding source and timetable data are provided. Maintenance costs will increase by approximately $1,500/mile.

Description:
This project involves the construction of the trails described in the table on the following page. A map of potential trail locations is included for reference in the document appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,479,000 to $58,854,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
There is strong community support for the Minnetonka Trail System as evidenced by the heavy use of the completed trail segments and inquiries received about opportunities for extensions. Cost projections are based on trail construction at the time of a road project (low range) to construction independent of a road construction project (high range).

Scheduling and Project Status:
These projects are currently unscheduled. Some trail segments may qualify for funding from outside sources. Staff conducted an educational and community dialogue for missing trail links to assist the Park Board and City Council in recommending projects to be constructed. In 2016 the city’s internal trails team updated the feasibility score and reprioritized unscheduled segments.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This is an integral part of the Parks, Open Space and Trail System and Comprehensive Guide Plans to construct the Minnetonka Trail System for walkers, joggers, and bicyclists. When completed, these trails and walkways will connect five community parks, adjacent communities, and allow users to travel throughout the city on trails and walkways physically separated from motorized vehicles.

Trails are evaluated by using a feasibility score updated in 2016 made up of Community Access (40%), Cost Effectiveness (10%), Degree of Difficulty (10%) and Nature of Use (40%).

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Although this project is currently unfunded, proposed funding source and timetable data are provided. Maintenance costs will increase by approximately $1,500/mile.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Unscheduled and Unfunded Trail Segments (all costs 2017 dollars)</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Est Cost w/ Road Project (by LF)</th>
<th>W/ Road Project Cumulative Cost</th>
<th>Est Cost Independently (by LF)</th>
<th>Independent Cumulative Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CR 60 - CR 3 to CR 62</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$624,387</td>
<td>$624,387</td>
<td>$2,229,953</td>
<td>$2,229,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CR 60 - CR 3 to CR 5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$622,604</td>
<td>$1,246,990</td>
<td>$2,223,584</td>
<td>$4,453,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ridgedale Dr - White Birch Rd to Target</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$227,721</td>
<td>$1,474,711</td>
<td>$813,289</td>
<td>$5,266,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CR 5 - The Marsh to Fairchild Lane</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$300,663</td>
<td>$1,775,374</td>
<td>$1,073,796</td>
<td>$6,340,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CR 73 - Cedar Lake Rd to Wayzata Blvd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$381,608</td>
<td>$2,156,982</td>
<td>$1,362,885</td>
<td>$7,703,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CR 3 - Woodland Rd to Clear Springs Rd/101 Library</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$354,336</td>
<td>$2,511,317</td>
<td>$1,265,484</td>
<td>$8,968,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CR 3 - Glen Oak St to Woodland Rd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$273,494</td>
<td>$2,784,812</td>
<td>$976,765</td>
<td>$9,945,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hwy 7 Cr 101 to Seven Hi La</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$30,730</td>
<td>$2,815,542</td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$10,055,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CR 73 - CR 5 to Minnetonka Mills Rd</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$237,797</td>
<td>$3,053,339</td>
<td>$849,274</td>
<td>$10,904,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CR 5 - Fairchild Ave to Woodlawn Ave</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$182,057</td>
<td>$3,235,396</td>
<td>$650,205</td>
<td>$11,554,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CR 16 - CR 101 to Crosby Rd (partly in Wayzata)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$212,546</td>
<td>$3,447,942</td>
<td>$759,094</td>
<td>$12,314,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Delton Ave - Vine Hill Rd to Old Excelsior Blvd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$258,536</td>
<td>$3,706,479</td>
<td>$923,344</td>
<td>$13,237,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vine Hill Rd - Delton Ave to Covington Rd (Kingswood Ter)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$319,581</td>
<td>$4,026,060</td>
<td>$1,141,362</td>
<td>$14,378,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Essex Rd - Ridgedale Dr to Oakland Rd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$272,948</td>
<td>$4,298,608</td>
<td>$973,385</td>
<td>$15,352,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hwy 7 Underpass west of CR 101*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$10,786</td>
<td>$4,309,394</td>
<td>$38,521</td>
<td>$15,390,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Minnetonka Mills Rd - CR 61 to CR 73</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$207,138</td>
<td>$4,516,532</td>
<td>$739,778</td>
<td>$16,130,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TH 7 - Cattle Pass to CR 101 on north side</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$148,086</td>
<td>$4,664,618</td>
<td>$528,880</td>
<td>$16,659,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hillside La - CR 73 to Tanglen School</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$50,426</td>
<td>$4,715,044</td>
<td>$180,092</td>
<td>$16,839,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Meadow Park to Ridgedale</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$131,250</td>
<td>$4,846,294</td>
<td>$468,749</td>
<td>$17,308,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Old Excelsior Blvd - Vine Hill Rd to CR 101 N side of Hwy 7)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$301,706</td>
<td>$5,148,000</td>
<td>$1,077,522</td>
<td>$18,385,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Williston Rd - CR 5 to Hwy 7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$355,149</td>
<td>$5,503,148</td>
<td>$1,268,388</td>
<td>$19,654,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wayzata Blvd N - Hampton Inn to Shelard Pkwy</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$111,517</td>
<td>$5,614,665</td>
<td>$398,275</td>
<td>$20,052,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ridgedale Connections</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$406,003</td>
<td>$6,020,669</td>
<td>$1,450,011</td>
<td>$21,502,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CR 16 - Crosby Rd to existing trail on west side of I-494</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$476,151</td>
<td>$6,496,820</td>
<td>$1,700,541</td>
<td>$23,202,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rowland Rd/Bren Rd - Lone Lake Park to Opus trail system</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$405,570</td>
<td>$6,902,390</td>
<td>$1,484,465</td>
<td>$24,651,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rowland Rd - CR 60 to SWLRT Trail</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$53,336</td>
<td>$6,955,727</td>
<td>$190,487</td>
<td>$24,841,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Porter/Delton Ave - Hutchins Dr to Cr 101</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$91,726</td>
<td>$7,047,452</td>
<td>$327,592</td>
<td>$25,169,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tonkawood Road - CR 5 to Hwy 7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$543,556</td>
<td>$7,591,008</td>
<td>$1,941,271</td>
<td>$27,110,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Woodland Rd - Townline Rd to Hwy 7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$751,559</td>
<td>$8,342,567</td>
<td>$2,684,139</td>
<td>$29,794,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Orchard Rd/Westmark Dr - Minnetonka Dr</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$469,712</td>
<td>$8,812,280</td>
<td>$1,677,544</td>
<td>$31,472,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pioneer Rd - Carlton Rd to CR 61</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$224,597</td>
<td>$9,036,877</td>
<td>$802,133</td>
<td>$32,274,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>CR 61 - CR 5 to Hwy 7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$391,492</td>
<td>$9,428,369</td>
<td>$1,398,187</td>
<td>$33,672,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Minnetonka Blvd - CR 101 west to Deephaven city limits</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$70,678</td>
<td>$9,499,047</td>
<td>$252,421</td>
<td>$33,925,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sunset Dr and Marion Lane West segments</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$104,987</td>
<td>$9,604,033</td>
<td>$374,952</td>
<td>$34,300,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Minnehaha Creek Trail - Headwaters to Jidana Park</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$321,244</td>
<td>$9,925,277</td>
<td>$1,147,299</td>
<td>$35,447,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>McGinty Rd E - CR 5 to Surry La</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$184,973</td>
<td>$10,110,250</td>
<td>$660,618</td>
<td>$36,108,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Wayzata Blvd - Claredon Dr to Wayzata city limits</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$90,755</td>
<td>$10,201,005</td>
<td>$324,124</td>
<td>$36,432,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Stone Rd - Saddlebrooke Cir to Sheffied Cur</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$47,113</td>
<td>$10,248,118</td>
<td>$168,262</td>
<td>$36,600,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Serving Locations</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td>Replacement Cost</td>
<td>O&amp;M Cost</td>
<td>Yearly Interest Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Orchard Rd/Huntingdon Dr - CR 60 to CR 61</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$241,729</td>
<td>$10,489,847</td>
<td>$863,320</td>
<td>$37,463,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>North Lone Lake Park - along RR tracks to Dominick Rd</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$120,315</td>
<td>$10,610,162</td>
<td>$429,696</td>
<td>$37,893,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Knollway Park to Wayzata Blvd/Horn Dr</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$69,556</td>
<td>$10,679,718</td>
<td>$248,414</td>
<td>$38,141,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Knollway Park to CR 61</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$113,894</td>
<td>$10,793,612</td>
<td>$406,764</td>
<td>$38,548,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>NTC - Meeting St to existing trail on west side of I-494</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$41,559</td>
<td>$10,835,171</td>
<td>$148,424</td>
<td>$38,697,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Clear Spring Rd - connect to Hwy 7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$79,212</td>
<td>$10,914,383</td>
<td>$282,899</td>
<td>$38,979,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Lake St Ext - CR 60 to CR 61</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$346,650</td>
<td>$11,708,377</td>
<td>$1,238,037</td>
<td>$41,815,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Victoria Evergreen to Mahoney Ave into Purgatory Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$91,944</td>
<td>$11,006,327</td>
<td>$328,371</td>
<td>$39,308,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lake St Ext - CR 60 to CR 61</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$346,650</td>
<td>$11,708,377</td>
<td>$1,238,037</td>
<td>$41,815,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Stone Rd/Meeting St - RR tracks to Linner Rd</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$220,907</td>
<td>$11,929,284</td>
<td>$788,952</td>
<td>$42,604,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Orchard Rd - Wyola Rd to Cr 60</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$53,870</td>
<td>$11,983,154</td>
<td>$192,393</td>
<td>$42,796,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>CR 3 - Pioneer to Nelson/CR 61 - 5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$346,552</td>
<td>$12,329,706</td>
<td>$1,237,686</td>
<td>$44,034,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Lake St Ext - Williston Rd to Spring Lake Rd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$257,505</td>
<td>$12,587,212</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td>$44,954,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Covington Park east side connection to CR 101</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$72,933</td>
<td>$12,660,144</td>
<td>$260,473</td>
<td>$45,214,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>NTC - Maywood La from I-494 crossing to CR 3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$61,266</td>
<td>$12,721,410</td>
<td>$218,807</td>
<td>$45,433,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Covington Rd - Vine Hill Rd to Mahoney Ave</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$331,028</td>
<td>$13,052,438</td>
<td>$1,182,242</td>
<td>$46,615,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Hilloway Park to YMCA La</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$174,453</td>
<td>$13,226,891</td>
<td>$623,046</td>
<td>$47,238,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>East side of I-494 - CR 5 to Wentworth Tr</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$145,648</td>
<td>$13,372,538</td>
<td>$520,170</td>
<td>$47,759,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Ford Rd - All</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$432,664</td>
<td>$13,805,203</td>
<td>$1,545,230</td>
<td>$49,304,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Woodland Rd to Williston Rd - Through Woodgate Park</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$262,540</td>
<td>$14,067,743</td>
<td>$937,644</td>
<td>$50,241,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Westmill Rd - Spring Hill Park to Clear Spring Rd</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$94,519</td>
<td>$14,162,262</td>
<td>$337,569</td>
<td>$50,579,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Oberlin along Park Ave to Ridgemount Ave</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$78,201</td>
<td>$14,240,463</td>
<td>$279,289</td>
<td>$50,858,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Holiday Rd/Seymour Rd - Woodland Rd to Spring Hill Park</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$258,987</td>
<td>$14,499,450</td>
<td>$924,952</td>
<td>$51,783,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Highwood Dr - Williston Rd to Tonkawood Rd</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$289,021</td>
<td>$14,788,470</td>
<td>$1,032,216</td>
<td>$52,815,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Cedar Lake Rd - Big Willow to CR 73</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$221,310</td>
<td>$15,009,781</td>
<td>$790,394</td>
<td>$53,606,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Jane La - Baker Rd to County Trail (Dominick Dr)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$231,280</td>
<td>$15,241,061</td>
<td>$826,000</td>
<td>$54,432,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>South St - Mayview Rd to CR 60</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$77,268</td>
<td>$15,318,329</td>
<td>$275,958</td>
<td>$54,708,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Oak Ridge Rd - CR 5 to Hopkins city limits</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$155,257</td>
<td>$15,473,586</td>
<td>$554,488</td>
<td>$55,262,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Kinsel Rd/Mayview Rd - CR 3 to Glen Moor Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$147,432</td>
<td>$15,621,018</td>
<td>$526,544</td>
<td>$55,789,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Ford Park to Lindbergh Dr</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$139,418</td>
<td>$15,760,436</td>
<td>$497,923</td>
<td>$56,287,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Jidana La - CR 5 to Jidana Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$79,825</td>
<td>$15,840,261</td>
<td>$285,089</td>
<td>$56,572,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Stodola Rd - Purgatory Park to Scenic Heights Dr</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$83,593</td>
<td>$15,923,855</td>
<td>$298,548</td>
<td>$56,870,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Highland Rd - Excelsior Blvd to Hwy 7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$555,069</td>
<td>$16,478,923</td>
<td>$1,982,388</td>
<td>$58,853,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Spaces
Project Title: Trail Rehabilitation
Total Estimated Cost: $425,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 4764.6560.S18204

Description:
Rebuilding and resurfacing existing Minnetonka Trail System and neighborhood trail connections. Replace and expand trail signage and maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
There is strong community support for the Minnetonka Trail System as evidenced by the heavy use of the completed trail segments. Some of the trail sections are approaching 20 years old and have reached a condition beyond what regular maintenance can address.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This project is to replace and rebuild existing trail segments. A rating system will be used to determine which segments will be addressed each year. Signage on the trail system will be continually updated and revised maps will be produced.

2018: CR 62-Baker Rd to Glen Lake Golf entrance; Minnetonka Blvd-Plymouth Rd to Big Willow Park.
2019: Ridgedale Area Sidewalks, Opus area trails
2020: Stone Road – Wellington to Oakland Rd, Opus area trails
2021: Fence rehabilitation along CR 62, Overlay 494 trail from Stone Road to Oakland Rd
2022: Cedar Lake Rd – Plymouth Rd to CR 73; North Frontage Rd – CR 73 to Hampton Inn.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This is an integral part of the plan to maintain the Trail System for walkers, joggers and bicyclists. The trails and walkways connect five community parks, adjacent communities and allow users to travel throughout the city on trails separated from motorized vehicles.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Maintenance costs have already been taken into consideration for existing trails.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails and Open Space  
**Project Title:** Trail Connections - Miscellaneous  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $50,000  
**Funding Priority:** 3  
**Account Number:** NA  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**  
Funding is allocated annually as a resource for responding to unanticipated opportunities and challenges that arise throughout the year in the development of the city’s trail system.

**Justification:**  
It is common for unanticipated opportunities to occasionally arise for the development of new trails or “missing links” when commercial or residential redevelopments are proposed. Additionally, residents or neighborhoods sometimes petition the city to add a safe connection to the Minnetonka Trail System or other community amenities. This item will provide the resources for a timely response to each situation and to accommodate unforeseen challenges in the construction of trails scheduled under the adopted improvement plan.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**  
Individual projects are scheduled in response to unanticipated opportunities and challenges that arise throughout a given year related to improvement of the city’s trail system.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**  
Decisions regarding the use of this funding will be based upon a set of criteria developed by staff during 2011. The criteria includes the level of participation by other parties such as the donation of rights-of-way by private commercial or residential property owners, as well support from other government entities and acceptable design standards for construction.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**  
Maintenance of additional trails increases operating costs by approximately $1,500 per mile.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space

**Project Title:** Mountain Biking Trails

**Total Estimated Cost:** $130,000

**Funding Priority:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
In December of 2016, the Park Board received a request from residents interested in adding mountain biking trails to the park system. A presentation was presented by Minnetonka High School VANTAGE program students who took on the project of researching and proposing trails in the city as part of their business curriculum.

Following the student’s presentation, the Park Board directed staff to complete a feasibility study that, when completed, will recommend trail routes, maintenance plans, use assessments, and design/construction costs. Completion of the feasibility study is anticipated for June of 2017. Requests for the addition of mountain biking were a common occurrence throughout the Imagine Minnetonka process recently completed by the city.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

- **2016:** Feasibility study outline completed and a consultant hired to begin developing recommended trail routes in Civic Center Park, Big Willow Park and the trail corridor adjacent to the existing trail that parallels the west side of 494 from Stone Road to 394
- **2017:** Completion of feasibility study by a team consisting of city staff, a contracted trail consultant and students in the Minnetonka High School VANTAGE program.
- **2018:** Trail construction completed by fall of 2018.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
These improvements are in keeping with the Park Board’s goals and specific objective to “renew, expand and maintain a trail system to encourage outdoor recreation”.

The three areas currently proposed for the addition of mountain biking would be connected by the existing regional trail from Big Willow Park to Civic Center Park.

The trail consultant will work closely with the Natural Resources Division to better understand and reduce possible impacts on the natural areas of the city’s park system.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Common practices currently in place in other cities involve a partnership with the non-profit organization Minnesota Off-Road Cyclists (MORC) to provide volunteer supervision and general maintenance of the trails. Completion of the feasibility study will help to define the required city funding to maintain the trail system, however that amount is not expected to exceed $10,000 annually.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space
Project Title: Purgatory Park Improvements
Total Estimated Cost: $250,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: NA

Recommended and Scheduled for Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The Park Board and City Council toured 17301 Excelsior Boulevard, a single family residence with a barn in 2012. The property was then acquired for Open Space and Park purposes in 2013. A structural review of the barn has been completed and renovation scenarios for a variety of recreational uses were discussed during the 2014 joint City Council and Park Board meeting. Those discussions will help formulate a public input process to be conducted in 2017. In addition to the open space value, early ideas for the site are passive uses, such as picnics and outdoor programmed recreational space.

Scheduling and Project Status:
In 2015 funding was set aside to correct structural deficiencies in the barn and secure the location. The parcel will be used primarily as open space until 2018 when funds to renovate the structures are allocated.

Description:
In January of 2013 staff completed the purchase of the Penaz property adjacent to Purgatory Park. This project includes the rehabilitation and incorporation of the barn as a park amenity for the 158 acre Community Preserve.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These improvements are in keeping with efforts to provide and maintain quality recreational amenities and to respond to needs not previously identified. This 1.23 acre highly visible property is adjacent to and would function as part of Purgatory Park, a 158 acre Community Preserve. Staff has presented options to the City Council, which include selling surplus property adjacent to the park to further fund these improvements.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Annual operating costs will be known when a final programming concept is approved. During the interim the parcel will be maintained as part of Purgatory Park.
**Description:**
This project proposes to enhance the use of the Big Willow Baseball Field from essentially a four month use for baseball, to a year around use. This would be accomplished by adding artificial turf which would allow for use by youth soccer in the fall and recreational skating on a refrigerated ice sheet during the winter months. Improved spectator seating would be constructed; as well as spaces for concessions, skate rental and a warming house/community room.

![Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Grants – Unfunded</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
The existing regulation baseball field at Big Willow Park has served as the premier community baseball field in the area since the 1980’s. Maintaining this field at a high level requires that the field be “rested” annually from September – April. Adding artificial turf would allow for extended fall use to meet the needs of youth soccer, a need identified in the 2012 Athletic Field Needs Study Update and better position the city for future programming needs. In addition, the new surface creates the ability to maintain refrigerated ice from late fall to early March.

The city contracted with a consultant to complete a feasibility study in 2017 and will focus on three components:
- Artificial turf on regulation baseball field
- Grandstand to house seating for baseball & skating, warming house/community room space, and refrigeration system
- Outdoor refrigerated ice rink on baseball field

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

2016-17: Feasibility study
2017: Apply for 2018 Hennepin County Youth Sports (HCYS) Grant for turf installation
2018: Replace current playing surface with new drainage system, ice rink sub-floor and artificial turf. Apply for 2019 HCYS grant for refrigeration plant.

2019: Construct public areas including bleachers, concessions and warming house/community room space; and purchase ice rink dasher boards, refrigeration equipment and resurfacing equipment.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
The ability to extend the use of the field for fall soccer and potentially April baseball helps to address needs indicated in the 2012 Athletic Field Needs Study.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Cost savings for maintaining the surface, including mowing, dragging, and striping the baseball field would save an estimated $6,000 annually. In addition field rentals for extended baseball and soccer use would generate an estimated $3,000 annually.

The annual operating budget would be increased an estimated $20,000 annually for maintenance and supervision of the ice skating rink, with revenues of $5,000-7,000 anticipated to offset the maintenance costs.

The installation of a refrigerated ice surface would coincide with an overall park system plan developed by the park board for outdoor ice maintenance.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space  
Project Title: Ridgedale Area Park Improvements  
Total Estimated Cost: $500,000  
Funding Priority: 3  
Account Number: NA

Source of Project Funding | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
Park and Trail Improvement Fund  
– Area 1 Funded/Unscheduled  
– Area 2 Funded/Scheduled | $250,000 | $250,000 | | | |

Justification:
The Ridgedale area is a major commercial and economic center in Minnetonka. The city’s comprehensive plan anticipates significant private development to occur in the Ridgedale area. In anticipation of development, the city completed a village center study for the Ridgedale area in 2012.

The elements of the vision plan include transforming the retail center into a mixed use community and enhancing the district’s natural features. Developing a park area on the south side of the mall would be a community gathering space which would be surrounded by an expansion to the mall and high density housing on the south side of Ridgedale Drive. Additional improvements are identified on the properties on the east side of Ridgedale Drive to enhance the natural area and open space surrounding Crane Lake.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Currently, the land on the south side of the mall is privately owned (area 1) and the city owns the existing open space property on the southeast corner of Ridgedale Drive and Wayzata Blvd (area 2). An off-leash dog area, previously approved adjacent to Crane Lake, would be reconsidered as part of an overall review of park amenities in the area. Park improvements are anticipated to be constructed in conjunction with the improvements to Ridgedale Drive and the mall property, including pedestrian and bike amenities as appropriate.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The project is consistent with the city’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan and the Ridgedale Village Center study and will be coordinated with the 2019 improvements to Ridgedale Drive and upon successful negotiations with private property owners.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Annual operating costs will be known when a final programming concept is approved.

Description:
In October 2012, the city completed the Ridgedale Village Center study. The study identified two park improvements: improvements to Crane Lake open space, and a new park, public square, and green space on the south side of the mall.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space

**Project Title:** Opus Area Park Investments

**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,000,000

**Funding Priority:** 3

**Account Number:** NA

---

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification:**

The Opus area is expected to undergo a transformation in upcoming and future years and the potential for light rail transit will compound that impact. This project begins the framework for investments to provide recreational and park uses for new business and residential uses anticipated in the area.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

Currently, staff is studying available land use concepts that would provide for a green corridor and logical park use in the Opus area.

**Description:**

The Opus business center is the largest employment center in Minnetonka. With the addition of proposed light rail the area will see increased opportunities for a mixture of further business and housing, necessitating the need for additional park and greenspaces.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

The project is consistent with the development of a park allowing for better access to a Neighborhood Park Service Area that is currently deficient of park and recreational uses. The creation of a gathering place for park use will also compliment the vast trail network currently in place.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Annual operating costs will be known when a final programming concept is approved.

---

**Legend**

- Preserves of State Site
- Parks, Trails, & Highways
- Metropolitan Council
- Metropolitan Council 15-Incl.
- Metropolitan Council 30-Incl.
- Metropolitan Council 45-Incl.

**Access to Parks and Water Bodies Outside the Opus Site**

- City of Minnetonka

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

In 2015 the Park Board received a petition to construct a park on a city owned vacant lot at the end of a cul-de-sac on Royzelle Lane. The Park Board held two neighborhood meetings and requested staff prepare a feasibility study. On March 2, 2016 the board voted to recommend the plan be approved by the city council and be included in the 2017-2021 CIP as funding allows.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

The Park Board recommended the mini-park improvements as funding allows. The park would include two play structures, swings, seating areas, site amenities and landscaping improvements. The council has not yet reviewed the project for consideration.

**Description:**

Construction of a mini-park on Royzelle Lane in the Robinwood Neighborhood.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

This neighborhood is currently deficient of park access. The development of a park allows for better access in Neighborhood Park Service Area #13.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Capital funding is only for infrastructure investment and operating costs would increase to maintain the parcel from an out-lot to a mini-park when it is developed.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space

Project Title: Bennett Family Park Improvements

Total Estimated Cost: $147,000

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number: NA

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Privately owned and operated Bennett Family Park provides softball, baseball and Miracle Field programs to residents of Minnetonka throughout the spring, summer and fall. This service is similar to other local organizations which provide programs on city owned property, such as Big Willow Baseball, Glen Lake Mighty Mites and GAL softball.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Bennett Family Park approached the city and requested financial assistance for various improvements in 2016. The park board recommended the project for council consideration as part of the 2018-2022 CIP review. Upon council review and approval, a cooperative agreement would be developed including a five-year plan, with one-year terms to be approved annually by the City Council, beginning in 2018 and ending in 2022.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
A similar agreement with Bennett Family Park was developed for capital improvements from 1995-2000. Bennett Family Park has identified over $260,000 worth of upgrades, of which $147,000 is being requested from the city. The identified projects requested for city funding are identical to the infrastructure amenities that the city has maintenance responsibility for at fields owned by the city that have primary use by one athletic organization.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Capital funding is only for infrastructure investment and should not affect (although possibly lowering) the operating costs which are funded by Bennett Family Park.

Description:
Improvements for Bennett Family Park are part of a five-year plan to provide capital funding for infrastructure improvements to the park starting in 2018.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment

**Project Title:** Dump/Plow Truck Replacements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,710,700

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** 4101.6540.S18306

**Description:**
These purchases anticipate the scheduled 15-year replacement of 21 dump trucks in the city’s fleet. Replacement costs include the chassis, dump body, hydraulics and snow equipment (plow, wing and sander). Dump boxes are refurbished after eight years at a cost of $5,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$266,300</td>
<td>$548,600</td>
<td>$300,100</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
<td>$303,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
These vehicles are used primarily for hauling and snow plowing and are included in the CIP due to their high individual and aggregate costs which are depreciable.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
The vehicles are purchased through the State Cooperative Purchasing Venture. Trucks are ordered the previous year for delivery in the funding year. Pricing has continued to rise due to the cost of EPA compliant engines and increased cost of components.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
These replacements are consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Replacements can reduce repair costs by up to $6,350 for the five years following purchase.
Project Category: Major Equipment

Project Title: Fleet Vehicles

Total Estimated Cost: $4,326,800

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4101.6540.S18310
5110.6540.S18310

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$604,600</td>
<td>$459,500</td>
<td>$690,800</td>
<td>$1,056,800</td>
<td>$875,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>153,200</td>
<td>115,600</td>
<td>103,700</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>57,400</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
These vehicles are used by staff for the delivery of city services and are included in the CIP due to their individual and aggregate costs which are depreciable.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The vehicles are purchased early in the year utilizing the State and County Cooperative Purchasing contracts when available.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These purchases are consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide. All replacements are evaluated for eligibility for replacement with energy efficient vehicles. City staff conducts ongoing analysis of vehicle use in order to eliminate underutilized equipment and provide appropriate vehicles for the intended use. Two additional cars have been added to the fleet in 2017 due to the addition of police and community development staff.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Scheduled replacements can reduce repair costs by up to $400 per year for the first three years following purchase.

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled replacement of departmental cars, pickups, light trucks & equipment, mowers and support equipment such as trailers, generators, rollers and turf care equipment.
**Description:**

This item provides for the scheduled replacement of three sidewalk/trail maintenance vehicles.

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

These units are primarily snow removal machines used on sidewalks and trails.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

Machines would be ordered in the summer of the funding year.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

Replacement is consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Replacement can reduce repair costs by up to $3,800 each year for the first three years.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Street Sweeper
Total Estimated Cost: $205,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 5600.XXXX.S18319

Source of Project Funding | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Storm Water Fund | $205,000 | | | | |

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled replacement of one of the city’s three street sweepers.

Justification:
These machines are used to clean city streets during the period of March through October. These tasks are an important element of the city’s MS4 storm water management plan.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Sweepers would be purchased in January of the funding year for delivery prior to the spring cleanup. These machines are purchased utilizing the State Cooperative Purchasing contract.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The purchase is consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Replacement can save up to $6,600 in repair expense following the first year of purchase.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Excavators
Total Estimated Cost: $290,000
Funding Priority: 2

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the two excavators used to dig storm water drainage maintenance projects and emergency watermain repairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
These machines are used for year round digging purposes throughout the city.

Scheduling and Project Status:
These machines would be purchased in the spring of the funding year by utilizing the State Cooperative Purchasing Venture.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This purchase is consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Replacement could save an estimated $10,500 per year for the first five years following purchase.

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the two excavators used to dig storm water drainage maintenance projects and emergency watermain repairs.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment  
**Project Title:** Aerial Bucket Trucks  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $317,600  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:**

**Description:**  
This item provides for the scheduled replacement of the two aerial bucket trucks in the city’s fleet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$167,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**  
These vehicles are used for tree trimming, street light maintenance and civil defense siren repairs.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**  
Trucks would be ordered in the spring of the funding year for delivery that year. One of the trucks has been delayed from 2016 due to its condition which required a new motor be installed.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**  
These replacements are consistent with the Vehicle Replacement Guide.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**  
Replacement could reduce annual repair costs by $4,400 per year for each of the first three years.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Electric Ice Resurfacer
Total Estimated Cost: $144,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$144,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The current machine life expectancy is ten years. The battery system and wear items on the mechanical portion of the machine determine life expectancy.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The purchase has been moved back to 2021. A 10-year replacement for propane models had been anticipated, however staff has found that the electric model is lasting longer and now anticipates a 15-year life for the model purchased in 2006. Amount above assumes cost after trade-in.

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of one of the ice resurfacers used at the ice arenas.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This replacement is consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Replacement could save approximately $1,000 annually for three years after replacement.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Skidsteer Loader
Total Estimated Cost: $78,800
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S18320

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the four city’s skid loaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$78,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
These machines are replaced on a 15-year basis and are used for snow removal, landscaping and small loading projects in the city.

Scheduling and Project Status:
These machines would be replaced in the spring of the funding year utilizing a Minnesota Cooperative Purchasing Venture contract.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This replacement is consistent with the Vehicle Replacement Guide.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
The city could save approximately $4,400 annually for the first two years following replacement.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment

**Project Title:** Sewer Jetter

**Total Estimated Cost:** $169,300

**Funding Priority:**

**Account Number:**

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$169,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description:

This item provides for the replacement of the high-pressure jet machine and truck chassis that is utilized to hydraulically clean 100-miles of underground sewer pipe annually.

### Justification:

This machine is routinely used to clean sewer lines in order to assure their operational reliability. The machine is included in the CIP due to its costs and because it is depreciated.

### Scheduling and Project Status:

This machine would be ordered in late 2017 for delivery in 2018. The machine would be purchased using the State Cooperative Purchasing program.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

This replacement is consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

This replacement could save approximately $3,600 annually for the first three years after purchase.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Vacuum Utility Truck
Total Estimated Cost: $587,200
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the truck-mounted vacuum machines that are used for sanitary sewer cleaning, watermain break excavation dewatering and storm sewer cleaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$282,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$305,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This machine is used on a year-round basis for sewer cleaning and watermain pipe repairs.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This machine would be ordered in the fall of 2017 for delivery in 2018. The machine would be replaced using the State Cooperative Purchasing Venture.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This replacement is consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This could reduce repair costs by $3,200 for each of the first two years after purchase.

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the truck-mounted vacuum machines that are used for sanitary sewer cleaning, watermain break excavation dewatering and storm sewer cleaning.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Street Flusher Truck
Total Estimated Cost: $183,600
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$183,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the city's street flusher, which is used for street sweeping, roadway cleaning, skating rink flooding and tree and sod watering in the warmer months.

Justification:
This vehicle was purchased in 2005 and will be eligible for replacement in 2020. This machine is included in the CIP due to its cost and because it is depreciated.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This vehicle would be ordered in late 2019 for delivery in 2020 utilizing the State Cooperative Purchasing Venture.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This replacement is consistent with the Vehicle Replacement Guide.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This replacement could reduce annual maintenance and repair costs by $5,200 each year for the three years after purchase.
Project Category: Major Equipment

Project Title: Fuel Pump and Leak Detection Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: $50,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: NA

Description:
This item anticipates the replacement of the cabinets, pumps and leak detection equipment which are components of the city's fleet fueling system.

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This fuel pumps and leak detection equipment were installed in 2003 and will need updating in 2020.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This equipment will be replaced during the funding year and must be linked to the fleet services computer software and leak detection equipment.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the city’s policy of maintaining its infrastructure.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will not affect operating costs.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Snow Blower
Total Estimated Cost: $140,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
These machines are used to clear streets, sidewalks and intersections during heavy snowfalls.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This item was originally scheduled for replacement in 2015 but was delayed until 2020 in order for funds to be used for the office expansion of the public works facility.

