Agenda
Minnetonka City Council
Regular Meeting, Monday, July 11, 2016
6:30 P.M.
Council Chambers

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call: Wagner-Ellingson-Allendorf-Acomb-Wiersum-Bergstedt-Schneider
4. Approval of Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes: June 6 and 27, 2016 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:
   A. Bids for manhole rehabilitation Phase VII
      Recommendation: Award contract to Hydro-Klean (majority vote)
10. Consent Agenda - Items Requiring a Majority Vote:
    A. Third Amendment to site lease with New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC for
       Williston Water Tower
    B. Resolution appointing election judges and absentee ballot board for the State
       Primary on August 9, 2016
    C. Resolution approving preliminary plat of FRETHAM 18th ADDITION, a three
       lot subdivision at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an
       unaddressed parcel

Minnetonka City Council meetings are broadcast live on channel 16.
Replays of this meeting can be seen during the following days and times: Mondays, 6:30 p.m., Wednesdays, 6:30 p.m.,
Fridays, 12 p.m., Saturdays, 12 p.m. The city’s website also offers video streaming of the council meeting.
For more information, please call 952.939.8200 or visit eminnetonka.com
11. Consent Agenda - Items Requiring Five Votes:
   A. Agreement with Metropolitan Council for the 2016 Street Rehabilitation project for the Libb’s Lake area

12. Introduction of Ordinances: None

13. Public Hearings:
   A. Temporary on-sale liquor license for The Rotary Club of Excelsior, 5016 Co Rd 101
      Recommendation: Hold the public hearing and grant the license (5 votes)

14. Other Business:
   A. 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)
      Recommendation: Adopt the resolution (5 votes)
   B. Ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel from R-1 to R-1A
      Recommendation: Adopt the ordinance (4 votes)
   C. Resolution endorsing the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study
      Recommendation: Adopt the resolution (4 votes)

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None

16. Adjournment
Minutes
Minnetonka City Council
Monday, June 6, 2016

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

4. Approval of Agenda

Wiersum moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to accept the agenda with addenda to items 10A and 14B. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

5. Approval of Minutes: None

6. Special Matters:

   A. Recognition of former City Council Member James Hiller

       Schneider read the recognition and presented Hiller with two plaques.

       Hiller thanked the council for the recognition. He said what he missed most about serving on the council was going out and meeting with neighbors. He said he would continue to seek opportunities for community involvement.

   B. Administer oath of office to Police Chief Scott Boerboom

       City Attorney Corrine Heine administered the oath of office to Police Chief Scott Boerboom.

       Boerboom said it was a tremendous opportunity for his family and himself. He thanked the city manager, council, and staff. He said the department would continue to build on its traditions of honor, professionalism, integrity and dedication.
7. **Reports from City Manager & Council Members**

City Manager Geralyn Barone reported on upcoming meetings and events.

8. **Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters not on the Agenda**

Doobie Kurus, 4120 St. Marks Drive, reported on the second annual Hopkins Royal Triathlon held over the 2015 Labor Day weekend. The number of participants increased from 330 people to 445 people. He said $10,000 was donated back into the community from the event. The third annual triathlon will take place on September 3, 2016.

9. **Bids and Purchases:**

   A. **Bids for the painting of Plymouth Road and Lake Street Extension water towers**

   Barone gave the staff report.

   Acomb moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to award contract to Classic Protective Coatings, Inc. in the amount of $971,900.00 and the 2016-2020 Capital Improvements Program be amended for the project. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

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

    A. **Resolution awarding sale of approximately $10,000,000 General Obligation Utility Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2016A**

    Schneider pulled the item from the consent agenda.

    Finance Director Merrill King gave the staff report. Kathy Aho from Springsted also provided information.

    Allendorf moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-040 awarding the sale of approximately $10,000,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2016A. Bids were received prior to the council meeting on June 6, 2016, and staff provided an addendum with results for the resolution and associated exhibits. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
B. Request to install a temporary banner on city property for the Minnetonka Summer Fest at 12810 Minnetonka Boulevard

Allendorf moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to approve the temporary banner associated with the Minnetonka Summer Fest to be displayed at 12810 Minnetonka Boulevard for 2016. The sign may be displayed for three weeks prior to the event and must be located outside of the right-of-way. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

11. Consent Agenda – Items requiring Five Votes:

A. Amend CIP for Williston Center fitness equipment

Bergstedt moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to amend the 2016-2020 CIP by advancing the cardiovascular equipment from 2017/2018 to 2016; and the strength equipment from 2019 to 2016. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

12. Introduction of Ordinances:

A. Ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel from R-1 to R-1A

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Bergstedt said the proposed notification area was adequate. He noted that this proposal seemed to address some of the council’s comments on the previous proposals and concerns about density.

Wiersum moved, Acomb seconded a motion to introduce the ordinance and refer it to the planning commission. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

13. Public Hearings:

A. Resolution approving a vacation of right-of-way and utility easements

Gordon gave the staff report.

Schneider opened the public hearing at 7:04 p.m. No one spoke. He closed the public hearing at 7:04 p.m.

Acomb moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-041 approving the vacation of right-of-way and utility easements. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
B. Public hearing and resolution approving the issuance of revenue bonds by the city of Deephaven for the financing of Eagle Ridge Academy in Minnetonka

Community Development Director Julie Wischnack gave the staff report.

Schneider opened the public hearing at 7:07 p.m. No one spoke. He closed the public hearing at 7:07 p.m.

Wiersum moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to hold the public hearing and adopt resolution 2016-042 approving the issuance by the city of Deephaven, Minnesota of its charter school lease revenue bonds, Series 2016A and Series 2016B (Eagle Ridge Academy Project). All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Wiersum noted he had asked Barone earlier in the day about the impact of the new proposed IRS rules related to conduit debt. The rules would apply in a situation where the EDA was not directly elected. Since Minnetonka’s city council serves as the EDA, the rules would not apply.

14. Other Business:

A. 2017-2021 Economic Development Program (EIP)

Barone gave the staff report.

Schneider said the document provided good information.

Allendorf asked for more information about the page on the Minnesota Investment Fund/Job Creation Fund. Wischnack said the information in the EIP was provided to document the city’s activity with applied for grant funds. The $500,000 was pass through money from the state.

Wiersum asked for information about the Welcome to Minnetonka loan program. The use of the program was low and he asked what the program was trying to achieve and if things could be done to improve it. Wischnack said the belief was that the problem with the program related to the required maximum $300,000 price of the home. She said the EDAC was scheduled to discuss changing the program’s guidelines. Wiersum said it would be helpful to include the current AMI in the EIP document.

Wiersum moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-043 approving the 2017-2021 Economic Improvement Program. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
B. **Items concerning parking lot reconfiguration and construction on the Minnetonka High School campus, at 18301 State Highway 7:**

1) Lot Division;  
2) Conditional Use Permit; and  
3) Site Plan Review

Gordon gave the staff report.

Acomb said at the last council meeting a group of parents and students expressed concerns about bike and pedestrian safety around the high school. She asked if staff had any concerns about adding to the problem with this proposal. Gordon said staff met with the group of parents and students who raised the concerns. He said the proposed improvements before the council would not negatively impact bike and pedestrian safety.

Bergstedt said the proposed improvements were much needed and long overdue. The new plan addresses existing parking issues and improves traffic circulation.

Bergstedt moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-044 approving the lot division at 5258 Michaele Lane; resolution 2016-045 amending existing conditional use permit for an educational institution at 18301 State Highway 7; and resolution 2016-046 approving final site plans for parking lot reconfiguration and construction on the Minnetonka High School campus, at 18301 State Highway 7. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

15. **Appointments and Reappointments:**

A. **Appointments to the Imagine Minnetonka Steering Committee**

Schneider moved, Acomb seconded a motion to approve the following individuals to the 2016 Imagine Minnetonka Steering Committee: Steve Adams (Chair), Margaret Bauer, Colbert Boyd, Scott Coolong, Betty Johnson, Ron Kamps, Brian Kirk, Cari Lindberg, Jason Moeckel, Madeline Seveland, and Joan Suko. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
16. Adjournment

    Wiersum moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Maeda
City Clerk
Minutes
Minnetonka City Council
Monday, June 27, 2016

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

4. Approval of Agenda

Wagner moved, Acomb seconded a motion to accept the agenda with addenda to items 10A, 10D, and 14A. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

5. Approval of Minutes: May 23, 2016 regular council meeting

Allendorf moved, Wagner seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the May 23, 2016 council meeting, as presented. Wagner, Ellingson, Allendorf, Acomb, and Schneider voted “yes.” Bergstedt abstained. Motion carried.

6. Special Matters:

A. Life Safety Award presented to firefighters and police officers

Fire Chief John Vance presented the award to Kevin Hruby, Brian Kerr, and Dan Sorenson. Brandon Harris, was unable to attend the meeting. Vance reported Hruby, Kerr, Sorenson, and Harris helped save a patient who had gone into full cardiac arrest at the scene.

B. Recognition of former senior citizen advisory board members

Schneider read the recognitions and presented plaques to Allan Kind, Jeanne Lutgen, and Loy O’Boyle.

C. Review of the 2015 financial report with the city’s audit firm of CliftonLarsonAllen LLP

Doug Host, partner with CliftonLarsonAllen, presented the report.
7. **Reports from City Manager & Council Members**

City Manager Geralyn Barone reported on events and upcoming meetings. City Clerk David Maeda noted absentee voting for the August 9, 2016 State Primary was underway.

8. **Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters not on the Agenda**

Angie Hasek, a staff person for Rep. Erik Paulsen, said she was attending the council meeting to learn more about what was happening in the community. She said Paulsen had an open door and was willing to help with any issues residents had.

Schneider thanked Rep. Paulsen for the yeoman work he and Sen. Amy Klobuchar did in getting the westbound I394 ramp done.

9. **Bids and Purchases: None**

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

    A. **Resolution awarding sale of approximately $10,000,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016B**

    Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-047 awarding the sale of approximately $10,000,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016B. Bids will be received prior to the council meeting on June 27, 2016, and staff will provide an addendum with results for the resolution and associated exhibits. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

    B. **Reauthorize city participation in the Minnesota Municipal Money Market Fund (4M Fund)**

    Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-048 reauthorizing the city of Minnetonka’s participation in the 4M Fund. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

    C. **Resolution approving a conditional use permit for 2,328 square feet of accessory structures at 4915 Highland Road**

    Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-049 approving a conditional use permit for 2,328 square feet of accessory structures at 4915 Highland Road. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
D. Resolution approving the final plat of LEGACY OAKS 3rd ADDITION

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-050 approving the final plat for LEGACY OAKS 3rd ADDITION. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

E. Resolution approving a conditional use permit for an accessory apartment at 13800 Spring Lake Road

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-051 approving the request. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

11. Consent Agenda – Items requiring Five Votes: None

12. Introduction of Ordinances: None

13. Public Hearings:

A. On-sale liquor licenses for MTKA Pizza, LLC (Station Pizzeria) at 13008 Minnetonka Blvd

Barone gave the staff report.

Schneider opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Ryan Burnet, 2857 Irving Ave S, Minneapolis, said he was the operating partner and owner of Station Pizzeria. He owns eight other restaurants in the Twin Cities. He said his partner, Clark Gassen, lives across the creek from this site. The existing bones of the building will be used with a significant amount of money spent on landscaping and buying the lot. There will be 55 indoor seats and 16 outdoor seats. There currently are 19 onsite parking spots. A plan was submitted to curb the street and he thought this would mean around eight additional parking spots.

Annette Bertelsen, 13513 Larkin Drive, said she thought the pizzeria would be a great addition to the neighborhood. Her two sons attended St. David’s school behind the property. She said as the council considered the liquor license that the hectic nature of the time period from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday be taken into consideration. She suggested putting a restriction on happy hour during that time.

Wagner said the city has had a long time interest in trying to get more visibility of the creek behind the property. He suggested Burnet work with
city staff on this as the landscaping is considered. Burnet said he would be happy to do so.

Bergstedt moved, Wagner seconded a motion to continue the public hearing to July 25, 2016. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

14. Other Business:

A. Concept plan for redevelopment of the TCF Bank site at 1801 Plymouth Road

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Steve Johnson, Solomon Real Estate Group, said the last time he appeared before the council was at a council study session. What he heard at that meeting was the council wanted an integrated building it could support. He went back to the drawing board and worked hard with TCF and RSP Architects. He felt what they came up with was a very attractive and integrated building. The intent was to keep a lot of the same integrity including the sidewalk all around the site and landscaping that would complement the apartment building across the street.

Bill Wittrock, RSP Architects, presented the proposed building. He said as he got into designing the building he realized he could make it bigger with the use of light. The site plan affords the sidewalk to be widened out and would potentially allow room for some outdoor seating. The building would be functional, relatively affordable, and unique.

Acomb asked if there had been any consideration given to flipping the building around so the back with the drive through wasn’t facing Cartway Lane. Wittrock said there were certain functional requirements that led to the proposed orientation.

Allendorf said what the council had been seeking was a look of density. He asked what the building height was excluding the tower. Wittrock said the height would be around 24 feet. There would be a 15 to 16 foot storefront. Allendorf asked if there was an architectural way to raise the height of the building to closer to 30 feet. Wittrock said there was a way to raise the height but the space would be nonfunctional. He said when the building was lit it would be quite noticeable and would address the same thing as density. Allendorf said it was possible to raise the height to 30 feet and make it stand out architecturally. Wittrock said it would be a design challenge to do so. He said he was struggling with what the proportions of the building would end up being and if there would be visual
satisfaction provided. The proportions and visibility of the building were very important to how it would work on a pedestrian level. If the building was too tall a pedestrian would not be able to relate back to what was inside the building. Allendorf noted the third design had the added height that was to be used as office and retail space. The issue was this didn’t balance out with the available onsite parking. He was looking for a way to get a little denser look to the property without requiring underground parking. Wittrock said any additional square footage to the building would require additional parking.

Wagner said there was marked improvement going from the first concept plan to this fourth one. He said if not for the density expectations, everyone on the council would likely support the building. He thanked Johnson and Wittrock for their work to improve the plan.

Annette Bertelsen, 13513 Larkin Drive, said she was speaking on behalf of a small group of residents from her neighborhood. As a former creative director she could get excited about what the building would look like even in this early stage of concept plan review. As she heard the architect talk about lighting it was a whole other dimension that got her excited about the plan. Her group supported the plan for a number of reasons. Although it would not add to the density to the area closer to the mall, it would add a little more graceful and elegant look as one came into the area. It might create better sightlines for drivers too. She said the village would see some gains as well. Currently the site is just a bank but with the plan it would add a handful of new businesses. During the visioning process, neighbors indicated a desire for small retail businesses in the area. Also during the visioning process retailers indicated for sustained success they like to have good storefront visibility and she thought the lighting concepts the architect presented would provide for that visibility. She liked the pedestrian friendly ideas in the plan.

Bertelsen said the potential moratorium raised questions about fairness given the developer’s participation over the past year in neighborhood meetings as well as planning commission and council meetings. If a moratorium were put in place, it should be applied to a larger area rather than just this property. She said further community work needed to be done with the vision before drafting an ordinance for this area. She thought the coffee group idea that was used in the Glen Lake area would be useful for the Ridgedale area as well in order to accelerate the process.

Wagner said he truly thought there was a marked improvement in the building but it was not at all what the council expected during the visioning process. The council had discussed the pros and cons. They had
discussed the pros of being more specific in what was expected. This would allow things to occur that were closer to the vision. The downside of this was the market may never react to the vision. Developers had looked at the area and other the banks on the road had sent out proposals and none of them matched the council’s vision for a hotel. The developers indicated the area was not walkable enough yet for a hotel. He said he didn’t want the same process of multiple concept plans for the Wells Fargo and US Bank properties and potentially other properties in the area. The downside was the city might have to live with stagnation for a long time. He thought Bertelsen’s comments about a lower level entry to the mall had some merit. He remained concerned that the meat had not been put behind the bones for what was desired for the quadrant and the council would continually be disappointed by what was easier and more profitable. He said he would lean toward greater certainty but wasn’t sure he wanted to do a moratorium. He would like more specific standards to be developed but he potentially would support this particular plan if it made its way through the process.

Allendorf agreed this plan was a vast improvement over the first two iterations that the council had reviewed. He accepted that the third concept plan was not possible to do financially because of the need for underground parking. He questioned if the council should continue to push for a taller building while looking for a way to make the parking work. He said doing a moratorium on a wider area but specifically including this property would lead to a point six months from now where it was determined underground parking was not a possibility and the city would be no further in the process. At this point he didn’t think a moratorium would get any more density than what was seen in this concept plan. He wondered if the original study/concept wasn’t flawed. It was good to say the city wanted more density but it never went through the iterations that the architect and developer did to prove out the concept.

Bergstedt said when TCF and the developer came before the council with the first concept plan, the council comments were pretty brutal and rightfully so. The developer and TCF took the comments to heart and came back with another plan. The council kept discussing more density and building height and trying to assemble the parcels to get closer to the vision. He understood Wells Fargo not being interested given the size of their parcel. The council all got excited about the third concept plan but the underground parking made the plan not doable. He said TCF and the developer had done everything they could to address the council’s concerns and this concept plan was as good as the city would get. He agreed with Allendorf about putting a moratorium on with no real hope that six months from now the city would be in a different spot. Because the
Ridgedale area was so vibrant he would hate to put a moratorium on and possibly send a message to future developers that the city was not a friendly, welcoming place.

Acomb said she appreciated the improvements that had been made to the plan and she agreed that not much would change in six months if a moratorium was put in place. She said it was disappointing because everyone felt it would be better if there was higher density for this site.

Ellingson agreed with the comments about the improvements to the design. He thought the site was appropriate for retail and he did not support a moratorium.

Schneider said huge improvements to the plan had been made. When he made his critical comments about the first plan, he realized the challenge of getting a truly dense high to mid-rise building on this corner. His comments were based on this being the entryway into Ridgedale and the need for something the city could be proud of instead of embarrassed by. He thought he could be proud of the building in this plan. He said a great job had been done in taking a challenging design concept with a drive thru, and coming up with something that looks like it’s supposed to be there rather than looking like an afterthought. He said like Acomb, he had the idea of putting the front of the building to the north but the reality was the only way that could happen would be to put TCF on the back end. He did not support a moratorium. He thought it might be useful during the visioning/guide plan process to look at the entire Ridgedale Mall area and compare it with what was happening in the Southdale Mall area. The reality was the real prime developable property would become available when General Growth decided that structured parking made sense. Until that happened nothing would change significantly. Southdale has reached that point. He thought Ridgedale would eventually get to this point too and it would be better to spend energy looking at that rather than going through a moratorium process.

15. Appointments and Reappointments:

A. Appointment to the senior citizen advisory board

Schneider moved, Wagner seconded a motion to approve Robert Waddell to the senior citizen advisory board to serve a two-year term effective July 1, 2016 and expiring on May 31, 2019. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
16. Adjournment

Wagner moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:02 p.m.
All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Maeda
City Clerk
City Council Agenda Item #9A
Meeting of July 11, 2016

Brief Description: Bids for manhole rehabilitation Phase VII

Recommended Action: Award contract to Hydro-Klean

Background

Beginning in 2006, the city undertook a variety of projects to remove extraneous clear water (inflow and infiltration) from the sanitary sewer collection system. This initiative was necessary because of the new rules regarding “peak flows” in the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) interceptors that carry the city’s waste for treatment. In order to reduce that flow of clear water, the city completed inspections of all residential homes and businesses for sump pump connections, foundation drains, area drains and roof leaders that may have been connected to the sewer system.

Public infrastructure such as manholes and underground piping was also inspected for clear water flow. Approximately 8,000 manholes were inspected and evaluated for leak deficiencies, and approximately 276 of the most deficient structures have been repaired to date. This project continues the ongoing process by sealing another 33 leaking structures.

From 2006 to 2011, the city was surcharged $377,000 annually for excess flow into the MCES interceptors. From 2011 to 2014, the city’s sanitary sewer flow did not exceed peak flow maximums and subsequently was not subject to surcharge. In July of 2014, a rain event resulted in the city’s flow maximum being exceeded which triggered another five-year period of surcharges totaling $144,000 annually. Surcharges under the current rules are allowed to be spent on projects that reduce infiltration and inflow into the system.

On June 23, 2016, bids were received for phase VII of the manhole rehabilitation program. The bids are tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydro-Klean</td>
<td>$148,670.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Range Environmental, LLC</td>
<td>$157,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thul Specialty Contracting, Inc.</td>
<td>$198,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Power Rodding Corp</td>
<td>$254,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer's Estimate</td>
<td>$199,414.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding for the project is approved in the 2016-2020 Capital Improvements Program and comes from the Utility Fund. There are four project areas that are generally located in the north and southeast areas of the city. This project will start this fall and will be completed in late 2016 or early 2017.
Recommendation

Based on the bid results, past experience with the contractor, and the recommendation of the consultant engineer, staff recommends that the manhole rehabilitation phase VII contract be awarded to Hydro-Klean in the amount of $148,670.00.

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

Originated by:
  Brian Wagstrom, Public Works Director
City Council Agenda Item #10A  
Meeting of July 11, 2016

**Brief Description:** Third amendment to site lease with New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC for Williston Water Tower

**Recommended Action:** Approve the third amendment to site lease

**Background**

New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC currently leases space on the Williston water tower for 9 antennae and related equipment. New Cingular has requested an amendment that would allow it to install an additional 3 antennae, for a total of 12.

Public works and its consultant, SEH Engineering, have reviewed and approved the technical aspects of the proposal, as contemplated by City Council Policy No. 12.5. City staff has negotiated a proposed lease, which is attached. Additional prorated rent for 2016 will be paid at the time of installation. Rent for 2017 will be $49,685.46 with a five-percent annual escalator.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the city council approve the third amendment to site lease agreement.

Submitted through:  
Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager  
Merrill King, Public Works Director  
Brian Wagstrom, Public Works Director

Originated by:  
Corrine Heine, City Attorney
THIRD AMENDMENT TO ANTENNA SITE AGREEMENT

THIS THIRD AMENDMENT TO ANTENNA SITE AGREEMENT ("Third Amendment"), dated as of the latter of the signature dates below (the "Effective Date"), is by and between City of Minnetonka, a municipal corporation, having a mailing address of 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, Minnesota 55345 ("Landlord") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, having a mailing address of 575 Morosgo Drive, Atlanta, GA 30324 ("Tenant").

Recitals

A. Landlord and Tenant entered into a Site Lease Agreement dated February 28, 2007 ("Original Agreement") as amended by Amendment No. 1 To Antenna Site Agreement dated July 1, 2011 ("First Amendment"), as further amended by Amendment No. 2 To Antenna Site Agreement dated November 18, 2011 ("Second Amendment") (the Original Agreement, First Amendment, and Second Amendment are collectively referred to herein as "Agreement") whereby Landlord leases to Tenant certain premises ("Leased Premises"), therein described, on the Williston Water Tower located at 4525 Williston Road, Minnetonka, Minnesota 55305.

B. Landlord and Tenant, in their mutual interest, wish to amend the Agreement as set forth below.

Amendment Terms

In consideration of the foregoing and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, Landlord and Tenant agree as follows:

1. Antennas Allowed. The Agreement is amended to allow the installation of three (3) additional antennas, connecting appurtenances, and other related ancillary equipment, for a total of 12 antennas, consistent with attached Exhibit A-1. Landlord’s execution of this Third Amendment will signify Landlord’s approval of Exhibit A-1. Exhibit A-1 hereby replaces Exhibit A to the Agreement. Within 90 days after completion of the installation of the three (3) additional antennas, Tenant must provide Landlord with a new Exhibit A-1 (As-Built), which must depict the as-installed locations of all antennas, connecting appurtenances and other related ancillary equipment installed pursuant to the Agreement, as amended, and Exhibit A-1 (As Built) shall replace Exhibit A-1 attached to this Third Amendment.

2. Rent. Rent shall be increased annually by Nine Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Four and 00/100ths Dollars ($9,924.00) ("Additional Rent"), for a total annual Rent of Forty-Seven Thousand Three Hundred Nineteen and 49/100ths Dollars ($47,319.49). For 2016, the Additional Rent shall be prorated to the date that Tenant commences installation of the additional antennas authorized by this Third Amendment. The payment for the pro-rated Additional Rent is due when Tenant commences installation of the additional antennas. Annual rent for the year 2017 will
increase from $47,319.49 to $49,685.46 and will thereafter be paid as provided for in the Agreement.

3. **Notices.** Section 21 of the Original Agreement and Section 2 of the First Amendment are hereby deleted in their entirety and replaced with the following:

**NOTICES.** All notices, requests, and demands hereunder will be given by first class certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, or by a nationally recognized overnight courier, postage prepaid, to be effective when properly sent and received, refused or returned undelivered. Notices will be addressed to the parties as follows.

If to Tenant: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC
Attn: Network Real Estate Administration
Re: Cell Site #: MPLSMN3518; Cell Site Name: FAIR HILLS (MN)
FA No: 10114784
575 Morosgo Drive
Atlanta, GA 30324

With copy to: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC
Attn: AT&T Legal Department
Re: Cell Site #: MPLSMN3518; Cell Site Name: FAIR HILLS (MN)
FA No: 10114784
208 S. Akard Street
Dallas, TX 75202-4206

If to Landlord: City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard
Minnetonka, MN 55345
Attention: City Manager

The copy sent to the AT&T Legal Department is an administrative step which alone does not constitute legal notice.

Either party hereto may change the place for the giving of notice to it by thirty (30) days prior written notice to the other as provided herein.

4. **Effect of Amendment.** Except as expressly set forth in this Third Amendment, the Agreement otherwise is unmodified and remains in full force and effect. Each reference in the Agreement to itself shall be deemed also to refer to this Third Amendment.

5. **Capitalized Terms.** All capitalized terms used but not defined herein shall have the same meanings as defined in the Agreement.

6. **Condition.** Tenant shall reimburse the Landlord for its reasonable expenses in reviewing and approving this Third Amendment and the Tenant’s plans for construction.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused their properly authorized representatives to execute and seal this Third Amendment on the dates set forth below.

[signature pages follow]
“LANDLORD”

City of Minnetonka, a municipal corporation

By: _______________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

By: _______________________
Geralyn Barone, City Manager

LANDLORD ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

STATE OF MINNESOTA)  ) ss:
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)  

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on _________________, 2016, by Terry Schneider, the mayor of the City of Minnetonka, a Minnesota municipal corporation, on behalf of the corporation.

Notary Public: _______________________
My Commission Expires: _______________________

STATE OF MINNESOTA)  ) ss:
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)  

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on _________________, 2016, by Geralyn Barone, the city manager of the City of Minnetonka, a Minnesota municipal corporation, on behalf of the corporation.

Notary Public: _______________________
My Commission Expires: _______________________


“TENANT”

New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC,
a Delaware limited liability company

By: AT&T Mobility Corporation
Its: Manager

By: _______________________
Name: _______________________
Title: _______________________
Date: _______________________

TENANT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

STATE OF _____________________)
) ss:
COUNTY OF _____________________)

On the ___ day of ______ in the year 20___ before me, the undersigned, a notary public in and for said state, personally appeared _____________________, personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the individual(s) whose name(s) is (are) subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his authorized capacity as officer of AT&T Mobility Corporation, the Manager of New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, and that by his signature on the instrument the entities upon behalf of which he acted, executed the instrument.

Notary Public: _______________________
My Commission Expires: _______________
EXHIBIT A-1

Street Address is 4525 Williston Road, Minnetonka, MN

Legal Description of Property:
LOT 2, BLOCK 1, TOWER HILL 2nd ADDITION
CITY OF MINNETONKA, HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA

It is agreed by Landlord and Tenant that the precise legal description for the Landlord’s Property will be corrected, if necessary, and that the correct legal description may be placed on this Exhibit A-1.

See attached construction drawings comprised of 12 pages, last revision date May 24, 2016, prepared by Daniel W Smith Fullerton Engineering.

Notes:
1. THIS EXHIBIT MAY BE REPLACED BY A LAND SURVEY AND/OR CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS OF THE PREMISES ONCE RECEIVED BY TENANT.
2. ANY SETBACK OF THE PREMISES FROM THE PROPERTY’S BOUNDARIES SHALL BE THE DISTANCE REQUIRED BY THE APPLICABLE GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES.
3. WIDTH OF ACCESS ROAD SHALL BE THE WIDTH REQUIRED BY THE APPLICABLE GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES, INCLUDING POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS.
GENERAL CONSTRUCTION
1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS, THE FOLLOWING SYMBOLS SHALL BE ACCEPTED: (A) C/W, (B) G/C, (C) A.S., (D) SP.
2. ALL SITE WORK SHALL BE COMPLETE AS NEEDED ON THE DATE OF THE CONTRACT, EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE STATED IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.
3. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROPER INSTALLATION OF ALL MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF THE SITE EQUIPMENT AND MACHINERY, INCLUDING THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
4. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
5. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
6. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
7. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
8. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
9. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
10. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
11. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
12. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
13. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
14. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
15. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
16. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
17. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
18. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
19. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
20. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
21. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
22. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
23. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
24. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
25. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
26. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
27. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
28. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
29. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
30. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
31. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
32. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
33. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
34. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
35. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
36. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
37. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
38. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
39. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
40. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
41. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
42. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
43. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
44. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
45. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
46. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
47. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
48. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
49. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
50. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY, MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF MACHINERY AND MACHINERY PARTS, AND EQUIPMENT.
**NOTES:**

1. All attachments to painted surfaces are to include the placement of neoprene strips between hardware and points of contact to reduce/eliminate damage to the painted surface. Hardware shall be installed in locations where tightening or clamping may cause the neoprene to tear causing metal to metal contact where possible. Exposed neoprene should be wrapped with white tape. Feathering sequence should include nylon washers between the painted surface and the gasketed washers.

2. Top mounting hardware is to be gasketed and/or provided in a non-corrosive material.

3. All exposed jumpers and cables are to be provided with manufactured white jacketing or taped white.

4. Rim units and all components attached to the inside wall of the water tower must be painted to not interfere with walkway access on the water tower. All cables and lines should be routed in a manner so as not to interfere with walkway access. All cables and lines should be bundled or supported to create a neat or clean installation appearance.

5. Proposed antennas, mounting pipes and 12x22x30 standoffs installed on the exterior of the water tower shall be gray painted to match the color of the water tower (gray color). Proposed new mounting pipes are to have welded end caps. Existing mounting pipes are to be capped at both ends with white rubber caps.

6. Contractor to touch up existing (damaged/failed) antenna support pipes and standoffs—depending upon their condition—may request replacement.

7. Contractor to touch up painting on existing antenna, spot repairs made with brush and w/o feathering should be completely rolled for uniformity.

8. All abandoned antennas, coaxial cable and detachable equipment that is no longer used are to be removed during the final inspection.

9. All equipment is to be identified by the tenant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>ANTENNA NUMBER</th>
<th>ANTENNA STATUS &amp; TYPE</th>
<th>ANTENNA MODEL NUMBER</th>
<th>ANTENNA VENDOR</th>
<th>TAUHU UNIT</th>
<th>AZIMUTH</th>
<th>GROUND POLARIZATION</th>
<th>CABLE FEEDER LENGTH</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>ANTENNA CONFIGURATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td>600010756</td>
<td>KATHEDRUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>45°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>DC TRUNK LINE (SHARED W/ A-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>LTE 3G</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP94-858-85-84</td>
<td>CCI ANTENNAS</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>45°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>DC TRUNK LINE (SHARED W/ A-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600010756</td>
<td>KATHEDRUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>45°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>15°5'0&quot;</td>
<td>1.15&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>LTE 10/20G</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP94-858-85-84</td>
<td>CCI ANTENNAS</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>45°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>DC TRUNK LINE (SHARED W/ A-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>LTE 3G</td>
<td></td>
<td>600010756</td>
<td>KATHEDRUM</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>120°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>ANDREW LIF (N) 1-6/8&quot; COAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>LTE 3G</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP94-858-85-84</td>
<td>CCI ANTENNAS</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>120°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>DC TRUNK LINE (SHARED W/ A-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600010756</td>
<td>KATHEDRUM</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>30°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>ANDREW LIF (N) 1-6/8&quot; COAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>LTE 10/20G</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP94-858-85-84</td>
<td>CCI ANTENNAS</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>120°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>DC TRUNK LINE (SHARED W/ A-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td>600010756</td>
<td>KATHEDRUM</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>270°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>ANDREW LIF (N) 1-6/8&quot; COAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600010756</td>
<td>KATHEDRUM</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>270°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>15°5'0&quot;</td>
<td>1.15&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>LTE 3G</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP94-858-85-84</td>
<td>CCI ANTENNAS</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>270°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>DC TRUNK LINE (SHARED W/ A-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>LTE 10/20G</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP94-858-85-84</td>
<td>CCI ANTENNAS</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>270°</td>
<td>82°-0°</td>
<td>DC TRUNK LINE (SHARED W/ A-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
1. AHOHOLE POG REQUIRED BETWEEN EXISTING TANK SURFACE AND NEW WIRING.
2. COLD GALVANIZED NIPPLES AFTER CHILLING ALL NEW HOLES.
   CAulk LITERALLY WITH SILICONE DURING INSTALL.

Existing Stiffener Ring

- New Z-Bracket
  - CGGUC / 1/2" GALV. U-BOLTS (Typ.)
  - (2) 8/9" GALV. U-BOLTS (Typ.)
- New Pipe 2 Std
  - 6" to 8", NEW U-BOLTS (Typ.)
- New Pipe 2 Std
  - 8"-10" LONG (GALV.)
  - W/ END CAPS
- New Coaxial Cable
  - 0.5/16" GALV.
  - U-BOLTS (Typ.)
- Existing Coaxial Cable
  - 0.5/16" GALV.
  - U-BOLTS (Typ.)
- New Coaxial Cable
  - 0.5/16" GALV.
  - U-BOLTS (Typ.)
- Existing Water Tower
  - New Pipe 2 Std
  - 6"-8" LONG (GALV.)
  - W/ END CAPS
  - (2) 8/9" GALV. U-BOLTS (Typ.)
- New W/200
  - (2) 8/9" GALV. U-BOLTS (Typ.)
  - (2) 8/9" GALV. U-BOLTS (Typ.)
- Existing Tank (Galvanized)

Notes:
1. Any Bolts On The Manhole Area Of The Stiffener Ring Need To Be Carefully Installed To Prevent A Tripping Hazard.
2. AHOHOLE Should Be Used Between The Roof And Painted Surface.
SECTION 09 97 15
COATING SYSTEMS FOR TELECOMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT

PART 1 GENERAL

1.01 SUMMARY
A. This section includes painting and painting repair work associated with the
installation of antennas, coaxial cables, and other common components
with direct attachment to water tank facilities.

1.02 REFERENCES
A. SOCIETY FOR PROTECTIVE COATINGS (SSPC): www.sspc.org
B. VOLUME 1: GOOD PAINTING PRACTICE
C. VOLUME 2: SYSTEMS AND SPECIFICATIONS

1.03 SUBMITTALS
A. PRODUCT DATA SHEET FOR EACH COATING SYSTEM

PART 2 PRODUCTS

2.01 MANUFACTURERS
A. MANUFACTURERS:
   1. SHHERWIN WILLIAMS COMPANY www.sherry-williams.com
   2. THOMAS COMPANY www.tce.com
   3. E+M PRODUCTS www.emproducts.com

PART 3 EXECUTION

3.01 EXAMINATION
A. VISUALLY EVALUATE SURFACE PREPARATION BY COMPARISON WITH PRACTICAL
STANDARDS OF SSPC-SP-1-6R.

3.02 PREPARATION
A. REMOVE ALL SURFACE CONTAMINANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SSPC-SP-1 SPECIFIED
CLEANING.
   1. DO NOT USE HYDROCARBON SOLVENT ON SURFACES TO BE COATED WITH
WATER-BASED COATINGS.

B. CLEAN AND REMOVE ALL RUST, SCALE, WELD SPATTER, WELD SCALES, WELD SCALE,
AND LOOSE PAINT.

C. PROTECT AREAS ADJACENT TO WELDING AND/OR GRINDING OPERATIONS TO
PREVENT DAMAGE OF SURROUNDING IN-PLACE PAINT SYSTEM.

D. FERROUS METALS/SSPC-SP-1 COMMERCIAL BLAST CLEANING

E. GALVANIZED STEEL: SSPC-SP-6 BRUSH OFF BLAST

F. ANODIZED COVERS, COAXIAL CABLE, NON-METALLIC SUBSTRATES AND PREVIOUSLY
PAINTED SURFACES: SCARIFY TO GE-GLOSS. SSPC-SP-6 WITH A
NON-HARDENING SOLVENT.

G. SURFACE PROFILE SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S PRODUCT
RECOMMENDATION

H. RE-BLAST ALL SURFACE
   1. WHERE RE-APPLICATION IS REQUIRED
   2. THAT DO NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THESE SPECIFICATIONS

3.03 APPLICATION
A. COATINGS SHALL BE APPLIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S PRINTED
INSTRUCTIONS.

B. SURFACES TO BE COATED SHALL BE CLEAN, DRY, AND FREE OF AIRPLUNGE BLOTCH
AND CONTAMINATION AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION AND WHILE FILM IS FORMING.