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled replacement of the city’s two loader-carried snow blowers.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These replacements are consistent with the Vehicle Replacement Guide.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Replacement could reduce maintenance costs by $1,000 for each of the first two years.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Asphalt Paver
Total Estimated Cost: $172,400
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: N/A

Description:
This item is used to install trail rock and asphalt mix used for bituminous thin-overlays and various pavement repairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$172,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This machine was purchased used in 2011. It is included in the CIP due to its replacement cost which is depreciable.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The replacement would be purchased through the State’s Cooperative Purchasing Program. The paver would be ordered in late 2020 for delivery in 2021.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
Replacement is consistent with the city’s Vehicle Replacement Guide.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Replacement could reduce repair costs by $3,700 each year for the three years after purchase.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Pumper Truck Replacement
Total Estimated Cost: $1,175,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The purchase in 2018 and 2021 will replace the primary duty crew engine. The duty crew engine is used significantly more than the engines assigned to satellite stations.

This program is scheduled to replace the duty crew engine every 4 years for the next 20 years, by refurbishing the duty crew engines and placing it at a satellite station for the remainder of its expected 20-year life span. This program scheduling allows the fleet to remain highly reliable by rotating apparatus and utilizing a refurbishment program once the apparatus is used as a duty crew engine, giving balance to the fleet and extending the life of the apparatus by at least 7 years.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Fire truck construction typically requires nine to twelve months. Each unit should be ordered as early as possible in the year scheduled.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The city completed a long term strategic plan for public safety in 2010 that addressed the total equipment needs of the Fire Department. These apparatus contribute to the city’s overall ability to provide fire protection and are necessary to maintain the city’s ISO rating. Also, by keeping up to date on replacement and refurbishment of front line emergency vehicles on a regular schedule, the fleet will be replenished on an on-going basis instead of needing to replace several expensive apparatus simultaneously.

This program will allow for apparatus to be consistent and for firefighters to be well trained on the operation of the vehicle before it is assigned for use at a satellite station.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Operating costs will remain consistent; however, during the first several years of service, maintenance costs should be reduced.

Description:
This project provides for the scheduled replacement of the city’s fire pumper trucks (also known as fire engines). These trucks carry water, hoses, equipment, a high capacity pump and personnel. Maintaining a highly reliable fleet is critical for emergency mitigation.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Apparatus Refurbishment
Total Estimated Cost: $350,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This program is intended to extend the life of fire department pumpers and ladder trucks while lowering ongoing maintenance costs and ensuring these vehicles are highly reliable as critical emergency response vehicles.

Duty crew engines respond on exponentially more calls than engines at the satellite stations. This program will refurbish the duty crew engines and allow us to replace older engines at the satellite stations. Two pumpers due for refurbishments have served as duty crew engines, the refurbishment thereby providing at least another 10 years of use out of each.

The goal of ladder truck refurbishment is to provide for the city 30 years of service out of a ladder truck. Since reducing the city's fleet of ladder trucks from five to three, it is paramount that we maintain ladder trucks to the highest level of reliability as possible, while also controlling maintenance costs and down time.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2019: Engine 1 (2008 Pierce) Refurbishment
2021: Engine 8 (2013 Pierce) Refurbishment
2022: Ladder 4 (2008 Sutphen) Refurbishment

Relationship to the General Plan and Other Projects:
The city completed a long term strategic plan for public safety in 2010 that addressed the total equipment needs of the Fire Department. These apparatus contribute to the city's overall ability to provide fire protection and are necessary to maintain the city's ISO rating. Also, by keeping up to date on replacement and refurbishment of front line emergency vehicles on a regular schedule, the fleet will be replenished on an on-going basis instead of needing to replace several expensive apparatus simultaneously.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Operating costs will remain consistent; however, during the first several years of service, maintenance costs should be reduced.

Description:
This project provides for the ongoing refurbishment of the city's pumper and ladder trucks, extending the operational service life for the apparatus.
Project Category: Major Equipment

Project Title: Air 2 Refurbishment

Total Estimated Cost: $200,000

Funding Priority: 1

Account Number: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This truck is a vital tool for refilling expended air tanks that firefighters use in atmospheres that are Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health. Taking a unique approach, the city uses a mobile air supply truck to bring the air to the scenes, station or training grounds instead of having an air compressor and supply at each station.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This truck is currently in service and will have been for ten years at the time of the scheduled refurbishment. The goal is to get a total of twenty years out of the box and many of the components of the truck.

Description:
This is the city’s only air truck and provides a mobile means of bringing breathing air to scenes, stations and training to replenish self-contained breathing apparatus tanks.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The city has completed a long term strategic plan for public safety in 2010 that addressed the total equipment needs of the Fire Department.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
These projects help maintain low operating cost by performing extensive maintenance and refurbishment at planned intervals.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Turnout Gear
Total Estimated Cost: $200,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Firefighting turnout gear is basic equipment (coat and pants) worn by firefighters while performing firefighting and rescue duties to protect them from the environments in which they are operating in. The city follows National Fire Protection Association standard 1851 that states the turnout gear shall not be in service any more than ten years.

Scheduling and Project Status:
It is the practice of the city to move a set of turnout gear to reserve status as a backup after 5 years of use. This allows a firefighter zero out of service time due to contaminated and gear that needs repaired. This follows the established schedule.

Description:
This project updates the firefighting turnout gear worn by firefighters to protect them from thermal insult and other environmental hazards while firefighting fires and performing rescues.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the policy of maintaining safe and effective equipment to be used by the firefighting staff.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
There is an annual cost for gear inspection by a certified vendor, period repair and ongoing cleaning and care.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Rescue Truck Program
Total Estimated Cost: $225,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: NA

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The fire department is responsible for not only responding to fire emergencies, but rescue emergencies as well. These calls require that specialized equipment be strategically placed within the city. This will allow us to consolidate equipment into two trucks and better reflects the deployment model used with duty crew staffing.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Staff has developed a long term rescue plan that will address critical emergencies such as vehicle entrapment, water rescue and serious medical emergencies. The first rescue truck was purchased in 2017.

Description:
This program replaces the replacement of a ladder truck which would cost an estimated $1,150,000 in 2020. These trucks would carry rescue and firefighting equipment currently spread out among various apparatus.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The original plan called for purchasing a ladder truck in 2020 at more than double the cost of this program. Between the city’s equipment deployment plan and partnerships with neighboring communities, the necessity to maintain a ladder truck at each fire station has changed allowing staff to take a critical look at that plan. Staff has determined that utilizing lighter duty trucks paired with other heavy apparatus is efficient and will be highly effective for our most common emergency calls for service.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
The rescue trucks will significantly lower maintenance and fuel costs and will also save wear on other heavier duty vehicles.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment

**Project Title:** Fire Hose Replacement

**Total Estimated Cost:** $150,000

**Funding Priority:** 1

**Account Number:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**

This will replace the city’s aging hose stock with a more durable and highly efficient in terms of weight, friction loss and kinking.

**Justification:**

The city currently maintains approximately 36,000 linear feet of hose which is projected to decrease due to the elimination of 2 aerial apparatus and 2 pumper trucks. Staff projects the cost per linear foot to increase as a result of purchasing hose that meets the needs of the fire department as a result of extensive flow testing and industry best practices including lighter weight large diameter hose and fire attack hose that resists kinking and reduces friction loss.

The city is required to hydrostatically pressure test hose annually and remove from service if it fails.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

This project will replace hose that is over 10 years old which is industry best practice.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

The Fire Department maintains a rigorous annual testing procedure that is intended to remove failed hose lengths from service and is consistent with our strategic plan to maintain our equipment to be highly reliable.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Without changing out the full complement of hose on a scheduled basis, the city can expect to have to begin to replace hose from the operation budget on a regular basis. Once replaced, there will be little expense to replace hose unless it fails a test or is destroyed at an incident.
Project Category: Major Equipment

Project Title: Support and Command Vehicle

Total Estimated Cost: $170,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This vehicle will serve multiple purposes for the city command support, mobile communications and customer stabilization. While this vehicle is smaller and less expensive than most command vehicles, it will provide the city with an area for incident command during emergencies, customer support for fire victims and a vehicle capable of delivering field communications support.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This vehicle will take approximately six months from the time the order is placed until it may be placed in service. Several pieces of communication equipment that would be used in this vehicle already exists within the cache. The cost reflects customization of the interior to accommodate its multiple purposes.

Description:
This vehicle will serve several purposes on emergency scenes as well as assisting with normal operation of the Fire Department. This vehicle will help provide a mobile command post, communication support, customer support and aid in fire investigations.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
In 2014 the fire department completed a comprehensive review of its fleet and determined that the department requires fewer pumpers and ladders trucks and needs a few additional support vehicles. This shift in allocation provides the department with the type of support necessary for emergency scenes while also lowering the cost liability of the entire fleet.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This vehicle will need routine maintenance and upkeep consistent with most utility vehicles.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Ballistic Tactical Vests
Total Estimated Cost: $45,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: N/A

Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the police department’s Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team tactical ballistic vests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Members of the police department’s Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team require a higher “threat” level of ballistic vest than patrol officers, due to the nature of their assignment. The manufacturer warranties the performance specifications of the product for 5 years from the date of purchase. All SWAT personnel received a new ballistic tactical vest in 2013.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This project will be researched in 2017 for purchase and implementation in 2018. The overall cost for tactical vests has increased from when last purchased in 2013.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the policy of maintaining current technology.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
No annual costs associated with this item.
Project Category: Technology

Project Title: Thermal Imaging Cameras

Total Estimated Cost: $78,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
Thermal Imaging Camera’s (TICs) allow firefighters to see through smoke to search for fire victims, hidden fires and track accountability of fellow firefighters.

Justification:
A thermal imaging camera (TIC) is a type of thermographic camera used in firefighting. These cameras allow firefighters to see areas of heat through smoke, darkness, or heat-permeable barriers.

Thermal imaging cameras pick up body heat, and they are normally used in cases where people are trapped where rescuers cannot find them and it allows firefighters to locate fires through smoke and through some types of walls.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The current TIC’s are at the end of their life cycle and are becoming more difficult to repair as the manufacturer has announced they will no longer repair our current model.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the policy of maintaining current technology.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Replacing our current TIC’s with updated, ruggedized technology will greatly reduce repair costs.
Project Category: Technology
Project Title: Fire Technology Update
Total Estimated Cost: $50,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: N/A

Source of Project Funding | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Public Safety Fund | | $50,000 | | | 

**Justification:**

**Mobile Computers**

The mobile computers will be similar to unit’s already in place on several fire vehicles and will allow for the same capabilities of receiving dispatch information, routing, fire hydrant location and other essential information while responding.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

Technology improvements and changes necessitate these projects as soon as feasible.

**Description:**

This project updates the computers and other electronic tools used for computer aiding dispatching computers in front line vehicles and apparatus.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

This project is consistent with the policy of maintaining current technology.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Annual maintenance of these items will be less after initial purchase and then will require upkeep due to normal usage.
**Project Category:** Technology

**Project Title:** Body Cameras

**Total Estimated Cost:** $73,500

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** NA

---

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI Forfeiture Account</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification:**

The use of technology can improve policing practices and build community trust and legitimacy. A body camera program implemented correctly can improve evidence collection, strengthen officer performance and accountability, and enhance agency transparency. The 2016 legislative session identified mandates for agencies implementing body camera programs, however the law does not mandate the use of body cameras.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

Body camera and in-car video technology should be scheduled in the same year, allowing purchase preference to an integrated system. The project will be researched in 2018 for purchase and installation in 2019. Prior to purchase of body cameras, state law requires agencies to accept public comment before purchase and implementation.

**Description:**

This item would augment the current in-car video system to allow for the recording of audio and visual data in the field beyond what is currently captured on in-car video.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

This project is consistent with the city’s policy of expanding existing systems.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Storage management of video and answering data practices request under the Freedom of Information Act will require an increase in records staffing, which is anticipated at 1 FTE. This technology will also require additional IT department support. Storage of captured video is based on retention schedules. A stand-alone server with an estimated capacity of 37 terabytes would be required to maintain the video files at an estimated cost of $30,000. The replacement schedule for the server would be every five years.
**Project Category:** Technology

**Project Title:** Police In-car Video System

**Total Estimated Cost:** $126,000

**Funding Priority:** 1

**Account Number:** NA

---

**Description:**
This project involves the replacement of the in-car video cameras in the police department’s patrol fleet.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI Forfeiture Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification:**
The current in-car video camera system was purchased in 2015 with DWI Forfeiture and Police Operating funds. Since inception in 2010 the in-car cameras have greatly aided in criminal prosecution, resolving citizen complaints against officers and as a training tool for both new recruits and veteran officers. A total of 20 in-car cameras will be purchased.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
In-car video and body camera technology should be scheduled in the same year, allowing purchase preference to an integrated system. The project will be researched in 2018 for purchase and installation in 2019.

---

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
This project is consistent with the city’s policy of maintaining current technology.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
As a stand-alone system, the in-car video system will have little effect on the current operating budget. As an integrated system with body cameras, the costs will be absorbed with the additional costs of a body camera program.
**Project Category:** Technology  
**Project Title:** Microwave Radios  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $90,000  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** NA

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:

Police and Fire currently utilize the 800MHz Statewide Radio System by way of microwave radio technology. The current microwave radios installed in 2006 have been discontinued and currently have been classified by the vendor as "Maintenance Only" until 2020. New microwave technology is IP based, smaller and consumes half the power of the existing system.

### Scheduling and Project Status:

This project will be researched in 2017 for purchase and implementation in 2018.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

This project is consistent with the policy of maintaining current technology.

The next replacement/upgrade is anticipated to take place in 2033.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

This project does require a service agreement that already exists within the Police Department budget.
Project Category: Technology  
Project Title: 800 Mhz Radio Infrastructure  
Total Estimated Cost: $168,000  
Funding Priority: 2  
Account Number: 4150.XXXX.

Description:  
This item provides for the replacement of the radio system infrastructure located at various water towers as part of the conventional 800 Mhz radio system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This project calls for the replacement of radio system infrastructure located at various water towers to operate a conventional 800 Mhz radio system for Public Safety and Fire Department paging.

The current infrastructure provides voice paging service to the Fire Department and also serves as a backup channel in the event the Metropolitan Regional Radio system is not available.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The current system was installed in the mid to late 1990’s and has a support date through 2018. Though the equipment can operate after the support date, its life cycle has ended and needs to be replaced.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the policy of maintaining current technology.

The life cycle of this equipment going forward will be on a planned, ten-year replacement cycle.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project does require an annual service agreement that already exists within the public safety budget.
Project Category: Technology
Project Title: Audio/Visual Equipment Replacement
Total Estimated Cost: $368,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 2210.6530.S18302

Description:
This project consists of the systematic maintenance and upgrading of audio/visual equipment to ensure the quality of official city meeting cable costs and video productions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television Fund</td>
<td>$61,400</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td>$53,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This project calls for the systematic maintenance and upgrades of the audio/visual equipment and additional equipment as new technology develops.

A list of major equipment to be purchased or replaced appears below.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Acquisitions will occur on a planned annual basis.

2018: Presentation equipment replacement, Purgatory Creek room presentation system, televisions

2019: Minor equipment replacement, Lake Rose, Police Main Conference Room presentation system

2020: Televisions, digital video equipment, Minnetonka Mills and Public Works presentation system

2021: Digital storage system, projector replacements, Community Room equipment

2022: Conference room televisions, cable channel bulletin board, projector replacements

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the city’s policy of establishing schedules for equipment replacement.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
The replacement purchases will not affect operating costs, and will reduce maintenance costs on equipment that is experiencing mechanical failure due to age.
Project Category: Technology
Project Title: Technology Infrastructure
Total Estimated Cost: $400,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: 2210.6530.S18311

Description:
These items provide for the acquisition of additional fiber optic cabling or wireless technology to connect the city hall campus with other remote sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Technology is an integral component in the delivery of city services. To keep stride with technology that becomes increasingly more sophisticated, the city continues to upgrade its technology infrastructure.

Fiber optic cabling has much greater bandwidth availability over a leased service from a commercial vendor (e.g. Comcast or CenturyLink) and continues to be the standard to interconnect city facilities. Microwave and wireless technologies are also moving in to this standard and can be built at a fraction of the cost compared to fiber optic cabling.

Between the three transmission methods, the city realizes operating costs by taking ownership of the utility.

The city has collaborated on several fiber projects with other cities, school districts and the county. The projects have resulted in redundant paths to LOGIS, and Public Works.

Staff will continue to look for opportunities to maximize our resources and to take advantage of lower labor costs related to road reconstruction projects.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The goal is to continue connectivity to city facility locations via fiber or microwave/wireless technology to increase bandwidth and improve transmission speeds while eliminating operating costs.

First Priority Projects:
- Place fiber optic cabling to Gray’s Bay Marina, and utility lift station
- Add additional capacity to the fiber optic cable from City Hall to Public Works
- Replace fiber optic hand hole markers along priority routes due to age
- Wireless connectivity to the Landing Shoppe
- Fiber connectivity to Woodland Water Tower
- Wireless connectivity to Fire Station 3, 4, & 5

Future Projects:
- Establish redundant paths to certain city facilities for disaster recovery

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
Connectivity with LOGIS and city facilities is an integral component in the delivery of city services. All city departments utilize the network and technology to conduct business. This project allows the build-out of a permanent, reliable solution to all city facilities.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will decrease operational costs due to the discontinuation of monthly service fees from commercial vendors.
Project Category: Technology
Project Title: Public Access Technology
Total Estimated Cost: $25,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
In 2010, the city purchased a new document management system to replace its existing outdated imaging system. The newer technology allows staff to better share working documents across departments and also incorporates powerful search functionality for easier retrieval. Implementation of Columbia Soft’s “Document Locator” system began at the beginning of 2011. Document Locator seamlessly integrates with LOGIS software systems and most other city database software making work processes more efficient.

The system is implemented and now fully in use in all but three departments. Funds were used to convert older city records that are maintained on microfiche into electronic records that will be stored in Document Locator. The $25,000 in 2019 would be used to provide updates and system enhancements, further integrating the Doclocator system. These updates are typically due to new software versions and not covered in the annual licensing requirements.

The next step in the project is to develop a web interface that would allow residents to look up city records online and reduce the need to come to city hall.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2016: Enhancements were made to the existing setup and continuation of implementation and conversion of microfiche.
2019: Enhancements and updates to existing systems to further department integrations and applications.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The implementation of the new document management system has created the opportunity for staff to look at existing processes and procedures to find more efficient and effective methods of collaboration. Residents will see the benefits of the second phase of this project as more and more city records become accessible via the city’s website.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
A $15,000 annual license is paid through the Technology Fund.

Description:
This item is designed to increase the availability of information to Minnetonka residents, and to enhance transfer of information between residents and the city.
**Project Category:** Technology  
**Project Title:** Office Equipment  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $357,400  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** 4230.6530.S18304

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fund</td>
<td>$128,100</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$99,300</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**  
This project funds the purchase of replacement copiers and other office equipment for all city departments.

**Justification:**  
This project provides for the systematic maintenance and upgrade of major office equipment, including: copiers, postage machine, desktop scanners, smart phone equipment, headsets, and other miscellaneous equipment. Copiers vary in size depending on location and usage. The city continues to maximize the use of workgroup copiers to save per count page costs over individual laser jet printers.

- **Copier Replacement Schedule**  
  - 2019: IT Department, Legal, Senior Center  
  - 2020: Engineering Plotter, Fire Station #1  
  - 2021: Information Desk, Community Development, Engineering/Planning, Finance, Police Investigations Division, Police Patrol Division Report Writing  
  - 2022: Public Works Main Office

- **Other Large Equipment**  
  - 2018: Replacement desktop phones and headsets  
  - 2019: Postage machine

**Scheduling and Project Status:**  
A replacement schedule has been established and is reviewed on a regular basis by Information Technology staff.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**  
Budgeting and purchasing office equipment through this project allows the city greater flexibility to direct equipment to where it is most needed rather than using individual budgets.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**  
These purchases will decrease annual maintenance costs because new equipment is generally more reliable than earlier models.
Project Category: Technology
Project Title: Technology Purchases/Upgrades
Total Estimated Cost: $2,250,800
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 4230.6530.S18308

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fund</td>
<td>$362,100</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$361,200</td>
<td>$341,900</td>
<td>$375,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

This project provides for the systematic maintenance and upgrade of the following equipment: desktop computers, laptops, iPad’s, servers, network infrastructure, uninterruptable power systems, and software.

Desktop computers, laptops, iPad’s, and servers are generally replaced on a four-year replacement while network infrastructure and uninterruptable power systems are replaced every five years. Printers will be replaced on an as needed basis or eliminated and replaced with multi-function copier devices.

Scheduling and Project Status:

A replacement schedule has been established and is reviewed on a regular basis by Information Technology staff.

Examples of projects within the schedule:
2018: Replacement of imaging scanners for the document management process
2019: Replacement of virtual network environment
2020: Replacement of large format plotter
2021: Replacement of e-mail archiving system, voice gateway
2022: Replacement of virtual network equipment, call recording hardware

Description:

This project funds the purchase of replacement computers, iPad’s, servers, network infrastructure, printers, and software.

It also provides for the purchase of new equipment and software that serves the city as a whole.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

Budgeting and purchasing technology equipment through this project allows the city greater flexibility to direct equipment to where it is most needed rather than using individual department budgets.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

Annual maintenance costs may increase due to the added equipment such as additional servers and networking equipment. Increases in consulting, maintenance agreements and equipment repair are in the Information Technology general fund operating budget.
Project Category: Technology  
Project Title: Security Equipment  
Total Estimated Cost: $412,400  
Funding Priority: 2  
Account Number: 4230.6530.S18303

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fund</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$65,300</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$58,800</td>
<td>$81,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
This project calls for the systematic maintenance and upgrading of the security equipment serving city facilities, including: card access, video surveillance and alarm system devices.

Justification:
As part of appropriate management, city staff evaluates and plans for the safety and security of our public facilities to protect our assets, citizens, employees and visitors. Continuing upgrades and replacement of security equipment is a key component of accomplishing that goal.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Acquisitions will occur on a planned annual basis. A list of major equipment to be replaced is as follows:

2018: Card access hardware replacement, video server hardware replacement, addition of cameras in the Community Center lot and addition of cameras at the Landing Gift Shop.


2019: Card access door strike replacements throughout the civic center campus and additional readers at the Glen Lake Activity Center.

2020: Card access hardware replacement, and addition of cameras at Ridgedale water tower.

2021: Begin systematic replacement of existing cameras on a ten-year replacement cycle. Addition of cameras in the City Hall lot, Public Works recycling area, and Tonkawood water tower. Card access additions to Police storage facility.

2022: Card access hardware replacement, camera replacements, Ice Arena A and B parking lot cameras

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the city’s policy of establishing schedules for equipment replacement.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
The replacement purchases will not affect operating costs and will reduce maintenance costs on equipment that is experiencing mechanical failure due to age.
**Project Category:** Technology  
**Project Title:** Public, Education and Government Expenses (PEG)  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $500,000  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** 2213.6530.S18316

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable Fund - PEG Fee Revenue</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description:

Project fund expenses are related to the production and playback of Public, Education and Government (PEG) programming for Southwest Suburban Cable Commission (SWSCC) related broadcasts. The cable franchise agreements provide member cities (Edina, Eden Prairie, Hopkins, Richfield and Minnetonka) with franchise fees and new PEG fees to offset costs when Comcast closed its studio facility for playback and public production in September of 2013.

### Justification:

This project calls for the transitional expenses related to the Public, Education and Government (PEG) Fee’s collected through the franchise agreements with Comcast Cable and CenturyLink for the Southwest Suburban Cable Commission (SWSCC) member cities. PEG fees received through the revised agreement with Comcast and new agreement with CenturyLink will be used for the benefit of broadcast production. During the Capital Improvement Program process, a new line item for both fees and expenses was introduced to the Cable Fund budget. This source of revenue will be used to provide needed capital replacement and technology enhancements for the benefit of broadcast production in city facilities, primarily the City Council Chambers.

### Scheduling and Project Status:

The SWSCC is currently refining annual operating expenses and expected capital needs to produce the broadcast programming through an agreement with the Bloomington Studio. The Bloomington location will be used by the public producers to create the broadcast content.

The PEG revenues will assist in replacing capital equipment used to produce city broadcasts.

### Acquisitions will occur on a planned annual basis.

#### 2018 – 2022

- Replace sound reinforcement panels to align with new branding standards (carpet and chairs). Repair and paint walls behind council dais. Replace countertops in dais area.
- Add Minnetonka logo into the space, removing the trapezoidal screen
- Move electrical and dimming systems to the upper catwalk of the chambers
- Systematic replacement of equipment in control room and dias/staff areas of the council chambers
- Council chamber lighting control and dimming system

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

This project is consistent with the city’s policy of collaboration and establishing schedules for equipment replacement.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

The PEG expenses will not affect operating costs and the associated revenues will help replace equipment that is experiencing mechanical failure due to age.
Project Category: Local Street Improvements

Project Title: Pavement Management Study

Total Estimated Cost: $220,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4410.6319.S18402

Description:
This project provides for the annual testing of 25% of the city streets, and for the updating of the pavement evaluation software. The street condition data base is used to analyze and program street improvements in a cost effective manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This system allows for the analysis of various repair/reconstruction options with respect to geographic areas, pavement conditions, and budget constraints to make the most efficient and effective use of available funds.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This is necessary to fully understand the interaction of street conditions throughout the local network, and to program repairs and replacements in the most cost effective manner.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This project provides for the annual update of the Pavement Management System.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This study will have no impact on annual maintenance costs.
Project Category: Local Street Improvements
Project Title: Local Street Rehabilitation
Total Estimated Cost: $33,750,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4410.XXXX (Street).S18401
5600.XXXX (Storm).S18401
5110.XXXX (Utility).S18401

Source of Project Funding | 2018      | 2019      | 2020      | 2021      | 2022      |
--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
Street Improvement Fund   | $3,500,000| $800,000  | $2,500,000| $4,600,000| $6,200,000|
Storm Water Fund (Upgrades)| 950,000   | 600,000   | 700,000   | 1,100,000 | 2,000,000 |
Utility Fund              | 4,500,000 | 100,000   | 1,400,000 | 2,200,000 | 2,600,000 |

Justification:
The most recent community surveys indicate that citizens still rank street maintenance highest amongst competing city service needs.

A thin overlay pavement program, which is a cost-effective method for extending the life of aging local streets for as much as six to ten years, was used extensively until 2014. The goal during this time period was to reconstruct or overlay all streets that had not received major maintenance in the prior 20 years, by 2014.

In 2011, staff began to transition from the thin overlay program to one that also includes preservation and maintenance programs for the streets that have been previously reconstructed. No additional funding was necessary since the thin overlay budget was spread out to also include the new preservation programs, which will be performed by public works crews.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These projects are consistent with the Pavement Management Study, the Water Resources Plan, the Infiltration and Inflow Reduction Program, and the NPDES Phase II Storm Water Program. The latter is state and federally mandated and requires cities to address illicit discharge into the storm sewer systems, as well as improve the quality of storm water runoff.

Page 8-7 includes significant additional city funding in 2018-2020 for needed street rehabilitation in the Opus Area.

Description:
This project will provide for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of various local streets throughout the city. The 2018 reconstruction program is scheduled to include Woodhill Road. Included in the project are improvements to the storm sewer system, necessary I & I remediation, and significant utility system upgrades.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Roads that are scheduled for reconstruction and rehabilitation include the following:
- Reconstruction
  - 2019 - Ridgedale Dr. (see page 9-1)
  - 2020 - Parkers Lake Rd., Twelve Oaks Center Dr.
  - 2021 - Groveland-Bay
  - 2022 - Tonka-Woodcroft (Phase I)
- Preservation (Mill and Overlay)
  - 2019 - Highland Rd.
  - 2020 - Minnetonka Mills Rd., Rowland Rd.
  - 2021 - Woodhaven Rd., Whitewater Dr.
  - 2022 - Scenic Heights Dr.

Sidewalks will likely be proposed for Woodhill Road and Parkers Lake Road.

Storm water and utility upgrades will be combined and coordinated with the street reconstruction projects. Higher storm sewer costs are shown in 2021-2022 due to the high storm sewer costs anticipated for these area streets.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Overall, this project will reduce annual road maintenance needs, but add to sidewalk maintenance.
Description:
This project will provide for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of various local streets throughout the city. Included in the project are improvements to the storm sewer system, necessary I & I remediation, and significant utility system upgrades.

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund (Upgrades) - Unfunded</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:
The most recent community surveys indicate that citizens still rank street maintenance highest amongst competing city service needs.

A thin overlay pavement program, which is a cost-effective method for extending the life of aging local streets for as much as six to ten years, was used extensively until 2014. The goal during this time period was to reconstruct or overlay all streets that had not received major maintenance in the prior 20 years, by 2014.

In 2011, staff began to transition from the thin overlay program to one that also includes preservation and maintenance programs for the streets that have been previously reconstructed. No additional funding was necessary since the thin overlay budget was spread out to also include the new preservation programs, which will be performed by public works crews.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These projects are consistent with the Pavement Management Study, the Water Resources Plan, the Infiltration and Inflow Reduction Program, and the NPDES Phase II Storm Water Program. The latter is state and federally mandated and requires cities to address illicit discharge into the storm sewer systems, as well as improve the quality of storm water runoff.

### Scheduling and Project Status:
This project is included in the CIP as a future project to illustrate the need for significant utility upgrades in this area, primarily to complete water main replacement.

- 2022: Tonka – Woodcroft area (Phase I) – see page 8-2
- 2023: Tonka – Woodcroft area (Phase II)

The construction year is estimated and will be further refined in future CIP’s.

Higher storm sewer costs are shown for this project due to the high storm sewer costs anticipated for this area.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Overall, this project will reduce annual road maintenance needs, but add to sidewalk maintenance.
Project Category: Local Street Improvements
Project Title: Local Street Preservation
Total Estimated Cost: $9,445,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4410.XXXX (Others). S18403
4410. XXXX (Overlay). S18404
5110. XXXX (Utility). S18401

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overlays</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Maintenance Programs</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Preserving existing streets with regular maintenance can significantly extend the life of a street. Keeping existing pavements in good condition requires varying levels of maintenance which can be thought of as preserving our street assets.

Rehabilitation projects are major maintenance activities, such as thick overlays and reconstructions. These projects are completed when a pavement has significantly deteriorated, and routine maintenance is no longer effective to extend the life of the street. Overlays have been shown to be a cost-effective strategy to extend the life of aging pavements.

Preservation type projects are minor in comparison and less costly. They include crack filling, patching and thin overlays. These projects are typically completed on streets that have already received major rehabilitation work, but are in need of minor repairs. These projects are aimed at solidifying the pavement, and keeping moisture from penetrating below the pavement, which is a key factor in the deterioration of roads.

Utility improvements are completed as needed, during preservation projects. Completing minor repairs and upgrades in conjunction with the road work extends the life of the utility infrastructure and creates a better, more reliable street. Typical preservation work includes sewer casting replacement and adjustment, water main valve repairs, and installation of chimney seals on sanitary sewer manholes.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The scheduling is based on 2018 through 2022 maintenance activities.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the city’s Pavement Management Study.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
These projects will not affect annual maintenance costs.

The majority of funding for this program is for supplies only and will be staffed with current employees.
Project Category: Local Street Improvements
Project Title: Electrical System Enhancements
Total Estimated Cost: $3,700,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: 2500.XXXX.S18405

Description:
This project involves electrical system enhancements related to the burial of overhead utility lines in conjunction with street reconstruction projects, addition of decorative lighting and energy saving (LED) retrofits.

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Utility Burial:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Street Rehabilitation areas</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plymouth Road (Ridgedale Dr. to Minnetonka Blvd.)</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High Priority Trail Connections</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Savings Street Light Retrofits (LED)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
The energy saving retrofit improvements will generate significant savings in power costs as well as annual maintenance costs.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
Lighting projects are selected relative to two criteria: (1) aesthetic benefit or visual clutter that would be improved and (2) traffic count as a representative of the number of citizens who would benefit from the project and greater energy savings would likely be achieved. Projects will be prioritized using the “aesthetic benefit” and “traffic/ped count” criteria as follows:

**High Priority**: County and state roads, MSA high volume streets, and high volume trails and public transportation related locations with high aesthetic benefit.

**Medium Priority**: MSA high and low volume streets, and low volume trails and public transportation related locations with high aesthetic benefit.

**Low Priority**: MSA high and low volume streets, and low volume trails and public transportation related locations with low aesthetic benefits.

High priority projects will typically be funded. Medium priority projects will be funded on a case-by-case basis. Low priority projects will likely not be funded unless there is an unusual circumstance.

Justification:
The burial of overhead utility lines and upgrades to energy efficient lighting is consistent with Minnetonka’s community vision and strategic goals for reducing the community’s use of energy as well as maintaining and improving its visual image, particularly along major road corridors where street lighting is most necessary. The installation of decorative lighting is also consistent with these goals, and will likely be done in high traffic areas.

Scheduling and Project Status:
When possible, the burial improvements would be completed in conjunction with street reconstruction projects scheduled within the CIP. Specific projects are identified above and are to be funded by the respective utility companies. The costs for Xcel Energy are noted above, and would be paid for with electric franchise fees.

Electric franchise fee costs are also shown within the Opus area and Ridgedale Drive CIP pages for years 2018 - 2019.

Redevelopment projects, such as in the Glen Lake area, may prompt the need to expedite LED retrofit projects if the redevelopment creates a need to relocate existing street lights. Also, current city trail planning may further expedite the need to move electrical poles and bury lines in conflict with future trail segments.
Project Category: Local Street Improvements

Project Title: Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure

Total Estimated Cost: $720,000

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number: 4410.XXXX.S17406 (Street)
5110.XXXX.S17406 (Utility)
5600.XXXS.S17406 (Storm)
2500.XXXX.S17406 (Electric)

Description:
When Southwest Light Rail (SWLRT) is constructed, local matching funds are required. The local match can be for road infrastructure to and from a station, trail connections, storm water improvements, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fees</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Local share of improvements necessary to accommodate light rail within the Shady Oak/Excelsior Blvd. area.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2018-19: Construction of light rail and public road improvements necessary to connect station areas.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The project will be connected to other redevelopment efforts and construction. The redevelopment will have to be coordinated and aligned with construction of the line.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Workload associated with this project may require dedicated personnel and increase annual operating costs.

If local road connections are created, maintenance of these facilities would be necessary.
**Project Category:** Local Street Improvements  
**Project Title:** Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $6,680,000  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** 4410.XXXX.S16406 (Street)  
4350.XXXX.S16406 (MSA)  
5600.XXXX.S16406 (Storm)  
2500.XXXX.S16406 (Electric)  
5110.XXXX.S16406 (Utility)

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal State Aid Fund</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fees</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Trails Fund</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Grant</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:

A comprehensive infrastructure and traffic analysis has identified various improvements as being necessary in the area to preserve and maintain existing street assets, as well as support redevelopment and intensification of the area in conjunction and following the Southwest Light Rail construction.

### Scheduling and Project Status:

All projects are currently funded with the exception of the bridge replacement project and utility upgrades associated with the trail improvements. All work will be coordinated in conjunction with the Southwest Light Rail improvements in the area.

In 2016, MnDOT bridge bond funding was applied for in the amount of $3,155,000. Dependent on if this money is received, specific project components and scheduling may need to be reevaluated in 2018.

### Description:

When Southwest Light Rail (SWLRT) is constructed, local matching funds are required. The local match can be for road infrastructure to and from a station, trail connections, storm water improvements, etc. The matching portion will not be determined until the project completes its final design and bidding.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

This project is consistent with the Opus area infrastructure and traffic analysis.

These improvements will be coordinated with the construction of the Southwest Light Rail, however remain independent city projects.

- 2018-19  Miscellaneous bridge replacement
- 2018: Red Circle Drive reversal
- 2018: Trail, utility and trail lighting improvement
- 2018: Green Oak reversal
- 2019: Street rehab and street light upgrade
- 2020: Trail and trail lighting improvement

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

Workload associated with this project may require dedicated personnel and increase annual operating costs.

The project should not affect annual maintenance costs.
**Project Category:** Local Street Improvements  
**Project Title:** City LRT Infrastructure  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $2,380,000  
**Funding Priority:** 3  
**Account Number:** 4410.XXXX.S17409

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fees</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
The city committed to a local LRT match of $2,000,000 by action at its January 9, 2017 city council meeting. Additional infrastructure changes are also needed to meet the city’s fence standards, retaining wall color standards, and storm sewer casing standards.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
Costs above reflect current forecasted timing of payments for the project, which will require temporary cash flow assistance from the city’s Special Assessment Construction Fund to accommodate the Housing Redevelopment Authority (HRA) portion. As provided in the city’s five-year Economic Investment Plan (EIP), the city will dedicate $75,000 per year for ten years (2016-2025) from its annual HRA levy of which $150,000 (two years) has already been committed prior to 2018.

All work will be coordinated in conjunction with the Southwest Light Rail improvements in the area.

**Description:**
When Southwest Light Rail (SWLRT) is constructed, local matching funds are required including the city’s $2M project contribution and local match funds to meet city standards for road infrastructure, fencing, retaining wall colors, and storm sewer.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
These improvements will be completed as part of the SWLRT project.

2018-19: Local Work (Fence, Wall Color, Casings)  
2018-20: $1.25M of Project Contribution

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Agreements with SWLRT are required for maintenance of the fencing and wall color.
Project Category: MSA Street Improvements

Project Title: Ridgedale Drive Improvements

Total Estimated Cost: $9,000,000 Total Cost

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: N/A

Description:
This project involves the reconstruction of Ridgedale Drive from Plymouth Road to I-394, and will include access, drainage, utility, landscaping, and lighting improvements around the mall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal State Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This project includes improvements that will allow for redevelopment and growth in the Ridgedale area, and is consistent with the recommendations of the Ridgedale Village Center study.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The project is currently funded. Optional funding sources will be investigated as the project nears construction.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the Ridgedale Village Center study. Park improvements to the area, including pedestrian walkability and bicycle plans, will be developed in conjunction with these road improvements.

A preliminary traffic study and a utility survey have been completed in order to determine the extent of improvements needed. These studies were used to develop costs in the above estimates.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will impact operating costs as they relate to street lighting, and sidewalk and landscape maintenance.
**Project Category:** MSA Street Improvements

**Project Title:** Flashing Yellow Conversion

**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,260,000 Total Cost

**Funding Priority:** 3

**Account Number:** N/A

---

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal State Aid</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification:**

This project includes traffic signal modifications that will allow for traffic flow improvements throughout the city. A partnership with Hennepin County provides significant savings to convert existing traffic signals to flashing yellow operations. Available Hennepin County crews provide labor for city materials.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

The project is currently funded. Optional funding sources will be investigated as the project nears construction.

**Description:**

This project involves the conversion to flashing yellow arrow equipped traffic signals.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

This project is included in the CIP to illustrate the need for upgrades to traffic signals in the city to further improve transportation.

A preliminary traffic signal study has been completed in order to determine the extent of improvements needed. This study was used to develop costs in the above estimates.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

This project should not affect annual maintenance costs.

The majority of funding for this program is for materials only and labor will be coordinated with Hennepin County.
Project Category: MSA Street Improvements
Project Title: Plymouth Road (CR 61) (Cedar Lake Road to Hilloway Road)
Total Estimated Cost: $13,400,000 Total Cost (Unfunded) 4,500,000 City Cost (Unfunded)
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: N/A

Description:
This project involves the reconstruction of Plymouth Road as a multi-lane roadway from Cedar Lake Road to Hilloway Road.

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County - Unfunded</td>
<td>$8,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal State Aid – Unfunded</td>
<td>4,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This project is included in the Hennepin County Capital Improvements Program as a provisional project, meaning that if funding were to become available, the county would schedule the project.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Although this project is currently unfunded, a proposed funding source for the city's contribution is provided.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

A utility survey will need to be completed prior to plan development to determine the extent of repairs needed on the city’s utility systems. These costs are not included in the above estimates.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project would impact operating costs as they relate to sidewalk maintenance.
Project Category: MSA Street Improvements
Project Title: Hopkins Crossroad (CR 73) (Cedar Lake Road to I-394)
Total Estimated Cost: $16,700,000 Total Cost (Unfunded)
7,100,000 City Cost (Unfunded)
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: N/A

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County - Unfunded</td>
<td>$9,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal State Aid – Unfunded</td>
<td>6,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This project is included in the Hennepin County Capital Improvements Program as a provisional project, meaning that if funding were to become available, the county would schedule the project.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Although this project is currently unfunded, a proposed funding source for the city's contribution is provided.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

A utility survey will need to be completed prior to plan development to determine the extent of repairs needed on the city's utility systems. These costs are not included in the above estimates.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project would impact operating costs as they relate to sidewalk maintenance.

Description:
This project involves the reconstruction of Hopkins Crossroad as a multi-lane roadway between Cedar Lake Road and I-394.
**Project Category:** MSA Street Improvements  
**Project Title:** Future Major Road Projects  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $32-49,000,000 Total Cost (Unfunded)  
19,500,000 City Cost Est. (Unfunded)  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** N/A

### Future Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal State Aid – Unfunded:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Blvd. (Mills area)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-394/Hopkins Crossroad Bridge widening</td>
<td>10-12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH7/Baker Road Bridge</td>
<td>5-10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-394/Plymouth Bridge</td>
<td>15-25,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

Traffic studies and other technical reports have identified these projects as being necessary to support redevelopment and intensification of adjacent areas. Funding sources have not been identified for any of these projects, and will vary significantly depending on the degree of support from the state, county, and area property owners. In some cases, right-of-way acquisition costs will be extremely high, and agency permitting will be difficult.

In 2012, an area vision study identified additional improvements that were necessary for Plymouth Road to support the long range vision for the area.

**Description:**

These projects will likely be necessary when redevelopment and intensification occurs in adjacent areas.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

None of these projects are currently scheduled for construction. When they are, funding sources and better cost estimates will be identified including the city’s share of each project. City costs identified above are a very gross estimate of 25 percent of total high costs.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

These projects are consistent with the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, and the Ridgedale area vision plan.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

These projects will impact operating costs.
Project Category: Storm Drainage Improvements

Project Title: Storm Sewer Risk Assessment

Total Estimated Cost: $1,100,000

Funding Priority: 1

Account Number: 5600.XXXX.S18601

**Description:**
This project provides for annual improvements to repair and replace high risk segments of storm sewer to prevent system failures, and possible flooding.

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
A storm sewer system risk assessment was conducted in early 2015 as a proactive effort to evaluate the risks of infrastructure failure throughout the city. The assessment included weighing the age and type of pipe, along with the proximity of the pipe, against the consequences of a failure. This identified high-risk portions of the city’s storm sewer system that will be further reviewed and possibly targeted for replacement.

Drainage improvements in this category will likely consist of pipe lining, and smaller system replacement projects. These improvements will likely be constructed without the need for improvement hearings and extensive feasibility studies.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
Phase two of the risk assessment was conducted in 2015 to identify specific projects for construction in 2016 and beyond. Staff began system rehabilitation in 2016 and has therefore proposed the above CIP budget. The 2018-2022 CIP contains more detailed information regarding project specifics and estimates. Whenever possible, projects will be coordinated with the street reconstruction and rehabilitation programs.

**Primary Projects:**

- 2018: Lake Rose Area
- 2019: McGinty Road Area
- 2020: Ridgeview Drive
- 2021: James Road
- 2022: Woodbine Rd. / Terrace Ln. Pond

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
This project is consistent with the Water Resources Management Plan and the NPDES Phase II Storm Water Program.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
These improvements will tend to reduce annual maintenance costs.
Project Category: Storm Drainage Improvements
Project Title: Water Quality
Total Estimated Cost: $500,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 5600.XXXX.S18601

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

The City of Minnetonka has a strong history of protecting water quality. The city’s first iteration of a water resources management plan was developed in 1959, 13 years prior to the inception of the Clean Water Act by the federal government in 1972. Since that time, the city’s water resources management plan, which includes stormwater, wetland, floodplain and shoreland protections, has continued to evolve to make certain water quality in the city is a primary focus for protection, while balancing the infrastructure and development goals of the city.

The city has historically defined water quality based on overall health, function and value (pollutant load, clarity, aquatic communities and wildlife benefit) and has identified improvements in water body areas within the city.

Also, the city does receive requests from residents for water quality improvements directly related to aesthetic appeal and recreational capability. These residents have requested the city increase its standards for protecting surface waters and provide a role in undertaking lake management strategies which include vegetation removal. Being these types of improvements are on primarily on water bodies with no public access, the city may consider funding assistance to these improvements through assessments to organized lake groups.

Description:

This project provides for annual improvements to improve water quality and lake funding assistance.

Scheduling and Project Status:

Improvements will be grouped into collective contracts whenever possible and coordinated with the street reconstruction program when feasible.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

This project is consistent with the Water Resources Management Plan and council policy.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

These improvements will tend to reduce annual maintenance costs.
Project Category: Storm Drainage Improvements
Project Title: McKenzie Point Road Storm Sewer
Total Estimated Cost: $100,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The lack of storm sewer and the flat street grades in this area have resulted in periodic street flooding.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This project was previously scheduled in 2014, but has now been rescheduled for construction in 2021 to follow the completion of the CR 101 road reconstruction project, and be coordinated with local street reconstruction in this area.

Description:
This project provides for the installation of a storm sewer outlet for a ponding area on McKenzie Point Road.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the Water Resources Management Plan.
It will be re-evaluated following Hennepin County's work on County Road 101, north of County Road 5.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will tend to reduce annual maintenance costs.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements
Project Title: Water - Miscellaneous Piping and Improvements
Total Estimated Cost: $750,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 5133.XXXX.S18706

Description:
This item provides for the unanticipated replacement/addition of water and sewer lines that are found to be deficient during the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Fixing deficient utilities minimizes the potential for liability of roads, utilities or other infrastructure when problems or failures are found.

Scheduling and Project Status:
While specific projects are not identified, improvements would generally be fixed as they are discovered. Planned replacements associated with road improvement projects are shown on the street project pages.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
Projects are coordinated with street projects and/or other utility projects when possible.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
These improvements do not increase operating costs.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements
Project Title: Water - Tower Maintenance
Total Estimated Cost: $2,425,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 5133.XXXX.S18701

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled maintenance of the city’s nine water storage structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Scheduled maintenance and repair of the city’s water storage structures extends their useful life and is important for public perception regarding water quality. In 2017 a tank consultant has been retained to re-evaluate the condition of tank coatings in order to assure the priority of tank improvements.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Major repair projects are bid up to one-half year prior to the scheduled work. Washing will be scheduled in the year that the cleaning is needed.

2018: Woodland and Tanglen paint
2019: Bren paint, Lake Street & Plymouth inspection
2020: Williston paint. Woodland & Tanglen inspection
2021: Lake Street, Plymouth and Woodland wash & dive
2022: Bren & Ridgedale wash and dive

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the city’s practice of maintaining its infrastructure. Costs vary from year to year due to the size of the tanks.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Timely inspection, touch-up and washing extends the useful life of the surface coating systems.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements
Project Title: Water - Fire Hydrant Upgrades
Total Estimated Cost: $350,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 5133.XXXX.S18708

Description:
This item provides for the inspection and repair of privately-owned fire hydrants. A majority of these hydrants are 40 years old and need to be evaluated in order to assure operability during and emergency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Over 500 private fire hydrants are located throughout the city in order to supply water to fire apparatus during emergencies. Most private hydrants have not been inspected and repaired to ensure trouble free operation. It is estimated that up to one-third of the private hydrants are deficient and in need of repair/replacement.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Annually utility and fire staff complete an inspection and evaluation of the city's public fire hydrants. This program begins a systematic inspection of private hydrants in order to assure operability. In 2017, Fire Department staff will focus on private hydrants that service residential areas.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The 2010 Public Safety Study recommended that all the city's public and private hydrants be inspected and operated annually to assure availability.

In 2014, the city completed the inventory of private hydrants in the community. Based on the results, staff proposed a program to the City Council to address the ongoing inspection and maintenance of the private hydrants.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will increase operational costs of the system. A new utility staff person was added in 2015 that assists with the inspection, valve exercising and record retention.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements

Project Title: Water - Removal of excavated materials

Total Estimated Cost: $100,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 5133.XXXX.S18716

### Description:
This item provides for the removal of excavated soils that accumulate over time and are stored at public works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:
Over the years the city has accumulated approximately 30,000 cubic yards of dirt as a result of watermain repairs. Approximately 10,000 cubic yards of material was removed in 2012 and again in 2013. Scheduled removal will now continue into the future in order to keep the size of the pile manageable.

### Scheduling and Project Status:
The dirt would be hauled by a contractor in the early spring of the year.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
Where possible, this material is used for a variety of city projects and is offered to contractors and developers if they are in need of clean fill. If the material is not used, it must be removed in order to make room for dirt that is accumulated during the year.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will not have any effect on operational costs.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements
Project Title: Water - System Sustainability Improvements
Total Estimated Cost: $6,711,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 5133.XXXX.S18715

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$2,332,000</td>
<td>$3,035,000</td>
<td>$196,000</td>
<td>$1,013,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:

A majority of the water system was constructed in the late 1970's and early 1980's. As a result, many of the components are approaching the end of their design life and need to be replaced. A sustainability plan was presented to the council in 2014 and this project schedule follows that plan.

### Scheduling and Project Status:

The recommended improvements are as follows:

2018:   WTP #3 – Filter media change, Electrical MCC & VFD upgrade. Move well 16B.
2019:   WTP #6 – Major Plant Renovation
2020:   Instrumentation and Control (I&C) update, WTP #15 media replacement
2021:   Instrumentation and Control (I&C) update, Ridgedale Booster Renovation
2022:   WTP #15 re-piping project

### Description:

This project implements the findings of the sustainability and optimization study that was completed for the city’s water and sewer utility in 2014.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

This project implements the recommendations of the sustainability and optimization study completed in 2014. In 2018, it is anticipated that well 16B will need to be relocated in preparation for the construction of a new Central Fire Station in 2019.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

This project will save operational costs that result from the installation of energy efficient pumps, motors and VFD’s.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements
Project Title: Sewer - Forcemain Lining
Total Estimated Cost: $1,500,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 5133.XXXX.S18713

Description:
This item provides for the lining of the sanitary sewer forcemains that flow from the Williston Lift Station and the Main Lift Station toward Guilliams Field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 funding</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
In July of 2013 and January of 2014, a section of the sanitary sewer forcemains running from the Williston and the Main lift stations ruptured.

Emergency repairs were made to restore service. Evaluation of the failed pipe revealed that the remainder of the piping should be lined in order to eliminate leaks and provide extended life of the pipes into the future.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The 2017 project schedule has been modified to prepare for the 2018 and 2019 improvements. Junction boxes and valves will be constructed and installed on both ends of the 24-inch forcemain that runs between the Williston lift and Guilliams Field in 2017. The directional boring of the secondary line will be delayed until 2018 with the lining of the 24-inch forcemain taking place in 2019.

2018: Install secondary forcemain from Williston lift station to Guilliam.
2019: Line 24-inch forcemain from Williston Road to Guilliams Field.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the city’s philosophy of maintaining the city’s infrastructure.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
These projects would not increase the city’s operating costs.
**Project Category:** Utility System Improvements  
**Project Title:** Sewer - Lift Station Rehabilitation  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $2,250,000  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** 5133.XXXX.S18703

**Description:**
This item provides for the replacement of lift station pumps, replacement piping, updated electrical controls and wet-well repair of the city’s 37 lift stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
As the lift stations age, the pumps, motors, controls and piping need scheduled replacement to assure operability of the sewer collection system. At the Main and Williston lift stations along with the previous items, the standby generators and control centers will be replaced in order to assure operability during power loss.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
Projects will be designed and bid in the winter preceding the scheduled funding. The project following schedule is anticipated.

2018: Williston Lift Station – valves, generator and control center replacement  
2019: Main Lift Station and generator and control center replacement  
2020: W. 34th and Woodgate Lift Stations  
2021: Burchlane Lift Station  
2022: Clarion & OPUS lift stations

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
This project is consistent with the city’s policy of maintaining the city’s infrastructure. Costs tend to be consistent from year to year.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Projects would save approximately $1,000 per year in energy costs due to energy efficient motors and pumps which are being replaced.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements

Project Title: Sewer - Infiltration and Inflow Reduction Program

Total Estimated Cost: $1,250,000

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number: 5133.XXXX.S18705

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
MCES policy now states that excess peak flows can result in a surcharge billable to the City of Minnetonka. The city is currently not compliant and is being assessed $130,725 for the next three years based on a July 13, 2013 exceedance of 1.6 MGD (million gallons a day). Since the beginning of the program it is estimated that 3.1 MGD have been removed from the sewer collection system.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Staff began studying excess clear water flow in 2005 for program development and implementation starting in 2007. In 2008 and 2009, all residential properties were inspected for sources of inflow. In 2010, all commercial property inspections were completed. Currently, 150 manholes have been sealed in the public right-of-way which have resulted in two of three MCES metering districts in compliance with peak flow requirements. The sealing of manholes will continue into the future along with projects contributing to sanitary sewer inflow.

Description:
The Metropolitan Council has implemented a policy that will add a surcharge for excess clear water from I&I that is entering the sanitary collection system. This ongoing program is intended to reduce peak sewer flows by correcting public sewer deficiencies.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The original MCES peak flow reduction program ended 2012. This program allowed cities to invest surcharges into their systems to reduce the flow of clear water. The program has been extended for those cities that have demonstrated efforts to reach compliance of which Minnetonka is eligible. Projects are being planned in order to ensure compliance and address deficiencies that have been detected in previous and ongoing investigations.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Reduction of clear water flow reduces the energy cost of the city’s wastewater treatment expenses.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements
Project Title: Outdoor Warning Sirens
Total Estimated Cost: $90,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

Description:
This project provides for the refurbishment of the 10 Outdoor Warning sirens located in the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
In 1995 the city began a 3-year phased replacement of the city’s civil defense sirens. The new sirens would have new radio receiving controls and mechanical drive system that rotates the megaphone.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This project will be scheduled for the spring and summer of the funding year.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the city’s policy of maintaining the city’s current infrastructure.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will not affect the operational expense of these machines. The replacement of the controls will have minimal effect on the expense of maintaining this equipment. It will have a positive effect on the system’s operational reliability and sound output.
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Introduction

The goal of the ranking system is to prioritize high use trail segments that are easy to construct above those trail segments that may have less users and/or those that are more invasive to construct. The questions below provide the basis for the ranking system. The yes/no questions are each assigned values of 1 or 0 so that the trail segments can be prioritized by a numeric priority score. Segments that contain “*” may partially meet the question and are therefore given partial points. An example of this calculation is shown at the end of this section.

Degree of Difficulty

Environmental Impacts: Can the trail be constructed without significant impacts to wetlands, water bodies, or other environmentally sensitive natural resources?

Minimal Tree Loss: Can the trail be constructed without significant impacts to trees?

Cost Effectiveness

Solutions: Can the trail be constructed without bridges, boardwalks, or significant infrastructure?

Right-of-way (ROW)/Easements Not Needed: Can the trail be constructed without ROW/easements?

Minimal Utility Relocation: Can the trail be constructed without significant utility relocation?

Nature of Use

Passive/Recreational Use: Will the trail be used for recreational purposes?

Transportation: Will the trail be used for transportation purposes

High Use Segment: Will the segment be used by a large number of users?

Completes a Route: Will the trail connect two existing trial segments to complete a continuous route?

Community Access

Village Center: Will the trail be located in the village center or connect to a village center?

Business Access: Will the trail provide business access?

Library/Government Center: Will the trail provide access to a library, city hall, or other government center?

School Access: Will the trail provide a connection to a school?

Connect to Transit Location: Will the trail provide a connection or is directly adjacent to light rail transit, bus transit, or a park and ride?

Regional Commuting: Will the trail be used by regional users?
Unfunded Trail Segments by Priority Ranking

Proposed Trails

Rank
- 1 - 19
- 20 - 38
- 39 - 56
- 57 - 71

Existing Sidewalks and Trails
- School Property
- Village Center
- Light Rail Station

Funded Trail Segments

1/4 Mile Village Center Ring
1/2 Mile Village Center Ring
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5.0
4.9
4.9
4.9
4.8
4.7
4.7
4.6
4.6
4.5
4.5
4.3
4.2
4.1
4.0
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2.9
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2.5
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2.0
1.9
1.9
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1.9
1.9
1.9
1.8
1.5
1.5
1.5
1.5
1.3
1.2
1.0

CR 60 ‐ CR 3 to CR 62
CR 60 ‐ CR 3 to CR 5
Ridgedale Dr ‐ White Birch Rd to Target
CR 5 ‐ The Marsh to Fairchild Lane
CR 73 ‐ Cedar Lake Rd to Wayzata Blvd
CR 3 ‐ Woodland Rd to Clear Springs Rd/101 Library
CR 3 ‐ Glen Oak St to Woodland Rd
Hwy 7 Cr 101 to Seven Hi La
CR 73 ‐ CR 5 to Minnetonka Mills Rd
CR 5 ‐ Fairchild Ave to Woodlawn Ave
CR 16 ‐ CR 101 to Crosby Rd (partly in Wayzata)
Delton Ave ‐ Vine Hill Rd to Old Excelsior Blvd
Vine Hill Rd ‐ Delton Ave to Covington Rd (Kingswood Ter)
Essex Rd ‐ Ridgedale Dr to Oakland Rd
Hwy 7 Underpass west of CR 101*
Minnetonka Mills Rd ‐ CR 61 to CR 73
TH 7 ‐ Cattle Pass to CR 101 on north side
Hillside La ‐ CR 73 to Tanglen School
Meadow Park to Ridgedale
Old Excelsior Blvd ‐ Vine Hill Rd to CR 101 N side of Hwy 7)
Williston Rd ‐ CR 5 to Hwy 7
Wayzata Blvd N ‐ Hampton Inn to Shelard Pkwy
Ridgedale Connections
CR 16 ‐ Crosby Rd to existing trail on west side of I‐494
Rowland Rd/Bren Rd ‐ Lone Lake Park to Opus trail system
Rowland Rd ‐ CR 60 to SWLRT Trail
Porter/Delton Ave‐ Hutchins Dr to Cr 101
Tonkawood Road ‐ CR 5 to Hwy 7
Woodland Rd ‐ Townline Rd to Hwy 7
Orchard Rd/Westmark Dr ‐ Minnetonka Dr
Pioneer Rd ‐ Carlton Rd to CR 61
CR 61 ‐ CR 5 to Hwy 7
Minnetonka Blvd ‐ CR 101 west to Deephaven city limits
Sunset Dr and Marion Lane West segments
Minnehaha Creek Trail ‐ Headwaters to Jidana Park
McGinty Rd E ‐ CR 5 to Surry La
Wayzata Blvd ‐ Claredon Dr to Wayzata city limits
Stone Rd ‐ Saddlebrooke Cir to Sheffield Cur
Orchard Rd/Huntingdon Dr ‐ CR 60 to CR 61
North Lone Lake Park ‐ along RR tracks to Dominick Rd
Knollway Park to Wayzata Blvd/Horn Dr
Knollway Park to CR 61
NTC ‐ Meeting St to existing trail on west side of I‐494
Clear Spring Rd ‐ connect trail to Hwy 7
58th St W ‐ Mahoney Ave into Purgatory Park
Victoria Evergreen to McKenzie Park
Lake St Ext ‐ CR 60 to CR 61
Stone Rd/Meeting St ‐ RR tracks to Linner Rd
Orchard Rd ‐ Wyola Rd to Cr 60
CR 3 ‐ Pioneer to Nelson/CR 61 ‐ S
Lake St Ext ‐ Williston Rd to Spring Lake Rd
Covington Park east side connection to CR 101
NTC ‐ Maywood La from I‐494 crossing to CR 3
Covington Rd ‐ Vine Hill Rd to Mahoney Ave
Hilloway Park to YMCA La
East side of I‐494 ‐ CR 5 to Wentworth Tr
Ford Rd ‐ All
Woodland Rd to Williston Rd ‐ Through Woodgate Park
Westmill Rd ‐ Spring Hill Park to Clear Spring Rd
Oberlin Park along Park Ave to Ridgemount Ave
Holiday Rd/Seymour Rd ‐ Woodland Rd to Spring Hill Park
Highwood Dr ‐ Williston Rd to Tonkawood Rd
Cedar Lake Rd ‐ Big Willow to CR 73
Jane La ‐ Baker Rd to County Trail (Dominick Dr)
South St ‐ Mayview Rd to CR 60
Oak Ridge Rd ‐ CR 5 to Hopkins city limits
Kinsel Rd/Mayview Rd ‐ CR 3 to Glen Moor Park
Ford Park to Lindbergh Dr
Jidana La ‐ CR 5 to Jidana Park
Stodola Rd ‐ Purgatory Park to Scenic Heights Dr
Highland Rd ‐ Excelsior Blvd to Hwy 7
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1.7
1.7
0.6
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0.0
0.6
0.4
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0.3
1.1
1.3
1.1
0.1
0.2
1.5
2.0
1.3
0.6
1.1
0.2
0.3
0.9
0.5
0.2
0.1
0.7
0.3
0.2
0.3
0.1
0.2
0.2
1.0
0.9
0.6
0.1
0.9
0.7
0.2
0.2
0.9
0.5
0.4
1.2
0.7
0.3
0.2
0.7
0.8
0.6
0.6
0.2
0.4
0.4
0.4
0.2
0.2
1.5

$624,387
$622,604
$227,721
$300,663
$381,608
$354,336
$273,494
$30,730
$237,797
$182,057
$212,546
$258,536
$319,581
$272,548
$10,786
$207,138
$148,086
$50,426
$131,250
$301,706
$355,149
$111,517
$406,003
$476,151
$405,570
$53,336
$91,726
$543,556
$751,559
$469,712
$224,597
$391,492
$70,678
$104,987
$321,244
$184,973
$90,755
$47,113
$241,729
$120,315
$69,556
$113,894
$41,559
$79,212
$91,944
$355,401
$346,650
$220,907
$53,870
$346,552
$257,505
$72,933
$61,266
$331,028
$174,453
$145,648
$432,664
$262,540
$94,519
$78,201
$258,987
$289,021
$221,310
$231,280
$77,268
$155,257
$147,432
$139,418
$79,825
$83,593
$555,069

$624,387
$1,246,990
$1,474,711
$1,775,374
$2,156,982
$2,511,317
$2,784,812
$2,815,542
$3,053,339
$3,235,396
$3,447,942
$3,706,479
$4,026,060
$4,298,608
$4,309,394
$4,516,532
$4,664,618
$4,715,044
$4,846,294
$5,148,000
$5,503,148
$5,614,665
$6,020,669
$6,496,820
$6,902,390
$6,955,727
$7,047,452
$7,591,008
$8,342,567
$8,812,280
$9,036,877
$9,428,369
$9,499,047
$9,604,033
$9,925,277
$10,110,250
$10,201,005
$10,248,118
$10,489,847
$10,610,162
$10,679,718
$10,793,612
$10,835,171
$10,914,383
$11,006,327
$11,361,727
$11,708,377
$11,929,284
$11,983,154
$12,329,706
$12,587,212
$12,660,144
$12,721,410
$13,052,438
$13,226,891
$13,372,538
$13,805,203
$14,067,743
$14,162,262
$14,240,463
$14,499,450
$14,788,470
$15,009,781
$15,241,061
$15,318,329
$15,473,586
$15,621,018
$15,760,436
$15,840,261
$15,923,855
$16,478,923

$2,229,953
$2,223,584
$813,289
$1,073,796
$1,362,885
$1,265,484
$976,765
$109,750
$849,274
$650,205
$759,094
$923,344
$1,141,362
$973,385
$38,521
$739,778
$528,880
$180,092
$468,749
$1,077,522
$1,268,388
$398,275
$1,450,011
$1,700,541
$1,448,465
$190,487
$327,592
$1,941,271
$2,684,139
$1,677,544
$802,133
$1,398,187
$252,421
$374,952
$1,147,299
$660,618
$324,124
$168,262
$863,320
$429,696
$248,414
$406,764
$148,424
$282,899
$328,371
$1,269,288
$1,238,037
$788,952
$192,393
$1,237,686
$919,662
$260,473
$218,807
$1,182,242
$623,046
$520,170
$1,545,230
$937,644
$337,569
$279,289
$924,952
$1,032,216
$790,394
$826,000
$275,958
$554,488
$526,544
$497,923
$285,089
$298,548
$1,982,388

Independent Cumulative Cost

Est Cost Independently (by LF)

w Road Project Cumulative Cost

Est Cost w Road Project (by LF)

Length (miles)

Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)

Priority Rank
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71

Unscheduled and Unfunded Trail Segments
(all costs 2017 dollars)

$2,229,953
$4,453,537
$5,266,826
$6,340,622
$7,703,507
$8,968,991
$9,945,756
$10,055,506
$10,904,780
$11,554,985
$12,314,080
$13,237,424
$14,378,786
$15,352,171
$15,390,692
$16,130,470
$16,659,350
$16,839,442
$17,308,192
$18,385,713
$19,654,101
$20,052,377
$21,502,388
$23,202,928
$24,651,393
$24,841,881
$25,169,473
$27,110,744
$29,794,883
$31,472,427
$32,274,560
$33,672,746
$33,925,167
$34,300,119
$35,447,418
$36,108,036
$36,432,160
$36,600,421
$37,463,741
$37,893,436
$38,141,851
$38,548,615
$38,697,039
$38,979,938
$39,308,309
$40,577,597
$41,815,633
$42,604,586
$42,796,979
$44,034,665
$44,954,328
$45,214,801
$45,433,608
$46,615,850
$47,238,896
$47,759,066
$49,304,295
$50,241,939
$50,579,508
$50,858,797
$51,783,750
$52,815,966
$53,606,360
$54,432,360
$54,708,318
$55,262,806
$55,789,350
$56,287,273
$56,572,362
$56,870,910
$58,853,297


### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $624,387
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $2,229,953
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access'</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length (feet) for estimate purposes: 8,894

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $622,604
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $2,223,584
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $227,721

Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $813,289
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $300,663
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,073,796
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length (feet) for estimate purposes: 5,452

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $381,608
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,362,885
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $354,336
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,265,484
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Minimal Tree Loss</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>ROW/Easements Not Needed</th>
<th>Minimal Utility Relocation</th>
<th>Passive / Recreational Use</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>High Use-Segment</th>
<th>Completes a Route</th>
<th>Village Center</th>
<th>Business Access</th>
<th>Library/Government Center</th>
<th>School Access</th>
<th>Connect to Transit Location</th>
<th>Regional Commuting</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $273,494
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $976,765
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $30,731
- **Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $109,753

---

**Hwy 7 Cr 101 to Seven Hi La**

**Trail Rank 8**

**Considerations**

- **Difficulty**
  - Environmental Impacts
  - Minimal Tree Loss
  - Solutions
  - ROW/Easements Not Needed
  - Minimal Utility Relocation
- **Effectiveness**
  - Passive / Recreational Use
  - Transportation
  - High Use Segment
  - Completes a Route
  - Village Center
  - Business Access
  - Library/Government Center
  - School Access
  - Connect to Transit Location
  - Regional Commuting
- **Nature of Use**
  - Transportation
  - Use Segment
  - Completes a Route
  - Village Center
  - Business Access
  - Library/Government Center
  - School Access
  - Connect to Transit Location
  - Regional Commuting
- **Community Access**
  - Length (feet) for estimate purposes
  - Village Center Ring
  - 1/2 Mile Village Center Ring

---

**Area of Interest**

- Funded Trail Segments
- Proposed Trails
- For the Trail Rank:
  - 1 - 19
  - 20 - 38
  - 39 - 56
  - 57 - 73
- Existing Sidewalks and Trails
- Poor Roads
- Schools

**Map Details**

- School Property
- Light Rail Station
- Village Center
- Alignment SWLRT LFA
- 1/4 Mile Village Center Ring
- 1/2 Mile Village Center Ring

---

**Printed: 3/29/2017**

**Unscheduled and Unfunded Trail Segments**

**Page 8 of 71**
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Length (feet) for estimate purposes | 3,397 |

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $237,797

Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $849,274
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $182,057

**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $650,205
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete a Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): | $212,546 |
| Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): | $759,094 |
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>Community Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y Y Y N Y N Y N N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trail Rank 12**

**Area of Interest**

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>Community Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y Y Y N Y N Y N N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $258,536
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $923,344
Trail Rank 13

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $319,581
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,141,362
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $272,548
- **Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $973,385
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Priority Score | Y | Y | N | N | N | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | N | N | N | N |

- **Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $10,786
- **Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $38,521
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (1=Low 10=High)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Access</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Minimal Tree Loss</th>
<th>Minimal Utility Relocation</th>
<th>Passive / Recreational Use</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>High Use Segment</th>
<th>Completes a Route</th>
<th>Village Center</th>
<th>Village Access</th>
<th>Library/Government Center</th>
<th>School Access</th>
<th>Connect to Transit Location</th>
<th>Regional Commuting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost with Road Project (by LF):</td>
<td>$207,138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Independent Project (by LF):</td>
<td>$739,778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>High Use-Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $148,086
- Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $528,880
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Solutions Not Needed</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $50,426
- **Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $180,092
Meadow Park to Ridgedale

Trail Rank 19

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access'</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $131,250
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $468,749
Old Excelsior Blvd - Vine Hill Rd to CR 101 N side of Hwy 7)

Trail Rank 20

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimates</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $301,706
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,077,522
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $355,149
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,268,388
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $111,517
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $398,275
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Impacts:
- Minimal Tree Loss: 5%
- ROW/Easements Not Needed: 10%
- Minimal Utility Relocation: 5%

Effectiveness:
- Difficulty: 4%
- Effectiveness: 5%

Nature of Use:
- Passive / Recreational Use: 10%
- Transportation: 10%
- High Use Segment: 15%
- Completes a Route: 5%
- Village Center: 10%
- Library/Government Center: 5%
- School Access: 5%
- Connect to Transit Location: 10%
- Regional Commuting: 5%

Community Access:
- Village Center: N
- Business Access: Y
- Library/Government Center: Y
- School Access: Y
- Connect to Transit Location: N
- Regional Commuting: N
- Length (feet) for estimate purposes: 5,800

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $406,003
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,450,011
## CR 16 - Crosby Rd to existing trail on west side of I-494

### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $476,151  
**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $1,700,541
**Rowland Rd/Bren Rd - Lone Lake Park to Opus trail system**

**Trail Rank 25**

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Recreational Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use-Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access/Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length (feet) for estimate purposes: 5,794

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $405,570

**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $1,448,465
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### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):</td>
<td>$53,336</td>
<td>Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):</td>
<td>$190,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $91,726

**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $327,592
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $543,556
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,941,271
Trail Rank 29

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>10237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $751,559
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $2,684,139
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $469,712
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,677,544
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $224,597
- Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $802,133
**Trail Rank 32**

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use-Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $391,492
- Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,398,187
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Excisions Not Needed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access'</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $70,678
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $252,421
Sunset Dr and Marion Lane West segments

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Village Center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):</td>
<td>$104,987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):</td>
<td>$374,952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4% 4% 10% 10% 15% 5% 10% 5% 5% 5% 10% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access`</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $321,244

**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $1,147,299
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $184,973  
**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $660,618
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $90,755

Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $324,124
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $241,729  
**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $863,320
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Environmental Impacts: 5%
- Minimal Tree Loss: 5%
- Minimal Utility Relocation: 4%
- Passive / Recreational Use: 10%
- Transportation: 10%
- High Use-Segment: 15%
- Completes a Route: 5%
- Village Center: 10%
- Library/Government Center: 5%
- School Access: 5%
- Connect to Transit Location: 10%
- Regional Commuting: 5%

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $120,315  
**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $429,696
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Environmental Impacts         | Y          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Minimal Tree Loss             | N          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Solutions                     | Y          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| ROW/Easements Not Needed      | Y          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Minimal Utility Relocation    | N          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Passive / Recreational Use    | Y          | Y             | Y             | N                | *                                 |
| Transportation                | N          | Y             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| High Use Segment              | Y          | Y             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Completes a Route             | N          | Y             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Village Center                | Y          | Y             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Library/Government Center     | N          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| School Access                 | N          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Connect to Transit Location   | N          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |
| Regional Commuting            | N          | N             | Y             | N                | N                                 |

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $113,894
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $406,764
NTC - Meeting St to existing trail on west side of I-494

**Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $41,559

**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $148,424
Clear Spring Rd - connect trail to Hwy 7

Trail Rank 44

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $79,212
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $282,899
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimal Easements Not Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $91,944
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $328,371
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Environmental Impacts: 5%
- Minimal Tree Loss: 2%
- Minimal Utility Relocation: 4%
- Passive / Recreational Use: 10%
- Transportation: 5%
- High Use Segment: 5%
- Complete a Route: 5%
- Village Center: 5%
- Library/Government Center: 5%
- School Access: 5%
- Connect to Transit Location: 5%
- Regional Commuting: 5%

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $355,401
**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $1,269,288
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Length (feet) for estimate purposes | 4,952 |

### Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $346,650
### Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,238,037
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Property</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Station</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sidewalks and Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $220,907
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $788,952
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $53,870  
**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $192,393
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use-Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):</td>
<td>$346,552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):</td>
<td>$1,237,686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Environmental Impacts          | 5%          | 5%             | 10%            | 15%               | 10%                                 |
| Minimal Tree Loss              | 2%          | 4%             | 10%            | 5%                | 1%                                  |
| ROW/Easements Not Needed       | 4%          | 10%            | 10%            | 5%                | 5%                                  |
| Minimal Utility Relocation     | 4%          | 10%            | 10%            | 5%                | 5%                                  |

| Environmental Impacts          | 5%          | 5%             | 10%            | 15%               | 10%                                 |
| Minimal Tree Loss              | 2%          | 4%             | 10%            | 5%                | 1%                                  |
| ROW/Easements Not Needed       | 4%          | 10%            | 10%            | 5%                | 5%                                  |
| Minimal Utility Relocation     | 4%          | 10%            | 10%            | 5%                | 5%                                  |

| Environmental Impacts          | 5%          | 5%             | 10%            | 15%               | 10%                                 |
| Minimal Tree Loss              | 2%          | 4%             | 10%            | 5%                | 1%                                  |
| ROW/Easements Not Needed       | 4%          | 10%            | 10%            | 5%                | 5%                                  |
| Minimal Utility Relocation     | 4%          | 10%            | 10%            | 5%                | 5%                                  |

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $257,505  
**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $919,662
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $72,933
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $260,473
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Business Access'</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $61,266  
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $218,807
Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use-Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>4,729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $331,028
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,182,242
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $174,453
- Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $623,046
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Length of Trail in Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $145,648

Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $520,170
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High, 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $432,664

**Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $1,545,230
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High; 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $262,540
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $937,644
**Westmill Rd - Spring Hill Park to Clear Spring Rd**

**Trail Rank 59**

### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High, 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $94,519
- **Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $337,569

Printed: 3/29/2017
Unscheduled and Unfunded Trail Segments
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High, 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Y N Y N Y N N N * N N N N Y N N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Environmental Impacts: 5%
- Minimal Tree Loss: 5%
- Solutions: 2%
- ROW/Easements Not Needed: 4%
- Minimal Utility Relocation: 4%
- Passive / Recreational Use: 10%
- Transportation: 10%
- High Use Segment: 15%
- Completes a Route: 5%
- Village Center: 10%
- Library/Government Center: 5%
- School Access: 5%
- Connect to Transit Location: 10%
- Regional Commuting: 5%
- Length (feet) for estimate purposes: 1,117

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $78,201
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $279,289
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use-Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $258,987
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $924,952
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access`</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>4,129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $289,021
* Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,032,216
Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High, 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $221,310
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $790,394
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus / Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):
$231,280

#### Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):
$826,000
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use-Segment</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $77,268
- Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $275,958
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>Community Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Complete a Route</td>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use</td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Access</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $155,257
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $554,488
## Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Est Cost with Road Project (by LF):** $147,432
- **Est Cost Independent Project (by LF):** $526,544
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Score</td>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $139,418
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $497,923
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
<th>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $79,825
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $285,089
### Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Y | N | Y | N | N | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | |

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $83,593
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $298,548
Highland Rd - Excelsior Blvd to Hwy 7

Trail Rank 71

Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Tree Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW/Easements Not Needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive / Recreational Use</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Government Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (feet) for estimate purposes</td>
<td>7,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est Cost with Road Project (by LF): $555,069
Est Cost Independent Project (by LF): $1,982,388
Trail Improvement Plan

Minnetonka Trails

- Historical Trail Development
- Trail Planning
- Costs and Funding

Hennepin County unpaved bicycle trail on the south side of Minnetonka Blvd, - 1900
Existing Trail and Sidewalk Network

• Citywide Inventory: 95 Miles
  – Concrete Sidewalks: 27 Miles
  – Paved Trails: 48 Miles
  – Gravel Trails: 20 Miles

• Winter Maintenance (including regional trails): 81 Miles
  – Concrete Sidewalks: 25 Miles
  – Paved Trails: 40 Miles
  – Gravel Trails: 16 Miles

Trail and Sidewalk System History

• Trail and Sidewalk System History
  – Existing Trail and Sidewalk System:
    • Off-road trails (paved and gravel)
    • Trails and sidewalks adjacent to roadways
    • On-road pedestrian-bicycle lanes

• First trail segment: 1971
  – Lake Street Extension
  – Led by Trails for Tonka
Trail and Sidewalk System History

- 1972 - $2.5 Million Park Referendum
  - Included $134,000 for trail development

- 1975 – Published Trails Guide Plan

- 1976 – Citywide Ped-Bike System established
  - Shifted lanes to provide a striped shoulder on selected roads

- 1981 – Ped-Bike system revised
  - Provided space on both sides of the road to comply with state law

Trail and Sidewalk System History

- Loop Trail System
  - Planning began in 1973 to connect Civic Center, Big Willow, Hilloway, and Meadow Parks.
Trail and Sidewalk System History

• Loop Trail Corridor System (LTS)
  – Mid 1980’s: planning began for citywide off-road trail system
  – Goal to create a system to connect the 5 community parks (Civic Center, Meadow, Big Willow, Lone Lake, Purgatory)
  – First segment completed in 1989
**Trail and Sidewalk System History**

1978 Trail Map

![1978 Trail Map](image)

**Trail and Sidewalk System History**

1988 Loop Trail System

![1988 Loop Trail System](image)
Trail and Sidewalk System History

1993 Loop Trail System

Trail and Sidewalk System History

1995 Loop Trail System
Trail and Sidewalk System History

2007 Missing Trail Links

Trail and Sidewalk System History

2012 Missing Trail Links
Missing Link Prioritization
Established 2009
Updated 2012 & 2016

Guidelines for Trail Link Prioritization

- Degree of Difficulty: 10%
- Cost Effectiveness: 10%
- Nature of Use: 40%
- Community Access: 40%
- Other factors (Environmental Impact, Waterway, Slopes, High Priority Trees, Internal vs. External, Easements, Median Relocation, Nature of Use, Connectivity to Village Center, Business Access, Place of Worship, Library, Gov. Center, Schools, Connectivity to transit location (park-n-ride, LRT, etc.), Regional Connectivity): 10%

Current Missing Trail Links

Unfunded Trail Segments by Priority Ranking

- Proposed Trails
- Existing Streets and Trails
- Village Center
- Light Rail Station

Map showing current missing trail links.
Current Missing Trail Links

Unfunded Length: 44.6 miles
Highest priority trails are concentrated along county roads

Unfunded Trail Segments by Priority Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Length (ft)</th>
<th>Cost in 2017 dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>828,397</td>
<td>$2,220,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>676,276</td>
<td>$2,119,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,076,798</td>
<td>$2,486,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,107,918</td>
<td>$2,220,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Cost

Currently Unfunded: $17,130,000 to $61,170,000
Top 10 Missing Trail Links

Top Ten Trail Segments

### Funding

- **Capital Improvement Plan**
  - Trail construction with road projects
  - Trail construction without road projects
- **Grants** (County, Safe Routes to School, DNR, etc.)
- **Partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category:</th>
<th>Parks, Trails and Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Trail Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost:</td>
<td>$6,025,000 Total Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Length in Miles</th>
<th>Estimated PTF Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodale Road - Afton (Way to Hwy 7)</td>
<td>PTF, Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail (Paving and navigational signage)</td>
<td>PTF, Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd (CR 61) - Amy Lane to Hildale Road</td>
<td>PTF, Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$1,850,000</td>
<td>$2,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail (Paving and navigational signage)</td>
<td>PTF, Other</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd - Twiwick Creek Dr to Plymouth-Canton</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail (Paving and navigational signage)</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior Blvd (CR 3) - Glenview to Caribou Rd</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior Blvd (CR 3) - Baker to Shady Oak (CR 61)</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority Ranking Calculation

CR 60 – CR 3 to CR 62

Below is a clip from the table showing which considerations apply to this future trail segment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Priority Score (Planning/Build)</th>
<th>Unscheduled and Unfunded Trail Segments (all costs 2017 dollars)</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Nature of Use</th>
<th>Community Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>CR 60 - CR 3 to CR 62</td>
<td>5% Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Material Free Loss</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KI/WK/RA/RA/RA/RA/R</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Assessment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on Recreation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Use Segment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completes a Route</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library/Government</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connect to Transit Location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Commuting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is the calculation to determine the Priority Score.

10% Transportation
15% High Use Segment
5% Completeness of Route
10% Village Center
5% Business Access
5% Library/Government Center
5% School Access
10% Connect to Transit Location

+ 5% Regional Commuting

70% or

Priority Ranking 7.0
City Council Agenda Item #14F  
Meeting of June 12, 2017

Brief Description: Public safety facilities design services contract, CIP amendment, and resolution authorizing an internal loan for the first phases of the contract to be repaid with future bond proceeds, if bonding is approved

Recommended Action: Approve the contract with Wold Engineers and Architects, amend the CIP and adopt the resolution

Background

In the spring of 2016, a consultant selection process was initiated to conduct an analysis of the city's police and fire facilities. The consulting firm that was selected was Wold Architects and Engineers of St. Paul. Their experience with over 20 public safety facilities and their professionalism resulted in their selection for the project.

In May of 2016, Wold began by meeting with staff and developing goals, guiding principles and anticipated outcomes for the project. The outcomes were to ensure the police and fire facilities meet service demands of today and the future by:

- Improving safety and response
- Accommodating growth and changing workforces
- Protecting investments in equipment

At the September 19, 2016 city council study session, the police and fire chiefs presented an overview of current operations and led a tour of the police and fire facilities on the Civic Center campus. This first-hand information was intended to provide a foundation for future discussions and decision making.

At the January 30, 2017 city council study session, John McNamara from Wold Architects and Engineers presented the findings of his analysis along with improvement alternatives and cost estimates for each of the alternatives. The council’s discussion indicated clearly that the preferred improvements were the construction of a new fire facility on the campus and the remodeling of the current police and fire space for police operations. This option provided the most value for the cost and met all of the anticipated outcomes of the study.

At the April 17, 2017 capital improvements study session, the council indicated its willingness to move the project ahead by inserting it in the 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The council strongly supported a transparent public process to help guide this major decision. The project process would consist of three
phases: (1) Needs Analysis and Concept Development; (2) Project Authorization; and
(3) Project Commencement.

**Phase 1: Needs Analysis and Concept Development**

- **Quarters 1–4 2016**: Analyze current space and identify needs
- **Quarters 1–2 2017**: City council reviews space study and considers options
- **Quarter 3 and 4 2017**: If council approves CIP and architects’ agreement, architects begin designing new facilities

**Phase 2: Project Authorization**

- **Quarters 2 and 3 2018**: 2019-23 CIP statutory public process for bond issuance
- **Quarters 3 and 4 2018**: City council reviews and authorizes architects’ plans and specifications - construction contract preparation begins
- **Quarter 1 2019**: Construction contract bidding begins and bond sale
- **Quarter 2 2019**: Contract awarded

**Phase 3: Project Commencement**

- **Quarters 3 2019 – Q 4 2020**: Fire station construction begins, followed by police remodel and addition
- **Quarter 1 2020**: Debt service begins

**Consultant Contract**

Attached for the council’s consideration and approval is a contract for Wold Architects and Engineers to move forward with schematic and detailed designs. The contract is separated into phases (schematic design, design development, construction documents, bidding or negotiation, and construction) with fees associated for each phase. The city has the right to terminate the contract at its convenience. If the contract is terminated, the city would be obligated to the architect only for services performed prior to termination, and reimbursable expenses incurred prior to termination. If the project is not constructed, the city would only be responsible for the fees associated for that phase of development. It is estimated that the design process will be completed by early 2018 and if approved, be advertised for bid in early 2019.

The city attorney has reviewed the contract and approved it as to form.

**Funding**

Costs under the contract for architectural services is estimated to be $1.513 million, which includes specified costs of $1.375 million and an additional estimated $138,000 (ten percent) for any additional services, which might arise during the project’s ongoing
development. The city currently anticipates ultimately financing these costs with the issuance of tax-exempt bonds in 2019 to cover the total price of the entire project.

With work under the contract beginning in 2017, staff recommends amending the 2017-21 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to accommodate the costs of these first development phases and authorizing an internal loan from the Special Assessment Construction Fund (SACF) to cash flow them. If after full public input the city council approves the project for construction, proceeds from the sale of bonds in 2019 would repay the SACF at that time. Staff recommends adopting a resolution to allow such internal borrowing.

Additional costs for the design of Furniture, Finishings and Equipment (FF&E) under the contract would also be borne by the proceeds of the 2019 tax exempt bonds after their issuance as one of the latter phases of development. These particular costs are currently undetermined, but are to be calculated on a fixed rate of six (6) percent of the documented FF&E actual costs.

**Recommendation**

Award the contract for the Public Safety Facilities Addition and Renovation to Wold Architects and Engineers, amend the CIP, and adopt the resolution authorizing an internal loan for the first phases of the contract to be repaid with future bond proceeds, if bonding is approved.

Submitted through:
- Geralyn Barone, City Manager
- Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager
- Merrill King, Finance Director
- Corrine Heine, City Attorney

Originated by:
- Brian Wagstrom, Public Works Director
AGREEMENT made as of the First day of April in the year Two Thousand and Seventeen
(In words, indicate day, month and year.)

BETWEEN the Architect’s client identified as the Owner:
(Name, legal status, address and other information)

City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard
Minnetonka, Minnesota 55345

and the Architect:
(Name, legal status, address and other information)

Wold Architects and Engineers
332 Minnesota Street Suite W2000
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101
Telephone Number: 651-227-7773
Fax Number: 651-223-5646

for the following Project:
(Name, location and detailed description)

Basic Contract Agreement for the Public Safety Facilities Addition and Renovation and
for future projects agreed upon in writing by both parties.

The Owner and Architect agree as follows.

ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS:
The author of this document has added information needed for its completion. The author may also
have revised the text of the original AIA standard form. An Additions and Deletions Report that notes added
information as well as revisions to the standard form text is available from the author and should be
reviewed. A vertical line in the left margin of this document indicates where the author has added
necessary information and where the author has added to or deleted from the original AIA text.

This document has important legal consequences. Consultation with an attorney is encouraged with respect
to its completion or modification.
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EXHIBIT A INITIAL INFORMATION

ARTICLE 1 INITIAL INFORMATION
§ 1.1 This Agreement is based on the Initial Information set forth in this Article 1 and in optional Exhibit A, Initial Information:
(Complete Exhibit A, Initial Information, and incorporate it into the Agreement at Section 13.2, or state below Initial Information such as details of the Project’s site and program, Owner’s contractors and consultants, Architect’s consultants, Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work, authorized representatives, anticipated procurement method, and other information relevant to the Project.)

§ 1.2 The Owner’s anticipated dates for commencement of construction and Substantial Completion of the Work are set forth below:
  .1 Commencement of construction date:
     | As mutually agreed upon by the parties in a future contract amendment.
  .2 Substantial Completion date:
     | As mutually agreed upon by the parties in a future contract amendment.

§ 1.3 The Owner and Architect may rely on the Initial Information. Both parties, however, recognize that such information may materially change and, in that event, the Owner and the Architect shall appropriately adjust the schedule, the Architect’s services and the Architect’s compensation.

ARTICLE 2 ARCHITECT’S RESPONSIBILITIES
§ 2.1 The Architect shall provide the professional services as set forth in this Agreement.
§ 2.2 The Architect shall perform its services consistent with the professional skill and care ordinarily provided by architects practicing in the same or similar locality under the same or similar circumstances. The Architect shall perform its services as expeditiously as is consistent with such professional skill and care and the orderly progress of the Project.

§ 2.2.1 Any designs, drawings, or specifications prepared or furnished by Architect that contain errors, conflicts or omissions will be promptly corrected by Architect at no additional cost to Owner. Owner’s approval, acceptance, use of or payment for all or any part of Architect’s services shall in no way alter Architect’s obligations or Owner’s rights under this section 2.2.

§ 2.2.2 Architect agrees that all Drawings and Specifications and other documents prepared by Architect for the Project which are utilized by Owner and/or Owner’s contractor or contractors, shall be reasonably accurate and complete as is customary for typical construction documents. Architect shall notify Owner in a prompt and timely manner of any discovered discrepancies, inconsistencies or missing information necessary to provide reasonably accurate and complete documents.

§ 2.3 The Architect shall identify a representative authorized to act on behalf of the Architect with respect to the Project.

§ 2.4 Except with the Owner’s knowledge and consent, the Architect shall not engage in any activity, or accept any employment, interest or contribution that would reasonably appear to compromise the Architect’s professional judgment with respect to this Project.

§ 2.5 Architect shall maintain in effect during the term of his Agreement the insurance coverages described below, which insurance must be placed with insurance companies authorized to do business in the State of Minnesota and rated A minus VII or better by the current edition of Best’s Key Rating Guide or otherwise approved by Buyer.

.1 Professional Liability Errors and Omissions Insurance including contractual liability coverage with limits of not less than $1,000,000 aggregate. Architect shall maintain this coverage in effect during the term of this Agreement and for two (2) years after the Date of Substantial Completion. Upon Owner’s request, Architect shall give prompt written notice to Owner of any and all claims made against this policy during the period in which this policy is required to be maintained pursuant to this Agreement.

(Paragraph deleted)

.2 Worker’s Compensation Insurance with statutory benefits and limits that fully comply with all state and federal requirements and contain Broad Form All States and Voluntary Compensation Endorsements and have limits not less than $500,000 per accident, $500,000 per disease and$500,000 policy limit on disease.

(Paragraph deleted)

.3 Comprehensive Automobile Liability Insurance with limits not less than $1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage.

.4 Commercial General Liability Insurance. A broad form Commercial General Liability Insurance Policy including, without limitation, a waiver of subrogation endorsement in favor of the additional insureds, and appropriate endorsements adding the following coverages: Premises and Operations Liability; Explosion, Collapse and Underground Damage Liability; Personal Injury Liability (with employee and contractual exclusions deleted); Broad Form Property Damage Liability; Broad Form Contractual Liability supporting Architect’s indemnification agreements in favor of the additional insureds; Independent Contractor’s Protective Liability; Completed Operations and products Liability for a period of not less than two (2) years following the date of final payment for all services provided under this Agreement, if insurance is available and affordable. The Commercial General Liability Insurance Policy must be written with a combined single limit of liability of not less than $1,000,000 for each occurrence of bodily injury and/or property damage and an annual aggregate of liability of not less than $2,000,000 for bodily injury and/or property damages, and an annual aggregate of liability of not less than $1,000,000 for Completed Operations and Product Liability.
.5 **Insurance requirements of subcontractors.** Architect agrees to require Subconsultants to comply with the insurance provisions required of Architect pursuant to this Agreement unless Architect and Owner mutually agree to modify these requirements for Subconsultants whose work is of relatively small scope. Architect agrees that it will contractually obligate its Subconsultants to advise Architect promptly of any changes or lapses of the requisite insurance coverages, and Architect agrees to promptly advise owner of any such notices Architect receives from its Subconsultants. Architect agrees that it will contractually obligate its Subconsultants to indemnify and hold harmless Owner to the same extent that Architect is required to do so as provided in this Agreement. Architect assumes all responsibility for monitoring Subconsultant contracts and insurance certificates for compliance with the insurance and other provisions of this Agreement until final completion of the Project.

*(Paragraphs deleted)*

.6 **Additional insurance requirements.** Architect shall not make changes in or allow the required insurance coverages to lapse without Owner’s prior written approval. All policies for insurance must be endorsed to contain a provision giving owner a thrity (30) day prior written notice by certified mail of any cancellation of that policy or material change in coverage. Receipt and review by Owner of any copies of insurance policies or insurance certificates shall not relieve Architect of its obligation to comply with the insurance provisions of this Agreement. The insurance provisions of this Agreement shall not be construed as a limitation on Architect’s responsibilities and liabilities pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

**ARTICLE 3 SCOPE OF ARCHITECT’S BASIC SERVICES**

§ 3.1 The Architect’s Basic Services consist of those described in Article 3 and include usual and customary structural, mechanical, and electrical engineering services, civil engineer, cost estimating, food service, pool, theater, acoustical, landscaping, consultant will be hired by Architect as services are required as part of Basic Services.

Services not set forth in this Article 3 are Additional Services.

§ 3.1.1 The Architect shall manage the Architect’s services, consult with the Owner, research applicable design criteria, attend Project meetings, communicate with members of the Project team and report progress to the Owner. Architect shall be fully responsible for coordinating all Architect’s Basic and Additional Services required under this Agreement regardless of whether performed by its own employees or by consultants hired by Architect to perform a portion of its services (“Subconsultants”). The purpose of such coordination is to ensure that the services required are performed in a reasonably efficient, timely and economical manner. Architect shall be responsible to Owner for the services furnished to Architect by any Subconsultant to the same extent as if Architect had furnished the services itself. Architect also agrees to coordinate and resolve any inconsistencies in its work and the work of its consultants. All of Architect’s contracts with its Subconsultant shall be in writing, signed by both parties, and shall include the following provision: "The Owner is intended to be a third party beneficiary of this agreement." Architect must comply with the requirements of Minn. Stat. § 471.425, subd. 4a with regarding to any contract with a Subconsultant, and the provisions of that statute are incorporated by reference.

§ 3.1.2 The Architect shall coordinate its services with those services provided by the Owner and the Owner’s consultants. The Architect shall be entitled to rely on the accuracy and completeness of services and information furnished by the Owner and the Owner’s consultants. The Architect shall provide prompt written notice to the Owner if the Architect becomes aware of any error, omission or inconsistency in such services or information.

§ 3.1.3 As soon as practicable after the date of this Agreement, the Architect shall submit for the Owner’s approval a schedule for the performance of the Architect’s services. The schedule initially shall include anticipated dates for the commencement of construction and for Substantial Completion of the Work as set forth in the Initial Information. The schedule shall include allowances for periods of time required for the Owner’s review, for the performance of the Owner’s consultants, and for approval of submissions by authorities having jurisdiction over the Project. Once approved by the Owner, time limits established by the schedule shall not, except for reasonable cause, be exceeded by the Architect or Owner. With the Owner’s approval, the Architect shall adjust the schedule, if necessary as the Project proceeds until the commencement of construction.

§ 3.1.4 The Architect shall not be responsible for an Owner’s directive or substitution made without the Architect’s approval.
§ 3.1.5 The Architect shall, at appropriate times, contact the governmental authorities required to approve the Construction Documents and the entities providing utility services to the Project. In designing the Project, the Architect shall respond to applicable design requirements imposed by such governmental authorities and by such entities providing utility services.

§ 3.1.6 The Architect shall assist the Owner in connection with the Owner’s responsibility for filing documents required for the approval of governmental authorities having jurisdiction over the Project.

§ 3.1.7 Architect shall promptly advise owner of any problems which come to Architect’s attention that may cause a delay in the completion of the Project, or any portion thereof, or in the performance of Architect’s services. Architect acknowledges that time is of the essence in this Agreement.

§ 3.2 SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE SERVICES

§ 3.2.1 The Architect shall review the program and other information furnished by the Owner, and shall review laws, codes, and regulations applicable to the Architect’s services.

§ 3.2.2 The Architect shall prepare a preliminary evaluation of the Owner’s program, schedule, budget for the Cost of the Work, Project site, and the proposed procurement or delivery method and other Initial Information, each in terms of the other, to ascertain the requirements of the Project. The Architect shall notify the Owner of (1) any inconsistencies discovered in the information, and (2) other information or consulting services that may be reasonably needed for the Project.

§ 3.2.3 The Architect shall present its preliminary evaluation to the Owner and shall discuss with the Owner alternative approaches to design and construction of the Project, including the feasibility of incorporating environmentally responsible design approaches if requested by Owner. The Architect shall reach an understanding with the Owner regarding the requirements of the Project.

§ 3.2.4 Based on the Project’s requirements agreed upon with the Owner, the Architect shall prepare and present for the Owner’s approval a preliminary design illustrating the scale and relationship of the Project components.

§ 3.2.5 Based on the Owner’s approval of the preliminary design, the Architect shall prepare Schematic Design Documents for the Owner’s approval. The Schematic Design Documents shall consist of drawings and other documents including a site plan, if appropriate, and preliminary building plans, sections and elevations; and shall include some combination of study models, perspective sketches, or digital modeling as agreed by the parties. Preliminary selections of major building systems and construction materials shall be noted on the drawings or described in writing.

§ 3.2.5.1 The Architect shall consider, if requested by the Owner, environmentally responsible design alternatives, such as material choices and building orientation, together with other considerations based on program and aesthetics, in developing a design that is consistent with the Owner’s program, schedule and budget for the Cost of the Work. The Owner may obtain other environmentally responsible design services under Article 4.

§ 3.2.5.2 The Architect shall consider the value of alternative materials, building systems and equipment, together with other considerations based on program and aesthetics, in developing a design for the Project that is consistent with the Owner’s program, schedule and budget for the Cost of the Work.

§ 3.2.6 The Architect shall submit to the Owner an estimate of the Cost of the Work prepared in accordance with Section 6.3.

§ 3.2.7 The Architect shall submit the Schematic Design Documents to the Owner, and request the Owner’s approval. The Architect shall not perform Design Development Phase services until the Minnetonka city manager has approved the Schematic Design Documents. Design Development Phase services that are performed in advance of the city manager’s approval shall be at Architect’s risk.