C. FINISH COAT SHALL BE UNIFORM IN COLOR AND SHINE WITHOUT SPATTERS, LAPS,
RUNS OR SPOOLS OF EXCESS MATERIAL.

D. SHOP PAINTING, SPRAY-ON (SPRAY-SPRAY technique) SURFACES THAT WILL BE IN THE
HEAT-APPLIED-ZONE DURING FIELDD MELTING.

E. COMPONENT PAINTING
   1. INTERIOR EXPOSED FERROUS METAL AND GALVANIZED STEEL
      A. PRODUCTS SHHERWIN WILLIAMS MACROPOXY 841 OR THYME SERIES 161
      1. NUMBER OF COATS: 2
      2. DRY FILM THICKNESS: 4.0-6.0 MILS (PER COAT)
      3. COLOR: BY OWNER
   
   2. EXTERIOR EXPOSED FERROUS METAL AND GALVANIZED STEEL
      A. PRIMER SHHERWIN WILLIAMS MACROPOXY 841 OR THYME SERIES 161
      1. NUMBER OF COATS: 1
      2. DRY FILM THICKNESS: 4.0-6.0 MILS (PER COAT)
      3. COLOR: BY OWNER
   
   B. PRIMER SHHERWIN WILLIAMS 310 RD 3 218 OR THYME SERIES 10740/10750
      1. NUMBER OF COATS: 1
      2. DRY FILM THICKNESS: 2.0-3.0 MILS (PER COAT)
      3. COLOR: BY OWNER
   
   C. PRIMER SHHERWIN WILLIAMS PRO-CRYL PRIMER
      1. NUMBER OF COATS: 1
      2. DRY FILM THICKNESS: 2.0-4.0 MILS (PER COAT)
   
   B. PRIMER SHHERWIN WILLIAMS SY-LATRIL NPA
      1. NUMBER OF COATS: 1
      2. DRY FILM THICKNESS: 2.5-4.0 MILS (PER COAT)
      3. COLOR: BY OWNER

4. COAXIAL CABLE
   A. PRIMER 31-LA 1138
      1. NUMBER OF COATS: 1
      2. DRY FILM THICKNESS: 2.0-3.0 MILS (PER COAT)
   
   B. FINISH SHHERWIN WILLIAMS SY-LATRIL NPA
      1. NUMBER OF COATS: 1
      2. DRY FILM THICKNESS: 2.5-4.0 MILS (PER COAT)
      3. COLOR: BY OWNER

3.04 REPAIR OF AREAS DAMAGED IN MELTING
A. REPAIR THE DAMAGE BY ONE OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS AS DIRECTED BY
THE ENGINEER
   1. MELTING-REPAIR TO SSPC-SP-6
   2. MACHINALLY CLEAN TO SSPC-SP-61
   3. FEATHER EDGES TO PROVIDE SMOOTH COATING TRANSITION
   4. APPLY PRIME Coat TO BASE METAL SURFACE
   5. MASK OFF RECTANGULAR AREA AROUND PRIME COAT
   6. APPLY FINISH COAT

3.05 QUALITY CONTROL
A. MEASURE DRY FILM THICKNESS WITH A MAGNETIC FILM THICKNESS GAGE IN
ACCORDANCE WITH SSPC-P62

B. VISUALLY inspect SHHERWIN FILM FOR RUNS, SOWS, DRY SPRAY, OVERSPRAY,
EMBEDDED PARTICLES AND OTHER ANOMALIES
C. PERFORM PERIODIC OR DAMAGED AREAS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLES 3.02 AND
3.03

SEH NOTES

SCALE: N.T.S.

A7

PROJECT: E-10-293/2032
1. CONTRACTOR IS TO REFER TO AT&T'S MOST CURRENT RADIO FREQUENCY DATA SHEET (RFDS) PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

2. THE SIZE, NATURE AND DIRECTION OF THE ANTENNAS SHALL BE ADJUSTED TO ACHIEVE THE ATTENUATIONS SPECIFIED AND LIMIT SHADING AND TO MEET THE SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.

3. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY THE HEIGHT OF THE ANTENNA WITH THE AT&T WIRELESS PROJECT MANAGER.

4. VERIFY TYPE AND SIZE OF TOWER LEGS PRIOR TO ORDERING ANY ANTENNA MOUNT.

5. UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE THE CONTRACTOR MUST PROVIDE ALL MATERIAL NECESSARY.

6. ANTENNA ALIGNMENT IS DETERMINED BASED ON THE DESIGN DRAWING. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL ALIGNMENT DURING THE PRE-CONSTRUCTION PHASE.

7. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL RF INFORMATION PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

8. SHED TEST SHALL BE PERFORMED BY GENERAL CONTRACTOR AND SUBMITTED TO AT&T WIRELESS CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS. TEST SHALL BE PERFORMED PER AT&T WIRELESS STANDARDS.

9. CABLE LENGTHS WERE DETERMINED BASED ON THE DESIGN DRAWING. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL LENGTH DURING THE PRE-CONSTRUCTION PHASE.

10. CONTRACTOR TO USE ROSENBERGER FIBER LINE MANUFACTURED COMPONENTS (OR ENGINEER APPROVED EQUIVALENT).

ANTENNA AND CABLEING NOTES

RF, DC, A COAX CABLE MARKING LOCATIONS TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EACH TOP JUMPER CABLE BE COLORED WITH (1) SET OF 3/4&quot; WIDE BANDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EACH MAIN COAX CABLE SHALL BE COLORED WITH (1) SET OF 3/4&quot; WIDE BANDS NEAR THE TOP JUMPER CONNECTION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CABLE ENTRY PORT ON THE INTERIOR OF THE SHELTER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALL TOP JUMPERS SHALL BE COLORED WITH (1) SET OF 3/4&quot; WIDE BANDS ON EACH END OF THE TOP JUMPER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL BOTTOM JUMPERS SHALL BE COLORED WITH (1) SET OF 3/4&quot; WIDE BANDS ON EACH END OF THE BOTTOM JUMPER.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CABLE MARKING DIAGRAM

1. THE ANTENNA SYSTEM COAX SHALL BE Labeled WITH VINYL TAPE.
2. THE STANDARD IS BASED ON EIGHT COLORED PANELS: RED, ORANGE, MAGENTA, BROWN, WHITE, AND VIOLET. THESE TAPE MUST BE 1/4" WIDE & UV RESISTANT SUCH AS SCOTCH 3M ELECTRICAL COLOR CODING TAPE AND SHALL BE REEL TO REEL AVAILABLE TO THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR ON SITE.
3. USING COLOR BANDS ON THE CABLES, MARK ALL TOP CABLE BY SECTION AND CABLE NUMBER AS SHOWN ON "CABLE COLOR GRAYSCALE".
4. WHEN AN EXISTING COAXIAL LINE THAT IS INTENDED TO BE A SHARED LINE BETWEEN TECHNOLOGIES IS ENCOUNTERED, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE THE EXISTING COLOR CODING SCHEME AND REPLACE IT WITH THE COLOR CODING PRECEDING THE ABSENCE OF AN EXISTING COLOR CODING SCHEME OR WHEN INSTALLING PROPOSED COAXIAL LINES. THIS GUIDELINE SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED AT THE SITE IN QUESTION.
5. ALL COAX CABLE TAPE SHALL BE 1/4" AND SHALL BE INSTALLED USING A MINIMUM OF (3) THREE WARPS OF TAPE AND BE HEAVILY CHASED AND SMOOTHED OUT SO AS TO AVOID UNWINDING.
7. ALL COAX CABLES SHALL BE INSTALLED SO AS TO ALIGN NEARLY WITH ONE ANOTHER FROM SIDE-TO-SIDE.
8. IF EXISTING CABLES AT THE SITE ALREADY HAVE A COLOR CODING SCHEME AND THEY ARE NOT INTENDED TO BE REUSED OR SHARED WITH THE NEW TECHNOLOGY, THE EXISTING COLOR CODING SCHEME SHALL REMAIN UNTOUCHED.
Brief Description: Resolution appointing election judges and absentee ballot board for the State Primary on August 9, 2016

Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution

Background

The city council is being asked to consider a resolution appointing election judges and the absentee ballot board for the August 9, 2016 State Primary.

Council is asked to approve the eligible election judges listed in the resolution. From this list, staff will make assignments to ensure the required party balance. These election judges will be used to staff polling places, assist with absentee voting and help with the absentee ballot board. Most polling places will be staffed with 5-6 election judges. The resolution also gives the city clerk authority to appoint emergency election judges to fill vacancies that may occur at the last minute.

In accordance with the approved 2016 budget, election judges will be paid $10.50/hour, assistant lead judges will be paid $11.00/hour and lead judges will receive $11.50/hour.

There are two polling place changes previously approved by the city council. Voters in Ward 1 Precinct A who previously voted at the Glen Lake Elementary School will now vote at Immaculate Heart of Mary Church (13505 Excelsior Boulevard). Voters in Ward 1 Precinct D who previously voted at Faith Presbyterian Church will now vote at Grace Apostolic Church (4215 Fairview Ave). Notices were sent to registered voters in the two precincts last week.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the city council adopt a resolution appointing the election judges for the August 9, 2016 State Primary.

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager

Originated by:
  David Maeda City Clerk
Resolution No. 2016-

Resolution appointing election judges for the August 9, 2016 State Primary

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The State Primary will be held on August 9, 2016. The City Council is required by law to appoint election judges to serve at the polling places on Election Day.

1.02. Voting will occur at all 23 precincts in the city. Election judges will serve at the polling places and assist with absentee ballot processing.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. The City Council hereby authorizes the city clerk to select from the attached list of individuals to serve as election judges for the August 9, 2016 State Primary and as the city’s absentee ballot board.

2.02. The City Council also appoints all members appointed to the Hennepin County Absentee Ballot Board as authorized under M.S. 204B.21, subd 2 under the direction of the county election manager to serve as members of the Minnetonka Absentee Ballot Board.

2.03. The City Council also authorizes the city clerk to make emergency appointments of election judges to fill last-minute vacancies.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on July 11, 2016.

_____________________________
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 July 11, 2016.

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
## List of Active Judges for Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrams</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Abrahamson</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Adamowski</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsden</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Jeanette</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashraful</td>
<td>Mohammad</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Baggeroer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Leda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bartram</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td>Dyanne</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Baumgardner</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belkin</td>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Berris</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bittner</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Bjorgo</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjornoy</td>
<td>Lu</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Blackman</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstad</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Blume</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bly</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Boardman</td>
<td>Sybel</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Brandt</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Brill</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinkman</td>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Buttweiler</td>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>Jacquelynn</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerra</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Daryl</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouse</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloton</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Corcoran</td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corcoran</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Coughlin</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courneya</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Courneya</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Crist</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronk</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culshaw</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Curtiss</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degonda</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Denzer</td>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devine</td>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Devine</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devore</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drahos</td>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Dranginis</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duerr</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Duske</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ederer</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Eliason</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliason</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Engelhardt</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelhardt</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Erger</td>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fallat</td>
<td>Leander</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erhard</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Favorite</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallat</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fauchald</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite</td>
<td>Janis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Feagler</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellman</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Fenc</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Flynn</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forseth</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Flynn</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredensborg</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Fredrickson</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Kennith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedlieb</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabler</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Gammon</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammon</td>
<td>Madonna</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td>Annquanne</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnett</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Garpestad</td>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvey</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Garvey</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gausman</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gavenda</td>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giese</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Godfrey</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>Merle</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Gooch</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Goset</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulin</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Gran</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Geraldine</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greengard</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunby</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Gunderson</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundlach</td>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Gustafson</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanwick</td>
<td>Theodore</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Hardin</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrom</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassig</td>
<td>Duane</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>H Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennes</td>
<td>Carla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hering</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetchler</td>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Hjerpe</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocker</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoekstra</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudoba</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hunsberger</td>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikhaml</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iverson</td>
<td>Ulrike</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagnow</td>
<td>Sondra</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennis</td>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Emelie</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachelmeier</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Kalscheuer</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern-Pieh</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kerber</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirscht</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline</td>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kiingbeil</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluzak</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohrt</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kokesh</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollodge</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kollodge</td>
<td>Monette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowalsky</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Kowalsky</td>
<td>Gregg</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kretchman</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kriesel</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurschner</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kvam</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanak</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Landberg</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langheinrich</td>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lantto</td>
<td>Orville</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Laumann</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leflar</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmann</td>
<td>Lorene</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leizinger</td>
<td>Aleta</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Levine</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levine</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipson</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loescher</td>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutgen</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Luxford</td>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Maglich</td>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mart</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Joann</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>McConnell</td>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCullough</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>McGrath</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>McSwiggen</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medema</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melinat</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinat</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Mellen</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menne</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Lenore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Millhone</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogan</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mogilner</td>
<td>Saralee</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Name 2</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Name 3</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moller</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nash</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Darhl</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nessen</td>
<td>Newell</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Nieting</td>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Dermott</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Novak</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numan</td>
<td>Berendina</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ode</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeefe</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Opsahl</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opsahl</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Oreck</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orren</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Otey</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parisi</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Patridge</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Peine</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peppel</td>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Persigeihl</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persson</td>
<td>Kristine</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Petersen</td>
<td>Marlys</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfeifer</td>
<td>Douglass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pochardt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Podany</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polad</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Qvale</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabens</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rabens</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabinovitz</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Ranallo</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasula</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rauen</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renneberg</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resnick</td>
<td>Harlan</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revier</td>
<td>Geraldine</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritten</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Essieleanera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Kaitlin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td>Jaimie</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Isabelle</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Roehl</td>
<td>Jeffry</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Rosenbaum</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenthal</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubel</td>
<td>Delores</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Rubel</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruesewald</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Sachs</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuels</td>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sandberg</td>
<td>Kristine</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandler</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schmitt</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Schons</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schowengerdt</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td>Winton</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Active Judges for Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Seals</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seefeldt</td>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Selberg</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewall</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapley</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shinler</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicard</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Simer</td>
<td>Geraldine</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simer</td>
<td>Loren</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair</td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Sleeper - WAYZATA</td>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeper, WAYZATA</td>
<td>Brad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoke</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sommer</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speliopoulos</td>
<td>Ginnie</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Spelstra</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Marie</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>St. Louis Park</td>
<td>Kari Koeplin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stageberg</td>
<td>Gene</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stageberg</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamboldjiev</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Steinhoff</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Stock</td>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storch</td>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Strimling</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroebel</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Stucki</td>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppan</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>LaRitta</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Swenson</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Lucienne</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thein</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Thingvold</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>Piper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tift</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tomczyk</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trebovick</td>
<td>Catharine</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Trenary</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Uran</td>
<td>Reo</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Oss</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Van Sloun</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varner</td>
<td>Nila</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Vogel</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogel</td>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wahlberg</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Walzer</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasgatt</td>
<td>Lorie</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Weiler</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Weinblatt</td>
<td>Myles</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinshel</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Weinshel</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werley</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelan</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Wildberger</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildman</td>
<td>Joann</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wold</td>
<td>Teri</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worrell</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Chrystal</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Zachman</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachmann</td>
<td>Geraldine W</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>Jacqueline A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>Joanell E</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>Linda L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Council Agenda Item #10C  
Meeting of July 11, 2016

**Brief Description**  
Resolution approving preliminary plat of FRETHAM 18th ADDITION, a three lot subdivision at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an unaddressed parcel

**Recommendation**  
Adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat

**Proposal**

Lake West Development is proposing to divide the subject properties into three lots. The existing homes would remain and one new home would be constructed. The proposed subdivision, which would be known as FRETHAM 18th ADDITION, requires approval of a preliminary plat.

**Planning Commission Hearing**

The planning commission considered the request on June 16, 2016. Staff recommended approval of the plat, noting that the proposed lots would meet all minimum standards of the subdivision ordinance. The staff report from that meeting is attached and various plans and documents describing the proposed project may be found on pages A1–A22.

At the meeting, the applicant addressed the commission suggesting that a future owner of the westernmost lot may wish to expand the buildable area of the site by filling an existing ditch and extended a public stormwater pipe. Staff indicated that ditch is currently part of the city’s stormwater conveyance system. Filling the ditch and extending the pipe may result in greater tree loss and infrastructure maintenance. As the proposed lot would meet all minimum standards, and as the city already has a prescriptive easement over the area, staff would not support such filling and had included a condition of approval to that effect.

A public hearing was opened to take comment; no comments were received. Following the public hearing, the commission asked questions and discussed the proposal.

**Planning Commission Recommendation**

On a 7–0 vote, the commission recommended that the city council approve the proposal. Meeting minutes may be found on page A31.

**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

Adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat of FRETHAM 18th ADDITION. (See pages A24–A30.)

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
Preliminary plat of FRETHAM 18th ADDITION, a three lot subdivision at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an unaddressed parcel

Recommendation
Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat

Introduction
The subject properties are located on the south side of Lake Street Extension, just west of the Highway 7 access ramp. The 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension properties are both improved with a single-family home; the unaddressed property to the south is vacant. The existing homes are located at the highest point of the combined 2.5 acre site. Grade falls in all directions from the homes, most notably toward a large ditch that runs nearly the entirety of the north-south distance of the 12701 property. This ditch is part of the city’s stormwater conveyance system. While the combined site does not contain a Woodland Preservation Area (WPA), the properties are heavily wooded with primarily cottonwood and box elder trees. (See pages A1–A2.)

Proposal
Lake West Development is proposing to divide the subject properties into three lots. The existing homes would remain and one new home would be constructed. The proposed subdivision, which would be known as FRETHAM 18th ADDITION, requires approval of a preliminary plat. (See pages A3–A4.)

Staff 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 applicant's request and staff’s findings.

- **Would the proposal meet minimum subdivision standards?**

  Yes. The subdivision ordinance outlines minimum area and dimensional standards for single-family residential lots. The proposed subdivision would meet all minimum standards.

- **Would the proposal meet the tree ordinance?**
Yes. Based on the submitted grading plans, three of the site’s nine high-priority trees would be removed or significantly impacted. This 33 percent removal/impact would be allowed under the tree protection ordinance. (See page A5.)

- **Should existing storm sewer and utilities be maintained?**

  Yes. There is an existing storm sewer pipe located in the northwest corner of the 12701 Lake Street Extension property. The pipe outlets to a conveyance ditch. The applicant has submitted two different plans for this area; under one plan the pipe would be relocated to the west and under the other plan the pipe would be maintained. (See pages A2–A3.) As the lot on which the pipe is located would meet all minimum standards, including buildable area, staff finds that the pipe should be maintained in its current location. Relocation would result in unnecessary grading and associated tree removal.

**Summary Comments**

Over the last several years, the city has reviewed a variety of subdivision proposals for the subject properties. (See the “Supporting Information” section of this report.) The current proposal represents one of the best, as it meets all minimum standards of both the subdivision and zoning ordinances.

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat of FRETHAM 18th ADDITION at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an adjacent, unaddressed parcel. (See pages A24–A30.)

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

Surrounding Land Uses
North: single-family homes
South: State Highway 7
East: single-family homes
West: single-family homes

Planning
Guide Plan designation: low-density residential
Zoning: R-1

Proposed Lots
The subject properties have a combined area of 2.5-acres. The proposed lots would meet all minimum subdivision standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Lot Width at Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Lot Width at Setback</th>
<th>Lot Depth</th>
<th>Buildable Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>22,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>80 ft</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>125 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>46,068 sq.ft.</td>
<td>155 ft</td>
<td>140 ft</td>
<td>345 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>22,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>195 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>40,392 sq.ft.</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>355 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* all numbers rounded to nearest 5 sq.ft.

Stormwater:
Existing
There is an existing storm sewer pipe located in the northwest corner of the 12701 Lake Street Extension property. City records indicate that the pipe was installed in the late 1970s; the pipe outlets to a ditch that is part of the city’s stormwater conveyance system. There is no formalized easement over either the pipe or the ditch. However, the city does have a “prescriptive easement” over the area. A “prescriptive easement” is established when the city has used an area of property for public purposes for at least 15 years.

Stormwater: Management
Under the city’s stormwater rule, stormwater management is required when a property is divided into three or more lots. The management mechanism must control for runoff rate, volume and quality.

Background
In 2012, the city council approved MUCKALA ESTATES, a plat dividing 12701 Lake Street Extension property into two lots. These lots met all minimum standards of the subdivision ordinance. The final plat was not recorded with Hennepin County and has since expired. (See page A7–A8.)
In 2013, the planning commission reviewed what was then referred to as FRETHAM 17th ADDITION, a plat dividing the subject properties into four lots. The plat required lot width at setback variances. Both staff and the planning commission recommended denial of the plat. At the request of the applicant, the proposal was not considered by the city council. (See pages A9–A16.)

In 2014, the planning commission review what was then referred to as FRETHAM 18th ADDITION, a plat dividing the subject properties into four lots. One of the lots required a lot width right-of-way variance. Both staff and the planning commission recommended denial. The council concurred with this recommendation and denied the plat. (See pages A17–A22.)

**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 the preliminary plat.

2) Disagree with staff recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council deny the plat. This motion must include findings for denial.

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.

**Neighborhood Comments**

The city sent notices to 38 area property owners and received no comments to date.

**Deadline for Decision**

August 22, 2016
Location Map

Project: Fretham 18th Addition
Applicant: Lake West Development
Address: 12689 & 12701 Lake St Ext
Project No.12034.16a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
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GRADING NOTES

1. Contractor shall first verify the locations to drainages and elevations of proposed utility connections referenced prior to start of the project. The contractor shall maintain the utility connections as referenced.

2. Grading elevation shall be accomplished within limits of each drainage ditch as shown on the final approved plan produced by Gopher State One Call. The contractor shall ensure that the elevations of the proposed ditches are maintained within the limits of each drainage ditch as shown on the final approved plan.
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EXISTING HIGH-PRIORITY TREES
PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED PLANS
committee to review. It was decided there was a better way to get the input. Currently input is received from the 160 plus neighborhood watch block captains. The department is connected with the school districts through Tonka Cares and the Hopkins One Voice programs. The department is actively involved with the Glen Lake Optimists. Officers are located at the two high schools. He and the mayor are members of the Rotary. Any of the groups can be contacted to address any issues that need discussion. Current members of the committee also would still be available to meet with. The department's citizens' academy also gives the department a valuable resource. He said the decision to dissolve the committee was not about severing connections with the community but rather finding a more efficient and effective way to get input from residents.

Schneider said it was his understanding the members of the committee understood the decision.

Wiersum said the committee did some ride alongs with police officers and it was an enjoyable and insightful opportunity that any resident could do.

Wiersum moved, Hiller seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2012-120. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

F. Resolution approving an interim use permit and variance for seasonal outdoor sales at 14625 Excelsior Blvd

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2012-121 approving the request. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

G. Resolution approving a conditional use permit for Millennium Adult Day Care at 10901 Bren Road East

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2012-122 approving the request. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

H. Resolution approving the preliminary plat of MUCKALA ESTATES at 12701 Lake Street Extension

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2012-123 with the addendum approving the request. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

I. Extension of previously approved expansion permit and floodplain alteration permit for construction of a new home at 20 Westwood Circle
B. Preliminary plat, with lot width at setback variances, at 12701 and 12689 Lake Street Extension and an unaddressed parcel.

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

Thomas reported. She recommended denial of the application based on the findings listed in the staff report.

Kirk was curious if the applicant could have done a flag lot. Thomas stated that a variance would have been required to create a flag lot. A conforming single-family, residential lot has a minimum lot area standard of 22,000 square feet, minimum width of right- of-way standard of 80 feet, and minimum width at setback standard of 110 feet.

Kirk asked where the drainage ditch would be located. Thomas pointed out the existing configuration and the proposed realignment. Historical records show that the pipes have been located there since at least 1973. The city has a prescriptive easement over the area which provides the right to continue the drainage pattern in the area. The lot width is staff’s issue with the proposal, not the drainage.

Kirk commented that State Highway 7 created the long and narrow lots. The lots remind him of lake lots without the view. He noted that variances have been granted for much narrower lots and setbacks to accommodate the long, narrow lots that led to a lake. He asked if the strange-shaped lot could be considered a hardship. Thomas recalled situations when staff recommended approval of variances for construction on narrow lots. In this case, the variance would create even narrower and longer lots. The existing depth, relative to the width of the property, is not a circumstance that recommends itself to creating even narrower and deeper lots.

Chair Lehman clarified that the conditions are being requested to be reset for the lots.

Yetka asked if a landowner could challenge a prescriptive easement. Thomas answered affirmatively. The drainage easement does not impact the lot widths request.

Ben Wikstrom, Lakewest Development, applicant, thanked staff for the report. He was an intern for Minnetonka years ago. He stated that:

- The request is reasonable.
• Early meetings with staff told him that this would be a good path to go down.
• In 2010, the legislature changed variance requirements from undue hardship to practical difficulty. He argued that this proposal is what the legislature had in mind.
• The proposal cannot prove a hardship. There would be a reasonable use of the land with the conforming plat.
• There is a practical difficulty because the lot has two fronts. The conforming plat would remove up to 50 percent of the woods and buffer. Keeping the buffer is of overall importance. The comprehensive guide plan states that one of its goals is to create and maintain buffers from conflicting land uses. State Highway 7 would be a conflicting use adjacent to residential houses.
• His working knowledge tells him that the 4-lot adjacent layout would be better than the cul-de-sac layout.
• He is working on a development called Woods of Fairview. There is a 49-inch silver maple tree he wants to save. By definition, the tree has about a 150-foot critical root zone with a 75-foot radius. He would like to do some grading within 60 feet of the tree, but, by definition, it would not survive and not be saved. Strict interpretation based on benchmarks are sometimes different from what knowledge from being in the field tells him. The proposed layout would only save 1 or, he believes, 2 more high-priority trees, than the cul-de-sac layout. Having the buffer on Lake Street Extension is important and the buffer on State Highway 7 is even more important.
• In this case, State Highway 7 makes the site unique.
• The conforming plat would have a public street with more impervious surface that would require maintenance and extension of public utilities. The proposed plan would not require that.
• The conforming plat would lose 2 existing houses. A goal of the comprehensive guide plan is to preserve housing stock. The proposal would do that.
• Muckala estates could not have been a four lot plat.
• A couple of new houses on 92-foot lots would not look small or narrow even though they would not be like the hundred foot lots next door or across the street or some of the bigger lots in the neighborhood.
• The clearing along Lake Street Extension would not cause one to be “taken aback.” There are about 30 to 32 lots along Baker Road and the frontage road. At least two thirds of those have little to no
trees and mow right up to the road or have landscaping. He disagreed that different types of lots would be created.

- The request is reasonable. The proposal would not increase density.
- The lots would meet the minimum required lot size.
- The uniqueness of the property proves a practical difficulty.
- He is appealing to the commission’s sense of “practicalness.”
- Staff’s recommendation holds the application to the undue hardship standard rather than the practical difficulty requirement.
- The reduced widths would not adversely affect the neighborhood.
- He is not aware of any negative feedback.
- The proposal would be a smarter, greener, and more efficient layout without the increase in maintenance for the city.
- He is trying for the highest and best use of the site.

In response to Lehman’s question, Mr. Wikstrom stated that the conforming plat was considered, but not a flag lot. West of the property there are three lots served by one driveway. The next two lots west of those share one driveway. That is something the applicant considered, but the applicant believes that the buffer to State Highway 7 is critical. It would be easier to market the proposed lots. The reality of locating two houses near State Highway 7 is not something he would like to do, so this option is being pursued. If this proposal is turned down, then reconfiguring to a private drive would be considered. He could not speak on behalf of Mr. Fretham at this time, but Mr. Fretham is usually open to reconfigurations. He requested the current option be approved.

The public hearing was opened.

Gina Genadek, 12731 Lake Street Extension, stated that her concern is the storm sewer pipe. A lot of snow melting or heavy rain travels from her lot onto the middle lot and onto the front house’s property where the water travels into a drain and into the drain ditch. The proposal would eliminate the existing drain. If the drain would be eliminated, that would cause flooding. Her driveway floods now and it is higher than the neighbor’s front yard. If her lot would not drain, it would flood up into the middle house. She did not have a problem with the layout of the houses.

Mr. Wikstrom clarified with Ms. Genadek that the drain is located in the front yard of her neighbor. Ms. Genadek said that a lot of properties’ runoff travel into the front house’s drain. She wanted an assurance that it would not be sealed off and create a flooding issue.
No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Chair Lehman confirmed with Thomas that there would be no elimination of storm water facilities.

Yetka confirmed with Thomas that no application was ever received for a three-lot subdivision of the proposed site.

In response to Yetka’s question, Thomas explained that staff requires a conforming plat be provided by an applicant to identify the number of lots that would be allowed if all requirements were met. The four-lot subdivision “proof of plat” is not being proposed by the applicant. The “proof of plat” shows that the property has the ability to be divided into four lots and meet ordinance requirements. Staff had done a review of the “proof of plat” to make sure that the lots meet minimum dimensions and standards. Natural resources staff reviewed the “proof of plat” and the site to verify its conformance with tree ordinance requirements. Stout added that the applicant has submitted a preliminary storm-water management plan, but no calculations or detailed design. If the proposal would be approved, then a full plan and designs would have to be provided to move forward with issuing building permits.

Yetka asked if the “proof of plat” had been assessed for storm water requirements. Stout answered in the negative.

Kirk asked staff to discuss tree loss and use of a cul-de-sac. Thomas explained that the proposed plan would cause grading and tree removal on the west. The applicant’s proposal would preserve seven of the nine high-priority trees. The conforming plat would preserve six of the high priority trees. Colleran added that the tree ordinance regulates woodland preservation areas. No more than 35 percent of high-priority trees may be removed. There are a lot of significant trees on the site. The difficulty is that the proposed plan would have a lot of grading. The amount of grading could be reduced. The cul-de-sac itself would cause more tree loss, but, comparing that plan to whether or not a variance should be granted to allow four lots is not an accurate comparison.

Yetka asked about the property west of the site. Thomas stated that the lots do not have frontages on a public street, so variances would have been required. Staff will research when that took place.

Magney asked if the house on the west would fit on Lot 3. Thomas answered in the affirmative.
Yetka did not see a compelling reason to recommend approval of a four-lot subdivision as proposed. Long, narrow lots are not good planning and would create lots that would not fit with the neighborhood. There are a lot of homes between Lake Street and Highway 7. She agreed with staff’s recommendation. She preferred a three-lot subdivision. A four-lot subdivision with a cul-de-sac may be a valid configuration, but it would need to be assessed to adhere to all requirements. That would be the time to make a decision on granting that plan.

Kirk and Magney concurred with Yetka.

Magney moved, second by Yetka, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution on pages A8–A11 of the staff report which denies a preliminary plat with lot width variances for Fretham 17th Addition.

Yetka, Kirk, Magney, Thaler, and Lehman voted yes. Knight and Odland were absent. Motion carried.
so what the city wanted to do was to manage the situation to the best degree as possible by being reasonable but also say that business as usual was not acceptable. The added green space was a plus but the challenge was given the nature of the business the parking issue hasn’t been solved and the issue had been a difficult one for the city. Taking away the parking spots would demonstrate a punitive action but would not guarantee there would never be a parking violation at Morries.

Wagner said the building looks like it is abandoned and an argument could be made that having some cars there makes it look less abandoned. He leaned toward taking Morries at its word that the issue will be addressed but making it as painful as possible if they do not.

Barone suggested tabling the item to allow staff time to work with Morries.

Wiersum said he would support tabling the item to allow time for some creative thinking about the use of the building. There was an opportunity to create a win/win solution. If the city could get an agreement that the building would be used in a particular way and was spruced up, that would benefit the Morries and the city.

Schneider liked the idea of getting the building occupied and utilized. He recommended that when staff looked at the penalty provision for violations it would be fairly easy to identify cars that were in violation because cars that were inventory would not have license plates on them. A first time violation would be penalized.

Allendorf said there had to be a way to ensure there were not disagreements about what a violation was and what was not.

Allendorf moved, Wagner seconded a motion to table the item.

Coyle said he had multiple conversations with Morries’ staff over the past week and had been assured every time that the only cars parked on the site were employee cars.

All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

C. Preliminary plat, with lot width at setback variances, at 12701 and 12689 Lake Street Extension and an unaddressed parcel

Gordon indicated the applicant asked for the item to be pulled.

Schneider asked for clarification if the applicant wanted the item pulled or if he wanted it continued.
Curt Fretham, 15400 Highway 7 said he would like the item continued to have further conversations with staff.

Wagner moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to continue the item to a date uncertain.

Schneider said he supported the motion. He indicated the little narrow lots made no sense to him. The private drive serving three lots with one facing Lake Street did make sense.

All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

D. Appeal of the planning commission’s denial of an aggregate side yard setback variance for the construction of a garage addition at 5123 Belwood Lane

Gordon gave the staff report.

Lisa McCormick indicated she was speaking on behalf of the applicants. She said the appeal boiled down to two points. The first was the reasonableness of the application. She said the staff report indicated that looking at the other 18 or 19 homes on Belwood Lane all had two car garages. The applicants’ garage was the only one car garage on the site. While she appreciated the attention to keep the conformity of the existing neighborhood she noted a three car garage exists around the corner six homes away from the applicants’ property as well another home with a three car garage within 400 feet. She said the proposal took many things into consideration and it wasn’t just an issue of aesthetics. The original builder and architect looked at current water problems as well as potential safety issues with the sloping yard as well as storage issues. The planning commission found that the current enclosed carport was a garage. However according to the planning commission’s policies the standards for a single car garage was 13x24 feet. The current structure was substandard as it was 14x20 feet. There was no room for storage. The proposal was not an equivalent of a three car garage but more accurately was the square footage of a two plus car garage. The proposal did not build out to the maximum amount but was only trying to address storage needs. The property was unique with its mature trees.

McCormick said another issue was if there would be a front extension or a side extension. Right now the site was one of two homes that extended out to the front. Most of the homes were in line with a consistent line along the front setback except for the two homes. The fact that the home extended out to the front and had a one car garage made it unique from all
bad but was worth looking at. He said having an appropriately designed project that fit better in the area was a higher priority than saving the barn.

Ellingson asked what percentage of the units would be considered affordable. Jensen said all the units would be in the $800 to $1,000 per month range so all would be technically affordable but not low income. Ellingson asked if there was a limit to the number eligible for Section 8 vouchers. Jensen said the company generally tried to keep the number between 10 percent to 20 percent for any building.

Schneider said one of the comments was about a cozy relationship existing between Shelter Corporation and the city. He said there were Shelter owned projects in the city but there was no special relationship. He noted the company had a good reputation for doing this type of project.

Schneider called a recess at 8:16 p.m.

C. Ordinance amending the city charter regarding purchasing

Schneider called the meeting back to order at 8:24 p.m.

City Attorney Corrine Heine gave the staff report.

Wagner moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to adopt Ordinance No. 2014 -12. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Allendorf was excused at 8:27 p.m.

B. Preliminary plat, with lot width at right-of-way variance, at 12701 and 12689 Lake Street Extension and an unaddressed parcel

Wischnack gave the staff report.

Wagner asked for confirmation that the three lots directly to the west were off of a private drive and not a public street. Wischnack indicated that was correct.

Wiersum said the staff report noted the city had a lot of property that fronts major thoroughfares. He asked if the city had ever enabled frontage along one of the major thoroughfares where there was no access to the roads as was being proposed for this development for the basis for a setback measurement. Wischnack said there were situations where they might be frontage on two different roads and maybe one road was not accessible because it was in a slope area or wetland or something like that. As far as a freeway she was not aware of a similar situation. She pointed to the
Terra Tonka development as an example. That development would have had frontage onto I494 and there could have been lot behind lot subdivisions. She said that area was similar and a new street had to be constructed to allow access back to the new lots. Wiersum said the request was to consider Highway 7 for the basis for the side yard setback and it appeared the city had not allowed that before without an alternative road.

Wagner said he would not ever consider Highway 7 being frontage.

Schneider said he didn’t ever recall the city saying a freeway or a major road that had the dynamics could be counted as frontage in order to make it a legal lot. He agreed with the staff’s assessment. With that off the table the question was if it made sense to have a lot behind a lot with all the normal provisions to grant a variance. He was more open to the setback if a three lot, or two lot subdivision was done with a private drive. If the size property warranted four lots what was the best end result? Saving two homes and doing a variance to accommodate this type of plat or putting in a public street that may result in some variances. He didn’t think it was beneficial to say the city was going to change policies to make it a legal lot but decide if it could be a buildable lot with appropriate variances. This was what he thought should be discussed.

Wiersum said the general direction was pretty clear that the Highway 7 frontage issue probably would not be agreed to by the council. The question then was if the subdivision with four lots make sense and if so how. It may not make sense. Resolving the first issue would open the door for discussion about the best options for the lot. Was it four lots or three? This remained to be determined.

Wagner asked if the driveway for the back would have an easement over both property lines. Wischnack indicated that there would have to an easement over both properties with the way it was shown.