§ 3.3 DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE SERVICES

§ 3.3.1 Based on the Owner’s approval of the Schematic Design Documents, and on the Owner’s authorization of any adjustments in the Project requirements and the budget for the Cost of the Work, the Architect shall prepare
Design Development Documents for the Owner’s approval. The Design Development Documents shall illustrate and describe the development of the approved Schematic Design Documents and shall consist of drawings and other documents including plans, sections, elevations, typical construction details, and diagrammatic layouts of building systems to fix and describe the size and character of the Project as to architectural, structural, mechanical and electrical systems, and such other elements as may be appropriate. The Design Development Documents shall also include outline specifications that identify major materials and systems and establish in general their quality levels.

§ 3.3.2 The Architect shall update the estimate of the Cost of the Work.

§ 3.3.3 The Architect shall submit the Design Development documents to the Owner, advise the Owner of any adjustments to the estimate of the Cost of the Work, and request the Owner’s approval. The Architect shall not perform Construction Documents Phase services until the Minnetonka city manager has approved the Design Development documents. Construction Documents Phase services that are performed in advance of the city manager’s approval shall be at Architect’s risk.

§ 3.4 CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE SERVICES

§ 3.4.1 Based on the Owner’s approval of the Design Development Documents, and on the Owner’s authorization of any adjustments in the Project requirements and the budget for the Cost of the Work, the Architect shall prepare Construction Documents for the Owner’s approval. The Construction Documents shall illustrate and describe the further development of the approved Design Development Documents and shall consist of Drawings and Specifications setting forth in detail the quality levels of materials and systems and other requirements for the construction of the Work. The Owner and Architect acknowledge that in order to construct the Work the Contractor will provide additional information, including Shop Drawings, Product Data, Samples and other similar submittals, which the Architect shall review in accordance with Section 3.6.4.

§ 3.4.2 The Architect shall provide a design which when constructed in accordance with the Contract Documents will comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations, orders or other legal requirements, including but not limited to all zoning restrictions or requirements of record, building, occupancy, environmental, disabled persons accessibility and land use laws, requirements, regulations and ordinances relating to the construction, use and occupancy of the Project existing on the date of this Agreement and which may be enacted prior to Owner’s approval of completed Construction Documents. Architect shall use its best efforts to avoid incorporating into the Project design, elements that would give rise to code interpretation questions and to discuss in advance all such situations with Owner. To the extent Architect is required to revise work previously performed as a result of an unanticipated change in applicable regulations, that work will be considered additional services.

§ 3.4.3 During the development of the Construction Documents, the Architect shall assist the Owner in the development and preparation of (1) bidding and procurement information that describes the time, place and conditions of bidding, including bidding or proposal forms; (2) the form of agreement between the Owner and Contractor; and (3) the Conditions of the Contract for Construction (General, Supplementary and other Conditions). The Architect shall also compile a project manual that includes the Conditions of the Contract for Construction and Specifications and may include bidding requirements and sample forms.

§ 3.4.4 The Architect shall update the estimate for the Cost of the Work.

§ 3.4.5 The Architect shall submit the Construction Documents to the Owner, advise the Owner of any adjustments to the estimate of the Cost of the Work, take any action required under Section 6.5, and request the Owner’s approval. The Architect shall after consultation with the Owner be primarily responsible for the preparation of the necessary bidding information and bidding forms. The Architect shall also assist the owner in the preparation of the General Conditions of the Contract for Construction, and form of agreement between the Owner and Contractor. All bidding documents and contractual agreements shall be in compliance with the requirements of Minnesota’s public bidding and contracting law as those laws apply to public entities.

§ 3.4.6 The Architect shall work with the Owner in connection with the Owner’s responsibility for filing documents required for the approval of governmental authorities having jurisdiction over the Project. The Architect shall have the primary responsibility to complete the required documents and ensure that they are properly filed on behalf of the Owner. The Architect shall observe those applicable laws, statutes, ordinances, codes, rules and regulations in
force and publically announced as of the date of this agreement or as of the date of subsequent compensation amendments whichever is the latter.

§ 3.5 BIDDING OR NEGOTIATION PHASE SERVICES
§ 3.5.1 GENERAL
Prior to initiation of the Bidding or Negotiation Phase, Owner will determine whether it will (a) negotiate a contract with a construction manager and bid one or more separate construction contracts for the Project or (b) bid a single contract with a general contractor for the construction of the Project.

.1 If Owner elects to use a Construction Manager, Owner will be responsible for the selection of the Construction Manager, and Architect will provide feedback in the selection of the Construction Manager upon Owner’s request. Architect will cooperate with Owner to modify the scope of this Agreement as necessary to avoid duplication of services with the Construction Manager.

.2 If Owner elects to use a general contractor without a Construction Manager, Architect shall assist the Owner in establishing a list of prospective contractors. Following the Owner’s approval of the Construction Documents, the Architect shall assist the Owner in (1) obtaining competitive bids and negotiated proposals, as applicable; (2) confirming responsiveness of bids and proposals; (3) determining the successful bid(s) and proposal, as applicable; and (4) awarding and preparing contracts for construction.

§ 3.5.2 COMPETITIVE BIDDING
§ 3.5.2.1 Bidding Documents shall consist of bidding requirements and proposed Contract Documents.

§ 3.5.2.2 The Architect shall assist the Owner in bidding the Project by

.1 procuring the reproduction of Bidding Documents for distribution to prospective bidders;
.2 distributing the Bidding Documents to prospective bidders, requesting their return upon completion of the bidding process, and maintaining a log of distribution and retrieval and of the amounts of deposits, if any, received from and returned to prospective bidders;
.3 organizing and conducting a pre-bid conference for prospective bidders, if requested by Owner;
.4 preparing responses to questions from prospective bidders and providing clarifications and interpretations of the Bidding Documents to all prospective bidders in the form of addenda; and
.5 organizing and conducting the opening of the bids, and subsequently documenting and distributing the bidding results, as directed by the Owner.

§ 3.5.2.3 The Architect shall consider requests for substitutions, if the Bidding Documents permit substitutions, and shall prepare and distribute addenda identifying approved substitutions to all prospective bidders.

(Paragraphs deleted)
§ 3.5.2.4 In the event the lowest bid (or bids) exceeds the budget for the Project, the Architect, in consultation with and at the direction of the Owner, shall provide such modifications in the Contract Documents as necessary to bring the cost of the Project within the budget, unless Owner directs the Architect to bid a project estimated over budget.

§ 3.6 CONSTRUCTION PHASE SERVICES
§ 3.6.1 GENERAL
§ 3.6.1.1 The Architect shall provide administration of the Contract between the Owner and the Contractor as set forth below and in AIA Document A201™-2007, General Conditions of the Contract for Construction. If the Owner and Contractor modify AIA Document A201–2007, those modifications shall not affect the Architect’s services under this Agreement unless the Owner and the Architect amend this Agreement.

§ 3.6.1.2 The Architect shall advise and consult with the Owner during the Construction Phase Services. The Architect shall have authority to act on behalf of the Owner only to the extent provided in this Agreement. The Architect shall not have control over, charge of, or responsibility for the construction means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures, or for safety precautions and programs in connection with the Work, nor shall the Architect be responsible for the Contractor’s failure to perform the Work in accordance with the requirements of the Contract Documents. The Architect shall be responsible for the Architect’s negligent acts or omissions, but shall not have control over or charge of, and shall not be responsible for, acts or omissions of the Contractor or of any other persons or entities performing portions of the Work.
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User Notes:
§ 3.6.1.3 Subject to Section 4.3, the Architect’s responsibility to provide Construction Phase Services commences with the award of the Contract for Construction and terminates at the end of the one year contractor’s construction warranty period.

§ 3.6.2 EVALUATIONS OF THE WORK
§ 3.6.2.1 The Architect shall visit the site at intervals appropriate to the stage of construction, or as otherwise required in Section 4.3.3, to become generally familiar with the progress and quality of the portion of the Work completed, and to determine, in general, if the Work observed is being performed in a manner indicating that the Work, when fully completed, will be in accordance with the Contract Documents. However, the Architect shall not be required to make exhaustive or continuous on-site inspections to check the quality or quantity of the Work. On the basis of the site visits, the Architect shall keep the Owner reasonably informed about the progress and quality of the portion of the Work completed, and report to the Owner (1) known deviations from the Contract Documents and from the most recent construction schedule submitted by the Contractor, and (2) defects and deficiencies observed in the Work.

§ 3.6.2.2 The Architect has the authority to reject Work that does not conform to the Contract Documents. Whenever the Architect considers it necessary or advisable, the Architect shall have the authority to require inspection or testing of the Work in accordance with the provisions of the Contract Documents, whether or not such Work is fabricated, installed or completed. However, neither this authority of the Architect nor a decision made in good faith either to exercise or not to exercise such authority shall give rise to a duty or responsibility of the Architect to the Contractor, Subcontractors, material and equipment suppliers, their agents or employees or other persons or entities performing portions of the Work.

§ 3.6.2.3 The Architect shall interpret and decide matters concerning performance under, and requirements of, the Contract Documents on written request of either the Owner or Contractor. The Architect’s response to such requests shall be made in writing within any time limits agreed upon or otherwise with reasonable promptness.

§ 3.6.2.4 Interpretations and decisions of the Architect shall be consistent with the intent of and reasonably inferable from the Contract Documents and shall be in writing or in the form of drawings. When making such interpretations and decisions, the Architect shall endeavor to secure faithful performance by both Owner and Contractor, shall not show partiality to either, and shall not be liable for results of interpretations or decisions rendered in good faith. The Architect’s decisions on matters relating to aesthetic effect shall be final if consistent with the intent expressed in the Contract Documents.

§ 3.6.2.5 Unless the Owner and Contractor designate another person to serve as an Initial Decision Maker, as that term is defined in AIA Document A201–2007, the Architect shall render initial decisions on Claims between the Owner and Contractor as provided in the Contract Documents.

§ 3.6.3 CERTIFICATES FOR PAYMENT TO CONTRACTOR
§ 3.6.3.1 The Architect shall review and certify the amounts due the Contractor and shall issue certificates in such amounts. The Architect’s certification for payment shall constitute a representation to the Owner, based on the Architect’s evaluation of the Work as provided in Section 3.6.2 and on the data comprising the Contractor’s Application for Payment, that, to the best of the Architect’s knowledge, information and belief, the Work has progressed to the point indicated and that the quality of the Work is in accordance with the Contract Documents. The foregoing representations are subject (1) to an evaluation of the Work for conformance with the Contract Documents upon Substantial Completion, (2) to results of subsequent tests and inspections, (3) to correction of minor deviations from the Contract Documents prior to completion, and (4) to specific qualifications expressed by the Architect.

§ 3.6.3.2 The issuance of a Certificate for Payment shall not be a representation that the Architect has (1) made exhaustive or continuous on-site inspections to check the quality or quantity of the Work, (2) reviewed construction means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures, (3) reviewed copies of requisitions received from Subcontractors and material suppliers and other data requested by the Owner to substantiate the Contractor’s right to payment, or (4) ascertained how or for what purpose the Contractor has used money previously paid on account of the Contract Sum.
§ 3.6.3.3 The Architect shall maintain a record of the Applications and Certificates for Payment.

§ 3.6.4 SUBMITTALS
§ 3.6.4.1 The Architect shall review the Contractor’s submittal schedule and shall not unreasonably delay or withhold approval. The Architect’s action in reviewing submittals shall be taken in accordance with the approved submittal schedule or, in the absence of an approved submittal schedule, with reasonable promptness while allowing sufficient time in the Architect’s professional judgment to permit adequate review.

§ 3.6.4.2 In accordance with the Architect-approved submittal schedule, the Architect shall review or take other appropriate action upon the Contractor’s submittals such as Shop Drawings, Product Data and Samples, but only for the limited purpose of checking for conformance with information given and the design concept expressed in the Contract Documents. Review of such submittals is not for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of other information such as dimensions, quantities, and installation or performance of equipment or systems, which are the Contractor’s responsibility. The Architect’s review shall not constitute approval of safety precautions or, unless otherwise specifically stated by the Architect, of any construction means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures. The Architect’s approval of a specific item shall not indicate approval of an assembly of which the item is a component.

§ 3.6.4.3 If the Contract Documents specifically require the Contractor to provide professional design services or certifications by a design professional related to systems, materials or equipment, the Architect shall specify the appropriate performance and design criteria that such services must satisfy. The Architect shall review Shop Drawings and other submittals related to the Work designed or certified by the design professional retained by the Contractor that bear such professional’s seal and signature when submitted to the Architect. The Architect shall be entitled to rely upon the adequacy, accuracy and completeness of the services, certifications and approvals performed or provided by such design professionals.

§ 3.6.4.4 Subject to the provisions of Section 4.3, the Architect shall review and respond to requests for information about the Contract Documents. The Architect shall set forth in the Contract Documents the requirements for requests for information. Requests for information shall include, at a minimum, a detailed written statement that indicates the specific Drawings or Specifications in need of clarification and the nature of the clarification requested. The Architect’s response to such requests shall be made in writing within any time limits agreed upon, or otherwise with reasonable promptness. If appropriate, the Architect shall prepare and issue supplemental Drawings and Specifications in response to requests for information.

§ 3.6.4.5 The Architect shall maintain a record of submittals and copies of submittals supplied by the Contractor in accordance with the requirements of the Contract Documents.

§ 3.6.5 CHANGES IN THE WORK
§ 3.6.5.1 The Architect may authorize minor changes in the Work that are consistent with the intent of the Contract Documents and do not involve an adjustment in the Contract Sum or an extension of the Contract Time. Subject to the provisions of Section 4.3, the Architect shall prepare Change Orders and Construction Change Directives for the Owner’s approval and execution in accordance with the Contract Documents.

§ 3.6.5.2 The Architect shall maintain records relative to changes in the Work.

§ 3.6.6 PROJECT COMPLETION
§ 3.6.6.1 The Architect shall conduct inspections to determine the date or dates of Substantial Completion and the date of final completion; issue Certificates of Substantial Completion; receive from the Contractor and forward to the Owner, for the Owner’s review and records, written warranties and related documents required by the Contract Documents and assembled by the Contractor; and issue a final Certificate for Payment based upon a final inspection indicating the Work complies with the requirements of the Contract Documents.

§ 3.6.6.2 The Architect’s inspections shall be conducted with the Owner to check conformance of the Work with the requirements of the Contract Documents and to verify the accuracy and completeness of the list submitted by the Contractor of Work to be completed or corrected.
§ 3.6.6.3 When the Work is found to be substantially complete, the Architect shall inform the Owner about
the balance of the Contract Sum remaining to be paid the Contractor, including the amount to be retained from
the Contract Sum, if any, for final completion or correction of the Work.

§ 3.6.6.4 The Architect shall forward to the Owner the following information received from the Contractor: (1)
consent of surety or sureties, if any, to reduction in or partial release of retainage or the making of final payment; (2)
affidavits, receipts, releases and waivers of liens or bonds indemnifying the Owner against liens; and (3) any other
documentation required of the Contractor under the Contract Documents.

§ 3.6.6.5 Upon request of the Owner, and prior to the expiration of one year from the date of Substantial Completion,
the Architect shall, without additional compensation, conduct a meeting with the Owner to review the facility
operations and performance.

ARTICLE 4 ADDITIONAL SERVICES

§ 4.1 Additional Services listed below are not included in Basic Services but may be required for the Project. The
Architect shall provide the listed Additional Services only if specifically designated in the table below as the
Architect’s responsibility, and the Owner shall compensate the Architect as provided in Section 11.2.
(Designate the Additional Services the Architect shall provide in the second column of the table below. In the third
column indicate whether the service description is located in Section 4.2 or in an attached exhibit. If in an exhibit,
identify the exhibit.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Services</th>
<th>Responsibility (Architect, Owner or Not Provided)</th>
<th>Location of Service Description (Section 4.2 below or in an exhibit attached to this document and identified below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.1 Programming</td>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.2 Multiple preliminary designs</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.3 Measured drawings</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.4 Existing facilities surveys</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.5 Site Evaluation and Planning (B203™-2007)</td>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.6 Building information modeling</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.7 Civil engineering</td>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.8 Landscape design</td>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.9 Architectural Interior Design (B252™-2007)</td>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.10 Value Analysis (B204™-2007)</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.11 Detailed cost estimating</td>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.12 On-site project representation</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.13 Conformed construction documents</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.14 As-Designed Record drawings</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.15 As-Constructed Record drawings</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.16 Post occupancy evaluation</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.17 Facility Support Services (B210™-2007)</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.18 Tenant-related services</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.19 Coordination of Owner’s consultants</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.20 Telecommunications/data design</td>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.21 Security Evaluation and Planning (B206™-2007)</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.22 Commissioning (B211™-2007)</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.23 Extensive environmentally responsible design</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.24 LEED® Certification (B214™-2007)</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.25 Fast-track design services</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.26 Historic Preservation (B205™-2007)</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.27 Furniture, Furnishings, and Equipment Design (B253™-2007)</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4.1.28 Preparation for and attendance at public meetings, presentations or hearings at the</td>
<td>3 public meetings included in Basic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 4.2 Insert a description of each Additional Service designated in Section 4.1 as the Architect’s responsibility, if not further described in an exhibit attached to this document.

§ 4.2.1 Furniture, Furnishings and Equipment Design – Fixed Fee based on 6% of the Furniture, Finishing, and Equipment cost of the agreed upon scope.

§ 4.2.2 Government Data. Architect acknowledges that, to the extent this Agreement requires Architect to perform a government function, all of the data created, collected, received, stored, used, maintained or disseminated by Architect in performing government functions is subject to the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (Minn. Stat. ch. 13, the "MGDPA"), and that Architect must comply with the MGDPA as if Architect were a government entity, including the remedies in Minn. Stat. §13.08.

§ 4.3 Additional Services may be provided after execution of this Agreement, without invalidating the Agreement. Except for services required due to the fault of the Architect, any Additional Services provided in accordance with this Section 4.3 shall entitle the Architect to compensation pursuant to Section 11.3 and an appropriate adjustment in the Architect’s schedule.

§ 4.3.1 Upon recognizing the need to perform the following Additional Services, the Architect shall notify the Owner with reasonable promptness and explain the facts and circumstances giving rise to the need. The Architect shall not proceed to provide the following services until the Architect receives the Owner’s written authorization:

.1 Services necessitated by a change in the Initial Information, previous instructions or approvals given by the Owner, or a material change in the Project including, but not limited to, size, quality, complexity, the Owner’s schedule or budget for Cost of the Work, or procurement or delivery method;

.2 Services necessitated by the Owner’s request for extensive environmentally responsible design alternatives, such as unique system designs, in-depth material research, energy modeling, or LEED® certification;

.3 Changing or editing previously prepared Instruments of Service necessitated by the enactment or revision of codes, laws or regulations or official interpretations;

.4 Services necessitated by decisions of the Owner not rendered in a timely manner or any other failure of performance on the part of the Owner or the Owner’s consultants or contractors;

.5 Preparing digital data for transmission to the Owner’s consultants and contractors, or to other Owner authorized recipients;

.6 Preparation of design and documentation for alternate bid or proposal requests proposed by the Owner;

.7 Preparation for, and attendance at, a public presentation, meeting or hearing;

.8 Preparation for, and attendance at a dispute resolution proceeding or legal proceeding, except where the Architect is party thereto;

.9 Evaluation of the qualifications of bidders or persons providing proposals;

.10 Consultation concerning replacement of Work resulting from fire or other cause during construction; or

.11 Assistance to the Initial Decision Maker, if other than the Architect.

.12 Additional Services shall specifically include Services and Reimbursable regarding Architect responses or actions related to requests under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act ("MGDPA"). Additional Services related to the MGDPA may be provided by the Architect without the Owner’s consent or permission. Owner’s obligation to pay Architect for Additional Services regarding the MGDPA shall survive the termination or completion of Services under this Agreement. Architect must notify Owner promptly of any MGDPA request made to Architect and must cooperate with Owner in responding to the request.

§ 4.3.2 To avoid delay in the Construction Phase, the Architect shall provide the following Additional Services, notify the Owner with reasonable promptness, and explain the facts and circumstances giving rise to the need. If the Owner subsequently determines that all or parts of those services are not required, the Owner shall give prompt written notice to the Architect, and the Owner shall have no further obligation to compensate the Architect for those services:
.1 Reviewing a Contractor’s submittal out of sequence from the submittal schedule agreed to by the Architect;

.2 Responding to the Contractor’s requests for information that are not prepared in accordance with the Contract Documents or where such information is available to the Contractor from a careful study and comparison of the Contract Documents, field conditions, other Owner-provided information, Contractor-prepared coordination drawings, or prior Project correspondence or documentation;

.3 Preparing Change Orders and Construction Change Directives that require evaluation of Contractor’s proposals and supporting data, or the preparation or revision of Instruments of Service;

.4 Evaluating an extensive number of Claims as the Initial Decision Maker;

.5 Evaluating substitutions proposed by the Owner or Contractor and making subsequent revisions to Instruments of Service resulting therefrom; or

.6 To the extent the Architect’s Basic Services are affected, providing Construction Phase Services 60 days after (1) the date of Substantial Completion of the Work or (2) the anticipated date of Substantial Completion identified in Initial Information, whichever is earlier.

(Paragraphs deleted)

§ 4.3.4 If the services covered by this Agreement have not been completed within Forty-Eight (48) months of the date of this Agreement, through no fault of the Architect, extension of the Architect’s services beyond that time shall be compensated as Additional Services.

ARTICLE 5
OWNER’S RESPONSIBILITIES

§ 5.1 Unless otherwise provided for under this Agreement, the Owner shall provide information in a timely manner regarding requirements for and limitations on the Project, including a written program which shall set forth the Owner’s objectives, schedule, constraints and criteria, including space requirements and relationships, flexibility, expandability, special equipment, systems and site requirements. Within 15 days after receipt of a written request from the Architect, the Owner shall furnish the requested information as necessary and relevant for the Architect to evaluate, give notice of or enforce lien rights.

§ 5.2 The Owner shall establish and periodically update the Owner’s budget for the Project, including (1) the budget for the Cost of the Work as defined in Section 6.1; (2) the Owner’s other costs; and, (3) reasonable contingencies related to all of these costs. If the Owner significantly increases or decreases the Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work, the Owner shall notify the Architect. The Owner and the Architect shall thereafter agree to a corresponding change in the Project’s scope and quality.

§ 5.3 The Owner shall identify a representative authorized to act on the Owner’s behalf with respect to the Project. The Owner shall render decisions and approve the Architect’s submittals in a timely manner in order to avoid unreasonable delay in the orderly and sequential progress of the Architect’s services. The Owner’s representative does not have the authority to approve an amendment to this Agreement.

§ 5.4 The Owner shall furnish surveys to describe physical characteristics, legal limitations and utility locations for the site of the Project, and a written legal description of the site. The surveys and legal information shall include, as applicable, grades and lines of streets, alleys, pavements and adjoining property and structures; designated wetlands; adjacent drainage; rights-of-way, restrictions, easements, encroachments, zoning, deed restrictions, boundaries and contours of the site; locations, dimensions and necessary data with respect to existing buildings, other improvements and trees; and information concerning available utility services and lines, both public and private, above and below grade, including invents and depths. All the information on the survey shall be referenced to a Project benchmark.

§ 5.5 The Owner shall furnish services of geotechnical engineers, which may include but are not limited to test borings, test pits, determinations of soil bearing values, percolation tests, evaluations of hazardous materials, seismic evaluation, ground corrosion tests and resistivity tests, including necessary operations for anticipating subsoil conditions, with written reports and appropriate recommendations.

§ 5.6 The Owner shall coordinate the services of its own consultants with those services provided by the Architect. Upon the Architect’s request, the Owner shall furnish copies of the scope of services in the contracts between the Owner and the Owner’s consultants. The Owner shall furnish the services of consultants other than those designated in this Agreement, or authorize the Architect to furnish them as an Additional Service, when the Architect requests
such services and demonstrates that they are reasonably required by the scope of the Project. The Owner shall require that its consultants maintain professional liability insurance as appropriate to the services provided.

§ 5.7 The Owner shall furnish tests, inspections and reports required by law or the Contract Documents, such as structural, mechanical, and chemical tests, tests for air and water pollution, and tests for hazardous materials.

§ 5.8 The Owner shall furnish all legal, insurance and accounting services, including auditing services, that may be reasonably necessary at any time for the Project to meet the Owner’s needs and interests.

§ 5.9 The Owner shall provide prompt written notice to the Architect if the Owner becomes aware of any fault or defect in the Project, including errors, omissions or inconsistencies in the Architect’s Instruments of Service.

§ 5.10 Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, or when direct communications have been specially authorized, the Owner shall endeavor to communicate with the Contractor and the Architect’s consultants through the Architect about matters arising out of or relating to the Contract Documents. The Owner shall promptly notify the Architect of any direct communications that may affect the Architect’s services.

§ 5.11 Before executing the Contract for Construction, the Owner shall coordinate the Architect’s duties and responsibilities set forth in the Contract for Construction with the Architect’s services set forth in this Agreement. The Owner shall provide the Architect a copy of the executed agreement between the Owner and Contractor, including the General Conditions of the Contract for Construction.

§ 5.12 The Owner shall provide the Architect access to the Project site prior to commencement of the Work and shall obligate the Contractor to provide the Architect access to the Work wherever it is in preparation or progress.

§ 5.13 Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Agreement, owner’s review and approval of any and all documents or other matters required herein shall be for the purpose of providing Architect with information as to Owner’s objectives and goals with respect to the Project and not for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of such documents, and in no way should any review and approval alter Architect’s responsibilities hereunder and with respect to such documents.

ARTICLE 6 COST OF THE WORK
§ 6.1 For purposes of this Agreement, the Cost of the Work shall be the total cost to the Owner to construct all elements of the Project designed or specified by the Architect and shall include contractors’ general conditions costs, overhead and profit. The Cost of the Work does not include the compensation of the Architect, the costs of the land, rights-of-way, financing, contingencies for changes in the Work, the value of any work performed by the Owner, or other costs that are the responsibility of the Owner.

§ 6.2 The Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work is provided in Initial Information, and may be adjusted throughout the Project as required under Sections 5.2, 6.4 and 6.5. Evaluations of the Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work, the preliminary estimate of the Cost of the Work and updated estimates of the Cost of the Work prepared by the Architect, represent the Architect’s judgment as a design professional. It is recognized, however, that neither the Architect nor the Owner has control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment; the Contractor’s methods of determining bid prices; or competitive bidding, market or negotiating conditions. Accordingly, the Architect cannot and does not warrant or represent that bids or negotiated prices will not vary from the Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work or from any estimate of the Cost of the Work or evaluation prepared or agreed to by the Architect.

§ 6.3 In preparing estimates of the Cost of Work, the Architect shall be permitted to include contingencies for design, bidding and price escalation; to determine what materials, equipment, component systems and types of construction are to be included in the Contract Documents; to make reasonable adjustments in the program and scope of the Project; and to include in the Contract Documents alternate bids as may be necessary to adjust the estimated Cost of the Work to meet the Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work. The Architect’s estimate of the Cost of the Work shall be based on current area, volume or similar conceptual estimating techniques.

§ 6.4 If the Bidding or Negotiation Phase has not commenced within 90 days after the Architect submits the Construction Documents to the Owner, through no fault of the Architect, the Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work shall be adjusted to reflect changes in the general level of prices in the applicable construction market.
§ 6.5 If at any time the Architect’s estimate of the Cost of the Work exceeds the Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work, the Architect shall make appropriate recommendations to the Owner to adjust the Project’s size, quality or budget for the Cost of the Work, and the Owner shall cooperate with the Architect in making such adjustments.

§ 6.6 If the Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work at the conclusion of the Construction Documents Phase Services is exceeded by the lowest bona fide bid or negotiated proposal, the Owner shall
   .1 give written approval of an increase in the budget for the Cost of the Work;
   .2 authorize rebidding or renegotiating of the Project within a reasonable time;
   .3 terminate in accordance with Section 9.5;
   .4 in consultation with the Architect, revise the Project program, scope, or quality as required to reduce the Cost of the Work; or
   .5 implement any other mutually acceptable alternative.

§ 6.7 If the Owner chooses to proceed under Section 6.6.4, the Architect, without additional compensation, shall modify the Construction Documents as necessary to comply with the Owner’s budget for the Cost of the Work at the conclusion of the Construction Documents Phase Services, or the budget as adjusted under Section 6.6.1. The Architect’s modification of the Construction Documents shall be the limit of the Architect’s responsibility under this Article 6.

**ARTICLE 7 COPYRIGHTS AND LICENSES**

§ 7.1 The Architect and the Owner warrant that in transmitting Instruments of Service, or any other information, the transmitting party is the copyright owner of such information or has permission from the copyright owner to transmit such information for its use on the Project. If the Owner and Architect intend to transmit Instruments of Service or any other information or documentation in digital form, they shall endeavor to establish necessary protocols governing such transmissions.

§ 7.2 The Instruments of Service are the property of both the Owner (upon full payment to the Architect) and the Architect and the Architect’s Consultants and may be used by both the Owner and the Architect as they deem necessary, in their reasonable discretion. Either the Owner or the Architect may retain copies, reproduce copies, and disseminate copies of the Instruments of Service as are reasonably necessary for the construction, repair, maintenance or alteration of the Project.

(Paragraph deleted)

§ 7.3.1 In the event the Owner uses the Instruments of Service without retaining the author of the Instruments of Service, the Owner releases the Architect and Architect’s consultant(s) from all claims and causes of action arising from such uses. The Owner, to the extent permitted by law, further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the Architect and its consultants from all costs and expenses, including the cost of defense, related to claims and causes of action asserted by any third person or entity to the extent such costs and expenses arise from the Owner’s use of the Instruments of Service under this Section 7.3.1. The terms of this Section 7.3.1 shall not apply if the Owner rightfully terminates this Agreement for cause under Section 9.4.

§ 7.4 Except as provided in this Article 7, no license or right shall be deemed granted or implied under this Agreement. Any unauthorized use of the Instruments of Service shall be at the Owner’s sole risk and without liability to the Architect and the Architect’s consultants.

**ARTICLE 8 CLAIMS AND DISPUTES**

§ 8.1 GENERAL

§ 8.1.1 The Owner and Architect shall commence all claims and causes of action, whether in contract, tort, or otherwise, against the other arising out of or related to this Agreement in accordance with the requirements of this Agreement within the period specified by applicable law.

§ 8.1.2 To the extent damages are covered by property insurance, the Owner and Architect waive all rights against each other and against the contractors, consultants, agents and employees of the other for damages, except such rights as they may have to the proceeds of such insurance as set forth in AIA Document A201–2007, General Conditions of the Contract for Construction. The Owner or the Architect, as appropriate, shall require of the
contractors, consultants, agents and employees of any of them similar waivers in favor of the other parties enumerated herein.

§ 8.1.3 The Architect and Owner waive consequential damages for claims, disputes or other matters in question arising out of or relating to this Agreement. This mutual waiver is applicable, without limitation, to all consequential damages due to either party’s termination of this Agreement, except as specifically provided in Section 9.7.

§ 8.2 MEDIATION
§ 8.2.1 Any claim, dispute or other matter in question arising out of or related to this Agreement shall be subject to mediation as a condition precedent to binding dispute resolution.

§ 8.2.2 Owner and Architect shall endeavor to resolve claims, disputes and other matters in question between them by mediation, to be conducted by an individual who is listed on the Minnesota judicial branch’s Statewide ADR-Rule 114 Neutrals Roster, is experienced in construction disputes and is mutually agreeable to both parties. A request for mediation must be made in writing and delivered to the other party to the Agreement. If the parties are unable to agree upon a mediator within 30 days, either party may pursue resolution in accordance with § 8.2.4 of this Article.

§ 8.2.3 The parties shall share the mediator’s fee and any filing fees equally. The mediation shall be held in the place where the Project is located, unless another location is mutually agreed upon. Agreements reached in mediation shall be enforceable as settlement agreements in any court having jurisdiction thereof.

§ 8.2.4 If the parties do not resolve a dispute through mediation pursuant to this Section 8.2, the method of binding dispute resolution shall be the following:

(Paragraphs deleted)

§ 8.2.5 Continuing obligations during disputes. In the event of any dispute under this Agreement, including but not limited to, whether specific services Owner expects Architect to perform are within the scope of Basic Services or any dispute as to whether Architect is entitled to additional compensation for Work requested by Owner, Architect shall continue to proceed diligently with the performance of its services under this Agreement pending resolution of the dispute, and Owner agrees to pay Architect in accordance with this Agreement for all services rendered by Architect which are not the subject of the dispute.

§ 8.3.4 CONSOLIDATION OR JOINER
§ 8.3.4.1 No mediation or legal action arising out of or relating to this Agreement shall include, by consolidation or joinder or in any other manner, an additional person or entity not a party to this Agreement, except by written consent containing a specific reference to this Agreement and signed by the Owner, Architect, and any other person or entity sought to be joined. Consent to mediation involving an additional person or entity shall not constitute consent to mediation of any claim, dispute or other matter in question not described in the written consent or with a person or entity not named or described therein. The foregoing agreement to mediate and other agreements to mediate with an additional person or entity duly consented to by parties to this Agreement shall be specifically enforceable in accordance with applicable law in any court having jurisdiction thereof.