Ben Wikstrom from Lakewest Development said last August Lakewest showed the planning commission a subdivision proposal that required lot width variances at Lake Street Extension. They thought that was a good, smart plan for many of the same reasons they preferred the one private driveway in this proposal. That plat and this one in opposition to the conforming plat with the cul-de-sac required less impervious surface, no extension of public utilities and associated maintenance and plowing. The tree loss would also be less with both of the plans. He said one extra high priority or significant tree would be saved with this plan. More importantly was the issue of the overall woods. The woods on Highway 7 was important to the buffer. Some of the trees may grow into a high priority or
significant tree at some point. All these detrimental factors could be eliminated when considering the cul-de-sac. The staff report mentioned the adjacent property and the character of the neighborhood. Those were the two lots immediately adjacent. He said those were developed in the 1980’s. West of those are two more homes approved in 1999.

Wikstrom showed an exhibit of other properties that could be viewed as examples of lots behind lots along major frontages. Wiersum said his question was for examples where the city allowed 'backage' to be treated as frontage similar to this proposal. Wistrom said one of the unique things about this property was it was subdivided during a time when access to Highway 7 was probably more likely. He showed an example of a five lot subdivision. There was the required square footage to do that with the same argument about frontage on to Highway 7. In the interest of meeting the city's comp plan goal of preserving existing housing and keeping the woods along Highway 7 the proposal was for four lots. The private drive on the proposed plat would essentially just serve one lot in the back. Wikstrom said the Fretham 13th Addition along Orchard Road was similar to this in that there was no access to Orchard Road or to Park Valley. There was a wetland in the entirety of that frontage. There was a 20 foot easement granted to get to the property.

Wikstrom said he understood the contention that using Highway 7 as frontage was problematic. The survey may indicate there was legal access. His contention was Highway 7 should be viewed as the access but the code did not say legal access was needed, it only required lot frontage. He said staff's interpretation of intent wasn't proper if the defined requirements of the ordinance were met. Lakewest's attorney agreed with this but they did not want to fight that battle. He said the plat was the smarter plat and the planning commission agreed. If the council approved the variance rather than believe it was not necessary, the practical difficulty was that the lots were old, deep and were approved when access to Highway 7 was probably more likely.

Acomb said recently the city had an appreciation event for the boards and commissions members. There was a sneak peek of the community survey. One of the survey’s questions was what residents appreciated most about the city. The number one answer was the natural character closely followed by neighborhood. As she reviewed the council packet and this agenda item and as she evaluated the appropriate layout for the development it seemed to her what the community was looking for was more neighborhoods like this rather than houses looking at the back of other houses. She understood the desire to maintain some existing housing stock but she thought some uniformity and making it a
neighborhood made sense to her. At this point she was not supportive of the configuration as proposed.

Wiersum said for this site you really might need to start with a blank sheet of paper. He was having a hard time coming up with a reason he would approve anything in front of him. He said the proposal was pretty classic shoehorning. He rejected the Highway 7 argument. If the desire was to preserve the existing homes the best scenario was likely for three lots. The third lot would still be strangely shaped.

Wagner said when he walked the property his first question was trying to figure out what was going on with the property to the west. He felt the property was challenging for four lots. He was not as adverse to a lot behind a lot because of the precedent to the west. He was not a big fan of lots behind lots but the precedent had been set. He said he could have some level of tolerance potentially for a lot behind a lot but his preference was not to further degrade the front lots. For him to support a lot behind a lot he would like to see access out to the private drive to the west. This would make the front two homes less intrusive.

Schneider agreed it was a challenging piece of property not only because of the shape but also because of the topography. The easement creates the complexity. When this is overlaid with the idea of saving two existing homes it makes it even more challenging. There was not an obvious easy solution and the challenge was coming up with the right solution. If asked what should be done that was most beneficial for the long term he would have said the lot lines should be eliminated altogether and to focus in on where the appropriate house pads should be located to fit into the topography with the lowest impact on the grades and the tree cover. He noted lots behind lots had been historically important long term to help shape the character of the city.

Ellingson said he understood the mayor's point about how lots behind lots had benefitted the community and thought he was right. By not having a big cul-de-sac there was the ability to maintain the wooded feeling. He has also seen examples of lots behind lots where it looked like the house was in someone's backyard.

Bergstedt said even though the city allowed lots behind lots in the past it had not allowed something similar in the recent history. He thought three lots would probably be most appropriate unless the two existing houses were taken down. Being ultra-creative to try to get a fourth lot did not serve the city well going forward.
Wiersum agreed lots behind lots had contributed a lot to the city and made Minnetonka a distinctive community. Combining the lot behind lot concept and the notion of good design with the level of development made the likelihood of the council approving many lot behind lot proposals in the future pretty low.

Wiersum moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2014-040 denying FRETHAM 18TH ADDITION, a preliminary plat, with lot width at right-of-way variance, at 12701 and 12689 Lake Street Extension and an unaddressed parcel. Acomb, Wiersum, Bergstedt, Wagner, Ellingson, and Schneider voted “yes.” Allendorf was excused. Motion carried.

D. Organizational performance

Barone presented the report.

Schneider said he occasionally gets asked by a resident why the city spends money on an annual survey. He said without the periodic ability to tweak questions, there would tend to be a blurred vision of what was going on in the city. An annual survey does provide better understanding to make better decisions.

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None

16. Adjournment

Bergstedt moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Maeda
City Clerk
Resolution No. 2016-

Resolution approving the preliminary plat of FRETHAM 18th ADDITION at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an adjacent unaddressed parcel

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01 Lake West Development has requested preliminary plat approval for FRETHAM 18th ADDITION, a three-lot residential subdivision, at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an adjacent unaddressed parcel.

1.02 The properties are legally described in Exhibit A of this resolution.

1.03 On June 16, 2016, 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.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 The preliminary plat would meet the design standards as outlined in City Code §400.030.

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 utility exhibit illustrating existing and proposed utility connections to each lot.

      2) Documentation indicating the pipe inlet just north of Highway 7 at the 969.19 elevation directs water to the south, under the highway.

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

         a. All existing easements, including those described by Document No. 4404108 and 44041505.

         b. A minimum 10-foot wide drainage and utility easement adjacent to the public right-of-way and minimum 7-foot wide drainage and utility easements along all other lot lines.

         c. Drainage and utility easement on proposed Lot 1 extending from the west property line of Lot 1 to 10 feet east of the existing storm sewer pipe and centerline of the existing ditch.

      4) Documents for the city attorney’s review and approval. These documents must be prepared by an attorney knowledgeable in the area of real estate.

         a. Private utility easements over any existing or proposed service lines that cross shared property lines.

         b. Title evidence that is current within thirty days before release of the final plat.
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)(3) above must be approved by the city attorney.

3. Prior to release of the final plat for recording, submit the following:
   a) Two sets of mylars for city signatures.
   b) An electronic CAD file of the plat in microstation or DXF.
   c) Park dedication fee of $5000.

4. Prior to issuance of a building permit:
   a) Submit a letter from the surveyor stating that boundary and lot stakes have been installed as required by ordinance.
   b) Submit the following items for staff review and approval:
      1) A final drainage plan and stormwater management plan. The plan must outline an acceptable method to address all of the following:
         a. Volume: One inch of abstraction over impervious surface is required.
         b. Rate. The speed of runoff leaving the site cannot exceed existing conditions. and
         c. Water Quality: 60 percent phosphorus and 90 percent total suspended solids must be removed.
      2) A final grading and tree preservation plan. The plan must:
         a. Be in substantial conformance with Grading Plan dated April 23, 2016;
         b. Illustrate the existing storm sewer pipe along the west side of proposed Lot 1 remaining in place.
Relocation of the pipe is not allowed. Any grading within this area must be approved by the city engineer.

c. Show sewer and water services to minimize impact to any significant or high-priority trees. No trees may be removed for installation of services.

3) 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.

4) 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.

3) All required hook-up fees.

c) 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.

5. No tree removal or grading may begin until a building permit is issued.
6. A full width patch of Lake Street Extension will be required if excavation for utility installation impacts greater than one half the width of the street.

7. All lots and structures within the plat are subject to all the R-1 zoning standards.

8. This preliminary plat approval will be void if: (1) a final plat application is not received and approved by July 11, 2017; and (2) the city council has not received and approved a written application for a time extension by July 11, 2017.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on July 11, 2016.

______________________________
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 July 11, 2016.
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
EXHIBIT A

That part of Lot 10, BRENLYN PARK SECOND DIVISION, lying West of the East 300 feet thereof.

AND

That part of the abandoned right-of-way of the Chicago Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company in the Northwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter lying North of the State Highway No. 7, except road, Section 23 Township 117, Range 22. The Westerly line of said right-of-way being a line drawn parallel with and 100 feet Westerly from the Westerly line of BRENLYN PARK SECOND DIVISION.

AND

The West 100 feet of the East 300 feet of Lot 10, BRENLYN PARK SECOND DIVISION.

AND

That part of Lot 9, BRENLYN PARK SECOND DIVISION, lying West of the East 130 feet thereof, excluding State Highway 7.
E. Preliminary plat of Fretham 18th Addition, a three-lot subdivision at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an unaddressed parcel.

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

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

Ben Wickstrom, of Lakewest Development, representing the applicant, stated that the existing drainage would be maintained. There would be an opportunity to bury the pipe without additional tree loss. He would like some clarification on that. He was available for questions.

The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

In response to a question, Thomas referred to staff’s recommendation to leave the pipe and stormwater conveyance at their current locations.

Mr. Wickstrom clarified that he is fine with the location of the pipe that travels under Lake Street Extension and into a ditch. The applicant wants to fill in the ditch and extend the pipe to the pipe that outlets under Highway 7. If that would not be allowed, then the project would still move forward.

Calvert noted that the site is wooded and there would be tree loss.

Chair Kirk stated that the proposal is the best option that he has seen. It would be the least intrusive.

Odland moved, second by Hanson, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat of Fretham 18th Addition at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an adjacent, unaddressed parcel (see pages A24-A30 of the staff report).

Knight, O’Connell, Odland, Powers, Calvert, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Motion carried.

F. Ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel from R-1 to R-1A.

Chair Kirk introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.
Brief Description: Agreement with Metropolitan Council for the 2016 Street Rehabilitation project for the Libb’s Lake area

Recommended Action: Approve the agreement and amend the CIP

Background

On March 14, 2016, the city council approved construction of the 2016 Street Rehabilitation project for the Libb’s Lake area. In collaboration with the city’s project, the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) is scheduled to complete a sanitary sewer lining project near Gro-Tonka Park.

In an effort to minimize disruption and complete both projects as efficiently as possible, the city’s project includes replacement of a MCES manhole on Woodlawn Avenue. Replacing the manhole as a part of the city’s project will reduce the overall disturbance to the neighborhood and eliminate the need to dig into newly paved road surfaces due to the timing of the MCES project, which is currently scheduled to be completed in early 2017.

Under the agreement, all MCES construction costs plus an additional 7% to cover indirect expenses such as survey, inspection, and testing, will be reimbursed by MCES, and both initial costs and their reimbursement will flow through the city’s Street Improvement Fund. The city attorney has reviewed and approved the agreement.

Recommendation

Approve the attached construction cooperation agreement with the MCES and amend the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to appropriately reflect the additional expenditures and offsetting revenues under the agreement.

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager
  Will Manchester, P.E., Director of Engineer

Originated by:
  Phil Olson, P.E., Engineering Project Manager
CONSTRUCTION COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR 
BETWEEN THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL 
AND CITY OF MINNETONKA

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into by and between the Metropolitan Council, a public corporation and political subdivision of the State of Minnesota (“Metropolitan Council”), and the City of Minnetonka, a municipal corporation under the laws of the State of Minnesota (“City”).

BACKGROUND RECITALS

1. The City plans to re-construct Woodlawn Ave from Minnetonka Blvd and Prospect Pl, during the summer of 2016 construction season (“the City Project”).

2. To avoid additional disruption to the community and to Woodland Ave, the Council desires to rebuild the Council’s maintenance hole structure MH 63A in Woodlawn Ave.

3. Both City and Council desire that the Council Project be constructed in conjunction with the City Project to minimize community impacts.

4. The Council is not staffed or equipped to construct the Council Project during the 2016 summer construction season.

5. Therefore, the Council desires to have the City construct the Council Project contemporaneously with the City Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, for mutual consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged by the parties, the parties agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

I. Purpose of Agreement

1. This Agreement describes the responsibilities of each of the Parties for design and construction of the Council Project.

2. The Council appoints the City as its agent to obtain bids, enter into a contract for the construction of the work, and supervise the work performed on the Council Project for compliance with the Council Project construction documents and this Agreement.

3. The scope of the Council Project is:
Replacement of MH 63A structure and install a casing pipe for the temporary conveyance system to remain in place until abandoned through a separate Council-let construction project in 2017.

4. The locations of the Council Project and the City Project are shown on Exhibit A to this Agreement.

II. Construction Documents

1. The City will prepare the necessary detailed construction documents for the Council Project (“Council Project Construction Documents”). The Council Project Construction Documents will contain plans and specifications and a schedule for construction of the Council Project suitable for use by proposed contractors in the preparation of their bids. The City will develop the Council Project Construction Documents using the most current industry standards and practices for a maintenance structure. The cost of the Council Project is shown in the attached Exhibit B.

2. The City will have a Registered Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Minnesota certify the Council Project Construction Documents that will be incorporated into the bidding documents for the City Project. The City’s Engineer or their representative must approve all Council Project Construction Documents before the Council Project Construction Documents are incorporated into the plans for the City Project.

3. Upon completion of construction of the Combined Project, the City will provide as-built drawings of the Council Project to the Council.

4. The City’s Engineer will incorporate the Council Project Construction Documents into the City Project Construction Documents (“Combined Project Construction Documents”) for the City and Council Projects (“Combined Project”).

III. Easements and Permits

1. The Council gives the City the right to enter onto Council property, and any easements and rights-of-way the Council obtained for construction of the Council Project for the purpose of the City fulfilling this Agreement.

2. The City will acquire all permanent and temporary permits, easements and property interests necessary in the City’s name for the Combined Project. If additional property acquisition becomes necessary due to Council changes to the Council Project as provided in this Agreement, the Council will be responsible for any land acquisitions outside of the City Project boundaries.

3. As of the date of this Agreement, no additional property acquisition is required for construction and installation of the Council Project. The Council is responsible for any land acquisitions outside of the City Project boundaries.
4. Before the scheduled date for the start of construction, the Council will get and pay all fees for the Council Project, including: None.

5. The City is responsible for getting all other permits associated with construction of the Combined Project.

IV. Procedure for Acceptance of Bids

1. Bidding Procedure. The City will advertise for bids for the work and construction of the Combined Project, receive and open bids and may, subject to Council’s acceptance of the bid submitted, enter into a construction contract with the successful bidder in accordance with applicable law. The bidding documents will require separate line items for specific Council Project bid items.

After opening the bids, the City will give the Council a written tabulation of the bids with the City’s recommendation for selection of the lowest responsible bidder.

2. Council May Accept or Reject of Council Project Bid Amount.

   a. Council Project Bid Amount is less than 120% of estimate. If the line items for the Council Project in the bid total less than 120% of the construction cost estimate in the final Council Project Construction Documents in Exhibit B (excluding contract administration costs), the Council accepts the bid for the Council Project and the City will award the Council Project portion of the bid.

   b. Council Project Bid Amount is 120% or More of Estimate. If the line items for the Council Project in the bid are 120 percent or more of the construction cost estimate in the final Council Project Construction Documents in Exhibit B (excluding contract administration costs), the City will award the Council Project portion of the bid, unless the Council gives the City written notice stating that the Council does not agree to be bound by the bid prices for the Council Project. The City must receive the Council’s written notification within 14 days of the date the City provided the Council with the bid tabulation. If the Council does not notify the City within 14 days, the bids for the Council Project will be deemed accepted by the Council.

   c. Compensation to the City if the Council Does Not Proceed with its Project. If the Council does not accept the bid amount for the Council Project as described in section IV.2.b above, or otherwise decides before the City’s award of the Combined Project not to proceed with the Council Project, the Council will reimburse the City for Council Project-related costs incurred by the City as of the date of termination. A decision by the Council not to construct the Council Project has no bearing on the City’s ability to proceed with the City Project.
3. **City decision not to award City Project.** If the City decides not to award the City Project, the City will reimburse the Council for Council Project-related costs incurred by the Council as of the date of termination. A decision by the City not to construct the City project has no bearing on the Council’s ability to independently advertise and accept bids for and construct the Council Project.

**V. Construction and Contract Administration**

1. The City will include in the construction contract for the Combined Project, the Council Project Construction Documents, and require that the contractor construct the Council Project according to these Documents. At least 14 days before the contractor begins work on the Council Project, the City will give written notice to the Council that the contractor will begin construction by sending notice to:

   Thomas Buchal  
   Council Authorized Representative (CAR)  
   Metro Plant CFO  
   2400 Childs Road  
   Saint Paul, MN 55106  
   Thomas.Buchal@metc.state.mn.us

2. The City will perform and direct all construction supervision, contract administration and inspections required to complete the Combined Project. The City will not interrupt the operation of Council’s sanitary flow facilities during the construction of the Council Project without the written consent of the Council.

3. The Council’s Authorized Representative (Thomas Buchal, or other designee identified to the City in writing) may observe the work during the construction of the Council Project, but the Council’s authorized representative is not responsible for supervising the Council Project. When observing the work, the Council’s authorized representative will cooperate with the City’s Engineer or designated representative. The Council’s authorized representative will be available to the City at all times during construction of the Council Project. The Council will designate an authorized representative with the authority and experience to make decisions concerning the construction of the Council Project so as not to delay construction of the City Project or the Combined Project.

4. If after installation, the Council determines that any portion of the Council Project was not constructed substantially in accordance with the Council Project Construction Documents, the Council’s authorized representative must inform the City of the deficiency within seven days. The Council’s notice to the City must also explain why the portion of the Council Project does not conform to the Council Project Construction Documents and the actions the Council believes the contractor must take to correct the deficiency. The City will require the contractor
to make the corrections to meet the requirements of the Council Project Construction Documents.

5. The Council’s authorized representative will participate in the inspection of the Council Project for substantial completion. Within seven days of any substantial completion inspection, the Council will provide the City the punch list items that need to be addressed before final completion of the Council Project. If the Council does not provide punch list items within seven days, the contractor’s work will be deemed accepted.

6. If punch list items are provided by the Council, the City will inform the Council in writing of final completion of construction (including the punch list items) of the Council Project. Within seven days of receiving the City’s written notice, the Council will inform the City in writing whether the Council Project conforms to the Council Project Construction Documents. The Council makes the final decision on whether the contractor’s Council Project work conforms to the Council Construction Documents. The Council must accept the work on the Council Project in writing.

7. The Council will participate in the claims process on the Combined Project for the following types of contractor claims:

   (a) Project delays relating in any way to site conditions; and
   (b) Council requests for changes or modifications to any construction documents (Council Project, City Project, or Combined Project).
   (c) Project delays caused by untimely response to the inspection requirements in Section III-VI above.

   The Council will pay the portion of any claim that relates to the acts of the Council.

VI. Modifications to Construction Documents

1. The City may make minor changes in the Council Project Construction Documents and the Combined Project Construction Documents if the changes are necessary to complete construction. The City may also enter into any change orders or supplemental agreements with the contractor on the Combined Project to incorporate these changes in the Council Project or Combined Project Construction documents. These changes may result in a change to the Council’s cost participation described in Section VIII.

2. The City will give the Council’s Authorized Representative all proposed amendments and material changes to the Council Project Construction Documents. The Council will review the documents and communicate in writing its acceptance or rejection to the City.
within seven days. The City will not amend or change the Council Project Construction Documents until it receives the Council’s written acceptance.

3. The Council may make changes to the Council Project if the all of the following occur:

   a. The Council gives the City seven days written notice;
   b. The Council bears the costs of all changes; and
   c. The change does not increase the cost or delay completion of the City Project.

VII. Cost Participation and Payment

1. The Council will reimburse the City for the costs shown in Exhibit B as specified in this Section VII. The Council will reimburse the City for the actual cost of construction for the Council Project, actual costs of construction for portions of the Combined Project as identified in Exhibit B, plus seven percent. The additional seven percent is for the following:

   a) surveying, inspection, and testing for the Council Project;
   
   b) other costs associated with the Council Project for contract administration, and other administrative expenses associated with the Council or Combined Project.

2. The City, at its sole expense will acquire in its name all permanent and temporary permits, easements, and property interests necessary for the Combined Project.

3. The City will pay its contractor for the contractor’s work on the Council Project. The Council will then pay the City under this section. During construction of the Council Project, the City will submit monthly invoices to the Council. The City’s monthly invoices will include a progress report. The Council must pay the City within 30 days after it receives the invoice. If the Council disputes any portion of an invoice if must give the City notice of the dispute within 14 days after the Council receives the invoice. If the Council disputes any portion of an invoice, the Council must pay the undisputed portion of the invoice within 30 days after receives the invoice, and it must pay the remainder of any amount due within 30 days after the dispute is resolved. 6.

   When the work on the Combined Project is substantially complete, the City will give the Council an updated cost participation breakdown. This cost participation breakdown will show actual construction costs based on the contract unit prices and the units of work the contractor performed. The updated cost participation breakdown will also contain the updated administrative and other costs to be paid to the City by Council.

4. If after subtracting the Council’s payments from the updated cost participation breakdown the Council owes the City money, the City will invoice the Council for that amount. The Council will then pay the City the amount owed within 30 days of receiving the invoice. If
the Council has already paid more than the updated cost participation breakdown, the City will refund the Council’s excess amount without interest.

VIII. Warranties/Maintenance

1. The Council Project bonds and warranties will be issued in the name of the City. Once construction of the Council Project is complete and the Council accepts the Council Project, the Council Project will be under the full control of the Council and all bonds, warranties and guarantees provided by the sureties, construction contractors and subcontractors for the Council Project are the property of Council. If a surety prohibits assignment then the City will require the contractor to ensure that the affected bond or warranty is applies both to the City and the Council.

2. After acceptance of the Council Project by the Council the Council is responsible for operation and maintenance of the Council Project.

IV. Liability

1. To the extent authorized by law each party is responsible only for its own acts and the results of its acts. The Council’s and City’s liability is governed by the provisions of Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 466.

2. The Council and City each warrant that they have an insurance or self-insurance program with minimum coverage consistent with the liability limits in Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 466. Nothing in this Agreement is a waiver or limitation of any immunity or limitation of liability by the Council or City.

3. The City will ensure that the Combined Project construction contract includes clauses that:

   A) require the Combined Project contractor to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the Council, its officers, agents and employees from claims, suits, demands, damages, judgments, costs, interest, expenses (including reasonable attorney’s fees, witness fees and disbursements) arising out of or by reason of the acts or omissions of the Contractor, its officers, employees, agents or subcontractors;

   B) require the Combined Project contractor to provide and maintain insurance and name the Council as additional insured; and

   C) require the Combined Project contractor to be an independent contractor for the purposes of completing the work on the Council Project.
X.
General Provisions

1. All records kept by the Council and City with respect to the Council Project are subject to examination by representatives of each party. All data collected, created, received, maintained or disseminated for any purpose by the Council and City under this Agreement are governed by Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13 (“Act”), and the Minnesota Rules implementing the Act.

2. The City agrees to comply with all laws applicable to the City relating to nondiscrimination, affirmative action, public purchases, contracting, employment, workers’ compensation, and surety deposits required for construction contracts. Minnesota Statutes, Section 181.59 and any applicable local ordinance relating to civil rights and discrimination and the Affirmative Action Policy statement of the Council is considered a part of this Agreement.

3. The employees of the parties, and all other persons engaged by each party will not be considered employees of the other party. Each party is solely responsible for all claims arising from its employees including claims under the Worker’s Compensation Act, the Minnesota Economic Security Law and all third party claim resulting from an act or omission of an employee.

4. If hazardous wastes, pollutants or contaminants as those terms are defined in law exist on the Combined Project site, the City is responsible for any response or remedial action, monitoring or reporting under the law. The City will apply for and have the Council named as a beneficiary in any no association letters, no action/no further action letters and other environmental regulatory assurances for the site. The City will give the Council copies of any Phase I and Phase II environmental investigations, approved Response Action Plans, and environmental assurance letters naming the Council as a beneficiary. This paragraph survives the termination of this Agreement.

7. This Agreement is the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes all oral agreements and negotiations between the parties relating to this Agreement. All exhibits and attachments to this Agreement are incorporated into the Agreement. If there is a conflict between the terms of this Agreement and any of the exhibits the Agreement governs.

8. The provisions of this Agreement are severable. If a court finds any part of this Agreement void, invalid, or unenforceable, it will not affect the validity and enforceability of the remainder of this Agreement. A waiver by a party of any part of this Agreement is not a waiver of any other part of the Agreement or of a future breach of the Agreement.

9. Any modifications to this Agreement must be in writing as a formal amendment.

10. This Agreement is binding upon and for the benefit of the parties and their successors and assigns. This Agreement is not intended to benefit any third-party.

11. Except as otherwise provided for in this Agreement, the Agreement may be terminated by the mutual agreement of the parties.
12. If a force majeure event occurs, neither party is responsible for a failure to perform or a delay in performance due to the force majeure event. A force majeure event is an event beyond a party’s reasonable control, such as unusually severe weather, fire, floods, other acts of God, labor disputes, acts of war or terrorism, or public health emergencies.

13. Under Minnesota Statutes, Section 16C.05, subdivision 5, the Parties agree that the books, records, documents, and accounting procedures and practices relevant to this Agreement are subject to examination by either Party and the state auditor or legislative auditor, as appropriate, for at least six years from the end of this Agreement.

14. A party must send all notices or demands under this Agreement either by:
   (A) certified mail;
   (B) e-mail, as long as the recipient acknowledges receipt by e-mail or otherwise in writing; or
   (C) delivered in person to the other party addressed to the following authorized representatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Representative</th>
<th>Metropolitan Council Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Villari</td>
<td>City Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council Environmental Services</td>
<td>City of Minnetonka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3565 Kennebec Drive</td>
<td>14600 Minnetonka Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagan, MN 55122</td>
<td>Minnetonka, MN 55345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The parties will use a dispute resolution process for any unresolved dispute between the parties before exercising any legal remedies. The dispute resolution process is a three level dispute resolution ladder that escalates a dispute from the project management level through the executive management level. At each level of the dispute resolution process, the Parties’ representatives will meet and explore resolution until either party determines that effective resolution is not possible at the current level, and notifies the other party that the process is elevated to the next level. The parties designate the following dispute resolution representatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>City Representative</th>
<th>Metropolitan Council Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Project Manager</td>
<td>Manager, Interceptor Project Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>City Engineer</th>
<th>Assistant General Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>City Manager</th>
<th>General Manager, Environmental Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
16. Metropolitan Council and the City are each authorized to enter into this Agreement. This agreement is authorized by the City pursuant to City Resolution No. 15-69, approved on ________________.

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL,
A public corporation and political subdivision
of the State of Minnesota

By: __________________________________
Weston W. Kooistra, Regional Administrator

Date: ________________

CITY OF MINNETONKA
A municipal corporation of the
State of Minnesota

By: ________________

Title: ________________

Date: ________________

and ________________

Title: ________________

Date: ________________
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Exhibit A
City Project and Metropolitan Council Project Locations
2016 Rehabilitation Program
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This map is for illustrative purposes only.
Exhibit B
Council Project Construction Costs Estimates
### 2016 Street Reconstruction Project

| Schedule A: Surface Improvements          | $3,901,804.89 |
| Schedule B: Sanitary Sewer Improvements - City | $608,264.55 |
| Schedule C: Sanitary Sewer Improvements - MCES | $246,472.00 |
| Schedule D: Watermain Improvements        | $1,163,460.00 |
| Schedule E: Storm Sewer Improvements      | $607,835.88 |
| Schedule F: Stormwater Management Improvements | $63,559.50 |
| Bid Alternate 1: Watermain Improvements (DIP) | $676,457.00 |
| **Total**                                 | **$7,267,853.82** |

### MCES Funding

| Schedule C: Sanitary Sewer Improvements - MCES (Construction) | $246,472.00 |
| Indirect Costs (Per Section VII of Agreement)                | $17,253.04 |
| **Total**                                                   | **$263,725.04** |
City Council Agenda Item #13A  
Meeting of July 11, 2016

**Brief Description**  
Temporary on-sale liquor license for The Rotary Club of Excelsior, 5016 Co Rd 101

**Recommendation**  
Hold the public hearing and grant the license

**Background**

The city has received an application for a temporary on-sale liquor license from the Rotary Club of Excelsior (The Rotary Club) for an outdoor fundraising event at Frattalone’s Hardware, 5016 Co Rd 101 (see page A1). The Rotary Club is requesting approval of a temporary liquor license for serving beer, following the Tour de Tonka bike ride on Saturday, August 6, 2016. The “After Party” event will be located in the west parking lot of Frattalone’s Hardware on 101/7. Mike Frattalone has granted permission for the Rotary Club to use the parking lot for the beer tent. (See pages A2-A4).

**The Event**

The dollars raised through the event will go toward Polio Plus, a Rotary initiative to eliminate polio, ICA Food Shelf, and the purchase of materials for a canoe to be built by Urban Boat Builders. The canoe will be donated to Camp Tanadoona to be used by summer campers.

The Rotary Club is hoping to have a successful “After Party” that will add to the fun and fellowship of the community that Tour de Tonka is known for and to make this an annual fundraising event.

The event will take place on Saturday, August 6, 2016 from Noon to 6 p.m. The event will include music, but it has not been determined if it is live music or a DJ. Riders, spectators, volunteers, and the general public are invited to attend. Bike racks, garbage cans, and bathrooms will be provided by the Rotary club.

The outside drinking area will be roped off around the tent, as is required for an outdoor event. Wristbands will be provided to anyone over age 21, provided they have provided the proper identification for proof of age. The Rotary Club volunteers will be responsible for pouring and serving the beer for anyone purchasing beer with a wristband.

Non-alcoholic beverages will also be for sale.
Recommendation

Staff recommends the council hold the public hearing and grant the temporary liquor license in connection with a fundraising event.

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

Originated by:
   Kathy Leervig, Community Development Coordinator
SATURDAY AUGUST 6
NOON to 6pm | Parking Lot of Frattallone's Hardware at 7 and 101

the After Party

CELEBRATE AFTER YOUR RIDE
Music by the BASEMENT KINGS

BEER & POP FOR SALE as FUNDRAISER for

Excelsior Rotary Club
To Whom It May Concern:

As a new fundraiser for our club we wanted to do something that would be local, be fun, and raise money for some of our service projects. Our whole club is very active in the annual Tour de Tonka Bike Ride with members participating and logging many volunteer hours. We came up with doing an “After Party” beer tent on the day of the Tour de Tonka, August 6th. The beer tent would be open to riders, spectators, volunteers and the general public from 12-6. We would offer beer, water and other beverages for purchase in order to raise funds. Feedback from the Tour de Tonka surveys has been that it would be nice to be able to buy a beer after the ride, so our after party would provide that option. We would also have music, which will create a fun, congenial atmosphere.

The After Party would be located in the west section of the parking lot at Frattone’s Hardware Store. We will have a large tent, bike racks, garbage cans, and bathrooms. We will be looking at id’s to hand out wristbands for those over 21. We will feature music—either live or a DJ and have tables and chairs. Our plan to market the after party is to include a flyer in the riders swag bags and also include it on the TDT website and on our Facebook page, etc.

The monies we raise will go toward Polio Plus-- a Rotary initiative to eliminate polio-- the local ICA Food Shelf, and the purchase of materials for a canoe to be built by Urban Boat Builders http://urbanboatbuilders.org/mission/. This canoe will be donated to Camp Tanadoona to be used and enjoyed by summer campers. Urban Boat Builders empowers youth to build life skills needed to succeed in school, work and life through the building of wooden boats.

We hope to have a successful After Party that will add to the fun and fellowship of the community that Tour de Tonka is known for---we also hope that it will become an annual event for our Rotary Club.
City Council Agenda Item #14A  
Meeting of July 11, 2016

**Brief Description:** 2017-2021 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 continue to position the city for the future – our Strategic Vision of what we will become and how we will work. The Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is the city’s plan to provide and maintain facilities, infrastructure and major equipment for the citizens and businesses of Minnetonka within the 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 2017-21 CIP funds $112.6 million of capital projects over the next five years. This amount is only 0.9 percent higher than last year’s CIP, and reflects the city’s ongoing commitment to needed road and storm sewer infrastructure improvements as well as increasing requirements of aging utility systems that must be positioned to accommodate the city’s current and future needs. Additionally, the plan includes a modest expansion of the city’s continuing efforts to meet growing citizen expectations for alternative transportation modes through its trails system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP ($000’s)</th>
<th>2014-18</th>
<th>2015-19</th>
<th>2016-20</th>
<th>2017-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
<td>$55,473</td>
<td>$45,793</td>
<td>$49,545</td>
<td>$44,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sewer &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>$21,875</td>
<td>$33,805</td>
<td>$34,131</td>
<td>$37,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Rec &amp; Trails</td>
<td>$7,201</td>
<td>$7,265</td>
<td>$8,015</td>
<td>$10,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$14,537</td>
<td>$16,258</td>
<td>$16,411</td>
<td>$15,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>$2,417</td>
<td>$2,707</td>
<td>$3,488</td>
<td>$4,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CIP</td>
<td>$101,503</td>
<td>$105,828</td>
<td>$111,590</td>
<td>$112,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Streets continue to be the largest city investment, still accounting for around 40 percent of the total five-year CIP. Nonetheless, beginning in 2015, water, sewer and storm water infrastructure has become the other most significant outlay within the capital program. The utility infrastructure costs account for one-third of the total plan. Annual street improvement funding and much of the major water, sewer and storm water expenditures vary with project scheduling. Projects include: Crosby Road street, water/sewer utility and storm sewer improvements in 2017 as well as Lake Street Extension, Oakland Road, Cedar Lake Road, Hillside Lane, Lindberg Drive, and Ridgemount Avenue street preservation efforts; 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 the Ridgedale Mall area, including Ridgehaven Lane and Plymouth Road (2017) and Ridgedale Drive (2019).
Higher funding over last year’s CIP for parks, recreation and trails reflects an added emphasis to meet growing community demand for an improved and expanded trail system. Traditionally, these projects were primarily scheduled to coincide with major county or state road projects. The recommended 2017-21 CIP includes the first of a number of high priority trail segments along roads for which the county and state have no plans in the next significant number of years to improve or reconstruct.

2017-21 CIP Highlights

**Major road projects.** The 2017-21 CIP continues to dedicate significant funding to a number of critical road improvement projects that were previously included in the prior capital budgets, sometimes unfunded. Although primarily financed with the city’s own revenue sources, the city continues to use various tools to diversify funding sources, including consideration of developer partnerships, county participation, overlying road improvement districts, its franchise agreements, and any applicable grants.

Water and sewer utility costs for a number of the projects are estimated to be significant, and they have been incorporated into the bonding and rate plan adopted by the council last fall. Pivotal to all of these road improvements are the associated rights-of-way acquisitions and their relationship with expansion of the city’s pedestrian and bikeway trails system.

Plans within the CIP for major Road, infrastructure, lighting, and associated pedestrian/biking improvements include: the **Ridgedale area** ($19.4 million), **SWLRT – Shady Oak** including the 17th Street extension ($1.5 million), **Opus Area** ($10.6 million with an additional $3 million from state bridge funds awaiting state action), and continuation of the city’s **road preservation program** using both outside contractors as well as in-house staff ($9.0 million).

The increasing complexity, intensity, public communication needs and fiscal oversight of work associated with these larger long-term projects and ongoing trail build-out has and will continue to have an impact on city staffing resources. Therefore, financial forecasts incorporated with the CIP anticipate the city will require additional operating resources including staffing to be discussed further during operating budget deliberations in the fall.

**Significant utilities & local street projects.** At the heels of several study sessions regarding critical maintenance of the city’s $500 million water and sewer system assets, the city council reviewed and adopted a long range water and sanitary sewer infrastructure plan along with an associated financing plan in 2015. Last year was the first year of the plan, and the city adopted a first-year increase in customer rates effective in January 2016 to support the plan. In June, the city sold bonds to finance the water and sewer capital costs in begun in 2015 as well as work in 2016 and a portion of 2017 projects.
Unlike the vast majority of our comparable cities, Minnetonka does not specially assess residents for a portion of the street, storm water, and utility replacement expenses. Instead, costs are spread across all taxpayers and rate payers. The council affirmed that practice when establishing the future plan for system upgrades.

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 funded in the CIP are 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 2016 capital budget funded significant local road reconstruction, rehabilitation and preservation as well as water main replacement costs in the Libb’s Lake and Gray’s Bay Boulevard area and for Oakland Road. At a total five-year cost of almost $28 million, the 2017-21 CIP continues targeted reconstruction, storm water system construction and water system replacement for Crosby Road in 2017 and Woodhill Road in 2018. A couple of the most expensive projects, those targeting the Tonka-Woodcroft neighborhood and Groveland Road/Bay Street local street areas, are scheduled just beyond the current five-year CIP horizon and are shown in the CIP as unfunded but scheduled for 2022 and 2023.

Other roads currently scheduled for reconstruction and/or storm water system improvements as part of the total five-year budget previously mentioned include: Parkers Lake Road (2020), Twelve Oaks Center Drive (2020), Groveland-Bay area (2021). Roads scheduled for mill and overlay during the five years currently include: Lake Street Extension (2017), Oakland Road (2017), Cedar Lake Road (2017), Hillside Lane (2017), Lindberg Drive (2017), Ridgemount Avenue (2017), Ford Road (2018), Williston Road (2018), Highland Road (2019), Minnetonka Mills Road (2020), and Rowland Road (2020).

Trail system. “Renewing, expanding and maintaining a trail system to encourage outdoor recreation, and improve connectivity and walkability of the community,” is a key strategy in the city’s Strategic Profile. Minnetonka has a longstanding chronicle of planning for trails. At its April 18 study session, council reviewed a history of the city’s trail system planning as well as a reprioritization of needed trail segments, which was the outcome of a cross-departmental city staff task force. At its June 20 study session, the council went over recent public input and testimony including responses from the city’s annual community survey that specifically address the city’s trail system and clearly demonstrate community support for its expansion and improvement.

The 2017-21 CIP provides funding for an additional 5.5 miles of new trails and walks including buildout of the trailway along Plymouth Road from Wayzata Boulevard to Sherwood Place in 2017 and from Minnetonka Boulevard to Hilloway Road in 2019. Another segment to be completed is along Woodhill Road from Atrium Way to Highway
7, which is planned for purposes of cost savings and customer service efficiencies to synchronize with road reconstruction at that location in 2018. Other segments to be constructed within the current five-year program are: 2017 Crosby Road (Portico to Wayzata city limits), 2019 Smetana Road (Westbrooke Way to Sanibel Drive), and 2020 Parkers Lake Road (Twelve Oaks Drive to Plymouth city limits).

The remaining needed trail segments are identified as unfunded in this capital budget. However, because the council recognizes the public safety needs associated with many of these trail segments, it intends further deliberation on identifying a dedicated funding source to support their construction. Staff will continue to work with any partners that can be found to help finance the currently unscheduled segments, including but not limited to Hennepin County, Met Council, landowners via right-of-way donations and developers. Additionally, the city will consider all other potential financial sources through efficiencies such as undergrounding electrical lines along the newly added trail segments at the same time the trails are to be built.

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 a core component of Minnetonka's assets. In addition to trails and the previously mentioned Ridgedale area park improvements, a number of projects related to recreational facilities are incorporated within the 2017-21 capital plan.

The 2017-21 CIP incorporates funding for the expansion of dedicated courts for pickleball, which is one of the fastest growing sports in the nation, state and the Minnetonka community. Currently, pickleball players have scheduled times for play at Meadow Park, but share the location with tennis. With a budget of $310,000 from the Parks & Trails Improvement Fund in 2018, staff is currently working through the park board with a group of Minnetonka residents to find the additional suitable locations.

At its May 23 meeting, the city council voted to support positive consideration of a new mini-park in the Robinwood neighborhood based on testimony at that meeting, park board recommendations, feedback from two neighborhood meetings and a feasibility study. Therefore, the 2017-21 CIP also includes funding the project at a cost of $105,000 in 2020 from the Parks & Trails Improvement Fund.

Public Safety. At last year's CIP study session, the council was updated on major improvements that have been completed at the city's central and four satellite fire stations. The 2017-21 CIP incorporates a schedule of ongoing facility maintenance and improvements over the next five-year period. At a total cost of $455,000 over that time, the projects cover all four outer fire stations and include HVAC and water boilers in 2018, technology and security upgrades in 2019 as well as roofing and window repairs in 2020 and 2021.

The 2016 capital budget also provided funding for a public safety facility study that will examine police and fire operational space needs and provide recommendations for
future capital improvements. The project will begin shortly and is anticipated to be completed in approximately sixteen weeks. Results of the study will then be presented to council this fall. After council review, costs for a public safety facility improvement project can then be inserted into the next CIP with anticipated available funding in 2019. The 2017-21 CIP includes a placeholder for the project with no specific amount or source of funds identified.

The Minnesota State Legislature has passed legislation on the use of and retention of data captured by police body worn cameras while on duty. The proposed 2017-21 CIP provides $70,000 from the Public Safety Fund and the city's DWI Forfeiture Account for their purchase very tentatively programed for 2019. Although the estimated cost of this equipment is not significant, the impact of this on operating costs will likely be substantial. Records administration and technology staff time for responding to public information requests is anticipated to be great. Therefore, financial forecasts incorporated with the CIP anticipate the city will require additional operating resources at the time any such evidence gathering technology is implemented.

**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 2017-21 capital plan – unfunded trail segments ($63 million in 2017 dollars), public safety facility improvements (cost unknown at this time), Glen Lake Activity Center facility improvements (currently slated at $2.5 million), and Big Willow Park enhancements (currently programmed at $1.8 million).

### CIP funding

![CIP Funding Sources](image)
Almost one-half of the recommended 2017-21 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. Local taxes traditionally support investments in streets, parks and trails, public buildings and equipment. User fees support capital costs of the utilities, and the budget includes utility fee-supported proceeds from revenue bonds to be sold over the five years. Other city funds include franchise fees, the Development Fund, 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 and Hopkins School District partnerships.

**Property taxes.** As directed by council, the 2017-21 CIP includes a 1.0 percent increase in property taxes for essential capital equipment and technology in 2017. Another increase in 2018 was already programmed as part of the adopted 2016-20 CIP and is associated with planned road reconstruction. After the first two years, property taxes for the final three years of the 2017-21 CIP is to remain nearly flat.

**Bonding/User Fees.** Minnetonka has traditionally used its bonding authority very discreetly, and the city maintains lower debt than most cities by using pay-as-you-go financing for streets and capital purchases and improvements. The few exceptions to this rule of thumb have been for water and sewer infrastructure, which is supported with user fee revenue, and a voter referendum passed in 2001 for open space and parks. This responsible financial baseline is a primary contributor to the city’s Aaa bond rating as well as its citation as one of the nation’s most financially resilient communities.

The 2017-21 CIP currently anticipates the sale of around $33 million in additional revenue bonds to finance the city’s multi-year, strategic water and sewer infrastructure plan. The final total of such bonds may vary, depending upon refined engineering estimates as well as actual construction timing and experience.

**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 2015 ended with a positive balance greater than in past years, and therefore, by the end of 2015, the GF fund balance had approximately $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 and already programmed in the current 2016-20 CIP. The 2017-21 CIP anticipates transferring for capital expenditures nearly $3.7 million of that total over the five years. (Another $555,000 of the balance is already adopted for use as part of the 2016 budget.) The remainder will ensure there is adequate fund balance to meet needs over that period for projected rising operating costs in the General Fund itself.

Transferred portions of the GF fund balance are targeted for essential equipment supported by the Capital Replacement Fund and Technology Fund as well as to finance build-out of the highest priority trail for public safety purposes, along Plymouth Road, using the Park & Trail Improvement Fund.

**Park Dedication fees.** Per state statute authorities and city ordinance, the city may require land or charge a park dedication fee for new developments and redevelopments related to the added demands and expectations for park, recreation, 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.

Forecasted revenues from this source ($70,000 annually over the five-year period) is responsibly based upon historical experience, which has varied from $15,000 in 2009, $25,000 in 2014 and a high of $375,000 in 2012. These actual revenues are directly related to the residential density and distinct characteristics of the projects in any given year. In 2015 and 2016, several key high density projects have not yet been finalized, and only conservative portions of the park dedication fees to be derived from those projects are safely assumed to be available to fund the 2017-21 CIP. Additional
information on some of those fees will be available later this year for discussion during the 2017 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.

**Community Investment Fund.** Although improving since the Great Recession, continued slower than historic rates of return on investments is projected to render the Community Investment Fund (CIF) as unavailable for significant projects in the near future. As a result, less than two percent of total resources funding the five-year CIP are from earnings in the CIF. These funds are allocated in this CIP for the final year of the Minnehaha Creek Corridor project (2017) and payback (2018-2020) of an interfund loan spent in 2015 to make the city’s ice arena compliant with the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standard for refrigerants effective in 2020.

**Summary**

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. This 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 2017-21 Capital Improvements Program.

Submitted through:

Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager

Originated by:

Merrill King, Finance Director
Resolution No. 2016-
Resolution Adopting the 2017-2021 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 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program was presented for consideration to and discussed by the City Council on April 18, 2016 and June 20, 2016.

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 July 11, 2016 provides for an effective and orderly allocation of resources for the community’s needs.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. That the 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program as discussed, amended and attached to the agenda packet of the City Council meeting of July 11, 2016 is hereby adopted.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on July 11, 2016.

______________________________
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 July 11, 2016.

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
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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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>$895,000</td>
<td>$895,000</td>
<td>$710,000</td>
<td>$745,000</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td>$4,075,000</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>$384,500</td>
<td>$1,254,500</td>
<td>$1,349,500</td>
<td>$899,500</td>
<td>$695,000</td>
<td>$4,583,000</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Trails and Open Space</td>
<td>$1,074,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$2,615,000</td>
<td>$1,015,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$6,224,000</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Equipment</td>
<td>$3,251,100</td>
<td>$3,789,300</td>
<td>$3,188,700</td>
<td>$2,840,000</td>
<td>$2,868,600</td>
<td>$15,937,700</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements*</td>
<td>$12,907,000</td>
<td>$9,563,000</td>
<td>$10,269,000</td>
<td>$4,769,000</td>
<td>$6,874,000</td>
<td>$44,382,000</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drainage Improvements*</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$930,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$1,410,000</td>
<td>$5,940,000</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer System Imp*</td>
<td>$7,571,000</td>
<td>$8,757,000</td>
<td>$7,760,000</td>
<td>$2,996,000</td>
<td>$4,343,000</td>
<td>$31,427,000</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$27,382,600</td>
<td>$26,758,800</td>
<td>$26,822,200</td>
<td>$14,164,500</td>
<td>$17,440,600</td>
<td>$112,568,700</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Road Projects</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Method of Financing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes †</td>
<td>$12,249,600</td>
<td>$12,210,100</td>
<td>$9,762,500</td>
<td>$8,456,900</td>
<td>$9,457,400</td>
<td>$52,136,500</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>$9,729,800</td>
<td>$11,833,100</td>
<td>$9,365,100</td>
<td>$4,261,100</td>
<td>$6,376,700</td>
<td>$41,565,800</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other **</td>
<td>$2,590,700</td>
<td>$1,636,400</td>
<td>$2,041,000</td>
<td>$838,000</td>
<td>$1,464,500</td>
<td>$8,570,600</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal City Funding</strong></td>
<td>$24,720,100</td>
<td>$26,179,600</td>
<td>$21,668,600</td>
<td>$14,006,000</td>
<td>$17,298,600</td>
<td>$103,872,900</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funding</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ***</td>
<td>$162,500</td>
<td>$79,200</td>
<td>$153,600</td>
<td>$158,500</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>$695,800</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Funding</strong></td>
<td>$2,662,500</td>
<td>$579,200</td>
<td>$5,153,600</td>
<td>$158,500</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>$8,695,800</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Method of Financing</strong></td>
<td>$27,382,600</td>
<td>$26,758,800</td>
<td>$26,822,200</td>
<td>$14,164,500</td>
<td>$17,440,600</td>
<td>$112,568,700</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Amounts are budgeted costs, not levy levels.
* Includes city portions of Hennepin County road projects.
** Includes franchise fees, Development Fund, Grants and forfeiture/seizure fines.
*** 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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$1,730,000</td>
<td>$2,230,000</td>
<td>$1,830,000</td>
<td>$1,830,000</td>
<td>$2,045,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In/Out</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>2,500</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><strong>$2,132,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,635,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,235,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,235,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,450,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

#### Municipal Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation Measures</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Building Components</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Roof Replacements</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm Panel Upgrades</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Automation Replacement</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Improvements</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station Refurbishment</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Fencing</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>Salt Dome Panels</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>

#### Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh Center Improvements</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$58,000</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>$220,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dump/Plow Truck Replacements</td>
<td>$258,500</td>
<td>$266,300</td>
<td>$548,600</td>
<td>$300,100</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Vehicles</td>
<td>541,100</td>
<td>604,600</td>
<td>459,500</td>
<td>690,800</td>
<td>1,056,800</td>
<td>1,056,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch Truck</td>
<td>228,500</td>
<td>228,500</td>
<td>228,500</td>
<td>228,500</td>
<td>228,500</td>
<td>228,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidsteer</td>
<td>50,700</td>
<td>78,800</td>
<td>78,800</td>
<td>78,800</td>
<td>78,800</td>
<td>78,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial Bucket Truck</td>
<td>162,700</td>
<td>162,700</td>
<td>162,700</td>
<td>162,700</td>
<td>162,700</td>
<td>162,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk &amp; Trail Maintenance Vehicle</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Pump &amp; Leak Detection Replacement</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>Snow Blower</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Flusher Truck</td>
<td>183,600</td>
<td>183,600</td>
<td>183,600</td>
<td>183,600</td>
<td>183,600</td>
<td>183,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Ice Resurfacer</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>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paver</td>
<td>172,400</td>
<td>172,400</td>
<td>172,400</td>
<td>172,400</td>
<td>172,400</td>
<td>172,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expenditures

| Total Expenditures                     | $1,942,800 | $2,166,400 | $1,990,100 | $2,196,500 | $2,509,200 | $0         |

### Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures

| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures | $189,700 | $468,600 | $244,900 | $38,500 | $(59,200) |

### Estimated Beginning Fund Balance

| Estimated Beginning Fund Balance       | (274,221) | (84,521) | 384,079 | 628,979 | 667,479 |

### Estimated Ending Fund Balance

| Estimated Ending Fund Balance          | $(84,521) | 384,079  | 628,979 | 667,479 | 608,279 |

### Fund Balance Guideline

<p>| Fund Balance Guideline                 | $541,600  | $497,500 | $549,100 | $627,300 | $540,300 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</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>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$650,500</td>
<td>$651,000</td>
<td>$652,000</td>
<td>$652,500</td>
<td>$655,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Device Purchase</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Truck Program</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire JPA SCBA Program</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Rescue Equipment</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumper Truck Replacement</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$495,000</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>Microwave Radios</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Cameras</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Technology Updates</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air 2 Refurbishment</td>
<td>332,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police In-Car Video System</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Mhz Radio Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; Command Vehicle</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Facility Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ XXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$841,100</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>$627,600</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures

($190,600)  $26,000  $24,400  $77,500  $325,500

**Estimated Beginning Fund Balance**

216,140  25,540  51,540  75,940  153,440

**Estimated Ending Fund Balance**

$25,540  $51,540  $75,940  $153,440  $478,940

Fund Balance Guideline

$468,800  $470,700  $431,300  $247,500  $449,800

* $100,000 per year in property tax-related revenue is from an annual source that will no longer be available after 2022.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest on Investments</strong></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenue</strong></td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$357,500</td>
<td>$382,500</td>
<td>$407,500</td>
<td>$432,500</td>
<td>$338,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects of General Public Benefit:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Minnehaha Creek Corridor</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Arena Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Open Space Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Lake Activity Center Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Willow Park Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$207,500</td>
<td>($117,500)</td>
<td>($92,500)</td>
<td>($17,500)</td>
<td>$338,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>20,014,844</td>
<td>20,222,344</td>
<td>20,104,844</td>
<td>20,012,344</td>
<td>19,994,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$20,222,344</td>
<td>$20,104,844</td>
<td>$20,012,344</td>
<td>$19,994,844</td>
<td>$20,332,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>19,871,203</td>
<td>19,891,203</td>
<td>19,913,703</td>
<td>19,938,703</td>
<td>19,966,203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$351,141</td>
<td>$213,641</td>
<td>$98,641</td>
<td>$56,141</td>
<td>$366,641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 for repayment of a portion of the Williston Center improvement project constructed in 2010-11.
### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Fees</td>
<td>$1,591,000</td>
<td>$1,591,000</td>
<td>$1,591,000</td>
<td>$1,710,300</td>
<td>$1,710,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court Fees</td>
<td>682,500</td>
<td>682,500</td>
<td>716,600</td>
<td>716,600</td>
<td>716,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>331,000</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$2,686,000</td>
<td>$2,686,500</td>
<td>$2,742,600</td>
<td>$2,862,900</td>
<td>$2,862,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

#### Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$2,078,000</td>
<td>$2,146,600</td>
<td>$2,217,500</td>
<td>$2,290,700</td>
<td>$2,366,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out - Indirect Costs</td>
<td>87,100</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>96,100</td>
<td>99,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$2,165,100</td>
<td>$2,236,600</td>
<td>$2,310,500</td>
<td>$2,386,800</td>
<td>$2,465,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capital Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williston Center Improvements</td>
<td>$234,500</td>
<td>$409,500</td>
<td>$424,500</td>
<td>$199,500</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$234,500</td>
<td>$409,500</td>
<td>$424,500</td>
<td>$199,500</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$2,399,600</td>
<td>$2,646,100</td>
<td>$2,735,000</td>
<td>$2,586,300</td>
<td>$2,960,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</td>
<td>$286,400</td>
<td>$40,400</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
<td>$276,600</td>
<td>($97,700)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Beginning Cash Reserve**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Beginning Cash Reserve</td>
<td>1,022,118</td>
<td>1,308,518</td>
<td>1,348,918</td>
<td>1,356,518</td>
<td>1,633,118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Ending Cash Reserve**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Ending Cash Reserve</td>
<td>$1,308,518</td>
<td>$1,348,918</td>
<td>$1,356,518</td>
<td>$1,633,118</td>
<td>$1,535,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cash Reserve Target - 20% Accumulated Depreciation & 3 mos. WC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Reserve Target - 20% Accumulated Depreciation &amp; 3 mos. WC</td>
<td>$1,296,700</td>
<td>$1,374,400</td>
<td>$1,452,700</td>
<td>$1,531,600</td>
<td>$1,611,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Target Achieved</td>
<td>100.9%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>106.6%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table VI  
CIP 2017-2021  
PARK & TRAIL IMPROVEMENT FUND  
Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

#### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>385,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income (includes Field Fees)</td>
<td>209,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Dedication Fees</td>
<td>70,000</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>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$1,232,100</td>
<td>$647,100</td>
<td>$2,197,100</td>
<td>$647,100</td>
<td>$647,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burwell House/City Housing</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$728,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Investment Plan</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Improvement Plan</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Rehabilitation</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Trail Connections</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Field Improvements</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak Beach Improvements</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation Measures</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Automation Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purgatory Park Improvements</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure (trails)</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinwood Park Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Family Park Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Area Park Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area Park Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Segments - Unscheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63,280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$728,500</td>
<td>$881,800</td>
<td>$2,493,400</td>
<td>$763,500</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$65,126,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (deficiency)</td>
<td>503,600</td>
<td>(234,700)</td>
<td>(296,300)</td>
<td>(116,400)</td>
<td>387,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Beginning Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>287,365</td>
<td>790,965</td>
<td>556,265</td>
<td>259,965</td>
<td>143,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Ending Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Athletic Field Capital Maintenance</td>
<td>71,655</td>
<td>81,255</td>
<td>90,855</td>
<td>100,455</td>
<td>110,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Available Ending Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>$719,310</td>
<td>$475,010</td>
<td>$169,110</td>
<td>$43,110</td>
<td>$420,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fund Balance Guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance Guideline</td>
<td>$290,994</td>
<td>$822,822</td>
<td>$251,955</td>
<td>$85,800</td>
<td>$338,395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Available balance excludes $250,000 reserved cash for Gray’s Bay Causeway, which will not be expended until 2016 or later.
### Table VII

**CIP 2017-2021**  
**FORESTRY FUND**  
Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$41,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funding Sources**  
- $62,000  
- $68,000  
- $68,000  
- $93,000  
- $93,000

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Ash Borer Program</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**  
- $154,000  
- $160,000  
- $160,000  
- $160,000  
- $160,000

**Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures**  
- ($92,000)  
- ($92,000)  
- ($92,000)  
- ($67,000)  
- ($67,000)

**Estimated Beginning Fund Balance**  
- 759,805  
- 667,805  
- 575,805  
- 483,805  
- 416,805

**Estimated Ending Fund Balance**  
- $667,805  
- $575,805  
- $483,805  
- $416,805  
- $349,805
Table VIII  
CIP 2017-2021  
MUNICIPAL STATE AID FUND  
Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Allotment</td>
<td>$2,178,700</td>
<td>$2,178,700</td>
<td>$2,178,700</td>
<td>$2,178,700</td>
<td>$2,178,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,178,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,178,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,178,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,178,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,178,700</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Expenditures</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total Capital Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Road</td>
<td>1,500,000</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></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></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></td>
<td>6,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Major Road Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MSA Bond Debt Service*                | 169,463 | 164,775 | 184,525 | 173,809 | 173,000 |                          |
| **Total Expenditures**                | **$2,669,463** | **$664,775** | **$5,184,525** | **$173,809** | **$173,000** | **$30,300,000** |

Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures

| Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures | ($490,763) | $1,513,925 | ($3,005,825) | $2,004,891 | $2,005,700 |
| Estimated Beginning Available Allotment | (107,980) | (598,743) | 915,182 | (2,090,643) | (85,752) |
| Estimated Ending Available Allotment | ($598,743) | $915,182 | ($2,090,643) | ($85,752) | $1,919,948 |

* 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.
### Table IX
CIP 2017-2021
STREET IMPROVEMENT FUND
Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>$6,200,000</td>
<td>$6,400,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>567,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>502,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$6,777,500</td>
<td>$6,407,500</td>
<td>$6,522,500</td>
<td>$7,022,500</td>
<td>$6,522,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>$11,200,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>$42,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Preservation</td>
<td>1,615,000</td>
<td>1,670,000</td>
<td>1,725,000</td>
<td>1,725,000</td>
<td>1,780,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Rehabilitation</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd</td>
<td>400,000</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></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>$8,157,000</td>
<td>$7,813,000</td>
<td>$3,569,000</td>
<td>$4,269,000</td>
<td>$5,724,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>$7,170,570</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</strong></td>
<td>($1,379,500)</td>
<td>($1,405,500)</td>
<td>$2,953,500</td>
<td>$2,753,500</td>
<td>$798,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>3,450,070</td>
<td>2,070,570</td>
<td>665,070</td>
<td>3,618,570</td>
<td>6,372,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$2,070,570</td>
<td>$665,070</td>
<td>$3,618,570</td>
<td>$6,372,070</td>
<td>$7,170,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance Guideline</td>
<td>$1,953,250</td>
<td>$892,250</td>
<td>$1,067,250</td>
<td>$1,431,000</td>
<td>$3,156,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>Electric Franchise Fees</td>
<td>$813,000</td>
<td>$813,000</td>
<td>$813,000</td>
<td>$813,000</td>
<td>$813,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$833,000</td>
<td>$833,000</td>
<td>$828,000</td>
<td>$833,000</td>
<td>$833,000</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><strong>Other Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Systems Enhancements</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>100,000</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>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Drive Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$2,260,000</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
<td>$1,710,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$1,160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</strong></td>
<td>($1,427,000)</td>
<td>($427,000)</td>
<td>($882,000)</td>
<td>$323,000</td>
<td>($327,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>3,044,238</td>
<td>1,617,238</td>
<td>1,190,238</td>
<td>308,238</td>
<td>631,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$1,617,238</td>
<td>$1,190,238</td>
<td>$308,238</td>
<td>$631,238</td>
<td>$304,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance Guideline</strong></td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$427,500</td>
<td>$127,500</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer Utility Fees</td>
<td>$2,530,000</td>
<td>$2,614,700</td>
<td>$2,702,300</td>
<td>$2,792,800</td>
<td>$2,886,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,542,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,624,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,717,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,812,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,906,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

**Operating Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$762,100</td>
<td>$787,200</td>
<td>$813,100</td>
<td>$839,900</td>
<td>$867,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>174,800</td>
<td>180,600</td>
<td>186,600</td>
<td>192,800</td>
<td>199,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$936,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$967,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$999,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,032,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,066,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>$4,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer Risk Assessment</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Sweeper</td>
<td>202,600</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Sewer Cleaner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgedale Drive Improvements</td>
<td>282,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie Point Rd Storm Sewer</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd/CR 61 (Cedar Lk Rd to Hilloway Rd)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Crossroad/CR 73 (Cedar Lk Rd to I-394)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,502,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,911,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$987,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$900,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,410,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>$4,400,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
<td>($254,300)</td>
<td>$730,200</td>
<td>$880,100</td>
<td>$429,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,560,880</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,663,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,409,080</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,139,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,019,380</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,663,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,409,080</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,139,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,019,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,448,880</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Reserve Target - 5% accumulated depreciation &amp; 3 mos. WC</td>
<td>$1,517,800</td>
<td>$1,669,700</td>
<td>$1,626,200</td>
<td>$1,517,100</td>
<td>$2,342,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent target achieved</td>
<td>109.6%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>131.6%</td>
<td>199.0%</td>
<td>147.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table XII
**CIP 2017-2021**
**UTILITY FUND**

### Funding Sources and Expenditure Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>$7,666,000</td>
<td>$7,753,000</td>
<td>$10,580,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sales &amp; Sewer Services</td>
<td>13,697,500</td>
<td>14,419,900</td>
<td>15,180,400</td>
<td>15,981,000</td>
<td>16,823,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>116,600</td>
<td>138,600</td>
<td>155,600</td>
<td>162,500</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hookup Fees</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>167,900</td>
<td>172,900</td>
<td>178,100</td>
<td>183,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>457,800</td>
<td>465,700</td>
<td>473,800</td>
<td>482,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>$22,093,100</td>
<td>$22,937,200</td>
<td>$26,554,600</td>
<td>$19,795,400</td>
<td>$22,058,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$5,693,400</td>
<td>$5,843,700</td>
<td>$5,998,300</td>
<td>$6,157,300</td>
<td>$6,320,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Service Charge</td>
<td>4,284,100</td>
<td>4,541,200</td>
<td>4,813,600</td>
<td>5,102,500</td>
<td>5,408,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,435,305</td>
<td>2,019,153</td>
<td>2,614,608</td>
<td>3,432,319</td>
<td>3,553,607</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>$12,513,305</td>
<td>$13,537,553</td>
<td>$14,594,008</td>
<td>$15,894,619</td>
<td>$16,521,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Improvements</strong></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>50,000</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water System Sustainability Imp.</td>
<td>791,000</td>
<td>832,000</td>
<td>3,035,000</td>
<td>196,000</td>
<td>1,013,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hydrant Program</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Watermain Break Excavation Pile</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Station Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$130,000</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 Forcemain Lining</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street-related Utility Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Preservation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Area LRT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>550,000</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><strong>Major Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Roof Replacements</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Vehicles</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>153,200</td>
<td>115,600</td>
<td>103,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump/Plow Truck Replacements</td>
<td>274,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>311,600</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>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Warning Sirens</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$7,992,700</td>
<td>$9,512,400</td>
<td>$7,953,200</td>
<td>$3,151,600</td>
<td>$4,471,700</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$1,587,095</td>
<td>($112,753)</td>
<td>$4,007,392</td>
<td>$749,181</td>
<td>$1,064,993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Beginning Cash Reserve</strong></td>
<td>11,657,634</td>
<td>13,244,729</td>
<td>13,131,976</td>
<td>17,139,368</td>
<td>17,888,549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Ending Cash Reserve</strong></td>
<td>$13,244,729</td>
<td>$13,131,976</td>
<td>$17,139,368</td>
<td>$17,888,549</td>
<td>$18,953,542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve Target (6 mos. WC + debt svc)</td>
<td>$8,007,900</td>
<td>$7,807,100</td>
<td>$8,838,300</td>
<td>$9,304,800</td>
<td>$10,227,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Reserve Target (10% accumulated deprec)</td>
<td>8,734,800</td>
<td>8,734,800</td>
<td>8,734,800</td>
<td>8,734,800</td>
<td>8,734,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash Reserve Target</strong></td>
<td>$16,742,700</td>
<td>$16,541,900</td>
<td>$17,573,100</td>
<td>$18,039,600</td>
<td>$18,961,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% target achieved</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fee</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>24,000</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>$938,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$938,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$940,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$942,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$943,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

#### Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$702,200</td>
<td>$725,400</td>
<td>$749,400</td>
<td>$774,200</td>
<td>$799,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>32,300</td>
<td>33,400</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$734,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$758,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$784,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$810,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$836,800</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capital Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio/Visual Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>$89,700</td>
<td>$61,400</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Educ &amp; Govt (PEG) Expenses</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>Technology Infrastructure</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Equipment</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$340,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$261,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$291,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$173,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$314,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,075,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,020,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,075,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$983,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,151,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>($136,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Beginning Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,685,546</td>
<td>1,548,846</td>
<td>1,467,146</td>
<td>1,332,646</td>
<td>1,292,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Ending Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,548,846</td>
<td>1,467,146</td>
<td>1,332,646</td>
<td>1,292,146</td>
<td>1,084,346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dedicated Future Transition Reserve*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>920,200</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>983,000</td>
<td>1,051,300</td>
<td>1,082,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Ending Available Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$628,646</strong></td>
<td><strong>$492,146</strong></td>
<td><strong>$349,646</strong></td>
<td><strong>$240,846</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,546</strong></td>
<td></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>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$581,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$581,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$581,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$580,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$581,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment</td>
<td>$118,500</td>
<td>$135,600</td>
<td>$30,300</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$87,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Purchases/Upgrades</td>
<td>$307,700</td>
<td>$360,300</td>
<td>$777,100</td>
<td>$355,900</td>
<td>$327,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Equipment</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$58,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$426,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$563,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$872,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$460,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$474,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surplus (deficiency) of funding sources over (under) expenditures</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$154,800</td>
<td>$17,100</td>
<td>($291,400)</td>
<td>$120,100</td>
<td>$106,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,784</td>
<td>172,584</td>
<td>189,684</td>
<td>(101,716)</td>
<td>18,384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$172,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>$189,684</strong></td>
<td><strong>(101,716)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,384</strong></td>
<td><strong>$125,184</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$140,975</td>
<td>$218,100</td>
<td>$115,100</td>
<td>$118,550</td>
<td>$139,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Category:** Municipal Building  
**Project Title:** Security Fencing  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $50,000  
**Funding Priority:** 1  
**Account Number:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>

**Description:**  
This item provides for perimeter security fencing around the police department vehicle parking and emergency vehicle parking area on the south side of the building. The fence would be architectural metal in design in order to match the texture of the building.

**Justification:**  
Enhance safety and security by limiting the public’s access to the emergency vehicle parking area, garages, and employee entrance to the Police Department.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**  
Installation of the fencing will occur in the summer/fall in the funding year.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**  
This project is in keeping with providing a safe and secure work environment. The public safety facilities study may impact this project as it may address the security issues through design.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**  
This project would have little effect on operating costs initially, however there would be some long term maintenance costs.
Project Category: Municipal Buildings

Project Title: Alarm Panel Upgrades

Total Estimated Cost: $150,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S17108

Description:
This item funds the design of a reporting backbone and the replacement of the obsolete fire panels in the city’s major buildings.

Source of Project Funding | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Capital Replacement Fund | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000

Justification:
A number of the city’s building fire panels are in need of replacement because they are functionally obsolete. In addition, the mechanism to transmit and receive notifications is deficient and in need of improvement. Rather than purchase an “off the shelf” product that is extremely expensive, staff has designed a system that utilizes the city’s fiber system and sends all alarms to police dispatch for 24-hour monitoring.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The project is consistent with current technology and the policy of maintaining the city’s infrastructure.

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. Fire stations 3, 4 and 5 are the next buildings to be connected to the system.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project does not increase annual operating costs.
Project Category: Municipal Buildings
Project Title: Energy Conservation Measures
Total Estimated Cost: $155,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S17106

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,000</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>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Bay Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
This item provides for the continued upgrade/replacement of energy consuming equipment such as light fixtures, ballasts, occupancy sensors, insulation, weather stripping, set-back thermostats and similar equipment that will save energy expense.

**Justification:**
Electric rate increases of 4 to 9% have been sought by Xcel from the Public Utilities Commission on an intermittent schedule. While fuel and natural gas are enjoying a period of low 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.

Because LED lighting is becoming more mainstream, emphasis on LED replacements are supported through both life cycle cost and rate of return analysis.

**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.

2017: Florescent to LED change outs
   Ice Arenas A & B
2018: City Hall Administration, Big Willow Soccer
2019: Police, Fire Departments, Park Shelter Restrooms
2020: Office Lighting, Grays Bay Marina
2021: Utility Building Lighting

**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: $625,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4111.XXXX.S17102

Description:
This item provides for the replacement or emergency repair of various major building components including: life safety equipment, low-voltage control or notification, heating, ventilation or cooling equipment, fire sprinkler systems, building envelope & sub-systems and structural repair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This item provides funding for individual department work space initiatives, deferred maintenance and the following specific scheduled repairs/replacements:

2017:
- Police Flooring – Pending PS Study Outcome
- Fire #1 boilers (3) – Pending PS Study Outcome
- Ice Arena Automated Front Entry Doors
- Service Doors

2018:
- Meadow Park heat
- Clean building ducts
- Public Works RTU #4

2019:
- Central fire generator – Pending PS Study
- Floor coverings – Civic Center

2020:
- Fleet Services epoxy floor re-coat

2021:
- City Hall air handling unit and masonry 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: $475,000  
Funding Priority: 2  
Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S17104

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.

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$70,000</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, and reduction in energy consumption & operating costs, and improve life cycle of major equipment.

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.

- 2017: City Hall, Police, Williston
- 2018: Burwell, Ice A & B
- 2019: Satellite fire stations & Glen Lake Act Ctr
- 2020: Various HVAC office comfort Improvements System Wide
- 2021: Central Fire #1

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The project is consistent with maintaining the city’s infrastructure. The system is more robust and efficient as the city’s IT fiber network is expanded to additional locations.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
These projects impact annual operational costs by eliminating air compressor maintenance, parts searches, and call backs. It also allows quicker response to comfort control adjustments.

The automation replacement includes new software licenses, computer graphics, and modules to enhance operator interfaces.
Project Category: Municipal Buildings
Project Title: Building Roof Replacements
Total Estimated Cost: $1,015,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4101.XXXX.S17109
5110.XXXX.S17109

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</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.

2017  Council Chambers veranda roof & deck
      Tower Hill Booster and WTP 13
2018  Community Center sky lights
      Ice Rink A roof analysis
      Well #11
2019  Park and Trail buildings and shelter roofs
      Well #3
2020  Central Fire
      WTP #16
2021  Public Works Sections B & C

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.

Description:

This item provides for the scheduled replacement of roof systems for major community and utility buildings.
**Project Category:** Municipal Building  
**Project Title:** Fire Station Refurbishment  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $455,000  
**Funding Priority:** 1  
**Account Number:** 4101.XXXX.S17111  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$115,000</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, lot pavement, windows, kitchen equipment, selected mechanical replacements and apparatus bay/operational facility improvements are identified and programmed.  

**Scheduling and Project Status:**  
Improvements will be scheduled and undertaken in the year of project funding.  

**Description:**  
This item provides for the repair and ongoing refurbishment of fire stations. Anticipated repairs include: gear lockers, selected window replacements, drywall repair, floor coatings, painting, furniture, and appliance replacements.

**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 will not increase operating costs. Energy conservation upgrades will save electrical and heat energy expenses however.

- **2017:** Grid lockers, main service doors, floor coatings, sign packages, exterior cladding
- **2018:** HVAC/hot water boilers, windows/glazing, stone/brick maintenance
- **2019:** Apparatus doors, technology upgrades, security improvements
- **2020:** Windows, medic area, roof tops – 1&2
- **2021:** brick/stone tuck-pointing, controls, roof repairs
**Project Category:** Municipal Building  
**Project Title:** Salt Dome Panels  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $50,000  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</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: $1,100,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4115.XXXX.S17105

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
This project provides for the funding of major maintenance projects and service delivery renovations of city hall and the community center, meeting rooms, banquet facilities, employee areas and public spaces.

Justification:
City hall was built in 1971 and the community center in 1987. Both buildings have received life cycle cosmetic replacements, roofs, and 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 workforce priorities are the driving forces for a comprehensive facilities plan.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Projects will include enhancements to the furnishings, lighting, building comfort, and security.

City Hall Projects
2017: Mezzanine improvements, floor coverings, lobby security, restroom fixtures, wall coverings, office cubes, elevator upgrades, duct cleaning
2018: Self-service kiosk, lighting, floor coverings, office cubes, lobby security and service delivery
2019: Office cubes, floor covering, paint
2020: Window replacements, fixtures
2021: Office work space and lighting upgrades

Community Center Projects
2017: Meeting room refurbishments, elevator upgrades, flooring, lobby renovation, council chamber upgrades
2018: Skylight maintenance, flooring, paint
2019: Restroom renovations
2020: Meeting room renovations, flooring
2021: Meeting room renovations, paint

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 completed in 2016. Staff is studying the integration of the roof deck and courtyard access to the Chambers deck area. Senior and public demand for services will drive the materials and changes at the Community Center facility.