(Paragraphs deleted)

ARTICLE 9 TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION
§ 9.1 Except for disputed sums, if the Owner fails to make payments to the Architect in accordance with this Agreement, such failure shall be considered substantial nonperformance and cause for termination.
§ 9.2 Upon written notice to Architect, Owner may order that Architect suspend all or any part of the services provided under this Agreement. Owner shall pay Architect all monies otherwise due hereunder to the date of the suspension. Owner shall not have any obligation to pay or reimburse Architect for lost profits and/or unabsorbed overhead or any other consequential or incidental damages. If the Project is suspended in whole or in part for more than three (3) months, and then resumed, Architect shall be compensated for reasonable costs of re-familiarizing itself with the Project.

§ 9.3 If the Owner suspends the Project for more than 90 cumulative days for reasons other than the fault of the Architect, the Architect may terminate this Agreement by giving not less than seven days’ written notice.

§ 9.4 This Agreement may be terminated by the Owner upon seven (7) days written notice to Architect in its sole discretion. The Architect may terminate this Agreement only in the event of substantial non-performance by the Owner. In the event the Architect proposes to terminate this Agreement, the Architect shall notify the Owner in writing stating with specificity the alleged non-performance and further stating that the proposed termination shall be effective if the non-performance remains uncorrected for a period not less than 15 days following said notice.

§ 9.5 In the event of termination not the fault of the Architect, the Architect shall be compensated for services performed prior to termination, together with Reimbursable Expenses then due.

§ 9.6 The Owner’s rights to use the Architect’s Instruments of Service in the event of a termination of this Agreement are set forth in Article 7.

§ 9.7 In the event of suspension or termination for convenience, upon request of Owner and payment of all fees pursuant to this Article 9, Architect shall promptly provide Owner with reproducible drawings and digital copies of all documents completed or in progress on the date of suspension or termination. Architect shall not be reimbursed for reproduction costs associated with Architect maintaining or storing Drawings, Specifications or digital data for its own use. Architect and Architect’s Consultants shall not be responsible to Owners for issues, claims or causes of action arising from alterations or modifications made to drawings and documents provided by other Architects.

(Paragraph deleted)

ARTICLE 10  MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

§ 10.1 This Agreement shall be governed by the law of Minnesota, without regard to choice of law provisions.

§ 10.2 Terms in this Agreement shall have the same meaning as those in AIA Document A201–2007, General Conditions of the Contract for Construction.

§ 10.3 The Owner and Architect, respectively, bind themselves, their agents, successors, assigns and legal representatives to this Agreement. Neither the Owner nor the Architect shall assign this Agreement without the written consent of the other, except that the Owner may assign this Agreement to a lender providing financing for the Project if the lender agrees to assume the Owner’s rights and obligations under this Agreement.

§ 10.4 If the Owner requests the Architect to execute certificates, the proposed language of such certificates shall be submitted to the Architect for review at least 14 days prior to the requested dates of execution. If the Owner requests the Architect to execute consents reasonably required to facilitate assignment to a lender, the Architect shall execute all such consents that are consistent with this Agreement, provided the proposed consent is submitted to the Architect for review at least 14 days prior to execution. The Architect shall not be required to execute certificates or consents that would require knowledge, services or responsibilities beyond the scope of this Agreement.

§ 10.5 Nothing contained in this Agreement shall create a contractual relationship with or a cause of action in favor of a third party against either the Owner or Architect.
§ 10.6 Unless otherwise required in this Agreement, the Architect shall have no responsibility for the discovery, presence, handling, removal or disposal of, or exposure of persons to, hazardous materials or toxic substances in any form at the Project site.

§ 10.7 The Architect shall have the right to include photographic or artistic representations of the design of the Project among the Architect’s promotional and professional materials. The Architect shall be given reasonable access to the completed Project to make such representations. However, the Architect’s materials shall not include the Owner’s confidential or proprietary information if the Owner has previously advised the Architect in writing of the specific information considered by the Owner to be confidential or proprietary. The Owner shall provide professional credit for the Architect in the Owner’s promotional materials for the Project.

§ 10.8 If the Architect or Owner receives information specifically designated by the other party as "confidential" or "business proprietary," the receiving party shall keep such information strictly confidential and shall not disclose it to any other person except to (1) its employees, (2) those who need to know the content of such information in order to perform services or construction solely and exclusively for the Project, (3) its consultants and contractors whose contracts include similar restrictions on the use of confidential information, or (4) as required by court order.

§ 10.9 Owner irrevocably assigns to Architects all rights to claim Section 179D federal tax credits under Energy Policy Act of 2005 as amplified and clarified in IRS Notice 2008-40. Owner shall cooperate with Architect to establish Architect’s eligibility for these federal tax credits. Architect shall be responsible for the costs of the independent third party energy study and certification.

ARTICLE 11 COMPENSATION

§ 11.1 For the Architect’s Basic Services described under Article 3, the Owner shall compensate the Architect as follows:

(Insert amount of, or basis for, compensation.)

A. Total Fee Calculation:

$18,350,000 Construction Cost x 7.5% = $1,375,000 (Total Architectural Fee)

B. Phase 1 (SD&DD) Compensation:

$1,375,000 x 35% = $481,250 (Phase 1 Fee)

C. Phase 2 (CO through Construction) Compensation:

$1,375,000 x 65% = $893,750 (Phase 2 Fee)

D. Furniture, Finishes, and Equipment (FF&E):

Fixed Fee Based on 6% of the agreed FF&E cost documented by Wold.

§ 11.2 For Additional Services designated in Section 4.1, the Owner shall compensate the Architect as follows:

(Insert amount of, or basis for, compensation. If necessary, list specific services to which particular methods of compensation apply.)

Fixed fee agreed upon by Owner and Architect in writing

§ 11.3 For Additional Services that may arise during the course of the Project, including those under Section 4.3, the Owner shall compensate the Architect as follows:

(Insert amount of, or basis for, compensation.)

Fixed fee agreed upon by Owner and Architect in writing

(Paragraphs deleted)

§ 11.4 Compensation for Additional Services of the Architect’s consultants when not included in Section 11.2 or 11.3, shall be compensated as follows:

AIA Document B101™ – 2007 (formerly B151™ – 1997). Copyright © 1974, 1978, 1987, 1997 and 2007 by The American Institute of Architects. All rights reserved. WARNING: This AIA® Document is protected by U.S. Copyright Law and International Treaties. Unauthorized reproduction or distribution of this AIA® Document, or any portion of it, may result in severe civil and criminal penalties, and will be prosecuted to the maximum extent possible under the law. This document was produced by AIA software at 09:55:09 on 04/26/2017 under Order No.7941928438 which expires on 01/09/2018, and is not for resale.

User Notes:
§ 11.5 Where compensation for Basic Services is based on a stipulated sum or percentage of the Cost of the Work, the compensation for each phase of services shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design Phase</td>
<td>fifteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Phase</td>
<td>twenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents Phase</td>
<td>forty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding or Negotiation Phase</td>
<td>five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>twenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Basic Compensation</td>
<td>one hundred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 11.6 When compensation is based on a percentage of the Cost of the Work and any portions of the Project are deleted or otherwise not constructed, compensation for those portions of the Project shall be payable to the extent services are performed on those portions, in accordance with the schedule set forth in Section 11.5 based on (1) the lowest bona fide bid or negotiated proposal, or (2) if no such bid or proposal is received, the most recent estimate of the Cost of the Work for such portions of the Project. The Architect shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with this Agreement for all services performed whether or not the Construction Phase is commenced.

§ 11.7 The hourly billing rates for services of the Architect and the Architect’s consultants, if any, are set forth below. The rates shall be adjusted in accordance with the Architect’s and Architect’s consultants’ normal review practices.

(If applicable, attach an exhibit of hourly billing rates or insert them below.)

# 11.8 COMPENSATION FOR REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES

§ 11.8.1 Reimbursable Expenses are in addition to compensation for Basic and Additional Services and include expenses incurred by the Architect and the Architect’s consultants directly related to the Project, as follows:

.1 Mileage based on Federal rates in connection with the project and Owner requested out-of-state travel, transportation and authorized out-of-town travel and subsistence;

.2 Fees paid for securing approval of authorities having jurisdiction over the Project, including government agency review and permit fees;

(Paragraph deleted)

.3 Postage, handling and delivery;

(Paragraphs deleted)

.4 All taxes levied on professional services and on reimbursable expenses;

.5 Postage, handling and delivery;

.6 Printing, reproductions, plots, standard form documents; and

.7 Other similar Project-related expenditures.

.8 Expense of computer aided design and drafting equipment time when used in connection with the Project.

§ 11.8.2 For Reimbursable Expenses, the compensation shall be the expenses incurred by the Architect and be billed at actual cost to Architect plus ten percent (10 %) of the expenses incurred.

§ 11.9 COMPENSATION FOR USE OF ARCHITECT’S INSTRUMENTS OF SERVICE

(Paragraph deleted)

Compensation for expenses incurred by the Architect’s consultants will be billed at actual cost to the Architect.
§ 11.10 PAYMENTS TO THE ARCHITECT
§ 11.10.1 An initial payment of zero ($ 0.00 ) shall be made upon execution of this Agreement and is the minimum payment under this Agreement. It shall be credited to the Owner’s account in the final invoice.

§ 11.10.2 Unless otherwise agreed, payments for services shall be made monthly in proportion to services performed. Payments are due and payable upon presentation of the Architect’s invoice. Amounts unpaid sixty ( 60 ) days after the invoice date shall bear interest at the rate entered below. The provisions of Minn. Stat. § 471.425 (the "Prompt Pay Act") apply to this Agreement. Architect must itemize its invoices with sufficient detail for Owner to confirm the basis for and calculation of the amount invoiced. For work reimbursed on an hourly basis, Architect must indicate for each employee, his or her name, job title, the number of hours worked, rate of pay, a computation of amounts due for each employee, and the total amount due. Architect must verify all statements submitted for payment in compliance with Minnesota Statutes Sections 471.38 and 471.391.

(Insert rate of monthly or annual interest agreed upon.)

Local rate of interest as set by Minnesota Statute Section 549.09.

§ 11.10.3 The Owner shall not withhold amounts from the Architect’s compensation to impose a penalty or liquidated damages on the Architect, or to offset sums requested by or paid to contractors for the cost of changes in the Work unless the Architect agrees or has been found liable for the amounts in a binding dispute resolution proceeding.

§ 11.10.4 The Architect must allow the Owner or its duly authorized agents reasonable access to the Architect’s books and records that are pertinent to all services provided under this Agreement, including books and records of any approved Subconsultants, for six years after the effective date of this Agreement. Any reports, information, data, etc. given to, or prepared or assembled by, the Architect and its subcontractors under this Agreement which the City requests to be kept confidential must not be made available to any individual or organization without the City’s prior written approval. The Consultant and its subcontractors must abide by the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act to the extent that the Act is applicable to data and documents relevant to the Work.

ARTICLE 12 SPECIAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS
Special terms and conditions that modify this Agreement are as follows:

§ 12.1 Architect agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the Owner, its officers, and employees, from liability, claims, damages, costs, judgments, or expenses, including reasonable attorney’s fees, resulting directly or indirectly from an act or omission (including without limitation professional errors or omissions) of the Architect, its agents, employees or Subconsultants in the performance of the Work and against losses by reason of the failure of the Architect fully to perform, in any respect, all obligations under this Agreement. Architect is not required to indemnify Owner with respect to damages that are determined to be attributable to the negligence or misconduct of the Owner, its officers or employees.

ARTICLE 13 SCOPE OF THE AGREEMENT
§ 13.1 This Agreement represents the entire and integrated agreement between the Owner and the Architect and supersedes all prior negotiations, representations or agreements, either written or oral. This Agreement may be amended only by written instrument signed by both Owner and Architect.

§ 13.2 This Agreement is comprised of the following documents listed below:
  .1 AIA Document B101™–2007, Standard Form Agreement Between Owner and Architect

(Paragraph deleted)
  .2 Other documents:
  (List other documents, if any, including Exhibit A, Initial Information, and additional scopes of service, if any, forming part of the Agreement.)
This Agreement entered into as of the day and year first written above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>ARCHITECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Signature)</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Printed name and title)</td>
<td>John McNamara, AIA, LEED AP Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Printed name and title)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution authorizing a transfer from the Special Assessment Construction Fund for preliminary costs related to public safety facilities and declaring the official intent of the City of Minnetonka to reimburse certain expenditures from the proceeds of bonds to be issued by the City

Be it resolved by the City Council (the “Council”) of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota (the “City”) as follows:

Section 1. Recitals.

1.01. The City is authorized to incur certain expenditures that may be financed temporarily from sources other than bonds and reimbursed from the proceeds of a tax-exempt bond.

1.02. The Internal Revenue Service has issued Treas. Reg. § 1.150-2 (the “Reimbursement Regulations”) providing that proceeds of tax-exempt bonds used to reimburse prior expenditures will not be deemed spent unless certain requirements are met.

1.03. The City expects to incur certain expenditures related to the Project described herein to be financed temporarily with a transfer from the City’s Special Assessment Construction Fund to the City’s Bond Construction Fund. The City anticipates reimbursing such expenditures with the proceeds of a tax-exempt bond in accordance with the terms hereof.

1.04. The City has determined to make this declaration of official intent (the “Declaration”) to reimburse certain costs from proceeds of bonds in accordance with the Reimbursement Regulations.

Section 2. Findings; Approvals.

2.01. The City proposes to undertake the construction of public safety facilities (the “Project”).

2.02. The City authorizes the transfer of up to $1,531,000 from the City’s Special Assessment Construction Fund to the City’s Bond Construction Fund to fund preliminary expenditures of the Project.

2.03. The City reasonably expects to reimburse the expenditures made for certain costs of the Project from the proceeds of bonds in an estimated maximum principal amount of $25,000,000. All reimbursed expenditures
will be capital expenditures, costs of issuance of the bonds, or other expenditures eligible for reimbursement under Section 1.150-2(d)(3) of the Reimbursement Regulations.

2.04. If the City determines not to issue tax-exempt bonds, the amounts disbursed from the Bond Construction Fund to pay for the preliminary expenditures of the Project will not be reimbursed.

2.05. This Declaration has been made not later than sixty (60) days after payment of any original expenditure to be subject to a reimbursement allocation with respect to the proceeds of bonds, except for the following expenditures: (a) costs of issuance of bonds; (b) costs in an amount not in excess of $100,000 or five percent (5%) of the proceeds of an issue; or (c) “preliminary expenditures” up to an amount not in excess of twenty percent (20%) of the aggregate issue price of the issue or issues that finance or are reasonably expected by the City to finance the project for which the preliminary expenditures were incurred. The term “preliminary expenditures” includes architectural, engineering, surveying, bond issuance, and similar costs that are incurred prior to commencement of acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of a project, other than land acquisition, site preparation, and similar costs incident to commencement of construction.

2.06. This Declaration is an expression of the reasonable expectations of the City based on the facts and circumstances known to the City as of the date hereof. The anticipated original expenditures for the Project and the principal amount of the bonds described in Section 2.03 are consistent with the City’s budgetary and financial circumstances. No sources other than proceeds of bonds to be issued by the City are, or are reasonably expected to be, reserved, allocated on a long-term basis, or otherwise set aside pursuant to the City’s budget or financial policies to pay such Project expenditures.

2.07. This Declaration is intended to constitute a declaration of official intent for purposes of the Reimbursement Regulations.
Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota this 12th day of June, 2017.

____________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:
Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on June ___, 2017.

____________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Brief Description 2018 – 2022 Economic Improvement Program (EIP)

Recommendation Adopt the Resolution

Background
The city’s first Economic Improvement Program (EIP) was developed in 2012, making this the sixth iteration of the document. The purpose of the EIP is to provide a detailed five-year plan of the city’s economic development activities. The document is updated annually.

Economic Improvement Program
The draft EIP has been prepared based upon the comments by the city council received during previous EIP reviews, as well as the EDAC commissioners’ comments from the March 16 and May 25 EDAC meetings and the April 17 city council study session.

- **Chapter 1 Policy** — defines what funding categories programs will fall under, and also details the funding principles (see page 1).

- **Chapters 2 through 7** — provides program pages for each of the city’s existing and potential future economic development efforts. The program page details the description, purpose, goals, budget impacts, schedule, and key measures. Additionally, it outlines the funds needed to develop or sustain the program over a period of years (see pages 3-50).

- **Chapter 8 Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections** — provides summary tables including the first table which is a one-year (2017) summary of total expenditures by category and by fund. The second set of tables presents 10-year funding sources and expenditure projections. The final table summarizes the 10-year projection of all funds (see pages 53-69).

- **Chapter 9 Affordable Housing Goals** — itemizes how the city has and will meet its 1995-2010 and 2011-2020 affordable housing goals, including any EIP programs used to assist the project and the affordable housing income limits (see pages 71-74).

- **Glossary** — Glossary of programs and terms (page 75)
Uses of EIP Funds

As has been the case for many years, the city’s highest priority in the recommended EIP continues to be housing. Approximately $4.4 million is projected to be spent on housing programs. This single category represents 54 percent of the entire portfolio.

The second highest category is business retention/expansion and attracting new business. It should be noted that a majority of those funds are not city dollars, but rather pass-through grants or other loan programs. The lowest categories of investment are development/redevelopment and transit program areas. However, the development category is expected to increase as more definitive plans for station area improvements for Southwest Light Rail Transit (LRT) come into place, and as more detailed work on the strategic marketing plan is completed later this year.

Accounting for the largest single resource for EIP implementation at 40 percent of all funding, approximately $3.6 million is available in pooled TIF funding. However, these funds are limited to specific types of housing projects. Monies from the Development Account, which are more flexible in their use and include outside flow-through grants, are projected to contribute to over one-third of the funding for the recommended EIP. The HRA levy would generate the next largest source of funding.
Owner Occupied/Small Projects Rehabilitation Programs
- The EDAC recommended continuing to have the Small Projects Program loans at $5,000.
- Staff reopened the program application process in April.
- A point of clarification was added to the Minnetonka Home Enhancement Page indicating that the housing HRA levy funding of $100,000 is split between the Minnetonka Home Enhancement Program and Welcome to Minnetonka Program.

Crown Ridge/Minnetonka Heights
- The Crown Ridge and Minnetonka Heights pages of the EIP were removed in 2017 as they are no longer funded.

Housing Improvement Areas
- Staff has been contacted by an association to conduct a large rehab of Cloud 9 condominiums. The association is requesting approximately $3.8 million for the renovation of the building. The project would be funded by housing revenue bonds or through an internal investment.
- Staff identified some dollars on the HIA project page for new proposals.

TIF Pooling
- Staff removed the Shelter Corporation commitment of $500,000 on the TIF pooling project page due to the withdrawal of the Music Barn development.
EDAC and City Council Review

At the March 16 and May 25 EDAC meeting, and the April 17 city council study session, the commissioners and council members undertook a review of programs in the EIP. Below are the combined comments and findings from their review:

Housing Chapter Summary

Owner Occupied/Small Projects Rehabilitation Programs

- Staff clarified the difference between the Minnetonka Home Enhancement and Small Projects Loan. The basic eligibility of the programs is outlined below:
  - Minnetonka Home Enhancement Program
    - Provides up to $15,000 for home repair, green improvements and some additions
    - Loan Term – 1% interest, up to 10 year term
    - Household income cannot exceed 120% AMI
    - Taxable Market Value cannot exceed $300,000
  - Small Projects Program
    - Provides up to $5,000 for eligible deferred maintenance repairs
    - Loan Term – 0% interest, payments deferred for 10 years
    - Household income cannot exceed 80% AMI
  - Welcome to Minnetonka
    - Provides up to $10,000 for down payment and closing costs
    - Loan term – 1% interest, up to 10 year term
    - Household income cannot exceed 120% AMI
    - Taxable Market Value cannot exceed $300,000

- Staff requested guidance on the $300,000 Taxable Market Value cap on the Welcome to Minnetonka and Minnetonka Home Enhancement Programs. The median value of single family homes in Minnetonka continues to rise. In 2016, the median value of a single family home was $323,400.
  - The EDAC recommended no changes to the $300,000 taxable market value eligibility cap on the Welcome to Minnetonka and Minnetonka Home Enhancement Programs.

- The 2017 Affordable Housing Income Limits were added to the Affordable Housing Section of the report (page 74). This suggestion was made following the review of the 2017-2021 EIP review.
TIF Pooling

The EDAC asked about the current fund balance of the TIF pooling funding from the Boulevard Gardens TIF district. The current fund balance in 2017 is $3,620,120 and an additional $3,020,000 will be available from 2018-2022.

Business Chapter Summary
Sewer Access Charge and Residential Equivalency Charge Program (SAC/REC Program)

- EDAC asked about the conceptual SAC/REC program.
  - The conceptual program would allow businesses and property owners to defer up to 80% of the charges related to the metropolitan council’s sewer access charge and the city’s residential equivalency charge. The business owner would be able to repay the fee over a period of 10 years instead of at the time of the issuance of a building permit. The goal of the program is to minimize the upfront out-of-pocket expenses for small business owners. High water usage businesses such as breweries, restaurants, salons, and daycares often have a large upfront cost which can impact the businesses’ available working capital.
  - A conceptual page was added to the EIP document. The program policy was approved at the May 22 city council meeting, and an ordinance will be considered at the council’s June 12 meeting.

Transit Chapter Summary

- The EDAC asked if the city contributes additional dollars to fund bus transit services provided by the Metro Transit.
  - Staff clarified that the bus service is paid for by the Motor Vehicle Sales Tax (MVST) and by fare revenues collected for service; there are no city funds provided for this service.
  - Staff updated the transit page with a note that the contract with Metro Transit will be renegotiated in 2017.

Development/Redevelopment Chapter Summary

- The strategic marketing page was updated from a conceptual program to an active program. The city is in the process of refreshing its brand strategy. Staff anticipates the branding initiative will outline a new communication strategy that includes a strategic marketing component. Staff included $50,000 per year to support this effort. The HRA levy was the proposed funding source for the council to consider for this initiative, which would need to increase from $175,000 to $225,000 annually.
At the April study session, the council discussed increasing the operating levy to support the strategic marketing efforts in place of funding this effort through the HRA levy. The EDAC discussed whether this initiative should be funded through the city operating levy rather than the HRA levy.

- The EDAC also recommended funding the program through the general fund operating levy rather than the HRA levy. The strategic marketing page was updated to reflect the city’s general fund as the source for this program.

- The future HRA levy page included a placeholder for strategic acquisition of property. The program is currently conceptual; however, the council and EDAC both considered an HRA levy of $100,000 per year to fund this initiative.

  - At the study session, the council discussed keeping the strategic acquisition program as a conceptual program. Future opportunities to acquire properties may arise as development around SWLRT occurs.
  - The EDAC concurred that the program should remain conceptual at this time.

**Recommendation**

On May 25, the EDAC recommended the city council adopt the 2018-2022 Economic Improvement Program. Staff recommends the city council adopt the resolution approving the 2018-2022 Economic Improvement Program.

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Merrill King, Finance Director

Originated by:
  Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director
  Alisha Gray, Economic Development and Housing Manager
2018-2022
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Economic Improvement Program Policy

The Economic Improvement Program (EIP) is the city’s long-term plan for housing, economic development, redevelopment, and transit programs that promote economic viability for the citizens and businesses of Minnetonka.

Funding Categories

The EIP covers a broad range of community development activities. Funding categories include:

1. Projects and programs which encourage diversity and broaden choices in types, sizes, and prices of the city’s housing stock to meet the needs of the aging population and to attract younger residents.

2. Projects that support existing business retention and expansion, attract new businesses, and allow the city to remain economically competitive.

3. Projects which enhance resident mobility by pursuing opportunities and solutions to improve transit service.

4. Activities that promote the vitality of the city through development and redevelopment.

Planning Principles

- The EIP will support achievement of the city’s Comprehensive Plan and long-term Strategic Goals.

- The EIP will be updated annually to reflect changes in programs, demographics, private housing stock, business needs, and the overall economic climate.

- The EIP allows flexibility, and may be amended during the year if necessary, in order to act upon unforeseen opportunities that may arise which enhance economic viability.

- Development of the EIP will be consistent with the annual operating budget. Future staffing and other budgetary impacts are projected and will be included in operating budget forecasts.
HOUSING CHAPTER SUMMARY

Projects and programs which encourage diversity and broaden choices in types, sizes, and prices of the city’s housing stock to meet the needs of the aging population and to attract younger residents.

The city currently has 10 programs in place to assist in the construction, maintenance, and renewal of housing in the city. An additional two programs are in the conceptual phase and will be explored for further consideration.

- The total five-year estimated cost of the programs is $4,478,800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>5-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Administration</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Projects</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes Within Reach</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Improvement Areas</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Home Enhancement</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Exempt Financing/Conduit Debt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing via TIF Pooling</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>$3,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Minnetonka</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,148,900</td>
<td>$854,600</td>
<td>$755,300</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$745,000</td>
<td>$4,478,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptual Programs
- Employer Assisted Hsg $0
- Next Generation Program $0

Programs in green=funding/program is expected to continue
Programs in yellow=funding/program is uncertain for a number of reasons
Programs in red=funding/program is ending

- Programs funded by Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program are expected to be eliminated or restructured in the near future due to decreases and potential elimination of the CDBG program at the federal level.
- Programs funded by the Livable Communities Account will either be eliminated or need a new funding source, as that source is expected to no longer be available after 2017.
**Economic Improvement Program**

City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

**Project #** Housing-01  
**Project Name** CDBG Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Program Administration Hours</th>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Key Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description**
The Community Development Block Grant program is a federally-funded program, administered at the local level. Federal regulations allow up to 20 percent of the city’s allocation for administrative responsibilities.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS:**
This is an ongoing program. The CDBG program year runs July 1 to June 30, which is different than the city’s fiscal year.

**Justification**
Based upon the needs, priorities, and benefits to the community, CDBG activities are developed and the division of funding is determined at a local level. All funded activities must meet at least one of the three national objectives:
- Benefit low and moderate income persons
- Help prevent and/or eliminate slums and/or blight
- Meet other community development needs of particular urgency

**PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS:**
Comprehensive Plan-Provide city services and collaborate with outside agencies and the private sector to leverage additional services that reinforce the city’s values.

Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

**KEY MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program Admin Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**
This funding is to repay the staff time involved for the overall administration of the CDBG program and the administration of the owner-occupied housing rehabilitation program. In 2015 the city took back the implementation of the Small Projects Program, resulting in an increase of time to administer the program.

It is expected that CDBG funds will be eliminated or restructured at some time in the near future by the federal government. For purposes of this report, we assume phaseout of the program by 2022.
The Small Projects loan program (previously called the Emergency Repair Program) offers ten-year, no interest deferred loans up to $5000. The program focuses on smaller projects that can quickly be completed without regulatory lead based paint issues.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS:
This is an ongoing program. New applications are only accepted during certain periods of time. A new round of applications opened in April 2017. Typical projects include furnaces, some windows, and roofs.

The CDBG program year is July 1 to June 30, which is different than the city's fiscal year.

Households up to 80% of area median income qualify for the $5000 Small Projects Program, which allows for housing repairs and maintenance. Additions and aesthetic improvements are not allowed under the program.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS:
Comprehensive Plan-Promote housing maintenance programs that improve the livability of existing residential dwelling units in a cost effective manner.

Strategic Plan-Initiate programs and policies to broaden housing choices to meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

### Key Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minnetonka staff oversee the entire program from application, to project management to signing of the loan documents. The administrative costs associated with the program are covered under the CDBG administration.

With the declining CDBG funds, less emphasis will be placed on this program, which will decrease assistance to households.

It is expected that CDBG funds will be eliminated or restructured in the near future by the federal government. The program would be expected to end at about that time unless new funding is identified. For purposes of this report, staff assumes a phase out of the program by 2021.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # Housing-04
Project Name Fair Housing

Description
As part of the city’s CDBG allocation, the city must participate in and further fair housing activities. This is accomplished by participating in the Hennepin County Consortium and Fair Housing Implementation Council. The city has been directly providing funds for fair housing since it became an entitlement community in 2005. The city is working with Hennepin County Consortium to coordinate a collaborative fair housing strategy.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This is an ongoing program. The CDBG program year runs July 1 to June 30, which is different than the city’s fiscal year.

Justification
To further fair housing and remove impediments to fair housing within the city.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS:
Comprehensive Plan-Provide city services and collaborate with outside agencies and the private sector to leverage additional services that reinforce the city’s values.

Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES (Program year is July 1 to June 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Typically, one percent of the city’s CDBG annual allocation is contributed to the Hennepin County Consortium. There is no staff time provided for this program, with the exception of review and feedback on information provided by the consortium and the Fair Housing Implementation Council.

It is expected that CDBG funds will be eliminated or restructured in the near future by the federal government. The program would be expected to end at about that time unless new funding is identified. For purposes of this report, it is assumed that the program will phase out by 2021.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # Housing-05
Project Name Homes Within Reach

Key Measures HWR units in Minnetonka

Key Measures

Description
Homes Within Reach (also known as the West Hennepin Affordable Housing Land Trust) is a non-profit community land trust that creates and preserves affordable homeownership opportunities in suburban Hennepin County.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This program is ongoing. Depending on the level of commitment by the city and other matching funds, Homes Within Reach anticipates adding one to two new permanently affordable owner-occupied units to the city each year.

Justification
In an effort to promote long-term affordable, scattered-site housing, while maximizing the cost-effectiveness of public investment, the community land trust model was presented as a tool in 2000 to help the city increase its amount of long-term affordable housing.

The Homes Within Reach program provides single-family, permanently affordable, homeownership opportunities to those at 80% AMI or less. Minnetonka’s funds will be used to leverage and match other county, regional, and state funds.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Creating partnerships with other agencies to ensure the longevity of affordable housing.

Strategic Plan-Initiate programs and policies to broaden housing choices to meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total HWR units in Mtnka</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Levy</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Homes Within Reach requests funding through the non-profit funding process each year. Growth in long term affordable units is important, but there should be some adjustment to the city’s commitment to ensure it is sustainable. In 2017 the Livable Communities Account is no longer available.

An EDAC subcommittee met in 2014 and recommended that HWR funding be decreased starting in 2017. An annual maintenance fee will be collected beginning in 2020 to assist with ongoing maintenance and operations.
Minnesota law provides a mechanism termed Housing Improvement Area (HIA) which allows cities to help arrange and finance rehabilitation on owner-occupied residential buildings, such as condominiums or townhouses.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
The council adopted an HIA policy in November 2011. The first HIA was adopted in early 2012. It is expected that interest in this program will grow as condo and townhouse developments age. State legislation for HIA's sunsets on June 30, 2028.

Justification
The program is intended to serve aging multi-family housing by providing a financing structure to address major building investments. The program would also ensure, going forward, that the association is able to correct the financing of long-term capital expenditures.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Continue to collaborate with lenders or other agencies that offer programs for home rehabilitation.

Strategic Plan-Initiating programs/policies to broaden housing choices to meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Maintenance</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
The HIA program is administered by staff who work on various parts of the project ranging from program information to HIA requests. Once an HIA request is received, staff time is committed to preparing a resolution, ordinance, development agreement, and determining fees. Costs to cover staff time for the HIA application are covered through an application fee and through a per unit administrative fee for time in administering the assessment.

A risk of the HIA program is pay-back of the assessment. However, because it is assessed on the property taxes, it will be paid back even if there is foreclosure of the property.

Staff is currently working with the Cloud 9 association that is in the process of applying for an HIA of up to $3.8 million in 2017. In a situation such as this, bonding or a city investment, rather than the development account would be utilized to finance the project.
The Minnetonka Home Enhancement program (MHEP) offers up to $15,000 through a low-interest loan for housing maintenance, repair, green investments, and some additions.

Justification
Minnetonka’s housing stock is aging. Nearly two-thirds of the city’s homes were built between 1950 and 1970, and over 75% of the housing stock is 30 years or older. Many of these homes now need repairs for windows, roofs, and heating systems. The MHEP targets households up to 120% area median income with loans for rehabilitation and other housing maintenance activities for housing valued at $300,000 or less. A marketing plan was developed in 2013.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Promote housing maintenance programs to improve the livability of residential dwelling units in a cost effective manner. Strategic Plan-Initiate programs/policies to broaden housing choices to meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pre-Apps Received</th>
<th>Pre-Apps Qualified</th>
<th>Loans Made</th>
<th>Loans Defaulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Levy</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other

The city contracts with the Greater Metropolitan Housing Corporation (GMHC) to administer the Minnetonka Home Enhancement Program for a 10% administrative fee. There is staff time associated with an initial pre-application, program marketing and answering questions.

Due to the slow uptake and lowering the interest rate to 1%, it's unlikely that this program will become self-sustaining. While there were loan paybacks put back into the program, another $100,000 was added in 2017 (split with the Welcome to Minnetonka program) to continue to make new loans. Project funding amounts may change as a sliding scale approach is used with this and the Welcome to Minnetonka program to allow flexibility to meet demands of the programs. Since there is a fund balance in the program from previous years allocations, the expenditures and sources are shown as zero above until the funds are used. Staff will be reviewing the program guidelines over the next year to determine if any changes need to be made.
**Economic Improvement Program**  
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota  
2018 *thru* 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Housing-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description
Up to 15 percent of the city’s Community Development Block Grant funds can be used to fund public services (non-profits). The public service agencies programs must meet one of the three CDBG national objectives.

### Scheduling and Project Status
Public services funded by CDBG funds are selected during the non-profit funding review completed by the EDAC each October. Projects then commence in July the following year. The CDBG program year runs July 1 to June 30, which is different than the city’s fiscal year.

### Justification
Public Service agencies provide a number of services, such as foreclosure prevention, information and referral, and senior home improvement services. Clients must be Minnetonka residents at 80% of area median income or less.

### Program Goals and Relationship to Other Plans
Comprehensive Plan: Provide city services and collaborate with outside agencies and the private sector to leverage additional services that reinforce the city's values.

Strategic Plan: Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

### Key Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Assisted</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to changes in programs funded (as determined by the recepients), there is a drop in the individuals assisted.

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Impact/Other
The funding is provided to the public service agencies to carry out the programs. Staff time is involved in payment requests and requesting reimbursement. Periodically, monitoring is completed on these agencies to make sure that they are meeting all CDBG criteria. City staff time to administer this program is taken out of the overall CDBG program administration.

In 2017, the following programs are being assisted: Community Action Partnership of Suburban Hennepin, ICA Housing & More program, ResourceWest, TreeHouse and Senior Community Services H.O.M.E. program.

It is expected that CDBG funds will be eliminated or restructured in the near future by the federal government. For purposes of this report, we assume phaseout of the program by 2021.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

**Project #**: Housing-11
**Project Name**: Tax-Exempt Financing/Conduit Debt Projects

**Description**
Cities, under State Statute Sections 469.152 to 469.165 and Chapter 462C, have the authority to issue tax exempt financing for industrial development, health care facilities and multi-family housing. In 1984 the city council adopted a council policy to guide the city in requests. A revised council policy was adopted in 2015. Examples of projects include St. Davids Center building updates and acquisition for a new charter school. Host approval can also be given for projects where financing is issued by another city (example: Hammer Residences).

**Scheduling and Project Status**
Projects are reviewed to determine if they meeting council policy guidelines and if the city has enough annual financing available. Projects are then brought forward after this review.

**Justification**
To attract/promote economically sound industry, commerce, and health care, as well as for housing projects for low/moderate income and elderly persons. Tax exempt financing is used on a selective basis to encourage development offering a benefit to the city as a whole.

**Program Goals and Relationship to Other Plans**
Comprehensive Plan-
- Support and encourage housing options that are attractive to a wide variety of age and income levels of residents.
- Facilitate connections between local businesses and programs that provide incentives and assistance for business retention and recruitment.

Strategic Plan-
- Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to meet both the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.
- Supporting business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

**Key Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects Considered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Implemented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**
Work on Tax Exempt Financing projects is completed by the city’s legal counsel and financial consultants. Application ($3500) and administrative fees (1/8 of 1% of financing amount) cover the city’s expenses, and most often, ending in positive income for the city.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

2018 thru 2022

Department: 1-Housing
Contact: Community Development
Type: Construction
Useful Life: N/A
Category: TIF
Priority: Green

**Project #** Housing-12
**Project Name** Affordable Housing via TIF Pooling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TIF pooling is a way, under state statute, to use excess tax increment dollars from a district to invest in affordable housing projects in other areas of the city.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS**
The dollars must be expended by 2021. It is expected that a majority of the funds will be used in 2017-2021 in connection to LRT related projects.
The Ridge was the first project funded (2012) with $1,025,000 in funds. Another $500,000 is proposed to be used in the Music Barn project on Shady Oak Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Pooling allows a percentage (35%) of the total increment generated by the district over its entire life to be used for tax credit eligible housing projects anywhere in the city. Depending on property values over the remaining 12 years of the district, the pooling dollars available during this time frame are estimated to be $6.44 million. These funds are required to be spent according to an amended TIF plan, which can take place as projects are proposed. The current fund balance is estimated at $3.6 million.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS**
Comprehensive Plan-Continue working with developers to include affordable housing in their developments, where appropriate.
Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects Considered</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Assisted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>3,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>3,020,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIF Pooling</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>3,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>3,020,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**
The use of pooling dollars does not affect staffing. If pooling dollars are not used, the dollars return to the appropriate taxing jurisdictions.
The funds are coming from the Boulevard Gardens TIF district.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project #    Housing-13
Project Name Welcome to Minnetonka Loan Program

Description
The Welcome to Minnetonka program provides up to $10,000 through a low-interest loan for downpayment and closing cost assistance. The Greater Metropolitan Housing Corporation administers the program.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
The program began June 2011. This is an ongoing program.

Justification
The Welcome to Minnetonka program targets first time homebuyer households up to 120% area median income with downpayment and closing cost assistance. Those participating in the program provide at least 25% of the total costs. A marketing plan was developed in 2013.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Provide services that support residents to maintain attractiveness as a balanced community that is economically diverse.
Strategic Plan-Initiate programs/policies to broaden housing choices to meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Apps Moved Forward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans Made</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans Defaulted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While pre-applications can be received at any time, a full application cannot be sent until a purchase agreement is signed.

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Levy</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
The city contracts with the Greater Metropolitan Housing Corporation (GMHC) to administer the Welcome to Minnetonka program on behalf of the city for a 10% administrative fee. There is staff time associated with an initial pre-application, program marketing, and questions.

Due to the slow uptake and lowering the interest rate to 1%, it's unlikely that this program will become self-sustaining. While there were loan paybacks put back into the program, another $100,000 was added in 2017 (split with the Minnetonka Home Enhancement Program) to continue to make new loans. Funding amounts may change as a sliding scale approach is used with this program and the Minnetonka Home Enhancement program to allow flexibility to meet demands. Staff will be reviewing the program guidelines over the next year to determine if any changes need to be made.
Economic Improvement Program  
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # Housing-14
Project Name Employer-Assisted Housing

Key Measures  Households Assisted
Key Measures

Description
Employer assisted housing programs can take many different forms; however, generally it focuses on local businesses and how to create housing opportunities within the city for their employees. The program requires business support.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This is a new concept that has not yet been explored or developed by city staff; however, the SWLRT Community Works project, as part of their housing strategy has recommended collaboration with local employers on new housing opportunities.

Justification
The Opportunity City Pilot Program and a University of Minnesota Resilient Communities Program student project recommended exploring opportunities to collaborate with businesses to better understand housing needs and evaluate links between employment wages and housing values.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Support existing businesses and collaborate with businesses to determine services, employee housing and transportation needs.
Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households Assisted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     |

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     |

Budget Impact/Other
There will need to be staff time committed to learning more about different aspects of a program such as this. There is no funding source at this time to fund the program.

The SWLRT Community Works Housing Strategy developed objectives with one being developing new housing opportunities. One of the ways identified was working with employers along the line to help fund new housing.
**Economic Improvement Program**

City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Housing-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Next Generation Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

A next generation program would purchase homes from seniors, perform rehabilitation as necessary, and sell on the market as affordable units.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS**

This is a new concept that has not yet been explored or developed. Initial council feedback has suggested that this program target a different audience such as those at 80 to 110% AMI.

**Justification**

As the city’s population ages, more seniors will be looking for alternative housing options to the single-family home. This program would assist seniors in the sale of their home, perform any deferred rehabilitation, and then assist young families by selling them at an affordable price.

**PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS**

Comprehensive Plan-Support existing businesses and collaborate with businesses to determine services, employee housing and transportation needs.

Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

**KEY MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**

There will need to be staff time committed to learning more about different aspects of a program such as this. There is no funding source at this time to fund the program.
BUSINESS
BUSINESS CHAPTER SUMMARY

Projects that support existing business retention and expansion, attract new businesses, and allow the city to remain economically competitive.

For the 2018-2022 Economic Improvement Program, there are eleven business programs, and another two under conceptual review.

- The total five-year estimated cost of the programs is $2,340,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Sprinkler Retrofit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Through Grants</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommonBond/Ind Rev</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreaterMSP</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIF/JCF</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Business</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDIF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TwinWest</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC/REC Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$768,000 $293,000 $468,000 $243,000 $568,000 $2,340,000

Conceptual Programs
- Economic Gardening $0
- Special Service Districts $0

Programs in green=funding/program is expected to continue
Programs in yellow=funding/program is uncertain for a number of reasons
Programs in red=funding/program is ending

- Several programs, such as the Grants, Common Bond fund, and Minnesota Investment Fund are inter-agency/consortium efforts that have funding sources that originate from other agencies, flow through the city, and then go to the business.

- The city’s role in business development in the past was more reactive, typically responding only when requested to do so. In more recent years, the city has been slowly investing in more programs for businesses, such as the Open to Business programs.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # Business-01
Project Name Fire Sprinkler Retrofit

Key Measures Buildings Assisted
Key Measures

Description
Minnesota law (State Statute 429) gives cities the authority to specially assess the cost of installing fire sprinkler systems for existing buildings. The City Council adopted Council Policy 5.2 in 1986 setting criteria for the use of this authority.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This program is ongoing, and use of this program is made by property owner petition. It was last used in 2006; however, there are a few inquiries every year.

Justification
The fire sprinkler retrofit program is intended to assist in the public safety and protection of commercial buildings.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Enhance personal and business safety.
Strategic Plan-Supporting business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses Assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Special assessments cannot last more than 10 years. The risk with this program is for the assessment to be paid back on the intended schedule. These dollars are financed through the special assessment fund.

There is some limited staff time involved once the petition is received and for the assessment.

City of Minnetonka 2018-2022 EIP
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project #  Business-02
Project Name  Grants

Key Measures  Projects Assisted  Key Measures  Housing Projects Assisted
Key Measures  Businesses Assisted  Key Measures  Housing Units Assisted

Description
Grants are available from county and regional agencies to facilitate development, redevelopment, housing, and environmental cleanup.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
Grants are dependent upon the types of projects occurring. Most grants require the funds to be spent within three years of award.

Justification
Grant opportunities assist in filling gaps in the financing of complex development, redevelopment, housing, and environmental cleanup projects. Most programs require the city to serve as the grant applicant, meaning that even if the developer/others apply for the grant, that it is to be awarded to the city, which then passes on the funds to the project.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-
- Ensure the longevity of affordable housing through city programs and partnerships with other public, non-profit, and private entities.
- Facilitate connections between local businesses and programs that provide incentives/assistance for business retention and recruitment.

Strategic Plan-Actively promoting the vitality of designated village centers, which integrate uses and connect people to commercial, residential, employment, and public activities.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects Assisted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: some of the projects are counted in more than one year.

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
If the city is the applicant, there is staff time to prepare the grant application, administer the grant and grant-funded activities, as well as any follow-up audits and paperwork generally required by most programs.

For pass-through grants, the staff is the facilitator in requesting the funds. The funds indicated are potential sources depending upon requests.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Business-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Common Bond/Industrial Revenue Bond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Measures: Businesses Assisted

Key Measures: Business Contacts

**Description**

The Common Bond fund and Industrial Revenue Bonds are sources of funding for industrial/manufacturing businesses that are expanding or relocating.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS**

There have been no previous projects, nor are any contemplated at this time. The city has previously used Industrial Revenue Bonds by giving host approval to another city to issue the bonds. The Common Bond fund, which is applied for and administered through the City of Minneapolis/Hennepin County has been explored by several Minnetonka businesses, but none have moved forward.

**Justification**

This program is to assist those manufacturing/industrial businesses with funding support for land acquisition, new facility construction, additions, renovations, and purchase of production equipment.

**PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS**

Comprehensive Plan-Facilitate connections between local businesses and various programs that provide incentives and financial assistance for business retention and recruitment.

Strategic Plan-Support business retention and expansion and attract new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

**KEY MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Contacts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses Assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**

There is minimal staff work involved with either of these programs. The Common Bond fund is administered through a Hennepin County/City of Minneapolis partnership, but requires city council approval. All Industrial Revenue Bonds require city council approval.

No funds flow through the city for the Common Bond fund.
## Economic Improvement Program

City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Business-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>GreaterMSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Measures</td>
<td>Business Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Measures</td>
<td>Key Measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description

GreaterMSP is the regional economic development organization for the Twin Cities metropolitan area. They partner to help provide a vision and agenda for regional economic development as well as to brand and market the region. GreaterMSP offers services in business retention and expansion, data tools and research, manufacturing assistance, small business assistance, and technology assistance.

### SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS

This is an on-going program. The city became a member in 2013.

### Justification

Greater MSP is an economic development tool for Minnetonka’s current and future businesses, and provides resources and connections that have not been previously available.

### PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS

- Comprehensive Plan: Facilitate connections between local businesses and various programs that provide incentives and financial assistance for business retention and recruitment.
- Strategic Plan: Support business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

### KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Headlines</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development Fund</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Impact/Other

Public Sector memberships are a three year, $25,000 per year commitment, which would be reviewed annually with the city budget for renewal.

City of Minnetonka 2018-2022 EIP
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City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

**Contact**
Community Development

**Type**
Program

**Category**
Business

**Priority**
Yellow

**Description**

The Minnesota Investment Fund (MIF) and Job Creation Fund (JCF) are Department of Employment and Economic Development programs that provide funds to cities, who then loan the funds to businesses, to assist in expansion. The business is then required to create a minimum number of jobs at a certain wage level. The city and EDA authority may each authorize one application per year for the programs.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS**

The city has received four MIF awards, one each for Cargill, Nestle and IMRIS, and NatureWorks. Two additional applications were submitted to DEED in 2016 but the applicants decided to withdraw the applications.

**Justification**

MIF is a business and economic development program, focusing on industrial, manufacturing, and technology related industries.

**PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS**

Comprehensive Plan-Facilitate connections between local businesses and various programs that provide incentives and financial assistance for business retention and recruitment.

Strategic Plan-Support business retention and expansion and attract new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

**KEY MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apps Submitted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Maintenance</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**

Application for the MIF program is a collaborative effort between the city and the business, with staff contributing approximately 80 hours of time per application. Staff must also assist in the distribution and repayment of funds, as well as reporting requirements.

Funding is dependent upon the state. A portion of the loan paid back by the business may be allowed to stay at the local level to facilitate business programs. All funds are reimbursement and show a net zero impact on the budget.
Economic Improvement Program
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Project # Business-07
Project Name Open to Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses Assisted</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Assist. Hours</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans Made</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description
The Minnetonka Open to Business program, in collaboration with the Metropolitan Consortium of Community Developers, provides one-on-one technical assistance customized to meet the needs of small businesses.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
The program began in 2011 and is ongoing. The contract is reviewed on an annual basis.

Justification
The Open to Business program assists small business owners and potential entrepreneurs, while filling a need in business programming not available previously. Assistance is given in planning and organizing business ventures, financial management, marketing and regulatory compliance. A small loan fund is also available to access the capital to grow their business.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Provide services that support residents and businesses to maintain attractiveness as a balanced community that is economically diverse.
Strategic Plan-Support business retention and expansion and attract new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
The Minnetonka Open to Business program is provided collaboratively with the MCCD. The MCCD provides the technical assistance, while the city assists in marketing the program. City staff spends approximately 40 hours per year with this program.
**Economic Improvement Program**

**City of Minnetonka, Minnesota**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Business-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Business Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description**

Business outreach will take a more proactive approach in contacting businesses.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS**

Staff is coordinating through "Sales Force", which is an online tool for cities, chambers and GreaterMSP to enter business contacts.

**Justification**

Business outreach in the past has been reactive to business needs. This outreach is another tool in creating a more proactive approach in supporting business retention and expansion.

**PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS**

Comprehensive Plan-Promote public involvement by residents and businesses, and actively communicate city values and services.

Strategic Plan-Supporting business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

**KEY MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Levy</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**

Funds are budgeted for a business survey or marketing to businesses.

Outreach will be coordinated with GreaterMSP and TwinWest Chamber.
In 2010, as part of the jobs bill, state legislation was passed that included provisions for the Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program. PACE allows for the voluntary creation of programs by local governments to help businesses finance renewable energy and energy efficient improvements. The program is repaid by businesses through a special property tax assessment.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
The City Council approved a Joint Powers Agreement with the St. Paul Port Authority (SPPA) in July 2014 to implement the PACE program in Minnetonka. Staff markets the program with commercial, office and multi-family property owners.

Justification
The legislation was adopted in 2010, and has been used by approximately 10 Minnesota communities. This program may help to provide another financing tool to the city's toolbox for local businesses.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan--Facilitate connections between local businesses and various programs that provide incentives and financial assistance for business retention and recruitment.

Strategic Plan--Supporting business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses Assisted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
The funds for the PACE program come from the SPPA, therefore, the financing that will flow through the city’s funds, both the special assessment revenue in from participants and payments out to SPPA, would simply appear as offsetting financial statements in the city’s records. Delinquency by the participant will be handled like any other property tax obligation, where the amount due runs with the property.
The Economic Development Infrastructure Fund is a new program offered by Hennepin County. Up to $500,000 is available in grant funding to municipalities to support business recruitment and expansion through investments in infrastructure. Projects must be outside of priority transit corridors, such as the Green Line Extension.

**Description**

The Economic Development Infrastructure Fund is a new program offered by Hennepin County. Up to $500,000 is available in grant funding to municipalities to support business recruitment and expansion through investments in infrastructure. Projects must be outside of priority transit corridors, such as the Green Line Extension.

**Justification**

The Economic Development Infrastructure Fund will assist businesses that are new or expanding and have a financial need due to extraordinary costs such as demolition, site clearance, soil stabilization and utilities. The business must expend at least $500,000 in property improvements and create at least 10 new permanent, full time jobs.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS.**

This is a pilot program.

**Program Goals and Relationship to other Plans**

Comprehensive Plan-In order to maintain and perhaps enhance its current economic vitality, the city in the future will need to consider and promote: business outreach and retention activities.

Strategic Plan-Supporting business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

**KEY MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**

Staff time would be required to work with the business to apply for the program and to administer the funds. The city would be a pass through of the funds.
Economic Improvement Program  2018 \textit{thru} 2022
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Business-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td><strong>TwinWest Chamber of Commerce</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Measures**
- Minnetonka Businesses

**Description**
TwinWest is the local Chamber of Commerce.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS**
This is an ongoing program.

**Justification**
The city is a member of TwinWest, which allows the city to connect with area businesses. Additionally, TwinWest advocates for a number of issues which the city is involved with, such as Southwest LRT.

**PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS**
Comprehensive Plan-Maintain a partnership with the TwinWest Chamber and collaborate with other agencies to recognize existing and new businesses.

Strategic Plan-Support business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

**KEY MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Funding Sources |
| General Fund |
| 2018 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 16,000 |
| Total | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 16,000 |

**Budget Impact/Other**
Memberships are renewed on an annual basis. There may be other fees associated with membership throughout the year in order to attend events hosted by the Chamber. TwinWest annually sponsors the Minnetonka State of the City event, held in February.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Economic Gardening

Key Measures
Businesses Assisted

Key Measures

Scheduling and Project Status
Originally, a pilot program, the Economic Gardening program is now a partnership between Hennepin, Anoka, Ramsey, Carver and Scott counties.

Justification
Hennepin County is offering this as part of a partnership to help high-growth / high potential Stage II companies grow faster and create more jobs by providing CEO peer mentoring, stage-specific content and referral to relevant service providers. Stage II is defined as: 10-99 employees, more than $1M in revenue and having high-growth potential. There is no cost to the companies accepted for participation in the network.

Program Goals and Relationship to Other Plans
Comprehensive Plan-In order to maintain and perhaps enhance its current economic vitality, the city in the future will need to consider and promote: business outreach and retention activities.

Strategic Plan-Supporting business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

Key Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses Assisted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
The county is providing this service, but some of the 2015 and 2016 programs were held in the Minnetonka Community Center. If the program expands, cities may be asked to participate in the costs of the program.
Economic Improvement Program  
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

**Project #** Business-13  
**Project Name** Special Service District

**Description**
Minnesota law provides a mechanism termed Special Service District which allows cities to help arrange and finance a higher level of services, such as snow removal and lighting, for commercial and industrial properties.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS**
There are no areas in the city with a Special Service District at this time. This has been previously explored with the Minnetonka Boulevard/County Road 101 area. Must be initiated by property owners.

State legislation for Special Service Districts sunsets on June 30, 2028. A change to this legislation, to allow mixed use projects with a housing component as part of special service districts, is currently under review at the state legislature.

**Justification**
The special service district provides the opportunity for commercial and industrial properties to be charged a fee to pay for a service that is not provided as a part of city services or at a level higher than what is being provided.

**PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS**
Comprehensive Plan-Provide city services and collaborate with outside agencies and the private sector to leverage additional services that reinforce the city's values.

Strategic Plan-Support business retention and expansion and attract new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

**KEY MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSDs Established</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**

Staff time is likely to be significant during the set up of the first special service district. There will be additional staff time needed annually to work with the businesses to determine the next year’s fee. The costs for all administrative time can be incorporated into the fees assessed on the businesses.

Annually, there will be an outflow of funds to pay for the services, but they will all be recouped through assessments on the properties.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # Business-14
Project Name SAC/REC Deferral Program

Key Measures

Businesses Assisted

Key Measures

Description

The goal of this program is to minimize the impact of the Metropolitan Council Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) and city's Sewer and Water Residential Equivalecy Charges (REC's) to small businesses by allowing businesses to defer a portion of the repayment of fees over time.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS

The program will be available in June 2017.

Justification

The Metropolitan Council developed the SAC deferral program in 2012. The program was developed to encourage and help communities promote business development by deferring community SAC payment and city REC payments.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS

Comprehensive Plan - Facilitate connections between local businesses and various programs that provide incentives and financial assistance for business retention and recruitment.

Strategic Plan - Supporting business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.

KEY MEASURES

Businesses Assisted

2017  2018  2019  2020  2021  2022

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other

Staff time will be required to work with the business to apply for the program. The repayments collected through this program will flow through city's utility fund for the Metropolitan Council's fees and the city's fees.

City of Minnetonka 2018-2022 EIP
TRANSIT CHAPTER SUMMARY

Projects which enhance resident mobility by pursuing opportunities and solutions to improve transit service.

The city’s role in transit in the past has been minimal as Metro Transit has been the provider of the city’s and the region’s transit system. In 2002, Minnetonka exercised its opt-out authority. It was determined at the time to be in the best interest of the city to have Metro Transit continue providing transit service for the community. In mid-2013, the city and Metro Transit renegotiated a contract in place providing more detail and clarity on the roles and responsibilities for both the city and Metro Transit. The city will renegotiate the contact in 2017.

In recent years the city’s role in transit has expanded as a more active participant in the city’s opt-out status as well as preparing for the Southwest LRT (Green Line Extension) line.

- The total five-year estimated cost of the programs is $60,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>5-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Services (494)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conceptual Programs**
- City Owned Properties
- Future HRA Levy Projects

Programs in green=funding/program is expected to continue
Programs in yellow=funding/program is uncertain for a number of reasons
Programs in red=funding/program is ending

- All facets of transit, such as commuting, bus/dial-a-ride, and Light Rail Transit (LRT) are included.

- The contract with Metro Transit for service was extended in 2016 and will be renegotiated in 2017.
### Description

Commuter Services is an outreach program of the I-494 Corridor Commission, which the city is a member of. The program seeks to reduce traffic congestion and promote alternative transportation options. Other cities include Bloomington, Richfield, Eden Prairie, and Edina.

### SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing program.

### Justification

Commuter Services provides programs, such as commuter fairs, carpool facilitation, and other information on alternative transportation choices to Minnetonka residents and businesses.

### PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS

Comprehensive Plan-Anticipate, plan for and collaborate with other agencies for local and regional transportation improvements and programs to lessen the impacts of congestion.

Strategic Plan-Pursuing shared sub-regional transit solutions with neighboring communities to improve service within the area.

### KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Contacts</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters Assisted</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Impact/Other

One council member and one city staff member attend monthly meetings of the I-494 Corridor Commission. With preparation time, this is approximately 40 hours of staff time. Additionally, the city is required to be the treasurer of the Commission for two years, which commits additional finance staff time. This happens every 10 years as it rotates between member cities.

Commuter Services is staffed separately, but coordinates with the city on events, such as the city-wide open house to promote their services.

The city’s fee is a formula based on population.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project #  Transit-02
Project Name  Transit Improvements

Key Measures  Annual Bus Trips
Key Measures

Description
In 2002, Minnetonka exercised its opt-out authority and entered into an agreement for Metro Transit to continue to provide transit service in the city. The city has the ability, with notice, to terminate the current agreement.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
The Sector Study was completed December 2012 and suggested route changes from that study were implemented August 2013. The negotiation of a new Transit Cooperation Agreement was also completed in 2013, with a three-year term. The agreement will be renegotiated 2017.

Justification
The service in Minnetonka has and continues to be focused on express route, peak service to downtown Minneapolis, with limited local and midday routes. Much of the transit design has to do with the low density of the city. The city may wish to retain some of its Motor Vehicle Sales Tax (MVST) money and provide more local service to better meet the needs of the community.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Encourage the expansion of multi-modal and transit services in the city with other government agencies to support resident and business transportation needs.

Strategic Plan-Pursue shared sub-regional transit solutions with neighboring communities to improve service within the area.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Bus Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>109,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>110,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>110,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>111,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MVST Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other

Staff time of approximately 40 to 80 hours per year will be spent attending quarterly meetings, marketing, and consulting with Metro Transit staff.

Currently, the MVST revenues due to the city (~$4.4 million) go directly to the Metropolitan Council for transit service.
DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT
DEVELOPMENT/REDEVELOPMENT
CHAPTER SUMMARY

Activities that promote the vitality of the city through development and redevelopment.

For the 2018-2022 Economic Improvement Program, there are four development/redevelopment programs underway.

- The total five-year estimated cost of the programs is $875,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>5-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predevelopment</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center/Comp Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT &amp; Station Areas</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Marketing</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptual Programs
City owned properties
Strategic Acquisition

Programs in green=funding/program is expected to continue
Programs in yellow=funding/program is uncertain for a number of reasons
Programs in red=funding/program is ending

- The Village Center studies, an outcome of the 2008 Comprehensive Plan update, are on hold while the Comprehensive Plan is updated.

- Some of the pass-through grants identified in the business chapter may be geared towards development/redevelopment activities.

- Costs may increase if the city wishes to take a more proactive role in development/redevelopment.

- The LRT page reflects the commitment by the city towards the LRT project. Additional programs may be needed to help implement station area plans in the Shady Oak and Opus station areas.
Economic Improvement Program

City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # Dev/Redev-01
Project Name Pre-Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Projects Assisted</th>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Projects Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Description
The initial stages of development or redevelopment require extensive analysis, by the developer and the city, to determine if a project is viable. Analysis by the city includes financial readiness, design assistance, geotechnical data gathering, and preliminary work for TIF/tax abatement.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This is an on-going program. Staff determines when it is appropriate to use for a potential redevelopment project. For example, initial TIF runs were done for the Tonka on the Creek project to determine if a TIF district would be feasible. Once it was determined that it was, and the developer moved forward as such, the developer was then responsible for paying all legal counsel and financial consultant expenses.

Justification
Predevelopment activities make the city development ready by preparing property for development or redevelopment.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Support existing commercial areas and encourage new development techniques that contribute to the vitality and diversity of the area.

Strategic Plan-Actively promoting the vitality of designated village centers, which integrate uses and connect people to commercial, residential, employment, and public activities.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects Continued after Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Design</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Development projects can be time intensive for staff. The range per year is 500 to 1,000 hours depending on the request, number of meetings and type of assistance requested. The predevelopment funds will be used to hire consultants or others to complete work outside of staff’s expertise.

City of Minnetonka 2018-2022 EIP
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Contact
Department: 4-Development & Redevelop
Type: Program
Useful Life: N/A
Category: Develop/Redevelopment
Priority: Green

Description
The village center studies take a look at each of the city’s thirteen designated village centers and create a guide for redevelopment. The following village centers have been completed: Minnetonka Mills, Opus, Hwy 7/101, Shady Oak, Ridgedale, and some Glen Lake. No other village centers will be completed at this time due to the Comprehensive Plan update process beginning in 2016. Additional work may be completed after the update is completed.

Justification
The village center studies provide a guide to potential investors or developers to the organization of the property, general layout of building envelopes, and a defined range of uses. There is a strong emphasis on community engagement and realistic implementation strategies. The Comprehensive Plan is the city's policy framework to guide development, redevelopment and public services and programs for 30 years.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Guide development and redevelopment to ensure community vitality.
Strategic Plan-Actively promoting the vitality of designated village centers, which integrate uses and connect people to commercial, residential, employment, and public activities.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Village Centers Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Levy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
While a consultant(s) is brought on to assist with the project, there is staff time spent on the village center studies to prepare contracts, review plans, facilitate ideas, prepare for public meetings and attend public meetings. This work can range from 1500-1750 hours per year.

There will be significant staff time when the Comprehensive Plan is updated, which will begin in 2017.
Minnetonka Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # Dev/Redev-03
Project Name LRT and LRT Station Area Development

Key Measures

Description
Minnetonka has actively been planning for LRT since the early 2000’s. By late 2015 SWLRT design was at 60% design and work on the infrastructure around the station areas continues to be discussed and added to when possible. As the LRT project progresses from design to construction there is a desire for redevelopment to occur around the city’s station areas to make a more transit oriented area.

Justification
It is anticipated that because of limited county, regional and state resources, as well as the competition for these resources, that in order to assist in facilitating redevelopment in the LRT station areas, the city will need to provide resources of its own. Resources that are available as of 2016 include:

Hennepin County
- Capital infrastructure (streets, etc.)
- Transit Oriented Development fund
- Community Works funds
- Affordable housing incentive fund
- Environmental Response fund

Regional (Met Council)
- LCDA-TOD fund
- TBRA-TOD fund

State
- Transit Improvement Area (unfunded)
- Redevelopment grant
- Contamination Clean-Up and Investigation
- Transportation Economic Development

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Encourage a greater density/intensity and mix of land uses where access is available and supported by regional transportation systems (such as LRT).

Strategic Plan-Actively promoting the vitality of designated village centers, which integrate uses and connect people to commercial, residential, employment, and public activities.

KEY MEASURES
TBD

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Levy</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
In July 2015 the city committed $2 million towards the LRT project. This is being initially funded through the Special Assessment Construction Fund. Partial payback will occur from HRA levy funds over a 10 year period for a total of $750,000.

It is unknown what type of programs will need to be added and therefore additional budget impacts beyond the city's financial commitment to the LRT project are unknown. As programs are developed, staff time and future funding will need to be reviewed to determine a program's viability.
Development of a marketing strategy to promote the city to current and future residents and businesses.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
The first step—a market assessment was completed in 2014. A marketing plan will be developed in 2017 with existing funds.

Justification
Minnetonka is ideally located and in the past has been successful in attracting residents, as well as all types of businesses, including multi-national corporations without much need for promotion. As the economy changes and attracting residents and businesses becomes more competitive it will be necessary to develop a marketing strategy to better promote the city.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan—Provide regional leadership in promoting community facilities, programs and land uses that are diverse, inclusive, and supportive of residents and businesses.

Strategic Plan—Actively promoting the vitality of designated village centers, which integrate uses and connect people to commercial, residential, employment, and public activities.

KEY MEASURES
TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Development of a marketing strategy will likely take significant time to develop—including time from both city staff and outside assistance. Funds were budgeted previously from the HRA Levy to begin the marketing project which resulted in the city pursuing a brand strategy.

Staff anticipates the branding initiative will outline a new communication strategy that includes a strategic marketing component. Staff included $50,000 per year to support this effort. The general fund is the proposed funding sources for the council to consider for this initiative.
The city owns scattered site residential and commercial properties. These properties have been purchased over the years for a variety of reasons.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This is an on-going project.

Justification
The city-owned properties include:

- 4292 Oak Drive Lane (residential)
- 4312 Shady Oak Road (commercial)
- 5937 County Road 101 (residential)
- 5501 Baker Road (residential)
- 5432 Rowland Road (residential)
- 3441 Martha Lane (residential)

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan—Encourage a diversity of land uses within the city to ensure a broad range of housing and employment choice, shopping and other services for residents and businesses.

Strategic Plan—Actively promoting the vitality of designated village centers, which integrate uses and connect people to commercial, residential, employment and public activities.

KEY MEASURES
TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
There is some staff time every year devoted to the upkeep on the properties; however, a property manager is hired for properties where there are tenants, lessening the staff time required.
**Economic Improvement Program**

**City of Minnetonka, Minnesota**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Dev/Redev-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Future HRA Levy projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description

Future HRA levy projects may include:

- Strategic Acquisition

### Justification

The future HRA levy page includes a placeholder for strategic acquisition of property. The program is currently conceptual. In the future, the council may want to consider an HRA of $100,000 per year to fund this initiative.

### Key Measures

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA Levy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Impact/Other

In the future, the council may want to consider an HRA levy of $100,000 per year to fund this initiative.
TAX INCREMENT FINANCING
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # TIF-01
Project Name Development Agreement and TIF Administration

Description
Any time a TIF district is formed, a development agreement is prepared between the city and the developer. Administration for both the TIF and the development agreement, over the life of the TIF district, is required.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
Administration and review of the existing development agreements and TIF districts is ongoing until the projects expire.

New TIF districts are anticipated to be added as new redevelopment projects are proposed in anticipation of the LRT.

Justification
In some cases redevelopment projects need city assistance, such as in the form of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) in order for the project to be financially feasible. Anytime a TIF district is set-up there is a cost to the city for monitoring the project.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Encourage redevelopment projects that include mixed income housing, including affordable units, while balancing density and the preservation of natural resources.

Strategic Plan-
-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.
-Actively promoting the vitality of designated village centers, which integrate uses and connect people to commercial, residential, employment and public activities.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp 2019</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Fund</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Development agreements and TIF administration are staff led activities. The city regularly calls upon its financial consultants and legal counsel to assist in these matters. Staff time estimates are 520 hours.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

### Description
The Beacon Hill TIF district is a housing district approved on February 14, 1994 to construct a senior living facility that includes both senior housing (110 units) and an assisted living component (42 units).

### SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This TIF district was approved in 1994 and will expire in 2021.

All of the original obligations were paid on the district by 2009. At that time though the EDA modified the district at that time to keep it open in order to keep the affordability in some of the units. With the revised contract stipulates the city extended the assistance for affordability, but reduces the percent of increment paid to the development, 90% for five years (2015) and decreases by 10% every year until 2020.

### Justification
The Beacon Hill TIF District was established to assist in the development of 152 total units, of which, 62 units are affordable to those at 60% AMI or less.

### PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Support and encourage housing options that are attractive to a wide variety of age and income levels of residents.

Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

### KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Impact/Other
Staff, with occasional consultant assistance, oversees the administration of the TIF district.

A portion of the tax increment is retained to cover administrative costs.

More detailed information on the TIF district, its obligations, performance, and other development agreement compliance can be found in the 2016 TIF Management Report prepared by the Ehlers, Inc., the city's financial consultant.
Economic Improvement Program

City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project # TIF-03
Project Name Boulevard Gardens TIF District

Key Measures Affordable Units

Key Measures

Description

The Boulevard Gardens TIF district was adopted December 11, 1995 to facilitate the redevelopment and affordable housing built at West Ridge Market, beginning in 1996. Over 500 housing units were created with over 200 of those units as affordable ownership and rental. West Ridge Market was one of the very first Metropolitan Council Livable Communities Demonstration projects.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS

This TIF district was approved in 1995, and will expire in 2022. The developer's note was paid in full in 2011. The housing affordability, set at 30 years, will expire between 2025 and 2027 depending on the component.

In 2010 a TIF plan modification was made using the "Jobs Bill" legislation to allow for special TIF pooling for affordable housing as well as $100,000 to pay for the utility costs associated with the construction of The Glenn by St. Therese in the Glenhaven TIF District.

Justification

The development agreement expired with the final TIF payment in 2011. This district has a maximum life of 26 years. The city could use the cash balance to pool for other redevelopment eligible projects in the city if the TIF plan and the project areas are modified.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS

Comprehensive Plan-Support and encourage housing options that are attractive to a wide variety of age and income levels of residents.

Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 0 0 0 0 0 0

Budget Impact/Other

Staff, with occasional consultant assistance, oversees the administration of the TIF district.

More detailed information on the TIF district, its obligations, performance, and other development agreement compliance can be found in the 2016 TIF Management Report prepared by the Ehlers, Inc., the city's financial consultant.
The Glenhaven TIF district is a renewal and renovation district approved on January 23, 2006. Special legislation was granted to the city in 2009 to extend the duration of the district by seven years to December 31, 2029.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This TIF district was approved in 2006 and will expire in 2029. The first two phases of the project included: a mixed use apartment building with retail on the first floor and a senior housing rental community. The third phase, originally planned as a condominium building, was recently changed and a 54-unit cooperative was completed in 2017.

TIF revenue bonds were issued in 2010 and have a lien on the current TIF revenues. Annually, after the bonds are paid, the excess increment will pay the city's $500,000 interfund loan. Next, the developer's pay as you go note is paid, and once that is paid off, then the city will repay itself for costs associated with the Alano facility. Even with the third phase, it's not likely the developer's note or the city's costs with Alano will be repaid.

The Glenhaven TIF District was established to assist in the Glen Lake Redevelopment of housing and mixed use. There are 43 affordable units in the total development, affordable to those at 60% AMI or less.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Support and encourage housing options that are attractive to a wide variety of age and income levels of residents.
Strategic Plan-
-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.
-Actively promote the vitality of designated village centers, which integrate uses and connect people to commercial, residential, employment, and public activities.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |

Staff, with occasional consultant assistance, oversees the administration of the TIF district. A portion of the tax increment is retained to cover administrative costs. More detailed information on the TIF district, its obligations, performance, and other development agreement compliance can be found in the 2016 TIF Management Report prepared by the Ehlers, Inc., the city's financial consultant.
Economic Improvement Program
City of Minnetonka, Minnesota

Project #  TIF-06
Project Name  Tonka on the Creek TIF District (The Overlook)

Key Measures  Affordable Units

Description
The Tonka on the Creek TIF district is a housing district approved February 10, 2014. A 100-unit apartment building known as The Overlook, containing 20 affordable units, was constructed as part of the project.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
This TIF district was approved in 2014 and will end in 2042. Construction began in late 2014, and was completed in early 2016.

Justification
The Tonka on the Creek TIF District was established to assist in the development of an 100-unit apartment building, of which 20 units will be affordable to those at 50% AMI or less.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Support and encourage housing options that are attractive to a wide variety of age and income levels of residents.

Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Staff, with occasional consultant assistance, oversees the administration of the TIF district.

A portion of the tax increment is retained to cover administrative costs.

More detailed information on the TIF district, its obligations, performance, and other development agreement compliance can be found in the 2016 TIF Management Report prepared by the Ehlers, Inc., the city's financial consultant.
The Applewood Pointe TIF district is a redevelopment TIF district approved August 2014. An 89-unit senior cooperative building, containing 9 affordable units will be constructed as part of the project.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
The TIF district was approved in 2014 and will end in 2041. Construction began in late 2015 and was completed in 2016.

Justification
The Applewood Pointe TIF District was established to assist in the development of an 89-unit senior cooperative building, of which 9 units will be affordable.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Support and encourage housing options that are attractive to a wide variety of age and income levels of residents.
Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Staff, with occasional consultant assistance, oversee the administration of the TIF district.

A portion of the tax increment is retained to cover administrative costs.
At Home apartments is a 106-unit apartment building that received TIF assistance through a housing TIF district. Twenty-one units are affordable to those at 50% AMI or less.

SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS
The TIF district was approved in 2015 and will end in 2043. Construction began in 2015 and was completed in 2016.

Justification
This TIF district includes 21 of the 106 rental units affordable to those earning 50% AMI or less.

PROGRAM GOALS AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS
Comprehensive Plan-Support and encourage housing options that are attractive to a wide variety of age and income levels of residents.

Strategic Plan-Initiating programs and policies that broaden housing choices to both meet the needs of our aging population and attract young residents.

KEY MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Impact/Other
Staff, with occasional consultant assistance, oversee the administration of the TIF district.

A portion of the tax increment is retained to cover administrative costs.
TAX ABATEMENT

MINNETONKA ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
The Ridgedale Tax Abatement was approved in connection with the Ridgedale Mall expansion and pertains to the Macy's, Nordstrom and mall properties. The funds are to be used for transportation improvements around the mall site and with public amenities on the site.

**SCHEDULING AND PROJECT STATUS**
The Ridgedale Tax Abatement project was approved in Spring 2013.

### Program Goals and Relationship to Other Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Property Value Increase</th>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Property Levy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Justification**
The Ridgedale Tax Abatement will assist in financing the transportation and other public improvements that must be completed due to the Ridgedale Mall expansion.

**Program Goals and Relationship to Other Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Plan</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Key Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage the impact of new development upon the local transportation system and encourage the use of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and other traffic management techniques.</td>
<td>Supporting business retention and expansion and attracting new businesses to help our private sector be economically competitive.</td>
<td>Property Value Increase N/A N/A N/A N/A 5.5% 5.3% 20% INFORMATION WILL BE AVAILABLE BY JUNE Property Levy N/A N/A N/A N/A 0 $26,000 $81,000 $118,800 $135,600 $152,800 $170,600 $188,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Impact/Other**

Staff, with occasional consultant assistance, oversees the administration of the Tax Abatement.

A portion of the abatement is retained to cover administrative costs.
FUNDING SOURCES AND EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS
FUND DESCRIPTIONS

Development Fund (2018 estimated beginning fund balance): $2,772,051
The Development Fund was created with funds remaining after retiring the bonds of a single Tax Increment Finance (TIF) district in 1993. Under provisions of the TIF contract and law, the Development Fund may only be used for costs associated with Minnetonka's redevelopment and economic development activities. The city's Economic Development Authority initiates projects appropriate to these activities.

Livable Communities Fund (2018 estimated beginning fund balance): $250,000
The Livable Communities fund was created after receiving special legislation to develop an account from the revenues of a closed Tax Increment Finance (TIF) district. The legislation specifically restricts the use of these funds for affordable housing programs. Standards for affordability are consistent with the Metropolitan Council's income, rent and sales price limits.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
Since 1975, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) fund has accounted for revenues and expenditures made under the federal CDBG program. Minnetonka typically uses these funds for housing projects and programs (such as housing rehab, affordable housing, and supportive housing) and supportive services (such as senior chore programs, information and referral services and others).

HRA Levy: $175,000
Minnesota Statutes 469.033, Subd. 6 authorizes housing and redevelopment authorities (HRAs) the power to levy a tax upon all property within its district to finance housing and redevelopment programs subject to the consent of the city council. In 1988 and amended in 1994 and 2010, the Minnetonka City Council established the Economic Development Authority (EDA) of the City of Minnetonka and transferred to the EDA the control, authority and operation of all projects and programs of the city's HRA. The law and council resolutions further require the EDA to file a budget in accordance with the budget procedure of the city in the same manner as required of executive departments of the city.

TIF Pooling (2018 estimated beginning fund balance): $3,620,120
Under the Minnesota Statutes Chapter 469, at least 75 percent of tax increment in a redevelopment tax increment financing (TIF) district must be spent on eligible activities within the district, leaving up to 25 percent of the funds to be pooled and therefore eligible to be spent outside of the district, but within the project area. An exception to the pooling funds is for affordable rental housing that meet federal housing tax credit guidelines. The city may choose to increase the pooling allowance to 35 percent, which can then go to finance certain affordable housing projects.
## SUMMARY TABLE
### EIP 2018
#### Expenditures by Category & Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>Devpt Fund</th>
<th>HRA Levy</th>
<th>Liveable Com</th>
<th>TIF</th>
<th>TIF Pooling</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing:</strong></td>
<td>CDBG Admin</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Projects Program</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Assisted Hsg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homes Within Reach</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Improvement Areas</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mika Home Enhancement</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Generation Pgm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Exempt Conduit Debt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing via TIF Pooling</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome to Minnetonka</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,148,900</td>
<td>$98,900</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business:</strong></td>
<td>Economic Gardening</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Econ. Dev. Infrastructure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Sprinkler Retrofit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Bond/Ind Rev</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass-Through Grants</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater MSP</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MN Investment Fund</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open to Business</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Service Districts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TwinWest</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$768,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit:</strong></td>
<td>Commuter Services</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Improvments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devpt &amp; Redevpt:</strong></td>
<td>Predevelopment</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Center/Comp Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LRT and Station Area</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Marketing</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Owned Properties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future HRA Levy Properties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIF Districts:</strong></td>
<td>Devpt Agmt &amp; TIF Admin</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beacon Hill TIF District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blvd Gardens TIF District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenhaven TIF District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mika Mills TIF District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonka on the Creek TIF District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applewood Pointe TIF District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rowland Housing TIF District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Abatement:</strong></td>
<td>Ridgedale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,223,900</td>
<td>$98,900</td>
<td>$1,185,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Fund

### Beginning Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,772,051</td>
<td>2,209,151</td>
<td>2,143,651</td>
<td>2,078,151</td>
<td>1,982,651</td>
<td>1,857,151</td>
<td>1,630,651</td>
<td>1,611,151</td>
<td>1,335,651</td>
<td>1,010,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenues and Other Fund Sources

#### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Gardens Returned Levy Proceeds</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Ridge Assessments</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIFAdmin Revenue</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>564,500</td>
<td>564,500</td>
<td>564,500</td>
<td>564,500</td>
<td>369,500</td>
<td>364,500</td>
<td>364,500</td>
<td>364,500</td>
<td>364,500</td>
<td>364,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Revenues and Other Fund Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,226,651</td>
<td>2,001,151</td>
<td>1,975,651</td>
<td>1,700,151</td>
<td>1,374,651</td>
<td>1,010,151</td>
<td>1,010,151</td>
<td>1,010,151</td>
<td>1,010,151</td>
<td>1,010,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Funds Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,336,551</td>
<td>2,773,651</td>
<td>2,708,151</td>
<td>2,642,651</td>
<td>2,547,151</td>
<td>1,857,151</td>
<td>1,630,651</td>
<td>1,611,151</td>
<td>1,335,651</td>
<td>1,010,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures and Uses

#### Capital Projects & Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Improvement Areas</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business-02</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreaterMSP</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-06</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIF/JCF Projects</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Service District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(640,000)</td>
<td>(440,000)</td>
<td>(440,000)</td>
<td>(240,000)</td>
<td>(540,000)</td>
<td>(440,000)</td>
<td>(240,000)</td>
<td>(240,000)</td>
<td>(540,000)</td>
<td>(240,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Development & Redevelopment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TIF Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreement and TIF Administration</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Uses</strong></td>
<td>(67,400)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Allocation (Transfers Out)</strong></td>
<td>(67,400)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(67,400)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures and Uses</strong></td>
<td>(1,127,400)</td>
<td>(630,000)</td>
<td>(630,000)</td>
<td>(660,000)</td>
<td>(690,000)</td>
<td>(590,000)</td>
<td>(590,000)</td>
<td>(490,000)</td>
<td>(490,000)</td>
<td>(490,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>(562,900)</td>
<td>(65,500)</td>
<td>(65,500)</td>
<td>(95,500)</td>
<td>(125,500)</td>
<td>(220,500)</td>
<td>(25,500)</td>
<td>(275,500)</td>
<td>(325,500)</td>
<td>(25,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance</strong></td>
<td>2,209,151</td>
<td>2,143,651</td>
<td>2,078,151</td>
<td>1,982,651</td>
<td>1,857,151</td>
<td>1,811,151</td>
<td>1,335,651</td>
<td>1,030,151</td>
<td>984,651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City of Minnetonka 2018-2022 EIP*
### HRA Levy

#### Beginning Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>(113,000)</td>
<td>(201,000)</td>
<td>(239,000)</td>
<td>(252,000)</td>
<td>(290,000)</td>
<td>(303,000)</td>
<td>(341,000)</td>
<td>(354,000)</td>
<td>(317,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Revenues and Other Fund Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Other Fund Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Valorem Tax Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan paybacks</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Revenues and Other Fund Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>(103,000)</td>
<td>(116,000)</td>
<td>(154,000)</td>
<td>(167,000)</td>
<td>(130,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Funds Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures and Uses

##### Capital Projects & Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes Within Reach</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MInnetonka Home Enhancement</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Minnetonka Loan Program</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Business                                            |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Outreach                                               | (25,000) | 0      | (25,000) | 0      | (25,000) | 0      | (25,000) | 0      | (25,000) | 0      |
| **Total**                                              | (25,000) | 0      | (25,000) | 0      | (25,000) | 0      | (25,000) | 0      | (25,000) | 0      |

| 4. Development & Redevelopment                         |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Village Center Studies and Comprehensive Plan          |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| LRT and LRT Station Area Development                   | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) |
| Future HRA Levy projects                               | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      |
| **Total**                                              | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) |

#### Total Expenditures and Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td>(275,000)</td>
<td>(225,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(225,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(225,000)</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>(125,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City of Minnetonka 2018-2022 EIP*
### HRA Levy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>(113,000)</td>
<td>(88,000)</td>
<td>(38,000)</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>(38,000)</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>(38,000)</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>(113,000)</td>
<td>(201,000)</td>
<td>(239,000)</td>
<td>(252,000)</td>
<td>(290,000)</td>
<td>(303,000)</td>
<td>(341,000)</td>
<td>(354,000)</td>
<td>(317,000)</td>
<td>(255,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Livable Communities Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Revenues and Other Fund Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues and Other Fund Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Funds Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change in Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ending Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sources and Uses of Funds

**City of Minnetonka, Minnesota**  
*Economic Improvement Program*  
2018 thru 2027

## Sources and Uses of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues and Other Fund Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal grant</td>
<td>88,900</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program income</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98,900</td>
<td>54,600</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues and Other Fund Sources</strong></td>
<td>98,900</td>
<td>54,600</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>98,900</td>
<td>54,600</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures and Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects &amp; Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Administration</td>
<td>(6,000)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Projects Program</td>
<td>(80,000)</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>(900)</td>
<td>(600)</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>(12,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(8,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(98,900)</td>
<td>(54,600)</td>
<td>(30,300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures and Uses</strong></td>
<td>(98,900)</td>
<td>(54,600)</td>
<td>(30,300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Minnetonka 2018-2022 EIP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDBG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TIF Pooling

### Beginning Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Revenues and Other Fund Sources

**Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pooled TIF Funds</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenues and Other Fund Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funds Available**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,220,120</td>
<td>4,220,120</td>
<td>4,220,120</td>
<td>4,220,120</td>
<td>4,240,120</td>
<td>3,620,120</td>
<td>3,620,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures and Uses

**Capital Projects & Equipment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(620,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing via TIF Pooling</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(620,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(620,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures and Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(620,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ending Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## EIP 2018-2027
### All Categories
#### Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Account</td>
<td>$1,185,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$5,045,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livable Communities Account</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grant</td>
<td>98,900</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$159,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Valorem Tax Levy</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$3,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled TIF Funds</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$2,158,900</td>
<td>$1,355,600</td>
<td>$1,290,000</td>
<td>$1,290,000</td>
<td>$1,360,000</td>
<td>$1,290,000</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$10,374,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>$1,148,900</td>
<td>$854,600</td>
<td>$755,300</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$745,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$5,953,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>768,000</td>
<td>293,000</td>
<td>468,000</td>
<td>243,000</td>
<td>568,000</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>$4,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Redevelopment</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF Projects</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$2,223,900</td>
<td>$1,474,600</td>
<td>$1,551,300</td>
<td>$1,525,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$902,000</td>
<td>$752,000</td>
<td>$1,052,000</td>
<td>$1,052,000</td>
<td>$827,000</td>
<td>$11,079,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Minnetonka
Housing TIF District No. 2 Beacon Hill

TAX BASE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ID</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTA-15</td>
<td>2,523,000</td>
<td>2,582,031</td>
<td>2,649,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA-16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,523,000</td>
<td>2,582,031</td>
<td>2,649,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIF PLAN BUDGET ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2,598,000</td>
<td>2,598,000</td>
<td>2,598,000</td>
<td>2,598,000</td>
<td>2,598,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paygo</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,608,000</td>
<td>2,608,000</td>
<td>2,608,000</td>
<td>2,608,000</td>
<td>2,608,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAX CAPACITY EXPANSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Fiscal Discretion Captured</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Base Total Revenue</th>
<th>Current Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIF Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Admin Per TIF Plan</th>
<th>TIF Plan</th>
<th>TIF Plan Allowable</th>
<th>Available Admin</th>
<th>Admin Actual</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable-1%</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>208,923</td>
<td>208,923</td>
<td>287,949</td>
<td>287,949</td>
<td>287,949</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>233,969</td>
<td>233,969</td>
<td>317,949</td>
<td>317,949</td>
<td>317,949</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>272,969</td>
<td>272,969</td>
<td>390,303</td>
<td>390,303</td>
<td>390,303</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CUMULATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIF Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Administrators Total</th>
<th>Admin Per TIF Plan</th>
<th>Available Admin</th>
<th>Admin Actual</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable-1%</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>252,981</td>
<td>252,981</td>
<td>332,949</td>
<td>332,949</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>287,949</td>
<td>287,949</td>
<td>390,303</td>
<td>390,303</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>317,949</td>
<td>317,949</td>
<td>390,303</td>
<td>390,303</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CUMULATIVE-1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIF Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Administrators Total</th>
<th>Admin Per TIF Plan</th>
<th>Available Admin</th>
<th>Admin Actual</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable-1%</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>243,969</td>
<td>243,969</td>
<td>314,574</td>
<td>314,574</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>278,949</td>
<td>278,949</td>
<td>347,284</td>
<td>347,284</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>307,949</td>
<td>307,949</td>
<td>370,294</td>
<td>370,294</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CUMULATIVE-2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIF Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Administrators Total</th>
<th>Admin Per TIF Plan</th>
<th>Available Admin</th>
<th>Admin Actual</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable-1%</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>234,969</td>
<td>234,969</td>
<td>294,574</td>
<td>294,574</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>269,949</td>
<td>269,949</td>
<td>327,284</td>
<td>327,284</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>297,949</td>
<td>297,949</td>
<td>350,294</td>
<td>350,294</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CUMULATIVE-3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIF Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Administrators Total</th>
<th>Admin Per TIF Plan</th>
<th>Available Admin</th>
<th>Admin Actual</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable-1%</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,969</td>
<td>225,969</td>
<td>284,574</td>
<td>284,574</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>260,949</td>
<td>260,949</td>
<td>312,284</td>
<td>312,284</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>287,949</td>
<td>287,949</td>
<td>333,294</td>
<td>333,294</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE CUMULATIVE-4%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIF Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Administrators Total</th>
<th>Admin Per TIF Plan</th>
<th>Available Admin</th>
<th>Admin Actual</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable</th>
<th>% Admin Allowable-1%</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>216,969</td>
<td>216,969</td>
<td>264,574</td>
<td>264,574</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>251,949</td>
<td>251,949</td>
<td>292,284</td>
<td>292,284</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>278,949</td>
<td>278,949</td>
<td>314,294</td>
<td>314,294</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City of Minnetonka
#### TIF District 2 - Boulevard Gardens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Area Redevelopment Admin</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Funding District</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Funding District</th>
<th>Funding District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Development District No 1</td>
<td>A Section</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>19952</td>
<td>Development District No 1</td>
<td>A Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UST D1</td>
<td>1460.75%</td>
<td>UST D1</td>
<td>1460.75%</td>
<td>UST D1</td>
<td>1460.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Yearly Cash Flow Projection - Real UP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Remaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tax Increment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Remaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Projected and Actual Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Current Local Tax Rate</th>
<th>Income Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Administrators Expense Test

**Test 1**: Actual per TIF Plan

**Test 2**: Estimated TIF Administrators Allowable (SN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>TIF Allowable</th>
<th>TIF Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23,604,395</td>
<td>22,984,395</td>
<td>620,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test 3**: Cumulative TIF Administrators Allowable (SN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>TIF Allowable</th>
<th>TIF Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56,204,395</td>
<td>53,984,395</td>
<td>2,220,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test 4**: TIF Administrators Expenses per TIF Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>TIF Allowable</th>
<th>TIF Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test 5**: Total TIF Expenses for the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>TIF Allowable</th>
<th>TIF Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28,804,395</td>
<td>28,804,395</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test 6**: District Excess

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>TIF Allowable</th>
<th>TIF Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,220,000</td>
<td>2,220,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test 7**: District Recap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>TIF Allowable</th>
<th>TIF Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29,024,395</td>
<td>28,804,395</td>
<td>2,220,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative Expenses

**Administrators Expense Calculation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Administrative Expenses</th>
<th>Administrative Costs</th>
<th>% Allowable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,181,312</td>
<td>1,181,312</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,374,831</td>
<td>1,374,831</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,714,313</td>
<td>1,714,313</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,694,835</td>
<td>1,694,835</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,506,827</td>
<td>1,506,827</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,617,885</td>
<td>1,617,885</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,577,843</td>
<td>1,577,843</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,717,882</td>
<td>1,717,882</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,628,269</td>
<td>1,628,269</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,552,892</td>
<td>1,552,892</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1,492,882</td>
<td>1,492,882</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>1,577,843</td>
<td>1,577,843</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>1,659,269</td>
<td>1,659,269</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1,502,892</td>
<td>1,502,892</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>1,492,882</td>
<td>1,492,882</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>1,577,843</td>
<td>1,577,843</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Increment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Increment Generated</th>
<th>Increment Authorized</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Increment Reserved</th>
<th>Net Reserved</th>
<th>F&amp;I Due after year end</th>
<th>Excess (Net Surplus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,209,352</td>
<td>1,209,352</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(51,465,960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,209,252</td>
<td>1,209,252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(51,465,960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(49,592,566)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(43,982,658)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(47,715,808)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(53,335,761)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(55,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>1,209,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(56,950,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Admin Expenses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Allowable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POOLING INCREMENT (5% Outside of Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Admin Expenses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Allowable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXCESS MONUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Admin Expenses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Allowable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>1,019,780</td>
<td>650,969</td>
<td>650,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOALS
AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOALS

Progress on the city’s affordable housing goals.

In 1995, the Minnesota Legislature created the Livable Communities Act (LCA) to address the affordable and life-cycle housing needs in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. When the LCA was established, Minnetonka was one of the first communities to sign up to participate in the program. At that time, a series of affordable housing goals for the city was established for 1996 to 2010. The city has elected to continue to participate in the LCA program, establishing affordable and lifecycle housing goals for 2011 to 2020.

### 1995-2010 AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals (1995-2010)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Percent Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Affordable Ownership Units</td>
<td>180 Units</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Affordable Rental Units</td>
<td>324 Units</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rental Units (All)</td>
<td>540 Units</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1995-2010 New Affordable Ownership Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>EIP Program Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gables of West Ridge Market</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Boulevard Gardens TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgebury</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ridgebury TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Enclave</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sanctuary</td>
<td>2005-2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-Grants -Homes Within Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Estates</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Homes Within Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud 9 Sky Flats</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Homes Within Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyldewood Condos</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Drive</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Homes Within Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deephaven Cove</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-Grants -Homes Within Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowwoods</td>
<td>2007/2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Homes Within Reach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1995-2010 New Affordable Rental Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>EIP Program Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior Court Apartments</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ridge Retirement</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Boulevard Gardens TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Gardens</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Boulevard Gardens TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Ridge Apartments</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Boulevard Gardens TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Mills</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Minnetonka Mills TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Pointe Townhouses</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cedar Pointe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oaks at Glen Lake</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Glenhaven TIF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2011-2020 Affordable Housing Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals (2011-2020)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Percent Achieved to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Affordable Units (rental &amp; ownership)</td>
<td>246 to 378</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lifecycle Units</td>
<td>375 to 800</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2011-2020 New Affordable Units (rental and ownership)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>EIP Program Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Glenn by St. Therese</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Glenhaven TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ridge</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>TIF Pooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonka on the Creek</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tonka on the Creek TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Home</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rowland Housing TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherrywood Pointe*</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates projects that are approved, but not yet constructed therefore affordable and lifecycle units are not counted in 2011-2020 goals.

## 2011-2020 New Lifecycle Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Lifecycle Units</th>
<th>EIP Program Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Glenn by St. Therese</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Glenhaven TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ridge</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>TIF Pooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonka on the Creek</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Tonka on the Creek TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Home</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Rowland Housing TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applewood Pointe</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Applewood Pointe TIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecesse*</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherrywood Pointe*</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zvago*</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Glenhaven TIF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates projects that are approved, but not yet constructed therefore affordable and lifecycle units are not counted in 2011-2020 goals.
The following is a list EIP programs and their contribution to the city’s affordable housing goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Program Administration</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Ridge Apartments</td>
<td>46 affordable units participate in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Repair Program</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Assisted Housing</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes Within Reach</td>
<td>Preservation of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Improvement Area (HIA)</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Heights Apartments</td>
<td>172 affordable units participate in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Home Enhancement program</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Regeneration Program</td>
<td>Program could preserve affordable units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Exempt Financing</td>
<td>Program may add or preserve affordable units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF Pooling</td>
<td>51 units added through The Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Minnetonka program</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Gardening</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Sprinkler Retrofit</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>May assist with components of projects that have affordable units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Revenue Bonds (Common Bond)</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreaterMSP</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Community Capital Fund (MCCF)</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Investment Fund (MIF)</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Business</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Infrastructure</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TwinWest</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Services</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Improvements</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redevelopment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predevelopment Projects</td>
<td>May assist projects that are developing affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Help to guide areas where affordable housing may be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Increment Financing (TIF)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agmt/TIF Admin</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Hill TIF District</td>
<td>44 affordable units added in 1994 (prior to affordable housing goals). Preserved in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Gardens TIF District</td>
<td>227 affordable units added in 1996/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenhaven TIF District</td>
<td>43 affordable units added in 2008 and 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Mills TIF District</td>
<td>30 affordable units added in 1997. Even though district has expired, units remain affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonka on the Creek TIF District</td>
<td>20 affordable units expected in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applewood Pointe TIF District</td>
<td>9 affordable units completed in 2017 (will not meet Met Council guidelines, therefore not included in goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Home Apartments</td>
<td>21 affordable units completed in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Abatement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2017 AFFORDABLE HOUSING INCOME LIMITS

### FY 2017 Income Limits Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2017 Income Limit Area</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>FY 2017 Income Limit Category</th>
<th>Persons in Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (50%) Income Limits ($)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI HUD Metro FMR Area</td>
<td>$90,400</td>
<td>31,650 36,200 40,700 <strong>45,200</strong> 48,850 52,450 56,050 59,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Low (30%) Income Limits ($)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,000 21,700 24,400 <strong>27,100</strong> 29,300 32,960 37,140 41,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low (80%) Income Limits ($)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,600 54,400 61,200 <strong>68,000</strong> 73,450 78,900 84,350 89,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI HUD Metro FMR Area** contains the following areas: Anoka County, MN; Carver County, MN; Chisago County, MN; Dakota County, MN; Hennepin County, MN; Isanti County, MN; Ramsey County, MN; Scott County, MN; Sherburne County, MN; Washington County, MN; Wright County, MN; Pierce County, WI; and St. Croix County, WI.

Source: [Economic and Market Analysis Division](https://www.hud.gov), HUD. 4/19/2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOALS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLOSSARY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Term</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)</strong></td>
<td>A program through HUD assisting state and local governments with a variety of community development needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED)</strong></td>
<td>A state agency assisting in economic development through programs targeting business recruitment, expansion and retention; workforce development; and community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development Advisory Commission (EDAC)</strong></td>
<td>An advisory commission to the city council on matters related to economic development, housing and redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development Authority (EDA)</strong></td>
<td>An authority granted to local governments by the state for the purpose of conducting economic development, housing and redevelopment activities. EDAs have the ability to levy taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Improvement Area (HIA)</strong></td>
<td>A defined area in the city in which housing improvements to commonly owned space in condominium/townhouse developments may be financing with the assistance of a city through special assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA)</strong></td>
<td>An authority granted to local governments by the state for the purpose of conducting housing and redevelopment activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Rail Transit (LRT)</strong></td>
<td>A mode of public transit where trains run in a separate right of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livable Communities Act (LCA)</strong></td>
<td>A program adopted in 1995 by the Minnesota State Legislature and administered by the Metropolitan Council for purposes of increasing affordable housing and investing in local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Council</strong></td>
<td>A regional policy-making body, planning agency and provider of services to guide growth in the Twin Cities metropolitan area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Transit</strong></td>
<td>The transit arm of the Metropolitan Council responsible for running the metropolitan area’s bus and train systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minnesota Investment Fund (MIF)</strong></td>
<td>A business financing tool offered by DEED to help businesses locate or expand in Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE)</strong></td>
<td>A program that allows businesses to make clean energy investments in their businesses by financing the costs through a special assessment on the property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Abatement</strong></td>
<td>A temporary deferral of property taxes for purposes of stimulating economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Increment Financing (TIF)</strong></td>
<td>A financing tool where additional property taxes generated from a new development are captured and used for public purposes such as housing, removal of blight and employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)</strong></td>
<td>Established in 1965 as a cabinet-level federal agency that is responsible housing and community development activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution No. 2017-
Resolution adopting the 2018-2022 Economic Improvement Program

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The preliminary 2018-2022 Economic Improvement Program was presented to the City Council for its consideration on June 12, 2017.

1.02. As a result of that review, it was concluded that the Economic Improvement Program articulates the city’s economic development priorities and identifies funding accordingly over a multi-year planning horizon.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. That the 2018-2022 Economic Improvement Program as presented and discussed by the City Council on June 12, 2017 and as amended is hereby adopted.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

________________________________________________________________________

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

________________________________________________________________________

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

__________________________________________

David E. Maeda, City Clerk