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: $ GO Bonds - TBD
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: NA

Source of Project Funding | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
GO Bonds |  | TBD | TBD |  |  |

Description:
This project implements the findings of the 2016 Public Safety Facility Study. Improvements are planned for both the police and fire departments.

Justification:
Fire Station #1 which 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 are 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 Facility Study scheduled to be completed by mid-year and will identify future improvements for the facility as well as cost estimates for the concepts. Initial plans are for construction to occur in 2018 into 2019, bonds sale in 2019, and first full debt service payment in 2020.

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. The study will also support and expand upon the findings the Public Safety Study that was completed in 2009.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
It is anticipated that annual operating and maintenance costs would increase with the expanded building size. Installation of energy efficient heating, lighting and construction materials would help to minimize operational cost increases.
**Project Category:** Recreational Facilities

**Project Title:** Lindbergh Center Improvements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $232,000 (city cost)  
800,000 (total cost)

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** 4123.6530.S17103

---

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Replacement Fund</th>
<th>Hopkins School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

---

**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 2015, the city’s 29% share of operating costs totaled $116,665.

**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:

2008-16: Walking/jogging track surface, cardiovascular equipment, HVAC upgrades, divider curtains, basket cable system, facility lighting, weight equipment, scoreboards

2017: 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, 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-sets 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: $1,385,000 (net cost)
Funding Priority: 2-3
Account Number: 5410.6530.S17107
4200. XXXX.S17107

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 33,700 daily users annually, and also as a cost-effective location to host 70 Recreation Services programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williston Center Fund</td>
<td>$234,500</td>
<td>$409,500</td>
<td>$424,500</td>
<td>$199,500</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund</td>
<td>($94,500)</td>
<td>($94,500)</td>
<td>($94,500)</td>
<td>($94,500)</td>
<td>($94,500)</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, 10 year useful life) and two 15 year old roof top units.

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.

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:
2010-16: The previously adopted Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) included funding in 2010 for a total renovation project cost of $4.47 million, of which $945,000 ($94,500 per year) was financed by the Williston Center over ten years through 2020. Construction was complete in 2011. Projects completed: 2014 - pool roof walls were repaired, 2015 - pool roof replaced, 2016 - flat roof over locker rooms replaced, installed UV pool disinfectant system, resurface pool deck, replace weight/cardiovascular equipment.

2017: Add a level to store room ($40,000), batting cage remodel ($35,000), replace Treehouse features ($15,000), miscellaneous building components ($50,000)

2018: Replace 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), miscellaneous building components ($50,000)

2021: Replace cardiovascular equipment ($160,000), replace HVAC RTU 5 & 6 ($75,000), tennis court resurface ($10,000), 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: $107,200 (city cost)
160,000 (total cost)

Funding Priority:

Account Number: 4701.XXXX.S17112

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</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>$33,500</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hopkins</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Landscape improvements, patio tables and chairs

2017: Entrance monument sign ($50,000)

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)

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

---
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Project Category: Recreational Facilities

Project Title: Glen Lake Activity Center Facility (GLAC)

Total Estimated Cost: $2,500,000 (Unfunded/TBD)

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Facility Bond - TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

Since 1995, the GLAC has served as a meeting facility for community groups and organizations, particularly those serving the Glen Lake area. The facility, initially constructed as a satellite fire station in 1965, is aging and in need of increasing maintenance, upkeep and capital improvements.

In December of 2015, the city council reviewed a park board recommendation to provide extensive programming space at the current GLAC location. Citing concerns related to location and cost, the Council instead directed staff and the park board to look for alternative locations to provide gymnasium space and to look to remodel the GLAC keeping the existing levels of meeting and activity space.

Scheduling and Project Status:

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 for the existing location.

2021: Refinish interior spaces, replace existing HVAC systems, address ADA requirements and redesign/improve parking and landscaping. Consider purchase of private property to the east of the GLAC.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

Existing GLAC space provided to the Police Department and HCMC ambulance service would be renovated as part of the interior refinish.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

Maintenance costs related to the GLAC would be reduced by an estimated $5,000 per year from 2022 - 2025, then increase slightly in the years to follow. Improved spaces could allow for an adjustment in rental fees for space provided to private groups.

Description:

Phase II of the feasibility study will be completed in 2016 with the goal of developing recommendations for replacement or renovation of the Glen Lake Activity Center consistent with the council’s direction of providing a smaller facility that proposed in Phase I replaces and slightly enhances the amount of space currently provided.
Project Category: Recreational Facilities

Project Title: Ice Arena Improvements

Total Estimated Cost: $1,860,000

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.

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund – payback</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 resurferacer (2011); renovate 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 funded through 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 2018-21 will not affect annual operating costs.

Maintenance costs on the refrigeration system installed in 2015 will be reduced due to better energy efficiency and the elimination of expensive R22 refrigerant. The project is estimated 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: $794,000

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number: 4510.XXXX.S17209

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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Fund</td>
<td>$154,000</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 will begin to deal with the anticipated effects of infestation. Additional staff will be hired to assist with the development of work plans for both public and private trees. 2015 will be the first full year of the program, and the annual amounts indicated for the remaining years through 2021 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 Title:** Park and Open Space Purchase  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $600,000 - Unfunded  
**Funding Priority:** 4  
**Account Number:** NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>

**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.

**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:**
- $640,000 Total Cost
- $425,000 City Cost
- $75,000 Grant Funding
- $140,000 Unfunded

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** 4701.XXXX.S17207

---

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail fund- City Facilities</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin Youth Sports Grant Funding</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded – Park &amp; Trail Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Description:**

The park board’s 2012 update of the city’s Athletic Field Needs Study continues to indicate a moderate need for increased game quality athletic fields for the sports of soccer, lacrosse and football; and increased access to quality practice fields for youth softball and baseball through partnerships.

---

**Justification:**

With a lack of available city property for athletic field expansion, 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:**

- **2017:** $75,000 is allocated to light the existing Civic Center fields. An additional $75,000 would be funded from a Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant. $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields.
- **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 and 2021:** $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
Total Estimated Cost: $235,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 4732.XXXX.S17202

Description:
This project provides for maintenance and improvements to the Burwell House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Expenditures</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$15,000</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.

2017: $50,000 is allocated for irrigation for the gardens and lawn are planned. The large investment in plants warrants this investment after losing many mature Elm trees to disease.

2018: $20,000 is allocated for the upgrade of the building automation software that controls the HVAC system. The allocated portions covering the Burwell House are listed with the city-wide Building Automation project.

2020: $90,000 is allocated for scheduled window replacement.

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 & Open Space  
**Project Title:** Upper Minnehaha Creek Corridor  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $150,000  
**Funding Priority:** 3  
**Account Number:** 4200.XXXX.S17208

### Justification:
A creek visioning plan developed in 2006 focused on the integration of the creek’s environmental, recreational, historic and economic resources. Conceptual ideas were generated for the corridor and discussed by the city council.

Over the last several years, the city has partnered with the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD), Three Rivers Park District, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park Board and the cities of Hopkins, Edina and St. Louis Park, to discuss creek projects of joint interest.

In 2010, the city and MCWD formed a steering committee to explore the potential for a joint facility to include public amenities and the district’s headquarters on city-owned property. Discussions ended in 2012 when the study determined it was not feasible.

Other projects included improvements to the canoe landings along the creek and development of the Minnetonka Mills Park (west of the Burwell House). Constructed in 2011 and 2012, the park project includes trails and boardwalks, bridges across the creek, park entrance features, and a botanical garden west of the historic house site and along the creek.

Potential future projects include:
- land acquisition in the corridor
- construction of additional trails and boardwalks throughout the corridor
- I494/Minnetonka Boulevard gateway improvements
- addition of a community play lot in the recreation core

### Scheduling and Project Status:
The required public hearings on use of the Community Investment Fund for creek corridor projects were held in 2009, and the city council subsequently approved these expenditures. In addition to the funds above, $200,000 for the remainder of this project is budgeted in 2015.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The visioning plan complements the city's Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) plan, Natural Resources Restoration and Management Plan, Comprehensive Guide Plan and City Council Policy on Open Space Preservation and 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. Operating expenses associated with an expanded trail and park use have been incorporated into annual operating budgets and the 30-year improvement schedule.
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Space
Project Title: Park Investment Plan
Total Estimated Cost: $605,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4701.62XX-63XX.S17203

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</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>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

2017
- Arbor Gazebo Painting – Meadow, Gro Tonka, Woodgate
- Hard Court Resurface – Glen Moor, Knollway
- Site Amenities
- Hockey Board replacement at McKenzie Park

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 Pioneer

2021
- Playground equipment and safety surfacing replacement – Ford and Mini-Tonka

2022-2024 – Future $450,000
- Playground equipment and safety surfacing replacement – Linner and Sunrise Ridge.
- Playground Equipment Replacement – Orchard, Covington, Glen-Moor, Gro-Tonka, McKenzie 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

Total Estimated Cost: $310,000

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</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></td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, six practice quality courts were added to one of the two existing paved hockey rinks at Meadow Park.

This project proposes the addition of up to six 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 were added to the two existing tennis courts at Meadow Park.
2014: Four pickleball court lines added to one of the two paved outdoor ice rinks at Meadow Park
2016 - 2017: Park Board conducts community meetings to develop a plan for the addition of permanent courts.
2018: Permanent courts added or converted from tennis courts.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These improvements are in keeping with the park board’s goals to provide and maintain a 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 and future capital costs 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: $2,425,000 Total Cost

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number: 4701.XXXX.S17206

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 walkways 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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund (PTF)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Funds (HC)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Trail Funding</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</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>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd (CR 61) – Wayzata Blvd to Sherwood Pl</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby Rd – Portico to Wayzata city limits</td>
<td>Strt Improv</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail wayfinding and navigation signage</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhill Road – Atrium Way to Hwy 7</td>
<td>Strt Improv</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail wayfinding and navigation signage</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd (CR 61) – Minnetonka Blvd to Hilloway Rd</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smetana Rd - Westbrooke Way to Sanibel Dr</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkers Lake Rd - Twelve Oaks Dr to Plymouth limits</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>TBD</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 from the Park and Trail Fund to construct trail connections to the new Light Rail Transit platform.

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: $17,719,000 to $63,280,000 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,719,000</td>
<td>$63,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
Independent Cumulative Cost

Excelsior Blvd (CR 3) ‐ Pioneer to Nelson/CR61

1.1

$351,989

$351,989
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7.5
7.0
7.0
6.5
6.2
6.1
5.9
5.9
5.6
5.5
5.4
5.3
5.1
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
3.9
3.8
3.7
3.7
3.7
3.6
3.4
3.3
3.2
3.1

Excelsior Blvd (CR 3) ‐ Glen View to Caribou (IHM)
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
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
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 CR101 Nof Hwy7
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 of I‐494
Rowland Rd/Bren Rd ‐ Lone Lake Park to Opus trail
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 W to Deephaven 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

0.6
1.7
1.7
0.6
0.8
1.0
1.0
0.7
0.1
0.6
0.5
0.6
0.7
0.9
0.7
0.0
0.6
0.4
0.1
0.4
0.8
1.0
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

$239,189
$624,387
$622,604
$227,721
$300,663
$381,608
$354,336
$273,494
$679,000
$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

$591,178
$1,215,565
$1,838,168
$2,065,889
$2,366,552
$2,748,160
$3,102,495
$3,375,990
$4,054,990
$4,292,787
$4,474,844
$4,687,390
$4,945,927
$5,265,508
$5,538,056
$5,548,842
$5,755,980
$5,904,066
$5,954,492
$6,085,742
$6,387,448
$6,742,596
$6,854,113
$7,260,117
$7,736,268
$8,141,838
$8,195,175
$8,286,900
$8,830,456
$9,582,015
$10,051,728
$10,276,325
$10,667,817
$10,738,495
$10,843,481
$11,164,725
$11,349,698
$11,440,453

$854,248
$2,229,953
$2,223,584
$813,289
$1,073,796
$1,362,885
$1,265,484
$976,765
$2,425,000
$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

$2,111,353
$4,341,306
$6,564,890
$7,378,179
$8,451,975
$9,814,860
$11,080,344
$12,057,109
$14,482,109
$15,331,383
$15,981,588
$16,740,683
$17,664,027
$18,805,389
$19,778,774
$19,817,295
$20,557,073
$21,085,953
$21,266,045
$21,734,795
$22,812,316
$24,080,704
$24,478,980
$25,928,991
$27,629,531
$29,077,996
$29,268,484
$29,596,076
$31,537,347
$34,221,486
$35,899,030
$36,701,163
$38,099,349
$38,351,770
$38,726,722
$39,874,021
$40,534,639
$40,858,763

Length (miles)

Est Cost Independently (by LF)

w Road Project Cumulative Cost

Est Cost w Road Project (by LF)

Priority Score (10=High 1=Low)

7.5

Priority Rank
1

Unscheduled and Unfunded Trail Segments
(all costs 2017 dollars)

46.3


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>Inflation Adj. Cost</th>
<th>Current Adj. Cost</th>
<th>Incremental Cost</th>
<th>Incremental Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Stone Rd - Saddlebrooke Cir to Sheffield Cur</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$47,113</td>
<td>$11,487,566</td>
<td>$168,262</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Orchard Rd/Huntingdon Dr - CR 60 to CR 61</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$241,729</td>
<td>$11,729,295</td>
<td>$863,320</td>
<td>2034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>North Lone Lake Park - along RR to Dominick Rd</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$120,315</td>
<td>$11,849,610</td>
<td>$429,696</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Knollway Park to Wayzata Blvd/Horn Dr</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$69,556</td>
<td>$11,919,166</td>
<td>$248,414</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Knollway Park to CR 61</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$113,894</td>
<td>$12,033,060</td>
<td>$406,764</td>
<td>2049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>NTC - Meeting St to existing trail on W of I-494</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$41,559</td>
<td>$12,074,619</td>
<td>$148,424</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Clear Spring Rd - connect trail to Hwy 7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$79,212</td>
<td>$12,153,831</td>
<td>$282,899</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>58th St W - Mahoney Ave into Purgatory Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$91,944</td>
<td>$12,245,775</td>
<td>$328,371</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Victoria Evergreen to McKenzie Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$355,401</td>
<td>$12,601,175</td>
<td>$1,269,288</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Lake St Ext - CR 60 to CR 61</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$346,650</td>
<td>$12,947,825</td>
<td>$1,238,037</td>
<td>2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Stone Rd/Meeting St - RR tracks to Linner Rd</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$220,907</td>
<td>$13,168,732</td>
<td>$788,952</td>
<td>2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Orchard Rd - Wyola Rd to Cr 60</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$53,870</td>
<td>$13,222,602</td>
<td>$192,393</td>
<td>2056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>CR 3 - Pioneer to Nelson/CR 61 - S</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$346,552</td>
<td>$13,569,154</td>
<td>$1,237,686</td>
<td>2058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lake St Ext - Williston Rd to Spring Lake Rd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$257,505</td>
<td>$13,826,660</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Covington Park east side connection to CR 101</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$72,933</td>
<td>$13,899,592</td>
<td>$260,473</td>
<td>2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>NTC - Maywood La from I-494 crossing to CR 3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$61,266</td>
<td>$13,960,858</td>
<td>$218,807</td>
<td>2064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Covington Rd - Vine Hill Rd to Mahoney Ave</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$331,028</td>
<td>$14,291,886</td>
<td>$1,182,242</td>
<td>2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Hilloway Park to YMCA La</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$174,453</td>
<td>$14,466,339</td>
<td>$623,046</td>
<td>2068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>East side of I-494 - CR 5 to Wentworth Tr</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$145,648</td>
<td>$14,611,986</td>
<td>$520,170</td>
<td>2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ford Rd - All</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$432,664</td>
<td>$15,044,651</td>
<td>$1,545,230</td>
<td>2072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Woodland Rd to Williston Rd - Through Woodgate</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$262,540</td>
<td>$15,307,191</td>
<td>$937,644</td>
<td>2074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Westmill Rd - Spring Hill Park to Clear Spring Rd</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$94,519</td>
<td>$15,401,710</td>
<td>$337,569</td>
<td>2076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Oberlin Park along Park Ave to Ridgemount Ave</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$78,201</td>
<td>$15,479,911</td>
<td>$279,289</td>
<td>2078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Holiday/Seymour Rd - Woodland Rd to Spring Hill</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$258,987</td>
<td>$15,738,898</td>
<td>$924,952</td>
<td>2080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Highwood Dr - Williston Rd to Tonkawood Rd</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$289,021</td>
<td>$16,027,918</td>
<td>$1,032,216</td>
<td>2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Cedar Lake Rd - Big Willow to CR 73</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$221,310</td>
<td>$16,249,229</td>
<td>$790,394</td>
<td>2084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Jane La - Baker Rd to County Trail (Dominick Dr)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$231,280</td>
<td>$16,480,509</td>
<td>$826,000</td>
<td>2086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>South St - Mayview Rd to CR 60</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$77,268</td>
<td>$16,557,777</td>
<td>$275,958</td>
<td>2088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Oak Ridge Rd - CR 5 to Hopkins city limits</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$155,257</td>
<td>$16,713,034</td>
<td>$554,488</td>
<td>2090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kinsel Rd/Mayview Rd - CR 3 to Glen Moor Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$147,432</td>
<td>$16,860,466</td>
<td>$526,544</td>
<td>2092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Ford Park to Lindbergh Dr</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$139,418</td>
<td>$16,999,884</td>
<td>$497,923</td>
<td>2094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Jidana La - CR 5 to Jidana Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$79,825</td>
<td>$17,079,709</td>
<td>$285,089</td>
<td>2096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Stodola Rd - Purgatory Park to Scenic Heights Dr</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$83,593</td>
<td>$17,163,303</td>
<td>$298,548</td>
<td>2098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Highland Rd - Excelsior Blvd to Hwy 7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$555,069</td>
<td>$17,718,371</td>
<td>$1,982,388</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Spaces
Project Title: Trail Rehabilitation
Total Estimated Cost: $275,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 4764.6560.S17204

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>2017</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>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$75,000</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.

- 2016 – Dominick to Shady Oak Beach/Beachside II
- 2017 – Pavement Management Updates - crack filling, culvert inspection/replacement and asphalt surface sealing
- 2018 – Pedestrian Ramps and ADA Upgrades
- 2019 – Ridgedale Area Sidewalks
- 2020 – Stone Road – Wellington to Oakland Rd
- 2021 – Fence rehabilitation along CR 62, Overlay 494 trail from Stone Road to Oakland Rd

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: $75,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: 4750.XXXX.S17201

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</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>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space  
**Project Title:** Purgatory Park Improvements  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $250,000  
**Funding Priority:** 3  
**Account Number:** NA

**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.

---

**Recommended and Scheduled for Five Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</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.

**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.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space

Project Title: Big Willow Park Enhancements

Total Estimated Cost: $2,200,000 Total Cost
Grant-Unfunded
$1,800,000 Unfunded

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: NA

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Grants – Unfunded</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The existing 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 spring.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2016: Feasibility study and pre-engineering
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.

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.

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 Unfunded

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number: NA

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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 and the city owns the existing open space property on the southeast corner of Ridgedale Drive and Wayzata Blvd. 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.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space  
**Project Title:** Opus Area Park Investments  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,000,000 Unfunded  
**Funding Priority:** 3  
**Account Number:** NA

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>Park and Trail Improvement Fund – Unfunded</th>
<th>$500,000</th>
<th>$500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space
Project Title: Robinwood Park Development
Total Estimated Cost: $105,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: NA

Recommended and Scheduled for Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
Construction of a mini-park on Royzelle Lane in the Robinwood Neighborhood.

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.

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:** $206,000 Unfunded

**Funding Priority:** 3

**Account Number:** NA

### Description:

Improvements for Bennett Family Park are part of a five-year plan to provide capital funding to the Park starting in 2018.

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$55,000</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. The park board recommended the project for council consideration as part of the 2017-2021 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 also requested $55,000 in 2022 for a five year total of $261,000.

### 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.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment  
**Project Title:** Dump/Plow Truck Replacements  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,940,200  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** 4101.6540.S17306  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$258,500</td>
<td>$266,300</td>
<td>$548,600</td>
<td>$300,100</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>274,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**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: $4,036,700
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4101.6540.S17310

Source of Project Funding | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Capital Replacement Fund | $541,100 | $604,600 | $459,500 | $690,800 | $1,056,800
Utility Fund | 87,000 | 84,500 | 153,200 | 115,600 | 103,700
Storm Water Fund | 0 | 0 | 57,400 | 0 | 0
Fleet Services | 0 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0

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.

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. One additional car has been added to the fleet in 2017 due to the addition of police 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.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment

**Project Title:** Sidewalk and Trail Maintenance Vehicle

**Total Estimated Cost:** $158,000

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
This item provides for the scheduled replacement of three sidewalk/trail maintenance vehicles.

**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: $431,600
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>$202,600</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled replacement of the city’s three street sweepers.

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: $311,600
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$311,600</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.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment  
**Project Title:** Aerial Bucket Trucks  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $312,700  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** NA

---

**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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$162,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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.

**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: $125,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

The current machine is ten years old and will need replacement due to the age of the battery system and wear on the mechanical portion of the machine.

**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.

**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.

**Description:**

This item provides for the replacement of one of the ice resurfacers used at the ice arenas.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment  
**Project Title:** Skidsteer Loader  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $129,500  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** NA

**Description:**  
This item provides for the replacement of the city’s skid loaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$50,700</td>
<td>$78,800</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:** Patch Truck  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $228,500  
**Funding Priority:** 2  

**Description:**
This item provides for the replacement of the truck chassis, hot box and accessory tools used to patch the city’s bituminous streets.

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$228,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
This vehicle is used to patch asphalt streets in the city. Bituminous material is contained and heated in the rear portion of the vehicle. It also carries tack oil, compressed air and compaction equipment on the vehicle in order to complete a roadway patch repair.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
This truck is scheduled to be ordered in late 2016 for delivery in the spring of the funding year.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
This replacement is consistent with the Vehicle Replacement Guide.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
This replacement could save up to $7,200 in repair costs for the first two years following purchase.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Sewer Jetter
Total Estimated Cost: $169,300
Funding Priority:
Account Number: NA

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Utility Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$169,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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.

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 Sewer Cleaner

### Total Estimated Cost:
$282,200

### Funding Priority:
2

### Account Number:
NA

### Description:
This item provides for the replacement of the truck-mounted vacuum machine that is used for sanitary sewer cleaning and watermain break excavation dewatering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$282,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment  
**Project Title:** Street Flusher Truck  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $183,600  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** NA

---

**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.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>

---

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</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

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled replacement of the city’s two loader-carried snow blowers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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.

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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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: $990,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: N/A

**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 effective fleet is critical for emergency mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
The purchase in 2018 will replace the primary duty crew engine. That purchase is proposed to be a heavy duty pumper, since it is the primary responding unit. The 2020 purchase will be placed at a satellite station and rotate as the duty crew engine with the goal of equalizing the substantial use of these vehicles.

**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. The purchasing schedule was adjusted from the previous CIP to reflect the usage and replacement of apparatus under the duty crew model.

**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.

**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 effective fleet is critical for emergency mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The purchase in 2018 will replace the primary duty crew engine. That purchase is proposed to be a heavy duty pumper, since it is the primary responding unit. The 2020 purchase will be placed at a satellite station and rotate as the duty crew engine with the goal of equalizing the substantial use of these vehicles.

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. The purchasing schedule was adjusted from the previous CIP to reflect the usage and replacement of apparatus under the duty crew model.

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.

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 effective fleet is critical for emergency mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Category:** Major Equipment

**Project Title:** Fire JPA SCBA Program

**Total Estimated Cost:** $500,000

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

The City uses joint response as a critical component to its fire protection plan. The ability of its firefighters to use similar equipment with other jurisdictions is paramount to utilize this cost saving and efficient program.

In 2009, the City formed a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) with 19 other Cities and Fire Departments to provide SCBA and SCBA maintenance to its firefighters. This innovative program allows all firefighters the ability to respond to other jurisdictions seamlessly while providing for the mandated maintenance and documentation of its SCBA.

This program includes:

- SCBA for firefighting and rescue
- Fill station and air compressor
- Maintenance and care of SCBA
- Required record keeping
- Ability for seamless interaction of all JPA entities.

**Description:**

This project provides for the ongoing maintenance and replacement of the City's self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA). These "air-packs" are essential to the City's ability to fight fires and rescue trapped persons.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

Under the terms of the JPA all equipment will be replaced every seven years.

**Relationship to the General Plan and Other Projects:**

This is consistent with the City's policy of maintaining its essential safety equipment. This follows the JPA's long term schedule. This also replaces a fixed compressor and fill station that failed several years ago. Since that time we have relied solely on a mobile compressor.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

This will provide consistent, timely replacement while avoiding unscheduled repair costs.
**Project Category:** Major Equipment  
**Project Title:** Air 2 Refurbishment  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $332,600  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$332,600</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:** Lucas Device Purchase  

**Total Estimated Cost:** $16,100  

**Funding Priority:** 2  

**Account Number:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
The Lucas Device is used to administer CPR to persons experiencing a cardiac arrest.

**Justification:**
In order to be able to save the lives of sudden cardiac arrest patients and avoid neurological damage, a steady supply of oxygen to the heart and brain is necessitated. Life-sustaining circulation can be created through effective and uninterrupted chest compressions. The city has been operating these devices since 2013 and it has proven to be an effective lifesaving tool.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
This device will be placed on the Fire/Rescue truck located at Station #5 in 2017 and also serves as a ready back-up.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
This is consistent with the City’s policy of providing essential lifesaving equipment.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
In the past more responders were required to respond to cardiac arrests in order to deliver effective chest compressions. Using these devices requires less staffing on scene and delivers better care than manual resuscitation.
Project Category: Major Equipment

Project Title: Rescue Equipment

Total Estimated Cost: $100,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number:

Description:
This project will update essential rescue equipment, some of it 30 years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The City of Minnetonka provides basic rescue services such as vehicle extrication and surface water rescue. In 2010 the City of Minnetonka liquidated its technical rescue cache and disbanded our technical rescue team. We also fortified our mutual aid arrangements to provide low frequency and unpredictable technical services. Our vision at the time and continues to be that the city will maintain equipment and training for the most frequent or most likely rescue calls for service.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This project coincides with the city switching from five ladder trucks to three ladder trucks and two rescue units.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This augments the plan for the city’s fire apparatus deployment and reflects the way that most service is delivered with the duty crew model.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
There will be minimal annual maintenance cost for some of the items.
Project Category: Major Equipment
Project Title: Rescue Truck Program
Total Estimated Cost: $450,000
Funding Priority: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
This program replaces the replacement of a ladder truck which would cost an estimated $1,050,000 in 2020. These trucks would carry rescue and firefighting equipment currently spread out among various apparatus.

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.

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:** 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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>

**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.

**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.

**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 Emergency Response Team (ERT) tactical ballistic vests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Members of the police department’s Emergency Response Team (ERT) 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 ERT 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: Fire Technology Update

Total Estimated Cost: $50,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: N/A

Description:
This project updates the pagers carried by firefighters to be alerted to emergency calls for service and installs computer aiding dispatching computers in front line vehicles and apparatus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 two projects as soon as feasible.

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 two 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: $70,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number:

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI Forfeiture Account</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
There is discussion at the Minnesota legislature level that body cameras may become required equipment for all police officers to wear while on duty. The current in-car video system purchased in 2015 would allow for body cameras to be incorporated should this become a mandate.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This project is funded and will not be implemented until such time as mandated or deemed to be of benefit to law enforcement, prosecution, and the community.

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:
This project will need to be closely monitored to see how captured video is going to be classified per data practices. If all data is considered public data this could have an impact on police records and IT staff time to produce these records under the Freedom of Information Act. We anticipate having to increase staffing by 1-1.5 FTE’s in order to process these requests. There are also significant costs for maintaining storage of captured video based on required 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: $120,000

Funding Priority: 1

Account Number: NA

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI Forfeiture Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</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:

This project will be researched in 2019 for purchase and installation in early 2020.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

This project is consistent with the city’s policy of maintaining current technology.

Manufacturer recommends that in-car cameras be replaced every 5 years. Technology in this area is rapidly evolving and therefore factored into this replacement schedule. The next replacement would take place in 2025.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

This project will have little effect on the current operating budget.

Description:

This project involves the replacement of the in-car video cameras in the police department’s patrol fleet.
**Project Category:** Technology  
**Project Title:** Microwave Radios  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $85,000  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** NA

**Description:**  
This item provides for the replacement of the microwave radios located at the Williston water tower as part of the 800 MHz Statewide Radio System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</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: $160,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4150.XXXX.S21316

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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$160,000</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 the Public Works department and conducting Fire Department paging.

The infrastructure provides voice paging service to the Fire Department and also serves as a backup channel for police and fire 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 and installed by 2021.

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:** $404,600

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** 2210.6230.S17302

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cable Television Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$89,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$61,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$114,500</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.

- **2017** – Editing system, LCD monitors, bulletin board system, projector replacements, televisions, and city hall digital marquee sign replacement.
- **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

**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.

**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.S17311

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**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.

**Current Projects:**  
- Place conduit system as part of the Shady Oak Road street project, from Excelsior Boulevard, north to Highway 7  
- Place conduit system as part of the Libbs Lake street rehabilitation project

**Future 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  
- 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.
**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.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

*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.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

A $15,000 annual license is paid through the Technology Fund.
Project Category: Technology

Project Title: Office Equipment

Total Estimated Cost: $412,600

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4230.6530.S17304

Description:
This project funds the purchase of replacement copiers and other office equipment for all city departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fund</td>
<td>$118,500</td>
<td>$135,600</td>
<td>$30,300</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$87,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
This project provides for the systematic maintenance and upgrade of major office equipment, including: copiers, postage machine, desktop scanners, smart phone equipment 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 laser jet printers.

Copier Replacement Schedule
2017 – Police Dispatch
2019 – IT Department, Legal, Senior Center
2020 – Engineering Plotter, Fire Station #1
2021 – Information Desk, Community Development, Engineering/Planning, Finance, Police Patrol Division, Police Chiefs Office

Other Large Equipment
2017 – Replacement postage machine, Replacement headset phone devices
2017/2018 – Replacement desktop phones

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: $2,128,700

Funding Priority: 1

Account Number: 4230.6530.S17308

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fund</td>
<td>$307,700</td>
<td>$360,300</td>
<td>$777,100</td>
<td>$355,900</td>
<td>$327,700</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:

2017  Replacement of closed circuit camera servers
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

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.

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.
Project Category: Technology

Project Title: Security Equipment

Total Estimated Cost: $306,800

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4230.6530. S17303
2210.6530. S17303

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$58,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television Fund</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></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:

- **2017** – Card access improvements to The Landing Shoppe, Water Treatment Plant 3. Addition of cameras at Fire Station 1
- **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, 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.

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.XXXX.S17316

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>

**Justification:**

This project calls for the transitional expenses related to the Public, Education and Government (PEG) Fee’s collected through the franchise agreement with Comcast Cable for the Southwest Suburban Cable Commission (SWSCC) member cities. PEG fees received through the revised agreement with Comcast 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.**

2017 – 2021

- 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
- Council chamber control/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.

**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 agreement with Comcast provides 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.
Project Category: Local Street Improvements
Project Title: Pavement Management Study
Total Estimated Cost: $217,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4410.6319.S17402

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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$44,000</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.

Scheduling and Project Status:
This project provides for the annual update of the Pavement Management System.

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.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This study will have no impact on annual maintenance costs.
### Project Details

**Project Category:** Local Street Improvements  
**Project Title:** Local Street Rehabilitation  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $27,900,000  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** 4410.XXXX (Street).S17401  
5600.XXXX (Storm).S17401  
5110.XXXX (Utility).S17401

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund (Upgrades)</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</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.

Page 8-6 includes significant additional city funding in 2017-2021 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 2017 reconstruction program is scheduled to include Crosby 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:

Collector roads that are scheduled for reconstruction and rehabilitation include the following:

- **Reconstruction**
  - 2017 - Crosby Rd.
  - 2018 - Woodhill Rd.
  - 2019 – Ridgedale Dr. (see page 9-2)
  - 2020 - Parkers Lake Rd, Twelve Oaks Center Dr.
  - 2021 - Groveland-Bay Preservation (Mill and Overlay)
- 2019 – Highland Rd.
- 2020 - Minnetonka Mills Rd., Rowland Rd.

Sidewalks will likely be proposed for Crosby Road, 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 2020-2021 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.
**Project Category:** Local Street Improvements

**Project Title:** Local Street Rehabilitation - Unfunded

**Total Estimated Cost:** $20,000,000 - Unfunded

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** N/A

---

**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>2022(est)</th>
<th>2023(est)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund (Upgrades) - Unfunded</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund - Unfunded</td>
<td>2,600,000</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.

- **2022-23** Tonka – Woodcroft area

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: $9,025,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number: 4410.XXXX (Others).S17403
4410. XXXX (Overlay).S17404
5110. XXXX (Utility). S17401

Description:
This item provides for crack sealing, thin bituminous overlays, pavement marking, and other maintenance and preservation items necessary to maintain the local streets in the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other Maintenance Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</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 2017 through 2021 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: $4,850,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: 2500.XXXX.S16405

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plymouth Road, N &amp; S of 394</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Overhead burial and decorative lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High Priority Trail Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minnehaha Creek Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Mtka Blvd – Shady Oak to Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossroad &amp; Oakridge to TH 169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energy Savings Street Light Retrofits (LED)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 also 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 2017 - 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.

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.
Project Category: Local Street Improvements

Project Title: Shady Oak Area LRT - Infrastructure

Total Estimated Cost: $1,500,000

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number: NA

Source of Project Funding | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Street Improvement Fund – 17th Avenue Extension | $500,000 | $300,000 | 

Utility Fund | 200,000 | 200,000 | 

Storm Water Fund | 100,000 | 

Electric Franchise Fees | 100,000 | 100,000 | 

Description:
When southwest light rail 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 final design and bidding.

Justification:
Local share of improvements necessary to accommodate light rail within the Shady Oak/Excelsior Blvd. area.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2017-19: 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 county construction of the line. And as the project approaches actual design stage, the breakdown of these local costs as they relate to non-tax levy sources, e.g. storm water fees will be clearer.

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: $10,630,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4410.XXXX.S17406

Description:
When southwest light rail 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal State Aid Fund</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fees</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Trails Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</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 2017.

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.

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:** MSA Street Improvements

**Project Title:** Plymouth Road

**Total Estimated Cost:** $2,000,000 Total Cost

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:**

---

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal State Aid</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Description:**
This project involves adding capacity and safety improvements at the Plymouth Road and south I-394 ramp intersection. These improvements were identified as a part of the Ridgedale Village Center study.

---

**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:**
Funding sources will be further refined during project development including partnering with Hennepin County and MnDOT.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
This project is consistent with the Ridgedale Village Center study, and the Plymouth Road improvements identified within the study.

The project will also include possible upgrades to the sidewalk on the west side of Plymouth Road adjacent to this project, and will be coordinated with the overhead utility line burial and decorative light installation identified on page 8-5.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
This project will not impact operating costs.
**Project Category:** MSA Street Improvements

**Project Title:** Ridgedale Drive Improvements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $8,900,000 Total Cost

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** N/A

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal State Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**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 and are included under the Parks, Trails & Open Space section of the capital budget.

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: 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

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>Total Cost (Unfunded)</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.

Description:
This project involves the reconstruction of Plymouth Road as a multi-lane roadway from Cedar Lake Road to Hilloway Road.

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 Project 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>

Description:
This project involves the reconstruction of Hopkins Crossroad as a multi-lane roadway between Cedar Lake Road and I-394.

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:** 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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Blvd. (Mills area)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-394/Hopkins Crossroad Bridge widening</td>
<td>10-12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH7/Baker Road Bridge</td>
<td>5-10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-394/Plymouth Bridge</td>
<td>15-25,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></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: $1,010,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 5600.XXXX.S16601

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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>$210,000</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 2017-2021 CIP contains more detailed information regarding project specifics and estimates. Whenever possible, projects will be coordinated with the street reconstruction and rehabilitation programs.

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.

Description:

This project provides for annual improvements to repair and replace high risk segments of storm sewer to prevent system failures, and possible flooding.
Project Category: Storm Drainage Improvements
Project Title: McKenzie Point Road Storm Sewer
Total Estimated Cost: $100,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: N/A

Description:
This project provides for the installation of a storm sewer outlet for a ponding area on McKenzie Point Road.

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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.

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: 5110.XXX.S17706

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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 deficiencies are found.

Scheduling and Project Status:
While specific projects are not identified herein, improvements would generally be fixed as they are discovered. Planned replacements associated with road improvement projects are shown on the street project pages.

Description:
This item provides for the unanticipated replacement/addition of water and sewer lines that are found to be deficient during the year.

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: 5110.6368.S17701

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
Scheduled maintenance and repair of the city’s water storage structures extends their useful life.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Major repair projects are bid up to one year prior to the scheduled work. Washing will be scheduled in the year that the cleaning is needed.
2017: Ridgedale wash & dive, Lake Street & Plymouth inspection
2018: Bren paint, Williston wash
2019: Woodland & Tanglen paint, Bren inspection
2020: Williston paint Woodland & Tanglen inspection
2021: Lake Street & Plymouth wash & dive

The painting of Bren tower has been delayed until 2018 due to the good condition of the coatings. The Plymouth and Lake Street towers have been substituted due to the condition of those coatings.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project is consistent with the city’s practice of maintaining its infrastructure. Costs tend to be consistent from year to year.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Timely inspection, touch-up and washing extends the life of the surface coating systems.

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled maintenance of the city’s nine water storage structures.

Description:
This item provides for the scheduled maintenance of the city’s nine water storage structures.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements
Project Title: Water - Fire Hydrant Upgrades
Total Estimated Cost: $1,000,000
Funding Priority: 1
Account Number: 5110.XXXX.S17708

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</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 evaluated and repaired to ensure trouble free operation. It is estimated that one-third of the private hydrants are inoperable 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.

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 operation and maintenance of the private hydrants.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This project will increase operational costs of the system. A new utility operator has been added in 2015 that will assist in the project along with scheduled water valve exercising.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements

Project Title: Water - Removal of watermain break excavation pile.

Total Estimated Cost: $150,000

Funding Priority: 2

Account Number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$50,000</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 cy 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 as small as possible.

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.

Description:

This item provides for the removal of excavation materials that accumulate over time at public works.
Project Category: Utility System Improvements
Project Title: Water - System Sustainability Improvements
Total Estimated Cost: $5,867,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 5110.XXXX.S17715

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$791,000</td>
<td>$832,000</td>
<td>$3,035,000</td>
<td>$196,000</td>
<td>$1,013,000</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 schedule of projects follows that plan.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The recommended improvements are as follows:

- **2017** Water Treatment Plant (WTP) #12 – Filter media change, Electrical Motor Control Center (MCC) & Variable Frequency Drive (VFD) upgrade
- **2018** WTP #3 – Filter media change, Electrical MCC & VFD upgrade
- **2019** WTP 6 – Major Plant Renovation
- **2020** Instrumentation and Control (I&C) update, WTP media replacement
- **2021** Instrumentation and Control (I&C) update, Ridgedale Booster Renovation

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This project implements the recommendations of the sustainability and optimization study completed in 2014.

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:** $3,000,000

**Funding Priority:** 2

**Account Number:** 5110.XXXX.S17713

---

**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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification:**
In July of 2013 and January of 2014, 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 project would be bid and installed in the funding year. The schedule would be as follows:

2017 – 24-inch: forcemain lining (Williston Road to Guilliams Field)

21-inch: forcemain directional drill to facilitate installation of the forcemain and construction of a collector junction box.

---

**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: $1,630,000  
Funding Priority: 2  
Account Number: 5113.XXXX.S17703

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td>$130,000</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.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Projects would be designed and bid in the winter preceding the scheduled funding. The following schedule is anticipated.
2017: Crosby and Ringer Lift Stations  
2018: Williston Lift Station – Forcemain header, valves & Generator replacement  
2019: Main Lift Station  
2020: W, 34th and Woodgate Lift Stations  
2021: Burchlane Lift Station

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.

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 more efficient motors and pumps which are 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:** 5130.XXXX.S17705

---

**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 program is intended to reduce peak sewer flows by correcting both private and public sewer deficiencies.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</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.

**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 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: $45,000
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>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
**Trail Analysis by Priority Ranking**

**Proposed Trails**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1 - 19</th>
<th>20 - 38</th>
<th>39 - 56</th>
<th>57 - 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Funded Trail Segments**
- **Existing Sidewalks and Trails**
- **School Property**
- **Village Center**
- **Light Rail Station**
- **1/4 Mile Village Center Ring**
- **1/2 Mile Village Center Ring**

---

**Map Details**

- Village Center
- Light Rail Station
- Existing Sidewalks and Trails
- School Property
- Funded Trail Segments
- 1/4 Mile Village Center Ring
- 1/2 Mile Village Center Ring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Trail (50+ High Use)</th>
<th>Unscheduled and Unfunded Trail Segments (all costs 2017 dollars)</th>
<th>Mid Cost (5-49 High Use)</th>
<th>High Cost (49+ High Use)</th>
<th>Independent Cumulative Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meadow Park to Ridgedale</td>
<td>$69,556</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meadow Park to Ridgedale</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HWY 7 Tr to 101 to Seven Hi La</td>
<td>$17,511,807</td>
<td>$1,257,105</td>
<td>$51,209,221</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ridgedale Connections</td>
<td>$39,927,640</td>
<td>$21,645,586</td>
<td>$282,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meadow Park to Ridge Rd</td>
<td>$405,663</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sunset Dr and Marion Lane West segments</td>
<td>$104,987</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. CR 3 - Pioneer to CR 61 N</td>
<td>$155,269</td>
<td>$1,282,295</td>
<td>$919,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Council Agenda Item #14B
Meeting of July 11, 2016

Brief Description
Ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel from R-1 to R-1A

Recommendation
Adopt the ordinance

Background

In 2014, the city council adopted the R-1A ordinance. Under the new ordinance, requests for rezoning and subdivision cannot be considered simultaneously. Rather, the rezoning review is informed by the submission of a conceptual subdivision. A formal plat application will only be accepted and considered if the rezoning request is approved. (See pages A1-A11.)

Proposal

AKARE Companies, represented by Rob Eldridge, is requesting that a portion of the property located at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel be rezoned from R-1 to R-1A. The submitted conceptual plan illustrates eight new R-1A lots accessed via a public cul-de-sac. These lots range in size from 16,000 square feet to 22,000 square feet. The conceptual plat illustrates that the existing home at 4301 Highview Place would remain. While the existing property at 4301 Highview Place would be reconfigured to accommodate the new lots, it would not require rezoning to R-1A, as it would meet all minimum R-1 standards.

Analysis

In accordance with the R-1A ordinance, the planning decision to be made at this time is whether or not a rezoning from R-1 to R-1A is appropriate for this site. Unlike other planning decisions – which must be made based on whether or not a submitted proposal meets a list of code-defined standards – a rezoning decision must simply have a reasonable and rational basis. In evaluating a rezoning request, the ordinance suggests that R-1A zoning be considered when:

1) The R-1A area would be appropriately integrated into the existing surrounding development; AND

2) EITHER more than a majority of the existing lots within the neighborhood do not meet R-1 standards OR the proposed R-1A areas would be served by a new street.

In staff’s opinion, the R-1A zoning would be appropriate for the site. Reasonable and rational arguments rezoning the area from R-1 to R-1A include:
1) The R-1A would not detract from the existing surrounding neighborhood. The site located on the edge of an existing neighborhood and at the intersection of Highway 7 and I494.

2) As presented in the conceptual plat, the R-1A area would be served by a new public street. This would result in the creation of a new neighborhood.

**Staff Comment**

While the decision to rezone a property to R-1A is discretionary, the decision to approve a plat within the R-1A district is not. If the requested rezoning is approved, the applicant could submit a formal plat application. If the formal plat is substantially consistent with the conceptual plat and meets the lot standards of the R-1A district, the city would be obligated to approve the plat.

Similarly, decisions regarding the home design and construction within the R-1A district are not discretionary. Within the R-1A zoning district the city can regulate home construction only by the standards included in the ordinance. These standards include setbacks, maximum height, floor area ratio, and imperious surface. If a formal plat is approved, the applicant could submit applications for building permits. If the permit applications meet all construction standards of the R-1A district – and the Minnesota State Building Code – the city would be obligated to approve the permits.

In the R-1A district, the city cannot regulate home design or pricing. Such regulations are allowed only within a flexible zoning district, such as the PUD zoning district.

**Planning Commission Hearing**

The planning commission considered the rezoning on June 16, 2016. One commissioner confirmed with staff that by rezoning the property to R-1A, a new plat would not exceed the maximum density established for the site. The commission discussion was somewhat divided on the proposed density, related to the number of lots, shown on the plan but ultimately was supportive of the rezoning.

Following the commission discussion, a public hearing was opened to take comment. Three people appeared in support of the rezoning.

Ultimately, on a 7-0 vote, the commission recommended the city council adopt the rezoning ordinance. (See page A19-A21.)

**Since Planning Commission Hearing**

The applicant has submitted a revised conceptual plat drawing for review. Conceptually, the revised plat drawing would meet the city’s minimum R-1A lot standards. The updated lot sizes are included in the “Supporting Information” section of this report. (See revised conceptual plat on page A23.)
Staff Recommendation

Adopt an ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed property from R-1 to R-1A. (See pages A12-A15).

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

Originator: Ashley Cauley, Senior Planner
Supporting Information

Concept Plan Review

During the past two years, three concept plan proposals have been reviewed for the two subject properties:

- In 2014, Whitten Associates, Inc. submitted a concept plan contemplating the redevelopment of the two properties. The concept plan included six lots of single-family detached homes around a newly constructed cul-de-sac. The plan met all R-1 district standards but the applicant had not yet partnered with a builder.

- In late 2015, Whitten Associates, Inc. and Ridge Creek Custom Homes submitted a revised concept contemplating the redevelopment of the properties with 10 villa style homes around a newly constructed cul-de-sac. The council was generally supportive of the smaller lots with price points in the range of $450,000 to $650,000 in the area. However, the council expressed concern related to the concept's proposed density.

- In early 2016, Whitten Associates, Inc. and Ridge Creek Custom Homes submitted another revised concept. This concept included 9 villa-style homes around a newly constructed cul-de-sac. The council again expressed concern regarding the concept's proposed density.

Neighborhood Meetings

The applicant has held two neighborhood meetings during the concept plan process. The following is intended to summarize those neighborhood meetings:

- On October 20, 2016, the developer held a neighborhood meeting to discuss the 10-lot concept plan. Approximately 10 people attended the meeting and raised a variety of questions related to traffic issues, density, setbacks, price points and construction noise.

- On January 13, 2016, the developer held a neighborhood meeting to discuss the 9-lot concept plan. Three people attended the meeting and raised concerns similar to those of the previous concept related to traffic and construction noise. In addition, the neighbors raised additional questions regarding the rationale for rezoning the property to PUD and density of the homes.
Lot Standards

The following chart is intended to summarize the required lot and setback standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>R-1 zoning</th>
<th>R-1A zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot area</strong></td>
<td>22,000 sf</td>
<td>15,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildable area</strong></td>
<td>3,500 sf</td>
<td>2,400 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot width at setback</strong></td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot width at ROW</strong></td>
<td>80 ft; 65 ft at cul-de-sac bulb</td>
<td>55 ft; 45 ft at cul-de-sac bulb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot depth</strong></td>
<td>125 ft</td>
<td>125 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. impervious surface</strong></td>
<td>Regulated only within the shoreland overlay district</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max floor area ratio</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Lots less than 17,500 sf = 0.24 Lots 17,500 sf or greater = 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front yard setback</strong></td>
<td>35 ft; but 50 ft from the ROW of major collector or arterial roadways</td>
<td>35 ft from streets exterior to the R-1A district; 25 ft from streets interior to the R-1A district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side yard setback</strong></td>
<td>10 ft; aggregate total of 30 ft</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear yard setback</strong></td>
<td>40 ft; or 20% of the lot depth whichever is less</td>
<td>30 ft; or 20% of the lot depth whichever is less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following information is based on the revised conceptual plat received on June 29, 2016 (See page A20.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Max Impervious *</th>
<th>Max FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>16,545 sf</td>
<td>8,270 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>22,377 sf</td>
<td>11,190 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>19,225 sf</td>
<td>9,610 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>16,845 sf</td>
<td>8,420 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>18,448 sf</td>
<td>9,225 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>19,395 sf</td>
<td>9,700 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>16,039 sf</td>
<td>8,020 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 9</td>
<td>16,690 sf</td>
<td>8,345 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest 5 sf

Floor Area and Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

Based on code-definition and the city’s McMansion Policy, floor area is the sum of the above ground horizontal area of a home, 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. Floor area ratio is the floor area divided by lot area.
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
June 15, 2016

**Brief Description**  
Ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel from R-1 to R-1A

**Recommendation**  
Recommend the city council approve the ordinance

---

**Background**

In 2014 the city council adopted the R-1A ordinance. Under the new ordinance, requests for rezoning and subdivision cannot be considered simultaneously. Rather, the rezoning review is informed by the submission of a conceptual plat. Only after the approval of a rezoning will a formal plat application be considered. (See pages A1-A11.)

**Request**

AKARE Companies, represented by Rob Eldridge, is requesting that a portion of the property located at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel be rezoned from R-1 to R-1A. The submitted conceptual plan illustrates eight new R-1A lots accessed via a public cul-de-sac. These lots would range in size from 16,000 square feet to 22,000 square feet. The conceptual plat illustrates that the existing home at 4301 Highview Place would remain. While the existing property at 4301 Highview Place would be reconfigured to accommodate the new lots, it would not require rezoning to R-1A, as it would meet all minimum R-1 standards.

**Evaluation**

In accordance with the R-1A ordinance, the planning decision to be made at this time is whether or not a rezoning from R-1 to R-1A is appropriate for this site. Unlike other planning decisions – which must be made based on whether or not a submitted proposal meets a list of code-defined standards – a rezoning decision must simply have a reasonable and rational basis. In evaluating a rezoning request, the ordinance suggests that R-1A zoning be considered when:

1) The R-1A area would be appropriately integrated into the existing surrounding development; **AND**

2) **EITHER** more than a majority of the existing lots within the neighborhood do not meet R-1 standards **OR** the proposed R-1A areas would be served by a new street.

In staff’s opinion, the R-1A zoning would be appropriate for the site. Reasonable and rational arguments rezoning the area from R-1 to R-1A include:
1) The R-1A would not detract from the existing surrounding neighborhood. The site is located on the edge of an existing neighborhood and at the intersection of Highway 7 and I494.

2) As presented on the conceptual plat, the R-1A area would be served by a new public street. This would result in the creation of a new neighborhood.

Staff Comment

While the decision to rezone a property to R-1A is discretionary, the decision to approve a plat within the R-1A district is not. If the requested rezoning is approved, the applicant could submit a formal plat application. If the formal plat is substantially consistent with the conceptual plat and meets the lot standards of the R-1A district, the city would be obligated to approve the plat.

Similarly, decisions regarding the home design and construction within the R-1A district are not discretionary. Within the R-1A zoning district the city can regulate home construction only by the standards included in the ordinance. These standards include setbacks, maximum height, floor area ratio and impervious surface. If a formal plat is approved, the applicant could submit applications for building permits. If the permit applications meet all construction standards of the R-1A district – and the Minnesota State Building Code – the city would be obligated to approve the permits.

In the R-1A district, the city cannot regulate home design or pricing. Such regulations are allowed only within a flexible zoning district, such as the PUD zoning district.

Staff Recommendation

Recommend that the city council adopt an ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed property from R-1 to R-1A. (See pages A12 - A15.)
Supporting Information

Concept Plan Review

During the past two years, three concept plan proposals have been reviewed for the two subject properties:

- In 2014, Whitten Associates submitted a concept plan contemplating the redevelopment of the two properties. The concept plan included six lots of single-family detached homes around a newly constructed cul-de-sac. The plan met all R-1 district standards but the applicant had not yet partnered with a builder.

- In late 2015, Whitten Associates and Ridge Creek Custom Homes submitted a revised concept contemplating the redevelopment of the properties with 10 villa style homes around a newly constructed cul-de-sac. The council was generally supportive of the smaller lots with price points in the range of $450,000 to $650,000 in the area. However, the council expressed concern regarding the concept’s proposed density.

- In early 2016, Whitten Associates and Ridge Creek Custom Homes submitted another revised concept. This concept included 9 villa-style homes around a newly constructed cul-de-sac. The council again expressed concern regarding the concept’s proposed density.

Neighborhood Meetings

The applicant has held two neighborhood meetings during the concept plan process. The following is intended to summarize those neighborhood meetings:

- On October 20, 2016, the developer held a neighborhood meeting to discuss the 10-lot concept plan. Approximately 10 people attended the meeting and raised a variety of questions related to traffic issues, density, setbacks, price points and construction noise.

- On January 13, 2016, the developer held a neighborhood meeting to discuss the 9-lot concept plan. Three people attended the meeting and raised concerns similar to those of the previous concept related to traffic and construction noise. In addition, the neighbors raised additional questions regarding the rationale for rezoning to the property to PUD and density of the homes.

Lot Standards

The following chart is intended to summarize the required lot and setback standards:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>R-1 zoning</th>
<th>R-1A zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>22,000 sf</td>
<td>15,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildable Area</td>
<td>3,500 sf</td>
<td>2,400 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width at Setback</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width at ROW</td>
<td>80 ft; but 65 ft at cul-de-sac bulb</td>
<td>55 ft; but 45 ft at cul-de-sac bulb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Depth</td>
<td>125 ft</td>
<td>125 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Impervious Surface</td>
<td>Regulated only within the shoreland overlay district</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lots less than 17,500 sf. = 0.24&lt;br&gt;Lots 17,500 sf or greater = 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>35 ft; but 50 ft from the ROW of major collector or arterial roadways</td>
<td>35 ft from streets exterior to the R-1A district&lt;br&gt;25 ft from streets interior to the R-1A district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 ft; aggregate total of 30 ft</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>40 ft or 20% of the lot depth whichever is less</td>
<td>30 ft or 20% of the lot depth, whichever is less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the lot sizes illustrated on the conceptual plat, the following maximum impervious surface and floor area ratios would apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Max Impervious *</th>
<th>Max FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>16,868 sf</td>
<td>8,435 sf</td>
<td>4,048 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>22,195 sf</td>
<td>11,100 sf</td>
<td>4,885 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>19,895 sf</td>
<td>9,950 sf</td>
<td>4,380 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>17,490 sf</td>
<td>8,745 sf</td>
<td>4,180 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>18,184 sf</td>
<td>9,245 sf</td>
<td>4,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>19,024 sf</td>
<td>9,512 sf</td>
<td>4,185 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>16,039 sf</td>
<td>8,020 sf</td>
<td>3,850 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 9</td>
<td>16,690 sf</td>
<td>8,345 sf</td>
<td>4,005 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest 5 sf

While review of the lot standards on the proposed plat are not part of the current review, staff would like to note that the lots around the cul-de-sac bulb would not meet the minimum lot-width-at-setback requirements. The applicant is working to resolve this issue prior to subdivision review.
Floor area and Floor Area (FAR)

Based on code-definition and the city’s McMansion policy, floor area is the sum of above ground horizontal area of a home, as measured from exterior walls and including attached garage space and enclosed porch areas, and one-half of the horizontal area of any partially exposed level such as a walkout or lookout level. Floor area ratio is the floor area divided by the lot area.

**Neighborhood Comments**

The city sent notices to 39 area property owners and received no comments to date.

**Deadline for Decision**

August 18, 2016
Location Map

Project: Highview Place
Applicant: Rob Eldridge
Address: 4301 Highview Pl
Project No. 88082.16b

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
City of Minnetonka

Regarding: Highview Place Plat

To Whom It May Concern:

Ridge Creek Custom Homes has submitted a concept plan for the redevelopment of 4301 Highview Place. The total area of the property is approximately 4.5 acres and is currently zoned R-1. Ridge Creek’s plan is to create a new cul-de-sac with 8 single family home lots. The pre-existing home in the North West corner of the development would blend into the new development. The new single family homes would have a home owners association to maintain the landscaping and turf areas and be zoned R-1A.

Parcel 2211722310031 is currently zoned Residential, Homestead.

Parcel 2211722310032 is currently zoned Vacant Land-Residential, Homestead.

Sincerely,

Ridge Creek Custom Homes
GOVERNING SPECIFICATIONS:
1. MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS
   PREPARED FOR CONSTRUCTION
2. AASHTO, ADOPTION OF MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS
   PREPARED FOR CONSTRUCTION
3. LOCAL LAWS AND ORDINANCES
4. CITY OF MINNETONKA STANDARDS
   PREPARED FOR CONSTRUCTION
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Parcel 1: That part of Lot 5, Block 1, Pierce's Addition, lying Southwesterly of a line drawn from a point on the Southerly line of said Lot 5 at a distance of 70.0 feet East of the most Westerly corner thereof to a point on the Northwesterly line of said Lot 5 at a distance of 56.15 feet Northeasterly of the most Westerly corner thereof.

Parcel 2: Tracts B, C, and D, Registered Land Survey No. 557, Hennepin County, Minnesota, except that part of said Tract C, lying Southwesterly of the following described line: Commencing at the northwest corner of said Tract C; thence on an assumed azimuth of 182 degrees 25 minutes 01 seconds along the west line of said Tract C for 56.98 feet to the point of beginning of the line to be described; thence Southeasterly for 123.37 feet on a non-tangential curve, concave to the Southwest, having a radius of 66.00 feet, a delta angle of 86 degrees 48 minutes 42 seconds and a chord azimuth of 135 degrees 52 minutes 42 seconds to the southerly right of way line of Trunk Highway No. 494 as now located and established and said line there terminating.

NOTE:

EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY PERFORMED BY ADVANCE SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

GOVERNING SPECIFICATIONS:

1. THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION, LATEST EDITION & SUPPLEMENTS
2. THE ENGINEERS' ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA'S (EAM) STANDARD STUDIES
3. THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S LOCAL EDITION
5. THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT'S STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS & DETAILS
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Parcel 1: That part of Lot 5, Block 1, Pierce's Addition, lying Southwesterly of a line drawn from a point on the Southerly line of said Lot 5 distant 70.0 feet West of the most Westerly corner thereof to a point on the Westerly line of said Lot 5 distant 56.15 feet Northwesterly of the most Westerly corner thereof and measured along the Northwesterly line.

Parcel 2: Tracts B, C and D, Registered Land Survey No. 557, Hennepin County, Minnesota, except the part of said Tract C lying Southwesterly of the following described line: Commencing at the northwesterly corner of said Tract C; thence on an assumed azimuth of 182 degrees 25 minutes 01 seconds along the west line of said Tract C for 56.98 feet to the point of beginning of the line to be described; thence Southwesterly along a line tangent to the southerly curve of a radius of 66.00 feet, having a chord azimuth of 135 degrees 52 minutes 42 seconds and a chord distance of 123.37 feet to a point on the northerly right of way line of Trunk Highway No. 494 as now located and established and said line there terminating.

LEGEND

- R-1 Zoning
- R-1A Zoning

GOVERNING SPECIFICATIONS:

3. All applicable federal, state and local laws and ordinances will be conducted in the construction of this project.
Highview Place
Maple Lane
State Highway No. 7
Interstate Highway No. 494
KYLIE CIRCLE
15-041
04/01/2016
N CAMPION ENGINEERING SERVICES, INC.
Civil Engineering Land Planning
TREE PRESERVATION PLAN
Highview Place Rezoning
RIDGE CREEK CUSTOM HOMES
MINNETONKA, MN
SHEET NO. 9 OF 11 SHEETS
15.041
Ordinance No. 2016-

An ordinance rezoning portions of the existing properties at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel

The City Of Minnetonka Ordains:

Section 1.

1.01 Portions of the property located at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel are requested to be rezoned from R-1 to R-1A.

Section 2.

2.01 The area to be rezoned from R-1 to R-1A is legally described on Exhibit A of this ordinance.

2.02 The described area is depicted on Exhibit B of this ordinance.

Section 3.

3.01 Rezoning of these properties is appropriate. This action is based on the following findings:

1. The R-1A area will be appropriately integrated into the existing development.

2. The R-1A area will not detract from the existing surrounding development, as it would be located at the edge of an existing neighborhood and at the intersection of Highway 7 and Interstate 494

3. All lots within the R-1A area will be served by a new street.

4. The rezoning is consistent with the comprehensive plan.
Ordinance No. 2016-

Section 4.

4.01 This ordinance is effective upon approval of the final development plan and final plat.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on July 11, 2016.

______________________________________________________________________________

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

______________________________________________________________________________

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this ordinance:

Date of introduction: June 6, 2016
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 regular meeting held on July 11, 2016.

______________________________________________________________________________

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
EXHIBIT A

Legal Description to be inserted following the plat approval by the city
ITEM 8D – 3105 Shores Boulevard

While the floor plans were labeled “walkout,” the elevations did not indicate an exterior door on the lower level. Since the distribution of the packet, the applicant has contacted the city to indicate that they are indeed proposing a “walkout” basement. For purposes of the McMansion Policy, floor area ratio calculations are consistent for “lookouts” and “walkouts.” As such, no substantive changes are made to the findings of the report or the resolution. However, please make the following change to page one of the staff report:

- As proposed, the home would be two stories in height with an attached garage and a “lookout” walkout basement.

The following comment and the attached comment were received after the packet was distributed:

Hello,
I live at 3108 Beverly Place - across the street from the old Truffles & Tortes building. I have met the new property owners, Heather & Joseph, and am very excited about them building their home on that lot. I do not have any issues with the setback variances.

Thank you,
LeAnne Johansen

ITEM 8F – 4301 Highview Place

The attached comments were received after the distribution of the packet.
ITEM 9A – Glen Lake Neighborhood Study

The following attached letters were received after posting of the plan on the website and distribution of the planning commission packet.
Dear Neighbors,

As you know, we listed our home in late April, and it sold quickly. After over 30 years in the house moving has been difficult, not only because of the things we had accumulated, but emotionally after all the memories that we created in the house and not seeing our neighbors/friends as frequently. The new owners, Martene and John Ackland, moved in June 4th. They are a wonderful young couple who are excited about the house and the expanding neighborhood.

We are slowing emptying out of the "big" garage, and have until the process of rezoning and platting with the City is completed. We are now working directly with the same builder, Rob Eldridge, on the project. We value his integrity and professionalism.

By now you should have received notification regarding the rezoning of the land from R1 to R1A. The number of lots that will be platted, after the rezoning and approval will be nine total (existing house plus eight additional lots). There will be an opportunity at the Planning Commission meeting this Thursday, June 16th (starts at 6:30 pm), for the neighbors to provide feedback. The rezoning is second to last on the Agenda. We are asking for your support, and if you are unable to attend, that you send your comments via email to Ashley Cauley (acauley@eminnetonka.com). You may also click the link below for further information.

We are making our farm near Ortonville, MN our permanent residence, and renting a townhouse near our building in St. Louis Park that houses Highview Plumbing for the time being. Both our boys are involved in the business, and we are hoping to transition it’s operation to them over the next few years.

On a sad note, we lost our 12 year old lab, Snickers, last Friday. His health had been declining over the last year or so. He was having a hard time breathing and the Vet said he likely had pneumonia. It’s been very hard on all of us, especially Hank and his walking buddy (aka Susie).

Thank you for your friendship and your support. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions.

Best regards,

Dan & Susie Swanson

Dan-612-916-0444
Susie 612-916-0445

-----Original Message-----
From: City of Minnetonka <CityofMinnetonka@public.govdelivery.com>
To: highplmg <highplmg@aol.com>
Sent: Fri, Jun 10, 2016 5:01 pm
Subject: City of Minnetonka Highview Place Update
F. Ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel from R-1 to R-1A.

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.

Rob Eldridge, of Ridge Creek Custom Homes, applicant, stated that Cauley did a great job. He was available for questions.

The public hearing was opened.

Martine Ackland stated that she and her husband, John, are under contract to purchase 4301 Highview Place. They are excited about the proposal.

Tony Fernandez, 4232 Highview Place, stated that he supports the proposal.

Susie Swanson, current owner of 4301 Highview Place, stated that the proposal is the one best for the neighborhood. It would be a good compromise.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Calvert asked how the R-1A zoning would set a precedent for the surrounding area. Cauley said that the commission has discretion to recommend denial of a site proposed to be rezoned to R-1A.

Calvert asked if the comprehensive guide plan designates the site for higher density. Cauley answered in the negative. All of the reviewed concept plans meet the required density for the site.

Powers saw a similar site in a single-family neighborhood in St. Paul. The proposal makes sense to him.

Chair Kirk still struggled with eight lots. The planning commission would be obligated to recommend approval of a plat conforming to R-1A zoning requirements.

Mr. Eldridge stated that his engineers worked to extend the cul de sac 10 feet to meet all right of way and R-1A requirements.
Chair Kirk supports the R-1A zoning for the site. It is an unusual parcel in the neighborhood. The houses would be quite nice.

Knight noted that the previous R-1A site had access to Excelsior Boulevard and County Road 101. This proposal is adjacent to Highway 7 and Interstate 494. Cauley explained that there is no requirement for an R-1A zoning district to be located near to a busy street. The Saville property does not have direct access to Excelsior Boulevard. It connects to Tracy Lynn Terrace. The previous R-1A site and current proposal are both reached by driving through single-family neighborhoods that connect to a cul-de-sac.

Chair Kirk noted that many drivers in Minnetonka neighborhoods use arterial streets to get to collector streets.

Odland thought there would be too much stuff on the site. It should be reduced to be an appropriate size. Powers did not disagree with Odland, but what is being considered is changing the zoning to R-1A. Odland did not disagree with the zoning being R-1 or R-1A, but she still felt there would be too much on the site.

O'Connell stated that the proposal went from 10 lots to 8 lots and, given the nature of the R-1A zoning requirements, the density would be appropriate. In past meetings, there has been a lot of neighborhood opposition. Aside from one letter requesting the subdivision to be smaller, there has been no other objection to the proposal.

Chair Kirk looked at the neighborhood lots to compare the reasonableness of the proposed lots. A large lot located so close to the highway might be a hard to sell. The parcel’s proximity to the highway makes smaller lots with a smaller price point reasonable and is the justification for him to support the proposal. Minnetonka is lacking new-house development.

Calvert agreed with everyone. She was squeamish with the density, but the price point and type of housing stock is unique.

Odland said that page 4 of the staff report listed “9 lots.” Gordon explained that the “9 lots” include the existing house with an additional 8 lots. He clarified that the approval to rezone the site does not include dimensional standards of the subdivision, details of grading or location of utilities, or any other details. The approval of the details of the plat would happen later. Shifting the road or lot lines would be looked at a future meeting. Rezoning the site to R-1A sets the density standard for the plat.
Knight favored the lots for the new houses being zoned R-1A because it would allow the city some control to limit the size of the floor area ratio (FAR).

O'Connell asked staff to compare Groveland Pond's density with the proposal. Cauley answered that Groveland Pond's 14 units on a cul de sac is significantly denser than the proposal. Groveland Pond's lots are approximately half the size of the proposal's lots.

Cauley confirmed that R-1A zoning would allow a restriction on the FAR and amount of impervious surface, but the R-1 zoning would not.

Powers moved, second by Knight, recommend that the city council adopt an ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed property from R-1 to R-1A (see pages A12-A15 of the staff report).

Knight, O'Connell, Odland, Powers, Calvert, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Motion carried.

The city council is tentatively scheduled to review this item at its meeting on July 11, 2016.
Revised Conceptual Plat received
June 29, 2016
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Parcel 1: That part of Lot 5, Block 1, Pierce's Addition, lying Southwesterly of a line drawn from a point on the Southerly line of said Lot 5 distant 70.0 feet East of the most Westerly corner thereof to a point on the Northerly line of said Lot 5 distant 56.15 feet Northeasterly of the most Westerly corner thereof and measured along said Northerly line.

Parcel 2: Tracts B, C and D, Registered Land Survey No. 557, Hennepin County, Minnesota, except that part of said Tract C lying Northeasterly of the following described line: Commencing at the northwesterly corner of said Tract C; thence on an assumed azimuth of 182 degrees 25 minutes 01 seconds along the west line of said Tract C for 56.98 feet to the point of beginning of the line to be described; thence southeasterly for 123.37 feet on a non-tangential curve, concave to the southwest, having a radius of 66.00 feet and an angle of 86 degrees 48 minutes 42 seconds and a chord azimuth of 135 degrees 52 minutes 42 seconds to the northerly right of way line of Trunk Highway No. 494 as now located and established and said line there terminating.

GOVERNING SPECIFICATIONS:

1. THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION "STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION" LATEST EDITION & SUPPLEMENT;
2. CITY ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA (CEAA) "STANDARD UTILITIES SPECIFICATIONS" LATEST EDITION;
3. ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAWS AND ORDINANCES WILL BE COMPLIED WITH IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THIS PROJECT;
4. CITY OF MINNETONKA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS & DETAILS;
City Council Agenda Item #14C
Meeting of July 11, 2016

Brief Description
Resolution endorsing the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study

Recommendation
Adopt the Resolution

Background

The study of the city’s village centers was identified as an implementation component in the city’s 2030 comprehensive plan. Since adoption of the comprehensive plan in 2008, planning studies and/or significant reinvestment/redevelopment have taken place at 11 of the city’s 13 village centers. Over the past decade, a significant amount of change has taken place in the Glen Lake neighborhood. In fact, this private investment has yielded over $33 million of increased property value in the area. While this value has been positive to the vitality of the neighborhood, the manner in which the city prepares for change needed improvement.

In 2014, the city initiated a series of new efforts to examine and plan for potential future changes in the neighborhood. The first of those efforts occurred in the summer of 2014 when the city collaborated with Glen Lake neighbors in a focused study of the former Kraemer’s hardware store redevelopment. In the fall of 2014, the City initiated a second step in the process that included the facilitation of a series of meetings to help assemble a neighborhood planning study specific to the northwestern intersection of Williston Road and Excelsior Boulevard.

At the conclusion of the northwestern study, and prior to the current effort, the city took time to engage the neighborhood in conversation about how to properly conduct a broader neighborhood study. This three-part conversation resulted in a framework for the next planning work. The group discussed ways to engage with neighbors and businesses, an effort to include the lake as an integral study component of the plan and maintain a broad but balanced view of future redevelopment.

The current effort was intended to provide the neighborhood with a close up review of larger parcels that had the potential of redevelopment in the Glen Lake area. In June of 2015, the city council approved a scope of work that included study of a number of properties with the purpose of evaluating future, detailed, redevelopment scenarios, regardless of the intention of current property owners. This responded to the past feedback that the city was not prepared for change. Rather than wait for development proposals to evaluate and be reactionary, the intention of the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study was to proactively identify important assets of these sites and provide general guidance for future change.
Public Engagement

In addition to the neighborhood work group, a series of four public community engagement meetings were conducted on various topics. Informational topics ranged from the status of the Hennepin County Home School to Glen Lake water quality. Interactive workshops explored future development potential, recreation and open space with participants. Input is included in the study appendices and was posted on MinnetonkaMatters.com to the broader public.

In addition to the foundational community engagement meetings, a few other outreach efforts were incorporated including listening sessions at the Glen Lake Caribou Coffee, online engagement with MinnetonkaMatters.com and postcards to residents in the Glen Lake mailing area at key stages in the process.

Prior to the planning commission and city council study review meetings postcards were sent to residents in the Glen Lake mailing area (897 mailings for each meeting).

Planning Commission review

The planning commission reviewed the study at their June 16, 2016 meeting. The meeting was noticed to all in the Glen Lake mailing area that in addition to the planning commission review, public comment would also be received.

During the public input portion, three people shared their comments about the study. The comments are included in the planning commission meeting minutes. (See pages A64-A75).

Public Comment

In addition to public comment received at the planning commission, the city received eight letters. They are included on pages A51-A63.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the city council adopt the resolution endorsing the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study (pages A76-A77).

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

Originated by:
  Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
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Project Overview

Over the past decade, a significant amount of change has taken place in the Glen Lake Neighborhood. A number of studies took place from 2003 to 2008. A 2005 market study investigated a number of topics, including can the community support and attract a full-service grocery store and can mixed-use development formats featuring housing situated over ground-floor retail contribute to the area? The answer to both of these questions is a resounding – yes. Lunds & Byerlys now occupies the long standing grocer location providing the neighborhood with a broad range of food products from this premium Twin City merchant. The Oaks Glen Lake Apartments, which features ground floor retail space, expanded the housing opportunities in the area.

In 2014 Kraemer’s Hardware store relocated from the north side of Excelsior Boulevard to the Glen Lake Center. Subsequent interest in the reuse of the property, as well as interest in the adjacent businesses, prompted the City to initiate the Northwestern Glen Lake Study. The study, completed in September of 2015, focused primarily on properties along Excelsior Boulevard between Williston Road and Beacon Hill. The study included four distinct community workshops involving almost 150 people. The outcome of the effort was a set of development guidelines that reflect the consensus of residents and property owners who participated in the sessions.

This study, Glen Lake Village Neighborhood Study, builds off of the work that was completed in 2015. It focuses on the examination of a series of parcels that are scattered throughout the general area to explore:

» The establishment of a common vision for future change in the area
» Exploration of park, open space and trail opportunities
» The identification of aesthetic and public realm improvements
» Providing overall future land use guidelines

Ideas pertaining to the future use of these parcels that were developed during the planning process were reviewed by a Neighborhood Work Group for feedback before being critiqued by the larger neighborhood.

Integrating Prior Plans:

Glen Lake Neighborhood Concept Plan - 2003
The plan integrated elements of the land use and public realm improvements identified in the plan including:

» Locations for commercial and retail development
» Intersection improvements

Glen Lake Streetscaping Project - 2008
The project integrated elements of the land use and public realm improvements identified in the plan including:

» Locations for gateway elements, public art, and water features
» Pedestrian and bicycle improvements and connections

Northwest Glen Lake Study - 2015
The study established a list of development guidelines to be used by the City and developers to address shared parking, coordinated and complementary land uses, attraction and retention of existing retail and services, and safe and effective traffic movement.
The Planning Process

The planning process has three primary components.

ORGANIZE THE EFFORT
» Establish base information

EXPLORATION
» Explore elements of a common vision
» Explore development and redevelopment alternatives, connection and recreational open space opportunities

CREATE A STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR THE FUTURE
» Assemble framework elements
» Compile framework document
FIGURE 1.1 PROJECT AREA MAP
Community Engagement Process

The neighborhood planning process included a series of neighborhood meetings with hands-on workshop opportunities for involvement by area residents and businesspersons. The meetings began in the summer of 2015 and concluded in early 2016 with a community meeting to review proposed redevelopment scenarios and public realm enhancement recommendations. Meetings included broader neighborhood group members and neighborhood liaisons to form a workgroup to help guide the planning process and meeting topics.

In addition, a new communication tool was used to actively engage all stakeholders before, during and after meetings throughout the process. Minnetonka Matters was an interactive tool to continue conversations on planning topics, issues & opportunities, and to comment on proposed concepts throughout the process. This on-line forum allowed for live participation during meetings and provided post-meeting follow-up dialogue for those interested in the process.
Public Meetings

JULY 23, 2015
Meeting Topic: The discussion included a summary of activities to date, the purpose of the current study, goals and a specific schedule of activities. Participants were asked to identify areas of concern, opportunities, and areas of inspiration. Below are links to the discussion topics.

http://minnetonkamatters.com/forums/glen-lake/ideas/opportunities-and-areas-of-inspiration
http://minnetonkamatters.com/forums/glen-lake/ideas/what-are-your-issues-or-concerns

AUGUST 13, 2015
Meeting Topic: The discussion included more in-depth discussion on the following topics: Hennepin County Home School (Commissioner Jan Callison speaking), natural resources including Glen Lake water quality and area parks and trails.

AUGUST 18, 2015
Meeting Topic: Interactive workshops to explored big picture options for future development in the neighborhood, focusing conversations around potential redevelopment opportunities, recreation and open space opportunities.

JANUARY 20, 2016
Meeting Topic: The meeting reviewed the redevelopment scenarios and outlined principles which will then be reviewed by the city’s planning commission and council.

A summary of each of these meetings can be found in the appendix.

“We need to improve Glen Lake. It’s a critical community resource and we need to improve access to the water and protecting the lake’s water quality”
Analysis Overview

GLEN LAKE / WATER QUALITY
As part of the planning process Minnetonka Staff presented information to address questions from residents about the health of Glen Lake which included:

» Fishery conditions: Dominated by small pan-fish, fish population heavily influenced by occasional winter-kill events
» Vegetation conditions: Diverse NATIVE aquatic plant community
» Water quality: Fluctuates, but is generally in line with other area lakes
» Impact of development: Recent area stormwater improvements are helping mitigate the impact of runoff from roadways and new development, but the lake still receives a large amount of contaminates from surface water runoff originating from older, established area land uses

» What residents can do to help improve the quality of Glen Lake

TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS
Development areas have direct access to a robust transportation network, with east west connections via Excelsior Boulevard and County Road 62, and Eden Prairie Road connecting north south. Transit service occurs along Excelsior Boulevard with express service to Minneapolis, and a planned LRT station at nearby Shady Oak Road.

HENNEPIN COUNTY SITE
Very preliminary conversations are occurring about the long-term future of the Hennepin County Home School property. Should the property ever become available for some other use, the site has many features that could make it attractive for redevelopment.

The Home School campus sits on the west side of the property. The majority of the property currently consists of open space. Large stands of mature pine and oak forests bound the site to the east and portions of the south, while Glen Lake and Glen Lake Golf Course border it on the north and west. The site boasts a rolling scenic natural landscape similar in character to an oak savannah with beautiful views throughout the site and good access to natural resource and recreational amenities. Access to the site is via an existing entrance at the southwest corner of Country Road 62, or in the northwest corner off a small dead-end residential road (Boy School Road).
FIGURE 3.2 AREA ANALYSIS MAP
Opportunities and Areas of Inspiration

As part of the community engagement process, public meetings were held to allow residents to identify existing natural resources and community assets that are important to the success and vitality of the community. These were broken down into the following two categories:

DEVELOPMENT/LAND USE

Land use and development patterns are a sign of the community character and vitality and often signal level of investment by local residents. The Glen Lake community identified these land use and development opportunities:

» New development has been successful and relatively well received
» Desire for a wider range of housing options that make the area attractive to a broader spectrum of people
» Interest in a wider range of retail options, either into existing buildings or as redevelopment of under-utilized sites
» Desire for more park and recreation options, including both active and passive recreation
» Take advantage of existing park and open space resources, and improve what is already in place
» Glen Lake is a substantial and under-utilized natural resource
» Potential for connections to regional trails and transit
» Area has a lot of housing options for seniors
» Good variety of local businesses (grocery, hardware, post office, etc)
» Local business owners are active in the community
» Area housing is affordable

AMENITIES/PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS

The public realm is an important component of a healthy neighborhood; it provides a sense of place and important public spaces for gathering and recreation. Glen Lake residents identified the following elements:

» Existing sidewalks and trails are frequently used
» Abundant area wildlife, particularly around Glen Lake
» Recent roadway improvements have added to the sidewalk and trail network and improved crossings of major roadways
» Golf course is an important community destination and resource
» Hennepin County site could be a substantial community resource, particularly for making a ‘lake loop trail’ and providing access to open water
» Proximity to LRT and Regional trails is something that should be more fully explored
» Area has good connections to major transportation infrastructure
» Glen Lake Station Park was renovated in 2009 and is frequently used by residents

Pedestrian crossing improvement at Woodhill Road and Excelsior Boulevard
Community Issues and Concerns

Local residents were also asked to voice their concerns about existing local development patterns, land use, amenities, and natural resources to provide a clear picture of what isn’t working in the area.

DEVELOPMENT/LAND USE

Development that doesn’t fit the scale, character or use of a neighborhood or land uses that have not aged gracefully or no longer provide the highest and best use of land can detract from a neighborhood’s character and economic health. Area residents identified the following concerns regarding land use and development:

» Substantial amount of density already in the area, concern that development isn’t matching the existing scale and character of the neighborhood
» Traffic congestion during peak periods can be problematic for residents
» Development and redevelopment need to address the lack of architectural character and attractiveness of some of the existing buildings
» Adequate parking and access for local businesses is lacking
» The area lacks a destination to draw in outside visitors
» Support and retain existing local businesses and employers
» Minimize the impact of development and redevelopment on Glen Lake
» Streetscape improvements are needed to make the sidewalks feel more pleasant

AMENITIES AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Just as high quality public spaces and natural resources can add interest and energy to a community, so too can they harm that community when those spaces and resources become uncomfortable, degraded, and unattractive. Community members identified the following areas of concern:

» Need to provide more transportation/transit options for local residents
» Pedestrian crossings on busy streets feel unsafe
» Sidewalk network is sporadic and disconnected in areas
» Certain areas are poorly lit and lack good visibility and safety
» Need to address the water quality and access concerns of the neighborhood’s most prominent and valuable resource, Glen Lake
» The neighborhood has no sense of entrance, nothing marks your arrival into the neighborhood
» Local parks are under programmed and under-utilized, lack appropriate programming for residents, don’t fully utilize natural resources
» General lack of plaza/public space on Excelsior Boulevard
» The neighborhood needs a coherent senses of identity/place
» Strengthening existing sidewalk and trail network connections to surrounding destinations and natural resources
» Create a loop trail system around Glen Lake
» Protect existing wildlife and natural resources

WHAT WE’VE HEARD:

“[The Glen Lake neighborhood] needs development that fits the existing character and feeling of the neighborhood”
Land Use

In the early stages of the planning process, a high-level review of all of the parcels in the study area was conducted. The vast majority of the Glen Lake neighborhood area includes various types of housing and commercial development that is firmly established and has been in place for many years. Other parcels are likely to change or may change over time.

Parcels that are the subject of pending development that have received prior approval from the City were considered as being subject to imminent change. Other parcels that owners and/or developers have expressed ideas and concepts about future development were categorized as having near term development potential. And finally, a third category of parcels was identified for areas where potential change might occur over a longer period of time. Properties in this category are those that have larger land areas or are in locations that could encourage future change. It is important to note that owners of properties in this third category have not expressed interest in development and that the City is not encouraging any specific change to any of these properties.

The purpose of looking at all of these land areas is to address the “what if” situation. Should changes occur in the future, the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study will serve as guidance for discussions between the property owners and the City.

Figure 4.3 identifies the properties that were categorized as either pending development, near term development potential or areas that may see change. The following is an overview of each:
PENDING/RECENT DEVELOPMENT

Williston Woods West
» Develop two north lots into 5 detached single family homes

Old Kraemer’s Hardware Site
» Demolish the existing building, new day care to be constructed

NEAR TERM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

East (south parcel) Site (Approximately 2.5 Acres)
» Townhomes potential similar to the ‘Water’s Edge’ development
» Single family, either on the entire site or as an interior development type paired with townhomes adjacent to Stewart Lane

Central Site (Approximately 11 Acres)
» Townhomes oriented to Eden Prairie Road
» Single family, either on the entire site or as an interior development type paired with townhomes along Eden Prairie Road

AREAS THAT MAY SEE CHANGE

Hennepin County Site (Approximately 146 Acres)
» Townhomes near southern end of site against Highway 62
» Large passive recreation park at the Home School site (lake access, wetlands, trails, interpretative activities)
» Site as regional park and open space, provide active and passive uses
» A mixed development of single family residential in the core and along Eden Prairie Road and apartments along Highway 62 with integrated park space along Glen Lake shoreline, potential PUD style development
» Single family homes at north end and in core of site, leaving space for park/natural area on east and north end along Glen Lake
» Trails on Home School site, especially along lake, as part of large housing development
» Create trails within a large park, particularly to provide access to the south shoreline of Glen Lake

West Site (Approximately 5.5 Acres)
» Single family residential on the west/south side of the site
» Better connect property to Excelsior Blvd. through commercial site to north
» Preserve existing farm

East (north parcel) Site (Approximately 1 Acres)
» Ideal location for retail development
» Potential location for restaurant
» Potential park use
» Mixed use building on site as extension of mixed use to the west
» Potential for commercial office

NORTHWEST GLEN LAKE PROPERTIES

These properties were previously studied by the community for redevelopment. Residents expressed interest in the following use(s):
» Retail in the middle and east end of the properties

» Bank could be an optional retail use at the eastern corner of the site
» Restaurants could be an optional use
» Develop properties with shared underground parking

Zvago - Glen Lake Senior Cooperative
» 54 units (4 affordable)
FIGURE 4.3 DEVELOPMENT SITES MAP
Public Realm Improvements

Input on public realm improvements came from the community, city staff and a review of previous public realm planning done for the area. Those recommendations are as follows:

**KINSEL PARK**
- Safety/lighting issues where trails exit park on east side onto Mayview Road
- Trails through park are difficult to use due to poor surface conditions
- Benches and tables are needed in conjunction with a small/simple shelter
- Planting to create more interest (gardens, rain gardens, orchard, etc.)

**GLEN LAKE PARK**
- Improve crossing from Glen Lake Park to Kinsel Park across Excelsior Boulevard
- Gateway opportunity near Glen Lake Park along Woodhill Road

**STEWART LANE**
- Traffic volume issues with development, need for traffic calming and management of cut-through movements

**EXCELSIOR BOULEVARD**
- Entry feature opportunity at NE corner of Williston Road and Excelsior Boulevard
- Improve the crossing at Excelsior Boulevard and Woodhill Road, unsafe despite recent improvements
- Improve biking conditions between Glen Oak Street and Glenview Drive
- Lighting improvements east of Kinsel Park
- Improve lighting between Williston Road and Beacon Hill Road
- More seating, benches and tables in conjunction with restaurants/retail
- Potential public art/place making/neighborhood identity opportunity on the NE corner of Beacon Hill Road and Excelsior Boulevard
- Gateway or place making element to announce arrival into Glen Lake area
- Post office difficult to access
- Vegetation/planting to screen power station

**WOODHILL ROAD**
- Needs improved lighting, too dark

**HENNEPIN COUNTY HOME SCHOOL SITE**
- Site could have enhanced wetland areas, with potential for interpretive/interactive plant centric programming

**GLEN LAKE**
- Create a loop trail that goes around Glen Lake, if possible
- Provide a connecting trail along the eastern and southern edges to connect north trails (Kinsel Park) to eastern and southern trail system

**OTHER**
- Parking along Tree Street is a concern

**WHAT WE’VE HEARD:**

“Kinsel Park could be a lot more than it is, there’s just not much to do there now. It needs more lighting, better trail surfaces, seating, a place to gather like a picnic shelter, and most importantly better access to Glen Lake”
FIGURE 4.4 PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS

LEGEND
- Bike Lane
- Enhanced Planting
- Water Feature
- Public Art / Placemaking
- Plaza Space
- Pedestrian Enhancement / Intersection Improvement
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The following redevelopment concepts represent possible redevelopment ideas and will be used as tools for discussion with developers or property owners who bring forward ideas and proposals. **No development plans are currently proposed for these sites.**

### Central Site

**OVERVIEW**

The Central site is located east of Eden Prairie Road south of the commercial node in the Glen Lake Neighborhood. This study site extends from the Glen Lake Family Dentistry south to Ferris Lane. The eastern boundary is created by Glen Lake and a wetlands complex to the northeast. The study area consists of 7-9 single family lots of varied size, age and condition. This site has seen development pressure in the past and because of it’s proximity to the neighborhood commercial center, it’s a large land area and it’s adjacent to Glen Lake.

The two concepts show different approaches to housing product types, but generally maintain the same development pattern with a singular, realigned access to align with Glendale Street and two cul-de-sac feeding development sites. The areas running north/south along Eden Prairie Road are envisioned to have villas or attached townhomes in order maintain a narrow development depth and preserve as much of the woodland hillside as possible. The southern street leg would be comprised of single family home sites and would provide access to the existing homes to the southeast of the study site. Lots would remain compact and home sites would be positioned outside of the bluff line to preserve the existing hillside forest. Concept B shows the potential to expand single family housing to the south off of the southern cul-de-sac should there be developer interest.
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

» Focus on residential land use on the site ranging from low density detached to high density attached

» Provide a mix of housing types on the site, including single family home sites, villas and townhomes

» Transition from medium density along Eden Prairie Road to lower density in the southern and eastern portions of the site

» Preserve the existing woodland on the eastern portion of the site.

» Preserve the large forested area on the hillside down to the wetland and lake by holding back development and home sites on top of the hill and utilizing conservation easements to preserve the land area as perpetual open space

» Target approximately 50% of the land area to be open space, preserve or park

» Align a singular access point with Glendale Street

» Control and route stormwater away from the lake, back toward the west

» Provide enhanced pedestrian connections along the east side of Eden Prairie Road, connecting back to the commercial core

» Explore the opportunity for additional trail connections through the woodland to connect back with Dickson Road, or to the south ultimately connecting to the Home School site

» Maintain access to existing homes to the south through shared access easements

» Explore the potential for additional single family housing lots south of new roadway (Concept B)

SUGGESTED LAND USES

As with the West Site, attached townhomes and stand alone villas were explored for this site to transition from the existing single family housing to the south, north to the commercial land uses. These uses provide smaller lot sizes and the ability to preserve more land as open space possibly through conservation easements.
**NOTE:** Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.
NOTE: Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.
**West Site**

**OVERVIEW**

The West site is located southwest of Excelsior Boulevard and Eden Prairie Road behind the commercial development including the new location for Kraemer’s Hardware Store. The site is accessed off of Glendale Street from the south and is a large, contiguous piece of land with an old farmstead situated in the center of the site. The site sits lower than Eden Prairie Road to the east and the commercial development to the north, is heavily wooded with small wetland pockets on the east and far west of the property.

Three concept alternatives were explored for this property. The first concept shows attached townhomes clustered together on the west central portion of the property preserving the woodland edge to the east. The second and third concepts highlight a villa housing type that could entirely redevelop on the site, or work in conjunction with the preservation of the existing farmstead.
GUIDING PRINCIPLES
» Preserve the existing woodland and small wetlands on the eastern portion of the site
» Preserve existing farm house
» Target approximately 40% of the land area to be preserved as open space
» Focus on residential land use on the site ranging from low density detached to medium density attached
» Explore a mix of housing types on the site ranging from preservation of the existing single family home in combination with villas or attached townhomes
» Provide pedestrian connections along Glendale Street to connect with newly installed trail on Eden Prairie Road
» Provide an internal pedestrian circulation network
» Explore the potential for a pedestrian connection to the commercial development near Williston Road
» Maintain a singular, vehicular access point to Glendale Street

SUGGESTED LAND USES
Attached townhomes and stand alone villas were explored for this site to transition from the existing single family housing neighborhood to the south, north to the commercial land uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TOTALS</th>
<th>Gross Density</th>
<th>Net Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 MDR</td>
<td>2.2 Unit/Acre</td>
<td>4 Unit/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTION A**
- 12 1.5 Acres
- 1 Acre

**NET:** Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.
**FIGURE 5.8 WEST SITE - CONCEPT B**

### DEVELOPMENT TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compact SF Res.</th>
<th>MDR</th>
<th>Wetland / Floodplain</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>UNIT TOTALS</th>
<th>Gross Density</th>
<th>Net Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5 Acres</td>
<td>1 Acre</td>
<td>12 SFR</td>
<td>2.2 Unit/Acre</td>
<td>4 Unit/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.
### DEVELOPMENT TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compact SF Res.</th>
<th>MDR</th>
<th>Wetland / Floodplain Open Space</th>
<th>UNIT TOTALS</th>
<th>Gross Density</th>
<th>Net Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.75 Acres</td>
<td>2 Acre</td>
<td>8 SFR</td>
<td>1.5 Unit/ Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.

---

**FIGURE 5.9 WEST SITE - CONCEPT C**
**East Site**

**OVERVIEW**

The East Site is comprised of two distinct areas, the first (South) is a narrow sliver of land extending from Stewart Lane southeast to Glen Lake. The second (North), is a smaller site nestled between Excelsior Boulevard and Stewart Lane just east of the Gold Nugget restaurant.

The Commercial / Mixed Use Site (North) along Excelsior Boulevard provides a great opportunity as a gateway to the commercial district in the Glen Lake Neighborhood. Two concepts explore the possibility of a stand-alone commercial/ office development and the other a vertical mixed use project with ground level retail and housing above. Access to this site must be considered in conjunction with the recently completed development to the east to potentially share a joint access to minimize the number access points to Excelsior Boulevard and keep traffic off of the much narrower Stewart Lane.

The Residential Site (South) is challenging for development due to the narrow width of the parcel, but it does have access to Stewart Lane and offers views of Glen Lake on the southern portion of the property. The concept alternatives explored the development of single family home sites or villa-type towhomes off of a singular, shared access drive. The five single family home sites would allow for more tree preservation on the larger lots and is suggested based on discussions with the neighborhood working group. Additional trail connections could connect back to Kinsel Park.
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Commercial / Mixed Use Site - North
» Focus on commercial office or vertical mixed use with retail on the ground level and residential above
» Locate the building toward Excelsior Boulevard with parking to the south or under the building
» Investigate a shared, singular access to Excelsior Boulevard between the proposed development and the property to the east
» Design the access as a driveway, not as an extension of Woodhill Road
» Provide pedestrian connections along Excelsior Boulevard and Stewart Lane
» Explore a pedestrian link between the Gold Nugget and the proposed development
» Treat the northeast portion of the property with high quality architectural features and landscaping to create a sense of entry to the commercial district

Residential Site - South
» Create a narrow lane along the western boundary of the site for development access and pedestrian connectivity
» Explore single family housing sites or villas on the property
» Preserve trees to the extent possible, particularly at the entry to the property along Stewart Lane and along the shoreline of Glen Lake
» Reduce grading on site by matching street and housing finished floor elevations to existing contours and collecting stormwater in locations shown on plan
» Explore a trail connection to Kinsel Park along the shoreline of Glen Lake in conjunction with easements with adjacent development
» Utilize dark sky compliant lighting to minimize light pollution

SUGGESTED LAND USES
Traditional single-family housing or villas are suggested as options for the residential site north of Stewart Lane. Commercial office (1-2 stories) or a mixed-use development (3-4 stories) including housing and a commercial business are suggested as options for the site south of Stewart Lane. Given the prominence of this location along Excelsior Boulevard, the buildings should have high quality materials and interesting architectural features.
**NOTE:** Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.

**FIGURE 5.10 EAST SITE - CONCEPT A**

This trail segment will require property owner cooperation.

### DEVELOPMENT TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF Res.</th>
<th>Compact SF Res.</th>
<th>HDR</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>UNIT TOTALS</th>
<th>Gross Density</th>
<th>Net Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION A</td>
<td>5 Units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,500 SF</td>
<td>6,500 SF Office</td>
<td>2 Unit/Acre</td>
<td>2 Unit/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.

This trail segment will require property owner cooperation.

Possible trail connections.

NOTE: Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.

This trail segment will require property owner cooperation.

### DEVELOPMENT TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF Res.</th>
<th>Compact SF Res.</th>
<th>HDR</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>UNIT TOTALS</th>
<th>Gross Density</th>
<th>Net Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 Units</td>
<td>22 Units</td>
<td>3,000 SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 + 22 Res 3,000 SF Comm</td>
<td>9.1 Unit/Acre</td>
<td>9.1 Unit/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hennepin County Site

OVERVIEW

Situated on the southern boundary of Glen Lake and north of Country Road 62 is the current Hennepin County Home School. Comprising nearly 146 acres of contiguous land, the site features a mix wetlands, woodlands, open grassland with the primary campus on the western portion of the site adjacent to Glen Lake Golf and Practice Center.

On August 13, 2015 County Commissioner Jan Callison provided an update to the community on the Hennepin County site including reviewing the history of the Home School, the current services at the facility, and then discussed the possibility of partnering with Ramsey County to consolidate the two entities and locations closer to where services are more needed, rendering this site obsolete. The County may be looking to sell the property in the future, thus the reason for the City of Minnetonka to explore potential development scenarios on the property, however no formal time table or commitments by Hennepin County have been established.

The eastern portion of the site has a large wetland, woodland area and pine stand as significant natural features. A central wetland bisects the site with the main campus on the western side and open grassland on the remaining eastern portion. There are two access points to the facility on the western edge near the golf course. During the review process with the community, comments on this site included:

» Try to find a balance between development, and preserving park, open space and wildlife habitat
» Ensure that development is designed sustainably to protect Glen Lake, too much density is a concern
» Create trail connections to and from the site
» Explore a broader park or small commercial use as well
FIGURE 5.12 HENNEPIN COUNTY SITE - SITE ANALYSIS
BUILDABLE AREAS ANALYSIS

After removing larger wetlands, steep slopes as well as desired landscape features to preserve such as the pine woodland on the eastern edge of the property and the lakeside areas, two distinct development areas exist. The West and East sides are separated by a large wetland complex. The West side is home to the existing Home School facility and comprises approximately 41 acres of buildable land. The East side is currently undeveloped and is similar in size at 38 buildable acres, for a total of 79 +/- buildable acres.

Access to the site is an important future consideration for development. Existing access points should remain. A third access point should be explored with the Hennepin County Transportation Department to provide direct access to the eastern half of the property. At the narrowest point between the east and west sides, a roadway connection could be established to link the two areas and provide better internal site circulation and emergency service access. The location is a great opportunity for a signature bridge feature for the development.
NOTE: Realign existing access to improve traffic flow and entry sequence into existing golf course and potential redevelopment area.

FIGURE 5.13 HENNEPIN COUNTY SITE - BUILDABLE AREAS
GUIDING PRINCIPLES - PARKS, TRAILS & OPEN SPACE

» Allow the existing natural features (wetlands, woodlands, pine groves, topography) to dictate development areas

» Preserve a continuous open space network along the southern shore of Glen Lake, extending to the east and capturing the wetland network and woodland hillside

» Preserve the existing woodland and dense pine stand on the east side of the site as a buffer and wildlife corridor

» Preserve and enhance the surrounding wetlands

» Preserve and enhance the central wetland as an amenity and wildlife corridor

» Target approximately 40% of the land area to be open space, preserve or park

» Create a common, shared dock and beach near existing Home School water access location

» Provide a network of trails linking a singular lake access point, smaller internal, neighborhood scale parks and connecting more broadly to the surrounding neighborhoods and the Minnesota River Bluffs LRT Regional Trail to the east

» Create wetland overlook and habitat viewing areas

» Provide an expanded trail network linking new park features, preserved open spaces, and existing trails and neighborhoods surrounding Glen Lake

» Develop a central open space amenity with wetland restoration, stormwater treatment, and central bridge feature

Develop a singular shared or common dock and beach area for the entire development, preserving the natural shoreline of Glen Lake.

Develop an integrated trail network, linking internal amenities with surrounding trails and adjacent neighborhoods.

An enhanced centralized wetland can be an attractive amenity for future development.
FIGURE 5.14 HENNEPIN COUNTY SITE - PARKS, TRAILS & OPEN SPACE CONCEPT
GUIDING PRINCIPLES - LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT

» Focus on residential land use on the site ranging from low density detached to high density attached

» Provide a mix of housing types on the site, including single family home sites, villas, townhomes, apartments and condominiums

» Transition from higher density in the southwest portion of the site to lower density in the northern and eastern portions of the site

» Explore options for preserving and reusing portions of the existing campus buildings

» Explore the opportunity for a new southerly access point to Highway 62

» Provide an identifiable loop street network throughout the development

SUGGESTED LAND USES

The size of the overall site, and the configuration (East and West sides) allows for a range of residential development on the site. The reuse of portions of the Home School Facility is a possibility as well.

High density housing is a possibility for this site, either as potential reuse of the existing facility or as redevelopment

Townhomes or villas are potential products

The eastern portion of the site has the potential for a new single family neighborhood
**NOTE:** Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.

**FIGURE 5.15 HENNEPIN COUNTY SITE - POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT**
Neighborhood Meeting Summary - July 23, 2015

The following summary is a list of comments submitted by neighborhood residents during a community open house for the Glen Lake Village Center Study.

**Opportunities and Areas of Inspiration:**

- Creation of large high quality park preferred over development
- Progressive recycling program
- Bicycle connection from trail to Kinsel Park
- Large lot sizes with lots of trees
- Existing hockey rink and track/athletic field(soccer) at Home School
- Retain golf course and ski trails
- Can we repurpose the old hardware store into a new post office to improve access?
- Allow for use of dog grooming building in Glen Lake Park
- Comcast office provides easy access
- Add sidewalks around the Glen Lake Park, bank, and St. Therese
- Alano is a community asset – do they share their parking lot?
- Lots of activity at Optimist Field – skating park
- Love the golf course, retain
- Provide overlook and/or picnic park space at Kinsel Park
- Provide picnic tables for DQ customers and baseball players around NW area
- Love Optimist Park/Kinsel Park
- Retaining grocery store and promoting walkability to other businesses is important
- Need to have a ‘shop local’ campaign to encourage people shopping in the neighborhood
- Make sure to protect loons and other birds, opportunity to highlight them as a feature
- I like the existing sidewalks and the Gold Nugget
- Keep bank, post office, Gold Nugget, Dragon Jade
- Love/support small businesses in area, would like to see more of them developed in the area
  Work to attract/establish a program to attract more small businesses
- Need a doctor’s office and drug store in the area
- Great play areas for kids. Sidewalks are a great start for improvements
- Fence playground on street side
- Pedestrian crossings and lights would be a step in the right direction
- Retain small town feel
- Proposal to develop Kraemer’s, currently not in keeping with neighborhood character, develop at a lower density
- Developed areas are centralized not sprawled out
- Appreciate the lack of fast food and chain style development, still room for café
- Senior housing availability
- Schools – Glenwood, Gatewood, golf course
- Retain cross country skiing in golf course and on Glen Lake
- Support/retain small businesses (DQ, market, liquor, hardware, post office, pet, service)
- Like having sidewalks and park trails and access to bridge over I494
- Lake and Hennepin County land great for outdoor experience
- Improve access to regional trail near LRT, for pedestrians and cyclists
- Preserve trees and open space
- Redevelop the north side
- Eco-friendly green development
- Mixed use with recreational opportunities, single family and multi-family housing connected to lake and golf

**Issues and Concerns**

- Develop as a park
- With LRT coming close, can there be a loop connection into Glen Lake area?
- If this is developed, keep it as lower density residential (R1) and do not allow more ‘high density’ like Zvago development
- Is there interest in saving this dying lake? Money needed for project to dredge lake, or at least for weed control
- Shrinking lake, water quality is great but for lower water levels and increase in aquatic weeds
- Water quality has already been tested and studied by watershed and deemed one of cleanest lakes in state
- Miss the old fountain which created more of a gathering place than current water feature
- Traffic congestion is a problem (especially around rush hour) on Excelsior Boulevard at light waiting to make left turn on County Road 5
- Retail and small businesses to create community and foot traffic. Develop the old Kramer’s building as soon as possible. Currently being used for bus parking
- There is enough high density housing in the Glen Lake Area?
- Sidewalk to connect Baker Road to Glen Lake. The sidewalks ends at Woodridge, this is very unsafe for pedestrians
- A lot of existing pedestrian and bike traffic without trails
- Difficult to find parking at post office
- Scary walking at night on streets, need more lights
- What exactly brings people to shop in Glen Lake neighborhood?
- Find a solution for green-topped ponds, small lakes, etc
- Need a pharmacy in the area with large numbers of senior residents
- Kraemer building needs aesthetic improvements
- Ball fields are in rough shape. Can we improve these?
- Expanded golf course could ruin water quality
- Don’t want to see significant development on the Home School site
- Improve connection to existing bike trails
• Can we improve fishing in the lake?
• Can anything be done to reclaim the lake from weeds?
• Bigger community center with better parking
• Keep post office or relocate to community center site
• Sidewalks on both sides within a ¼ mile of intersection Williston and Eden Prairie Road and Woodhill and Beacon Hill
• Concerned about multi-family homes
• Glen Lake, retain public access
• There is no active public space
• Water level going down in lake
• No community gathering attractions (concerts, etc.) Use of ball field?
• Dock access to water?
• Confusing Excelsior Boulevard crossing
• Parking at post office an issue
• Retain hardware store
• Parking, trees, street congestion and safety
• Glen Lake activity center, what can be done?
• Concerned about health of lake due to development of Zvago
• Safety of auto traffic on Stewart Lane very poor site distance
• More child and family friendly park near ball park, neighborhood gathering place
• Avoid high density shift in housing
• Keep the Glen Lake neighborhood a ‘neighborhood’ meaning mix of residential, retail, educational, recreation with a small town like feel
• Traffic concern with development behind Kraemer’s on Williston
• Schools need connectivity to businesses and lake
• Lack of parking at post office, Gold Nugget, Optimist Park, Glen Lake Activity Center
• Glen Lake and businesses, improve access and connectivity to it
• Reconnect to the lake, can’t see or access the lake because of vegetation growth
• Would like easier canoe access to the lake
• What is the Home School site development impact potential on the area?
• Need transportation between Glen Lake and nearby LRT station
• Optimist field to DQ connection improvement
• Woodhill and Beacon Hill intersections with Excelsior are dangerous for pedestrians
Neighborhood Meeting Summary - August 18, 2015

The following summary is a list of comments offered by neighborhood residents during two community open houses held on August 18, 2015.

LAND USE

Pending Development:

Kraemer Site
- Quality restaurants are needed in the area, they would be a good fit on the Kraemer Site
- 4-5 story mixed use on Kraemer’s site, transitioning to lower scale retail moving east along Excelsior Boulevard would be good

Williston West Site
- Quality restaurants are needed in the area, they would be a good fit on the Williston West Site

Zvago
- None

Near-term Development Potential:

East(South)
- Potential for townhomes similar to the Water’s Edge development on the property
- A mix of single family residential homes and townhomes on the site, with townhomes closer to Stewart Lane
- Potential small park location near Stewart Lane
- A mix of single family residential homes and townhomes on the site, with townhomes closer to Stewart Lane
- Apartments on un-named parcel if they fit

Central Site
- Property has potential for a new retail restaurant
- Townhomes on entire site
- Townhomes on northwest area of the site, transitioning to single family residential (2)
- Single family residential on south and east area of the site, transitioning to townhomes to west and north (2)

Areas That May See Change:

Hennepin County Home School Site
- Large park at the site, potential for consolidated sports fields (baseball, softball, soccer) and passive recreation (lake access, wetlands, trails, interpretative activities)
- 9 hole golf expansion into site (likely not financially viable)
- Site as regional park and open space, provide active and passive uses, Arboretum like setting/program a possibility, could also play host to large outdoor events
• A mixed development with single family residential in the core of the site and along Eden Prairie Road and apartments along Highway 62 with integrated park space along Glen Lake shoreline, potential PUD style development
• Single family homes at north end and in core of site, leaving space for park/natural area on east and north end along Glen Lake
• Trails on site, especially along lake, as part of large housing development
• Create trails within a large park located in the site, particularly to provide access to the south shoreline of Glen Lake (2)
• Townhomes near southern end of the site against Highway 62

**West Site**
• Property has potential for new retail, including pet hospital and bike related shop if commercial area to the north is expanded down into the site
• Townhomes on the eastern half of the west site
• Small park space in northeast corner of west site
• Single family residential on the west/south side of the west site
• Could west site incorporate commercial project to north for larger redevelopment opportunity with commercial/residential density towards Excelsior Boulevard
• Better connect west property to Excelsior Boulevard through commercial site to north if it redevelops.

**East(South) Site**
• Retail on the site
• Site as potential location for restaurant
• Potential park use on the property
• Mixed use building on site as extension of mixed use to the west

**Northwestern Glen Lake Properties**
• Retail in the middle and east end of the properties
• Bank could be an optional retail use at the eastern corner of the properties
• Restaurants could be an optional use on the properties (2)
• Quality restaurants are needed in the area, they would be a good fit on the properties

**Other Sites**
• Existing Dairy Queen corner site(s) would be a great location for a restaurant
• Quality restaurants are needed in the area, they would be a good fit on the commercial properties across Excelsior Boulevard from the Kraemer Site
• Improve existing parks along Excelsior Boulevard, better use of space, safer playground, improved programming
• Repurpose existing private business/property within the park to a public park use
• Provide more public access points to Glen Lake
• Provide a fence around Glen Lake Park playground along Excelsior Boulevard
• Kinsel Park would be an ideal spot for a lake overlook or boardwalk
• Potential consolidation of parcels between East(south) site and Central site(excluding existing townhomes) into a more viable single family residential site, with townhomes near Stewart Lane
• Develop the commercial/retail site southwest of Excelsior Boulevard and Eden Prairie Road into mixed use with parking on lower level to bring retail to eye/road level of Excelsior Boulevard, potential to expand southward into West Sites.
• Incorporate existing local businesses (incl. post office) into new mixed use structures

SAFETY & AESTHETIC IMPROVEMENTS

Kinsel Park
• Safety/lighting issues especially in winter where Kinsel Park trails exit park on east side onto Mayview Road
• The trails through Kinsel Park are difficult to use for older adults because of poor surface conditions
• Benches and tables are needed in Kinsel Park, perhaps in conjunction with a small/simple shelter (2)
• Kinsel park needs better planting to create more interest, perhaps gardens, rain gardens, orchard, or other unique plantings/trees

Glen Lake Park
• Unsafe to cross from Glen Lake Park to Kinsel Park across Excelsior Boulevard at Kinsel Road, could a better crossing or bridge be provided? (2)
• Gateway opportunity near Glen Lake Park along Woodhill Road

Stewart Lane
• Stewart Lane has traffic volume issues, small road with increasing levels of traffic coming from recent (and pending) development
• Can access to Stewart Lane onto Excelsior Boulevard be shifted west to align with Woodhill Road intersection?
• Traffic safety issues (access and turning) at intersection of Stewart Lane and Excelsior Boulevard

Excelsior Boulevard
• Water feature at northeast corner of Williston Road and Excelsior Boulevard
• Improve the crossing at Excelsior Boulevard and Woodhill Road, intersection still feels less than safe despite recent improvements (3)
• Traffic along Excelsior Boulevard (Beacon Hill Road to Glenview Drive) is fast/unsafe, would like to see traffic calming in this area
• Improve the biking conditions along Excelsior Boulevard through the Glen Lake commercial area, west of Glen Oak Road and east of Glenview Drive are ok, but in between feels unsafe for bikes...share the road signs, narrower lanes, stripping, or other options?
• Better lighting east of Kinsel Park is needed along Excelsior Boulevard
• Lighting needs to be improved along Excelsior Boulevard between Williston Road and Beacon Hill Road
• More seating along Excelsior Boulevard, benches and tables in conjunction with restaurants
• Potential public art opportunity on the NE corner of Beacon Hill Road and Excelsior Boulevard
• Potential place making/neighborhood identity opportunity on the NE corner of Beacon Hill Road and Excelsior Boulevard
• Both ends of Excelsior Boulevard need some kind of gateway or place making element to announce arrival into Glen Lake area
• Gateway opportunity at intersection of Williston Ave and Excelsior Boulevard
• Gateway opportunity at intersection of Eden Prairie Road and Glendale Street

**Woodhill Road**
• Woodhill Road needs improved lighting, too dark

**Hennepin County Home School Site**
• Passive water feature in Home School site, perhaps as part of wetland or lake areas
• Home School site could have enhanced wetland areas, with potential for interpretive/interactive plant centric programming
• Outdoor seating (benches and picnic tables) needs to be provided in the Home School site, if it becomes park space

**Kraemer Site**
• Enhanced plantings/garden feature at northeast corner of Williston Road and Excelsior Boulevard (Kraemer site)
• Could Kraemer, Williston West, and NW Glen Lake properties be developed together with underground parking?

**Glen Lake**
• Parking (related to The Glen bldg.) along Tree Street causes issues with access and the passing of two way traffic (too narrow)
• Post office is impossible to use/get into and out of, improve traffic access/follow or relocate to better/bigger location
• Create a loop trail that goes around Glen Lake (2)
• Provide a connecting trail along the eastern and southern edges of Glen Lake to connect north trails (Kinsel Park) to eastern and southern trail system

**East(South) Site**
• Enhanced planting of the East(South) property along Excelsior Boulevard

**Other Sites**
• Screening vegetation/planting on vacant land west of power station, and for the station on Excelsior Boulevard boundary
• Art as a temporary installation on vacant land near power station site (2)
• Art could be part of the neighborhood identity making

**General Notes**
• Improved bus service and facilities to and from the area, provide a senior, dial a ride service that is more reliable the Metro Mobility
PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS

- More public art locations to provide neighborhood identity
- Pedestrian and bike improvements needed on Woodhill Road
- Punching Woodhill Road across Excelsior Boulevard is a bad idea
- Pedestrian and bike improvements needed on Eden Prairie Road
- Need a new restaurant in the south strip mall (containing Kraemer’s)
- Placing public art on the old Kraemer’s Hardware site not needed
- Impossible to make left hand turns onto Eden Prairie Road during rush hour, need better traffic signal coordination
- Currently an overabundance of large senior only buildings (7 listed)
- Need bike lanes up both sides of Excelsior Boulevard as well as up Williston Road
- Like sidewalks on the south side of Excelsior Boulevard, need more like it on neighborhood streets
- There is a need for more upscale retail and appropriate retail adjacent to daycare
- Need restaurants in current retail buildings
- Would like to see clean, passive water features, potentially those that support wildlife
- Hard to access Kraemer shopping area by foot/bike
- Improve the neighborhood aesthetic to create a destination
- Improve access to shopping
- More parking needed everywhere
- Consider the impact to wildlife that adding lighting to Kinsel Park would have
- Parking on curve of Beacon Hill Road, can that be shared with The Glen
- Is there going to be too much light pollution from new lighting if added to Kinsel Park?
- Would Stewart Lane be a one-way street?

WEST SITE

Concept A
- Worried townhomes are going to add more senior only housing
- Are the wetland setbacks enough in the scenarios?
- Prefer the townhome option (2)
- Need townhomes in the $250,000-450,000 range for balance
- Where does guest parking occur in both scenarios?
- Would like to see a high density of housing in this option
- More walking paths around wetland area
- Prefer the access intersection in this option
- Prefer the option that preserves the most green space
- Trail access and density are ok

Concept B
- Scenarios may require additional traffic control for Glendale Street
- Planning needs to be compatible on both sides of the street
- Add community gardens to this concept
- Are urban size lots appropriate for Minnetonka?
CENTRAL SITE

Concept A
- Need a larger buffer on Eden Prairie Road
- 50-60’ Lots small/close for the neighborhood, market needs larger lots
- Development intensity may create too much lighting, worried about wildlife impacts
- Access to the private drives is problematic on both concepts

Concept B
- Trail or sidewalk connection to Eden Prairie Road from the end of the cul-de-sac
- Worried about the displacement of neighborhood wildlife (turkey, deer, woodpecker, eagles, waterfowl etc.) Where will they go when their habitat is removed?
- Density is too high in either concept, the lots in both are too small for the area
- Density of the ‘Compact Residential’ is too high
- All of these pieces don’t fit together, don’t see an overall grand vision

EAST SITE

Concept A
- Eliminate 5 SF Lots and replace with a small park to provide access and views of Glen Lake
- Concern about buffering the wetland, examine ‘buildable’ lots as appropriate (3)
- Flip building footprint to the east away from townhomes
- Stop light would be needed at new intersection
- Improve walkability and add landscaping along Excelsior Boulevard. More greening needed along Kraemer strip mall
- Would like to see a small boardwalk into the lake off the trail connection in between lots 4 and 5
- Lot 5 is too close to lake
- Worried about water quality impacts development will have on lake
- Concerned about the increased traffic development would create
- Concerned about traffic at the new proposed intersection of Stewart Lane and Excelsior Boulevard
- Too much hard surface, but do like the opportunity to share parking with the Gold Nugget
- Would like to see a comprehensive picture of all the potential trail connections with private property barriers indicated
- Trails in this option runs through private property

Concept B
- Some of these units would be a tough sell with no views of the lake
- Units 1-4 might make a good location for townhomes
- Restaurant visible from Excelsior is needed, prefer the more attractive parking configuration compared to the Gold Nugget
- Potential for housing and restaurant/retail underneath?
- Crossing safety concern at new intersection
- Too much grading needed to make this work
- Gold Nugget has loud fan noise on east side of building
- Lots 9-10 are too wet to develop, would prefer a park or trail connection
- Would like to see a small boardwalk into the lake off the trail connection in between lots 4 and 5
- To many units in this option
- Restaurant will need to have adequate parking
- Is the wetland disruption caused by the boardwalk worth the public benefit?
HENNEPIN COUNTY SITE

- Try to find a balance between development and park and open space, need to preserve the existing habitat, as its already limited
- Remember what happened to Wing Lake
- Must have a walking trail around the lake
- The economy, market, and environmental impacts of the proposed development will determine the final development scenario
- More trails connect with limited development
- City needs to develop a plan to purchase the land
- Relocate Optimist Field / Gilliam Ball Field here, redevelop Optimist Fields to commercial
- Is there an option to put retail on this site?
- Trail system needs to be connected to parks
- Add a small zoo to one of the parks
- Like Centennial Lakes, develop recreational options
- 800 units seems very high, but the proximity to Gatewood Elementary School and access to transportation are good elements
- This much development will kill the lake
- Avoid doing another grass lawn choked development and make it a focus on intentional green living and planting
- Remember what happened to Birch Lake
- Way too many units, with all the other proposed housing we should keep this area wild, save the trees
- Maybe too much density
- Could this be a site for a college or university expansion
- How much of this land could the city buy from the compiled park dedication fees from recent development?
From: J. Michael Noonan [mailto:J.Michael.Noonan@hennepin.us]
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 2:22 PM
To: Julie Wischnack
Subject: Gem Lake Neighborhood

Julie – this is further to our discussions over the past several weeks related to the concept plan that the City has prepared for the County Home School. As I have shared with you we have discussed this plan internally and have the following comments.

First, we appreciate the effort undertaken by the City of Minnetonka. The analysis undertaken is logical and provides an objective assessment of the physical properties of the land. We agree with the conclusion that the site consists of an east and west development parcel. At this point in time we can generally agree with the development parcel identified but would expect that as development plan proceed we would work with the City to better understand the constraints and opportunities and associated acreage.

Second, we appreciate the density exercise that has been undertaken. This does provide an initial inclination as to what could be placed on site. We appreciate the concept planning illustrating how the property may be developed. What is shown is quite reasonable at least from a planning perspective.

Third, as part of the density exercise various residential use categories had been proposed. These range from single family, to villas, to medium density to high density. We appreciate the range of densities but would say that what is or is not an appropriate density will be determined by the market. For example, is there too much high density and not enough medium density. The plan may be just right depending upon market conditions or it may miss the mark. We would like the plan to come with a measure of flexibility that will permit plans to be advanced based upon market demand and market conditions.

Fourth, the other land uses shown on the plans are reasonable placeholders which would be more precisely defined and negotiated as plans advance.

Fifth, the bridge connection on the north edge of the wetland is appropriate also as a placeholder. An exact location will be placed at the appropriate time and will be reflective of the impact of the wetland areas. The County is in the process of establishing a wetland bank in the area. This will impact the buffer/edge condition adjacent to the wetland. Plans are in development and we will have a better sense as to that impact as plans are finalized and implementation begins.

Please let me know if you have any questions related to the contents of this email.

J. Michael Noonan, AICP, MCIP
Senior Department Administrator,
Land Management Division
Community Works Department
701 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN.
55415-1843
(612) 348-8537
Please share my concern with the Mayor.

I am concerned at the rapid

Minimize Planning Commission —
My position is to preserve green space and I implore the city planners to downscale, not super size. Please read through to the habitat comments at the end - thank you.

Too many units in every site! All of these projects should be reduced by 75%.

1. I oppose a trail around Glen Lake, I will not allow it on my property. It is an environment of highly diverse wildlife and aquatic life and should be protected as an environmental preserve from human and pet traffic and snowmobile and ATV vehicles. There is no justification for exposing the unique and fragile lake to human and mechanical intrusion.

2. I oppose strongly any high density developments ON the lake. I oppose any removal of the tree canopy around the lake and oppose any additional public access. I support limiting zoning around the entire lake at single family homes or VERY low density housing.

3. I oppose any further development (and the past approved development) in which structures loom above the neighborhood tree line.

4. I oppose the practice of "what if guidance" to fast track development of what is now privately owned property. I particularly oppose the number of units in all of the plans for the Central Site which will nearly abut my property. (I am also appalled that there is even is plan for the West Site. I hope the owner designates it for conservation, if possible.) I oppose West Site, East site, and the Central Site development and support single family homes.

5. The East side of the Hennepin County Site should remain untouched. NO public access on the west side. No dock, no beach. I oppose a recreational site on the south end of the Lake.

Any city "what if" plan should have the very minimum number of units, not what is just allowed, below it!

FYI:
We have nesting loons and many other nesting waterfowl on our lake. Trolling boats, floaties, etc. would disrupt and destroy this habitat.

We have over a 120 species of birds that migrate through or live here on the lake. We have very few remnants of the great oak savannah and the linden/basswood trees that our pollinators prefer. We are losing much of the habitat that essential bats and other mammals require.
Mary Cavert
neighborhood resident since 1975

14333 Ferris Lane
June 14, 2016

Dear Planning Commission and City Staff:

I am responding to the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study on the agenda for the June 16 meeting of the Planning Commission. My family’s property is prominently included in the report with speculative design plans — the West Site. I was not involved in these designs, they don’t reflect my family’s intent, and I respectfully request that references to my property be removed from the final report.

The report is overreaching. The City announced the meetings as an opportunity for general neighborhood input on the future of Glen Lake, yet detailed concept plans were developed for five parcels of land that weren’t identified before the meetings, at least one of which — mine — has never come up for redevelopment. The agenda from the March 21 special council session described the meetings as a “planning phase” to articulate “a common vision for future change in the area; exploration of park, open space and trail opportunities; aesthetic improvements; and overall future land use guidelines with development scenarios.” These meetings WERE NOT announced as a planning process.

After the strong mandate for “no more senior housing” in the Northwestern Glen Lake Study was ignored by the City on the Kinsel site, I was discouraged, burned out, and felt it wasn’t worth my time to attend a second round of Glen Lake meetings. So I was shocked to learn a concept plan for redevelopment of my property was presented at the Jan 20 meeting. The City never let me know that my property was up for discussion; I had no warning and no opportunity to respond.

Comments summarized in the Appendix focus on issues like the lake, retail and recreational amenities, traffic flow, pedestrian access, etc. They don’t suggest a desire to explore concept plans for redevelopment of actual properties. Yet after only three meetings, the report rushes to publish concepts for an overhaul of Glen Lake with no direct input from the actual property owners. Is the City laying groundwork for guiding changes in the next Comprehensive Guide Plan? It certainly creates a bad precedent by suggesting a resident’s property can be put on the table for public discussion regardless of the owner’s wishes.

The report invades my privacy. It is insensitive to my family’s wishes and to the history and current use of property. We have no plans to develop it. Five generations of family have lived here. I plan to live here the rest of my life, and my nieces and nephews have interest in preserving the property. One parcel has the original 19th-century farmhouse and log barn. The other has an important midcentury architectural design: a ceramic, cavity-wall building that may be one of the last ones built in the US with considerable research and input from the ceramics institute. And this parcel is unplatted, still described as a piece of a section under the system of land division that goes back to the Homestead Act. There is frequent interest from residents who pass by and ask about its history. The local Boy Scout troop has come by for tour. And neighbors tell me they enjoy seeing the wildlife in the natural habitat when they walk by with their children and point them out. When these pieces are gone, there will be no remnant of that history.
The inclusion of my property represents aggressive density and development creep. The addition of several “Gateway” labels on the map, including one immediately south of my property on Eden Prairie Rd, appears to sweep several properties into a newly expanded Glen Lake center. The 2030 Comp Guide Plan shows my property as low-density residential. Was there specific community input and desire to expand the perimeter of commercial/high density of Glen Lake south of Excelsior Blvd? The report states that, “land uses that … no longer provide the highest and best use of land can detract from a neighborhood’s character and economic health” (p. 10). When did land use that isn’t the highest and best use of land become detracting? All single-family homeowners should be concerned about potential re-guiding of their own properties, since the City seems to suggest that property next to commercial areas should become high-density as a buffer between commercial and single family homes, and so on, outwards.

**Please omit the sections concerning my property from the final report.** It’s an invasion of privacy and overreach of government that has frightened me and caused considerable stress. This is my home. Do you know what it’s like to see everything my family has built, mowed, plowed, gardened and played on erased? Reading strangers’ comments about their preferences for my property has been gut wrenching. And it has been physically invasive. People entered my property without my knowledge and took photographs of the property for inclusion in this report. They weren’t invited, and I wasn’t contacted or given advance notice. That’s called trespassing.

It’s simply wrong to include unsolicited design plans for a private property in a public report, and I object to our property being singled out over other private property in Glen Lake for inclusion. If meeting attendees had concerns about our large parcel, it shouldn’t create a mandate for the city to focus on our property. It would get out of hand, if neighbors felt they could bring any private property to the city’s attention and start a public discussion about it without the owners’ participation.

Finally, this report may imply that high-density has been "approved" for our property or create the impression the land is targeted for development. Disclaimers that “owners of properties . . . have not expressed interest in development” or “the City is not encouraging any specific change to any of these properties” are easily overlooked when the visual designs remain in the public’s minds. You could simply note in the final report that a study of the property was conducted but omit the details out of respect for the property owner’s privacy.

There’s no positive outcome for me in this report. Please act out of simple courtesy and recommend that my property be removed from the report. I object to the unwarranted attention and strongly feel the city has no obligation, and in fact a duty not, to put unsolicited design plans into a public report.

Sincerely,

Anne Malm Hossfeld
Planning Commission regarding Glen Lake Neighborhood Study
June 15, 2016

I have asked my neighbor, Jane Christensen to read my comments on the Glen Lake Neighborhood report. I am not in the state and cannot attend this meeting. These remarks were written by Grace Sheely, 14325 Grenier Road.

I hope my comments may improve the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study. First, I would like to improve some parts of the community engagement process. My three suggestions are:

A. Please name these Village/Neighborhood Studies consistently. I was anticipating meetings for a Glen Lake Village Study. I was not aware that the name had changed and this Neighborhood study was the Glen Lake VILLAGE study as it has always previously been referred.

B. List the minnetonkamatters.com links for blogging on each of the meeting notifications. I was unaware of this opportunity for input until my reading of this report recently.

C. Personally invite neighbors living in or adjacent to pending development areas under discussion at meetings, PRIOR to the meetings. Reach out more actively than a public announcement when specific properties will be discussed.

Next, I would like to suggest areas in need of improvement within this report. My suggestions are:

A. The report is weak in its suggestions to improve the trails, bike and pedestrian accesses. Many trails go to nowhere or lack future planning for their existence. I remember the Glen Lake Pedestrian Study and I wonder if it could be reviewed and incorporated into the report. A significant bike trail exists on the east side of Glen Lake and it should have plans on how it connects within this report.

B. Page 27 suggests “exploring a trail connection to Kinsel Park along the shoreline of Glen Lake.” I would delete this comment as it is not possible with the trail arrangement that was agreed already upon at the Zvago site. This exploration is unnecessary and is simply impossible; it should not be “explored” or included in this report.

C. Page 17 is a development plan for the CENTRAL SITE. I believe that the opportunity for this development plan is moot. Several of the 4 houses on this site have already sold as single family homes. The original developers/owners no longer wish to pursue their original plans for its development. I think it might serve the report better to consider the entire western side of Glen Lake as an area to re-guided in the next Comprehensive Plan as mid density. With a church and daycare already located in this section and its easy access to a transportation artery, Eden Prairie Road, it could manage higher density well. I wonder how these CENTRAL SITE homeowners feel about their attempts at redevelopment and having their properties included in this report. I believe this may have been another missed opportunity for reasonable higher density in Glen Lake.

D. I wish to support Anne Malm Hossfeld’s desire to have the development plans for her property (WEST SITE) excluded from the report. Maybe some other
explanation/paragraph could be included without development plans... and with Anne's approval. The property that she and her brother own is the only property in this report that the owners have not expressed some wish or desire to develop their property. The privacy of the WEST SITE will be invaded by land developers reading this report. It is not in the Hossfeld's interest to be in this report. Re-guiding the zoning of this property twords higher density within the next Comprehensive Plan could proceed without development plans included in this report.

E. I would like the County Home School Site to be pulled from the Glen Lake Neighborhood study. A 145 acre site needs city-wide comment, input and discussion and its own report. I am/was surprised to see the first preliminary plans for this huge development within this report. I cannot believe that other options for this property should not be considered with a broader city-wide audience. One meeting and one consultant's plan is being proposed and presented here as if the Glen Lake community agrees with this proposal. Housing with varying levels of density is not the only option and it might not be the best option.

F. I am an adjacent neighbor to the County Home School Site and share a long fence line with this Site property. I wish I had known about the consultant's proposal. I would have appreciated an email or a phone call to inform me of the proposal and its presentation date. I believe that I should be included in the discussion about the access road to this property. The traffic noise will increase on a road directly south of my property and while this may negatively impact my property, the road also could add value to my property if it could be re-subdivided for additional housing along the north side of this new road. I (along with other western side of Glen Lake shoreline neighbors) would like to be included in the discussion of the trail for ease of access to the proposed lake access on this site.

I thank you again to the staff and Planning Commission for your time and energy in writing and reviewing this report. I hope some of my corrections can be made and that you might consider an additional Glen Lake meeting to accept input to this report while it is still preliminary. The report's appendix lists many areas of concern and improvement. Additional comments and review by the Glen Lake community could only strengthen this report. Please consider slowing the submission and approval process down and allowing one additional meeting.

Sincerely,

Grace Sheely
952-451-6014
Hunting Jan 16,
John Gordon.
City Omaha,

Just one hopes, there is such a nice little community, it maybe to let to keep it cohesive, but that would be my hope. Right now it is a bit of a quibble & rather disconnected. With Knoblauch out seems it would be nice to tie in with the Post Office. Then, the water pipe & these strips make a tangled mess. Maybe a late. Any thoughts it bring it together.

Thank you,
Helen Flanner
Long time resident
Unfortunately I am unable to attend the meeting this evening. There are a couple of points I would like to make about the above.

1. With construction of the new building Zvago, the traffic on Stewart lane has become dangerous. This is a narrow road with trucks, mail man, etc. stopped during the day at the appt building on Stewart Lane, now along with Zvago construction traffic and the traffic yet to come with the 54 units, it will only get worse. The 90 degree curve from Excelsior Blvd on Stewart along with the huge bush on the corner has already had several near accidents. Something needs to be done. Also, the driveway to Zvago property is only several feet away from the driveway to Glen Lake Shores property. This could cause a problem.

2. The Property West of Glen Lake Shores is a long but NARROW piece of property, having multiple homes/townhouses is intrusive to the neighbors that have owned their property there for years. It is sad that there is now being more housing allowed to be built on "Glen Lake’s Greatest Resource". It truly is a shame more building is being done on the lake.

Please help us preserve and protect our lake, the woods with the wild life and nature we have here in Glen Lake.

Thank you for your time,
Sincerely,
Pam Bromme
Loren,

As a resident of the area encompassed by the Glen Lake Neighborhood Draft Study, I'm writing to express thoughts and concerns about the Glen Lake Draft Study.

First, I would like to make two comments about the process:

1) I understand that this report includes renderings and overlays wherein the city will take over and raze private property. My understanding is that the city and the Planning Commission did not consult with or provide notice to the residents of those properties of these renderings (and possibly, in one case, did not ask permission to go onto the property and photograph and mark the land). If this is true, it's also alarming and a discredit to the civic values expected of our city government.

2) As you can see below, I received links to this study on June 10 at 11:43 AM, and what appears to be the sole comment period on this product of the city's is tonight -- approximately 4.5 business days and less than a week after it was distributed. The 54 page report merits more input from the community, and certainly more time for impacted residents to have considered its short-, medium- and long-term implications.

With respect to the plan itself:

1) There is little discussion of alternatives. Our community, state and nation speak wistfully of preserving open space in metropolitan areas and lament sprawl and overdevelopment, but this document assumes development and lot subdivision is the sole and required path moving forward. Preservation of the southern parcel of this study could be an incredible gem for our city and the west metro area, but it appears the prevailing thought is to make it into a subdivision. I'd strongly recommend and request that long-term conservation of this largely undeveloped parcel be considered.

2) Auspiciously missing is forethought into the implications of such change on the traffic, crime, and livability of the affected neighborhoods. This dramatic increase in population will cause roads to be widened (residents to lose front yards) and make Excelsior Boulevard, Eden Prairie Road, Williston and 62 nightmares, affecting far more residents in Minnetonka and Eden Prairie than the plan considers. Today --without this added traffic -- the city does not enforce "Local Traffic Only" signs on the Kinsel - South Street/North Street - Baker Road route, and the does the city not recognize the danger and impact of adding hundreds of more cars to the area?

3) Also missing from this study is the impact of the light rail on the commercial element of Glen Lake. Housing and businesses will become prevalent along the light rail stops, which will lower the necessity of overbuilding in the Glen Lake area. We should be cautious about increasing density in an area where residents never anticipated or wanted such density, in particular when it will occur naturally around the light rail stop to the east.

4) Finally, I'd like to discourage linking the new high-density neighborhoods of the Northwest and South to the older and lower-density neighborhood of the East. Driving the number of people the Planning Commission wishes to add into the backyards and neighborhood of the Glen Moor area will decrease the quality of life of the neighborhood through crime, noise, and traffic.

I would appreciate the Planning Commission provide more time for input from the community, and would welcome an augmented study that more thoroughly addresses the issues I raise above as well as other issues raised by other residents in response to this study.

Regards,
You are subscribed to Glen Lake Redevelopment for the City of Minnetonka.

The Glen Lake Neighborhood Draft Study (pdf) is complete and is now available. The Planning Commission will review the study and take comments at the June 16, 2016 meeting.

Click here for more information about the project.
Hi
I live on Kinsel Road across from Kinsel Park. The study noted the desired connection between Kinsel park and the baseball fields. In the summer I note a large volume of kids as pedestrians and on bikes traveling to the baseball fields and skate park (as visible by the accessories they carry). The proposed ideas seemed to place the crossing improvements at the intersection of Woodhill and Excelsior. I do not feel that kids will walk two blocks out of their way to cross at the lights there. I know that when I cross with my kids, we rarely use the longer route unless we have additional errands in that direction. Please plan improvements that will allow safe pedestrian crossing of Excelsior at Kinsel Road.

Thank you,
Rachel
July 5, 2016

Dear City Council Members and City Staff:

I’m writing to inform you of the unwanted inclusion of my family’s property — the West Site — in the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study coming up for your review on July 11. We have a large lot that drew the attention of the City and residents during the Glen Lake neighborhood meetings in 2015 and 2016 with a result that speculative design overlays of our property re-imagining it with high-density development have been included in the report.

My family has owned this parcel since the 1920s with continuous occupation of two single family homes: the original 1880s farmhouse and log barn and a unique mid-century ceramic (brick) house built by my father, a professor in the Forest Products department at the University of Minnesota. We have no plans to develop.

We did not participate in this process, and the City didn’t inform affected landowners of the special attention their property would get in the neighborhood meetings. We hope that you will be sympathetic to our plea and request that you omit the West Site from the final version of this report. There is no precedent for publishing development plans for property that owners have no intention of developing. It causes great fear and stress to think that the City is floating high-density land use for our property without our knowledge or input.

I attended the first round of Glen Lake neighborhood meetings in 2015 that focused on gathering community input to various uses for the Kraemer property. This was a property already posted for sale or for lease and known to be a likely candidate for redevelopment. Such community input aligned with the original intent of starting neighborhood/village meetings: to have neighborhood input into community development before large-scale projects are sprung on residents.

I was aware of the second round starting in the Fall of 2015 but was unable to attend. Advance descriptions of the meetings didn’t indicate that individual properties not currently intended for redevelopment would be discussed and neighborhood input solicited as to possible land uses. When the final January 20 meeting was held — again, one I couldn’t attend — I was shocked to receive emails late at night from friends who attended the meeting, saw the design plans for my property, and were surprised that it appeared my family was going to redevelop our property.

I contacted the City and design firm in January asking them to remove our property from the report and halt any further work on the designs on the grounds that my family didn’t authorize them, and it was deeply hurtful and intrusive to see our family’s property and lives effectively swept away even if only as speculation. I was told that the process had to continue.

I provided advance feedback to the draft report in time for the June 16 Planning Commission meeting and spoke during the meeting. In their discussion at the close of public
comments, the commissioners were clearly responsive to my concerns and sensitive to my fear that something had been taken out of my control: that speculative planning for my property had in some way became open to the public. But they thought it was a task for the council to determine if my section should be omitted.

So I’m asking you to omit the West Site when you review the study for its final version. At the Planning Commission meeting, the City defended the report by saying it was obligated to do “planning.” I believe the City is overreaching its mandate by initiating speculative public discussion of private property that has no likelihood of development in any foreseeable future. Further, I greatly fear it’s taking steps to identify properties it may wish to guide for higher-density in the upcoming 2050 Comprehensive Guide Plan, and I will fully resist any attempts to reguide our property as high-density against our wishes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Anne Malm Hossfeld
9. **Other Business**

**A. Glen Lake Study**

Chair Kirk called for the staff report.

Gordon and Wischnack reported. They recommended that commissioners review the study and provide feedback.

O’Connell confirmed with Gordon that the study is an informative tool. Wischnack explained that reviewing the studies is part of preparing for updating the comprehensive guide plan. O’Connell got the sense that residents thought the study would dictate something to happen now.

Mark Koegler, landscape architect with Hoisington Koegler Group, consultant for the city, gave his staff report. He stated that:

- He does a lot of community planning work, has lived in the area for 30 years, and knows Glen Lake. It is a special place and it has changed a lot.
- The study is not a mandate of what shall happen, but it looks at some “what if” situations.
- He provided the history of the meetings since summer of 2015.
- He heard a lot of observations from the residents.
- A work group looked at options for possible available sites and redevelopment proposed by developers.
- The Williston Woods West project is moving forward.
- The three yellow areas anticipate where change may occur in the future. Nothing has been determined at this time.
- Residents requested increased lighting, additional landscaping, an entrance feature, and improved trail access. Possible uses of the properties were discussed.
- There is an 11-acre site that is being considered for compact, residential lots to provide a buffer between the commercial and residential areas.
- The east site is long and narrow. A low-density townhome development may fit.
- The north site is one acre with a single-family house surrounded by other kinds of uses.
- The south, Hennepin County site, is 146 acres. There has been discussion regarding social programming and services becoming obsolete. It would be wise to be prepared if Hennepin County
chooses to sell the property. The area would have the opportunity to create a very livable residential community with trails.

- He wanted to provide a feel of what is there. It is not a prescription for change. Options are there to help inform future discussions and decisions for if and when development would occur on the properties.
- He was available for questions.

Wischnack stated that Hennepin County indicated that the county would sell the Homeschool site if the use would be eliminated. The site would not be donated to the city for park land.

Chair Kirk asked why the surrounding businesses were not included in the yellow areas for the long, narrow site and site on the north. Mr. Koegler explained that the central site’s cut off seemed natural. The commercial uses on the north are sound and productive. The neighbors put a lot of value on keeping the existing businesses and growing more businesses. In the case of the east site, there has been significant reinvestment there recently. Old homes became substantial new homes.

Chair Kirk invited those present to provide comments.

Anne Malm Hossfeld, 14616 Glendale Street, stated that:

- She sent in her comments which are included in the June 16, 2016 change memo.
- Her family has lived there for 90 years.
- She was shocked and astounded that the city would publish potential development plans for privately-owned, residential, inhabited properties at a public meeting without the owner being contacted. She received meeting notices for the Glen Lake neighborhood meetings. She was unable to attend. She did not like seeing a designer’s overlay that would “wipe out her existence.” The city was callous.
- She requested in January that her property be taken out of the report.
- She requests that her property be taken out of this report.
- She understood that there is a new review process.
- She understood that the report discusses “what ifs” and that the city does not want to alter the public record, but the report does not have to be a frozen record of what was said. It is not meant to be
unchangeable. The city can have some sensitivity to private property owners.

- She wants her property taken out of the report to protect her privacy.
- Trespassing occurred for someone to take pictures on her property.
- This is not something people have the right to float boxes around and make designs.
- Putting this in the public record serves as a precedent.
- It puts pressure on her and her family to sell. There is no intent to develop the property for a long time.
- She appreciated the plans being changed to keep the farm house, but she does not want development.
- She read from her submitted written comments.
- She does not want the attention.
- She received the meeting notices, but had no indication there would be this level of planning for places of interest.
- The city has responded and provided more opportunities for citizen input.
- This report went too far by creating “concrete design plans.”

Jane Christensen, 5709 Glen Avenue, stated that she was representing Grace Sheely who was unable to attend and resides at 14325 Grenier Road. Ms. Christensen read Ms. Sheely’s comments:

- Please name the village neighborhood studies consistently. She was not aware that the name changed.
- List the meeting notifications on minnetonkamatters.com.
- Personally invite neighbors living in or adjacent to pending development areas prior to meetings.
- The report is weak in suggestions to improve the trails. Many trails go nowhere. She suggested the pedestrian study be incorporated in the report.
- The report should say how a trail would connect to the trail on the east side of Glen Lake.
- The comment on Page 27 should be deleted since it is not possible and unnecessary with the trail agreement that was agreed upon the Zvago site.
- Page 17 is a development plan for the central site. The opportunity for this is mute. The entire western side of Glen Lake should be reguided as medium density. There is easy access to a major artery, Eden Prairie Road, and could handle high density well.
• She supports excluding Ann Malm Hossfeld’s property from the report to protect her privacy and not being included in the next comprehensive guide plan.
• She would like the Hennepin County Homeschool site pulled from the study. A 140-acre site needs its own report and to be reviewed city wide. One meeting and one plan is being presented as if the Glen Lake residents agree to the proposal. Housing might not be the best option. She would have appreciated being informed of the consultant’s proposal. She has concerns with the access road, traffic noise, and impact to her property value.
• She thanked staff and commissioners for writing and reviewing the report. She hoped some of her changes could be made.
• She suggested having an additional Glen Lake neighborhood meeting while it is still preliminary.

Melissa Pilney, 5524 Mayview Road, stated that:
• She attended some of the village study meetings.
• It should be addressed as an environmentally sensitive area. Keep that in mind. Limit how much and what would be done. There are mature trees, a lake, and floodplain.
• Any sizable property seems to be placed automatically into high-density zoning. She would prefer that the neighborhood not be turned into a “cornfield development.”

Wischnack pointed out the emails and comments received just prior to the start of the meeting. They will also be given to the city council. The item is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council June 27, 2016.

O’Connell asked if it would be possible to indicate that the property owner prefers not to be contacted by solicitors. Gordon explained that the tools being utilized are used to plan for the whole community. He respects the property owner wanting to keep the property as it is. The property owner’s wishes are invited to be expressed at the meeting. Wischnack noted that developers regularly look for large parcels in Minnetonka. Not including a parcel in a hypothetical plan would not prevent developers from contacting a property owner.

Powers stated that Ms. Malm Hossfeld did her parents proud. He understood her concern that the property being included in the public record would codify something that is not there. The property is valued. That is why it comes under discussion. The process is evolving and improving over time. He applauded
O’Connell confirmed with Gordon that all of the properties are privately held. O’Connell said that the process is good for the community, too. If the city stands still, something will happen. For people to have input early on without codifying a plan is beneficial.

Jim Stroebel, 14319 Stewart Lane, questioned how the proposal would improve and increase the vitality of the Glen Lake village area. He was disappointed that the only plans were to increase the density of the available land in the area.

Chair Kirk asked for additional comments from the audience and no one responded.

Calvert noted that the report is a lot to digest. She thought it was hard to do justice to a 56-page report at the end of a long meeting. Issues include walkability, housing density, demographic needs, environmental concerns, and transportation and it is already late.

Chair Kirk appreciated guiding principles being in place to provide direction when reacting to an application submitted by a developer. He applauded staff for taking the time and resources to try to figure out a way to at least discuss future potential redevelopment. Modifying the process, which may include allowing more time for feedback and being more inclusive, is up to the city council to decide. It is a great example of balancing individual rights and community responsibilities. The city should look way down the road. The review of the comprehensive guide plan provides an opportunity for everyone to get involved and comment on the guiding of property in Minnetonka.

Wischnack noted that commissioners could continue review of the proposal to another meeting. There is no deadline to take action on this item. Chair Kirk weighed that against the benefits and his concerns.

Calvert emphasized that no concept is written in stone and there is no one plan for a parcel. It is hard to talk about conceptual ideas. This is about development and community planning which is more than just constructing buildings.

Chair Kirk compared this to creating ideas for the Shady Oak Road project without a developer with a plan already submitted.

Odland is a Glen Lake resident. What is shown on the conceptual plan for Ms. Malm Hossfeld’s property would drastically change the character of the
neighborhood. The area is gracious and comfortable. She understood the need to plan.

Calvert supports having a variety of housing stock and demographics in every area of the city.

Powers said that a property owner has the right to change his or her mind. He respected removing the west site from the report. Conceptual plans for the Hennepin County site should be reviewed by the entire city. Calvert agreed. Chair Kirk predicted that site would get a lot of attention if anything happened. Wischnack shared that 900 notices and hundreds of emails were sent to notify residents of the sites being reviewed and discussed which resulted in 28 residents being present at the meeting. Wischnack agreed that issues need to be talked about and discussed, but it is difficult to get residents to attend a meeting if there is no concrete plan of possible consequence being reviewed. There have been four meetings over the last year and each had low attendance.

Odland said that the city did a great job in 2014 of imploring neighbors to attend the meetings. She thought an invitation might have more of a reaction than a postcard.

O’Connell expected a planning commission to do this type of conceptual thinking for a city of this size and amount of buildup. He understood the concerns of the west side property owner. Cities all across the country do similar reviews. Developers look at GoogleMaps to find properties of appropriate size located near wanted amenities and will contact property owners. The city needs to start a discussion somewhere.

Odland thought another meeting would be worth it.

Calvert concurred. There was so much work that went into the report. She was concerned with big developments impacting the lake’s water quality. She would love to learn what people said about a college extension.

Knight understood the property owner on the west side being upset. He would like more conceptual plans for the central site. There are a number of “for sale” signs in that area.

Chair Kirk appreciated neighbors providing input.

10. Adjournment
Resolution No. 2016-xx
A Resolution Endorsing the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The Glen Lake neighborhood area has been a long established hub of community activity, commerce and life.

1.02. Minnetonka’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan identifies the Glen Lake Station village center as a community village center. Community village centers are places with generally strong market demand for commercial activity and the ability to support higher residential densities in appropriate locations.

1.03. Glen Lake has undergone a number of redevelopment efforts and studies since the first Glen Lake Study was completed in the late 1970s. Redevelopment efforts have generally occurred in the commercial area since that time.

1.04. In concert with the Comprehensive Plan implementation efforts, a study of the Glen Lake neighborhood commenced in 2015. The effort was informed by a scoping study that involved a neighborhood working group in 2014.

1.05. The study was guided by a neighborhood working group, public input and a consultant team. The group identified number of areas, generally on the periphery of the Glen Lake commercial area where change could occur.

1.06. The outcome of the Glen Lake Neighborhood study is a document to guide future discussions for change in the neighborhood. The study represents a common vision for future change in the area.

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. Be it resolved, the council of the city of Minnetonka adopts this Resolution endorsing the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on July 11, 2016.

______________________________
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 July 11, 2016.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk