

CITY OF RICHFIELD

MINNESOTA



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET AND PLAN

2018 - 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD	3
Capital Plan Process	4
Legal Framework	5
Document Organization	6
Capital Plan Summary	6
SECTION ONE: GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	
Land Use	9
Housing	10
Transportation	11
Parks	13
Utilities	13
SECTION TWO:	
FINANCING THE 2019-2022 CAPITAL PLAN	19
Special Revenue Funds	19
Industrial/Commercial Revenue Bonds	19
Capital Improvement Bonds	20
Federal & State Grants/County & Local Governments	20
Municipal State Aid	20
Tax Increment Financing	20
General Obligation Redevelopment Bonds	21
General Obligation Improvement Bonds	22
User Fees	22
General Obligation Bonds	23
Debt Policies for the City of Richfield	24
SECTION THREE:	
Capital Improvement Budget & Plan Overview	27
Plan Summary - Estimated Costs and Funding Sources	28
Project Descriptions	37
Recreation and Open Space	38
Right of Way Improvements	43
Public Facilities	55

FORWARD

The Richfield Capital Improvement Budget and Capital Improvement Plan (CIB/CIP) is a comprehensive list of major improvements necessary to meet the needs of the community over a five-year period. This list is prepared through compiling the project needs requested by the various City departments. The CIB/CIP sets forth the proposed scheduling and details of the specific project by year, estimated cost, sources of funding and a justification or description for each improvement. The CIB/CIP provides organized information to those responsible for making policy decisions regarding expenditures for new facilities and provides information so that individual project requests can be better evaluated against community needs and the community's ability to pay.

The specific objectives of CIB/CIP are:

1. To develop a realistic list of capital improvement needs which relates proposed projects to the City's capacity to finance such projects.
2. To minimize the impact of projects on the resident's ability to pay.
3. To schedule various projects and improvements in a way which allows adequate time for detailed design and engineering of the projects, preparing environmental statements or grant applications, or exploring alternative methods of financing.
4. To provide coordination between City departments, various units of special and general local government and public utilities.
5. To implement the community's Comprehensive Plan in an orderly fashion.
6. To keep the public involved and informed about needed public improvements and to better enable the public to schedule private improvements.

The CIB/CIP is adopted by resolution of the Council and it authorizes spending and borrowing only for those projects included in the Capital Improvement Budget for the current budget year. The CIB/CIP is reviewed and revised annually.

CAPITAL PLAN PROCESS

Richfield's CIB/CIP process provides a vehicle for identifying annual project needs and priorities for project coordination and for financial planning. In addition, the Capital Improvement process provides for public discussion of short range City improvements. The process of formulating the Capital Plan is as important as the plan itself.

CIB/CIP projects are identified through discussions of the various city commissions and the City's Housing and Redevelopment Authority. From these discussions City staff compiles estimated costs, scope and potential funding sources for the projects.

A preliminary report is generated by the City Manager based on these discussions and presented at a meeting of the Planning Commission. Additionally, the Community Services Commission reviews Recreation and Open Space projects prior to the presentation to the Planning Commission of the complete report.

The Planning Commission then reviews the projects and scheduling based on the following considerations:

1. The community's need for the proposed project.
2. Priority and scheduling for the proposed project.
3. The proposed project's conformance to the Comprehensive Plan.

The CIB/CIP, as recommended by the Planning Commission, is then returned to the City Manager. The Manager then formalizes the CIB/CIP and submits it in summary form to the City Council as part of the current year proposed budget process.

If the plan includes "improvements" as defined under Minnesota Statute Sections 475.521 and 475.58, and bonds are a projected source of funding, there are certain legal requirements that must be followed before the projects and the issuance of debt can occur. In the current plan there are no projects that fall within the meaning of Section 475.521, however, there are several projects that fall within the meaning of Section 475.58.

The Council may delete projects from the program or may change the scheduling and priority of allocation of funds. In accordance with State statutes, the City Council should refer any new project they may add to the CIB/CIP to the Planning Commission for review.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

CITY CHARTER PROVISIONS: THE RICHFIELD CITY CHARTER (Chapter 7) requires that, it is the City Manager's responsibility to include in the annual budget message a capital improvement budget outlining proposed capital expenditures for that year. In addition, in 2004 the City Charter was amended to also give the City Manager the responsibility to develop a Capital Improvement Plan for the four fiscal years succeeding the budget year and submit it to the Planning Commission to ensure compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan. The City Manager, upon compliance with the Comprehensive Plan by the Planning Commission, includes the Capital Improvement Budget and Plan in the current year budget document.

STATE LEGISLATION: State enabling legislation (M.S. 462.351-462.364) directs the Planning Commission to review proposed capital projects in relation to the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

In 2003, the legislature authorized a capital improvement bond program that applies to cities similar to that which is current law for counties. A new section 521 was added to Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 475 allowing municipalities to issue bonds for certain capital improvements contained in a capital improvement plan. Under the statute, capital improvements are defined as the acquisition or betterment of public lands, buildings or other improvements for the purpose of a city hall, town hall, library, public safety facility, and public works facility. In addition, an improvement must have an expected useful life of five years or more to qualify.

The statute also imposes certain requirements that must be addressed in order for a municipality to issue capital improvement bonds. These requirements are:

-) A public hearing must be held on the plan and approved by the governing body.
-) A public hearing must be held by the municipality on the issuance of bonds and approved by three-fifths of the members of a five member governing body.
-) Issuance of capital improvement bonds is subject to referendum approval if a petition signed by voters equal to five percent of votes cast in the municipality in the last general election is filed with the City Clerk within 30 days after the public hearing.
-) The plan must cover at least a five-year period beginning with the date of its adoption. The plan must set forth the estimated schedule, timing, and details of specific improvements by year, together with the estimated cost, the need for the improvement, and sources of revenue to pay for the improvement.

A municipality may also issue and sell obligations for street reconstruction under Minnesota Statute Section 475.58 if certain conditions are met. These conditions are:

-) The streets are reconstructed under a street reconstruction plan that describes the street reconstruction to be financed, the estimated costs, and any planned reconstruction of other streets in the municipality over the next five years, and the plan and issuance of the obligation has been approved by a vote of all of the members of the governing body present at the meeting following a public hearing for which notice has been published.
-) Issuance of the obligation is subject to referendum approval if a petition signed by voters equal to five percent of votes cast in the municipality in the last general election is filed with the City Clerk within 30 days after the public hearing.
-) Obligations issued under this subdivision are subject to the debt limit of the municipality and are not excluded from net debt under section 475.51, subdivision 4.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: In recent years, the federal government has adopted legislation designed to help strengthen local governments through emphasizing program planning and management. This legislation encourages municipalities to “program and budget for community development activities”. By establishing policies which systematically improves the community’s physical and social environment.

DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This Capital Plan is divided into three sections. The first section outlines the goals and policies of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. This section provides the general background and direction of the Capital Plan and outlines the goals to be implemented through the Capital Plan.

The second section of this document describes the City’s policies for financing capital improvements, including an inventory of existing and potential resources. The past use of these resources and the anticipated future use are outlined.

The third section of the Capital Improvement document provides a summary of proposed projects and a long-range schedule of individual projects.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET/CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUMMARY

All the projects contained in this document conform to the City’s adopted Comprehensive Plan and have been reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Several major resources are used in financing the CIB/CIP. These sources of funding include, but are not limited to, Federal, State, and County grants, municipal state aid, special assessments, use of debt, and user fees from enterprise funds.

The CIB/CIP provides for the major maintenance of neighborhood parks and ball fields, construction and improvements to public buildings, renovation of water plant facilities, storm water projects, and road, bridge, intersection and traffic light improvement projects.

THIS PAGE WAS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

SECTION ONE

Goals and Policies of the Richfield Comprehensive Plan

Land Use

Goal: *Maintain and enhance the “urban hometown” character of Richfield.*

Policies:

-) Establish a land use pattern and supporting infrastructure that creates a “walkable” environment.
-) Maintain a housing supply that meets changing needs while sustaining the integrity of existing neighborhoods.
-) Encourage “green” building practices.
-) Preserve historical, natural and cultural resources.
-) Develop residential standards (scale, density, etc.) for redevelopment areas that create neighborhood character.
-) Support commercial land uses that are diverse and responsive to their context.
-) Maintain and provide quality amenities and a safe living environment.

Goal: *Develop the Lakes at Lyndale area as a City Center.*

Policies:

-) Continue to develop and redevelop the Lakes at Lyndale area as a mixed-use center of living, commerce and recreation.
-) Provide appropriate density transitions from the intense uses at 66th and Lyndale to the surrounding neighborhoods.
-) As the market permits, provide circulator transit services connecting the City Center area to the remainder of Richfield.
-) Provide the means to calm vehicular traffic at the intersection of 66th Street and Lyndale Avenue to enhance safety and livability for residents and visitors.
-) Expand the vision of the Lakes at Lyndale area to include the original “HUB” and Nicollet shops.

Goal: *Beyond the City Center, develop identifiable nodes, corridors and gateways throughout the community.*

Policies:

-) Facilitate an intense mixed pattern of regional and community-oriented land uses along regional corridor routes including I-494 and Cedar Avenue.
-) Encouraging a mix of uses that serve a market in and around Richfield in community commercial nodes.
-) Encourage a mix of uses that serve surrounding local neighborhoods in neighborhood commercial nodes.
-) Create meeting places in multi-unit complexes to allow for interaction between its residents and between its residents and surrounding neighbors.
-) Improve gateways to create a visual means of welcoming people to Richfield.

Goal: *Provide an economic climate within Richfield that will encourage the availability of quality goods, services and employment opportunities for residents.*

Policies:

-) Accommodate business growth.
-) Encourage and support development of strong commercial districts that respect the values and standards of the citizens of Richfield.
-) Encourage the development of viable and responsive neighborhood commercial services.
-) Promote development that broadens the tax base.
-) Create commercial districts that sustain specific types of development and stabilize the economic base.

Housing

Goal: *Maintain and enhance Richfield's image as a community with strong, desirable and livable neighborhoods.*

Policies:

-) Encourage the use of quality, durable building and landscaping materials to maintain a high-quality standard in residential development.
-) Support the rehabilitation and upgrading of the existing housing stock.
-) Encourage the creation of "move-up" housing through new construction and home remodeling.
-) Support ongoing maintenance and upkeep of residential properties.
-) Ensure redevelopment and infill projects maintain the integrity of existing neighborhoods.
-) Maintain an appropriate mix of housing types in each neighborhood based on available amenities, transportation resources and adjacent land uses.
-) Encourage the use of design elements and strategies to create safer streets; facilitate social interaction between neighbors; foster connections with nearby businesses; and enhance neighborhood character, such as sidewalks, traffic calming strategies, front porches, alley enhancements and open/green space.
-) Limit redevelopment of single-family neighborhoods into other uses except where such neighborhoods are directly adjacent to commercial areas or areas adversely affected by major roadways, the airport, or other major developments.
-) Implement housing codes and support programs which incorporate state-of-the-art technology for new construction and which promote innovative and sustainable building methods that have application for remodeling homes.
-) Support initiatives which help connect residents with their neighborhood and foster a sense of community, such as block groups, neighborhood clean-up days, and cultural activities.

Goal: *Ensure sufficient diversity in the housing stock to provide for a range of household sizes, income levels and needs.*

Policies:

-) Promote the development of a balanced housing stock that is available to a range of income levels.

-) Encourage improvements to the housing stock to better serve families with children and seniors.
-) Promote additional housing diversity to serve families at all stages of their life-cycle through assistance, incentive programs, and the exploration of possible partnerships.
-) Regularly review land use and zoning ordinances to ensure maximum opportunities for development of housing.
-) Promote the development, management, and maintenance of affordable housing in the City through assistance programs; alternative funding sources; and the creation of partnerships whose mission is to promote low to moderate income housing.

Transportation

Goal: *Improve non-motorized and pedestrian travel in the City.*

Policies:

-) Construct additional, wider sidewalks that are set back farther from the street for increased safety.
-) Require Mn/DOT to include pedestrian access to transit in future I-494 and TH 62 reconstruction projects.
-) Construct additional bus shelters attractive to users and safely located around intersections.
-) Reduce roadway widths to allow for sidewalk and/or bike lanes. This may also reduce vehicular speeds.
-) Create safe road crossings in high traffic areas. Such crossings may include the use of skyways, if appropriate.
-) Use traffic-calming measures to discourage through traffic on local streets.
-) Identify pedestrian/bike trails to connect with adjacent/surrounding communities.

Goal: *Explore opportunities to enhance mass transit systems.*

Policies:

-) Work with transit providers in order to establish local or circular bus routes within Richfield and from Richfield to other places in the metropolitan area.
-) Encourage private companies within Richfield to provide local transportation for employees, guests and clients.
-) Work with existing groups and organizations to adequately meet the specialized transportation needs of seniors, youth, handicapped, and underprivileged citizens in the City.
-) Design road improvements to bear the surface stress produced by heavy vehicles.
-) Promote mass transit options, such as bus rapid transit, to reduce dependence on automobiles and provide a diverse, balanced set of public transportation alternatives.
-) Promote telecommuting and flex scheduling to reduce traffic.

-) Identify or develop additional park-and-ride lots throughout the City to encourage transit ridership.
-) Provide transit service for internal trips in Richfield via dial-a-ride or circulator bus.

Goal: *Place utilities underground wherever possible.*

Policies:

-) Bury utility lines. Funding for the project should come from a combination of City revenues and user fees.
-) Whenever possible, bury local utility lines, with assistance from the utility provider, when the adjacent street is reconstructed.

Goal: *Improve the flow of traffic in the City.*

Policies:

-) Re-stripe under capacity streets (i.e. Nicollet Avenue, 76th Street east of I-35W, etc.) with reduced through capacity and dedicated turn lanes.
-) When possible and needed, construct left and right-turn lanes or roundabouts at intersections.
-) Continue to work with Mn/DOT and the State Legislature to improve the capacity of I-494.
-) Encourage shared access to streets by adjacent land uses.

Goal: *Encourage development of areas where vehicle use is minimized.*

Policies:

-) Encourage shared parking between different developments when appropriate.
-) Strongly encourage pedestrian-friendly and transit-friendly building and site design through measures such as higher density development and growth, which is located along major transportation routes.
-) Require pedestrian connections between complementary land uses.
-) Advocate the location of commercial activity at focused points in the City ("downtown" areas). Preserve crucial public places like parks, recreation areas, open spaces, wetlands and Wood Lake Nature Center.
-) Require new developments of a certain size to prepare Travel Demand Management Plans.

Goal: *Encourage the use of alternative power sources in public buildings and in public vehicles.*

Policies:

-) Make fuel efficiency and alternative fuels a high priority when purchasing vehicles for use by the City.
-) The City will become and innovator in the use of alternative fuels, wind power and other sustainable energy sources.
-) Install solar panels or similar energy sources on public buildings and encourage owners of businesses and private property to do the same.

Goal: *Encourage protection of the environment in the day-to-day conduct of City business.*

Policies:

-) Reduce pollutants through public transit, car-pooling, traffic control, use of berms and trees, and stronger enforcement of pollution policies.
-) Create more ways to monitor pollution and put plans in place to resolve problems.
-) Use state-of-the-art methods to protect the environment in public projects and encourage the same in private development.
-) Encourage innovative solutions to land use and transportation problems.
-) Incorporate landscaping and aesthetics in all transportation improvements.

Parks

Policies:

-) There will be “no net loss of parkland.”
-) The City will not program adult or youth athletics in neighborhood parks. Scheduled league play should only occur in community parks and athletic complexes.
-) All residents should have access to and have the opportunity to be involved in recreation programs. The City has long offered financial assistance to those residents who need assistance with program fees and this practice shall continue.
-) All new park and facility improvements must include criterion that improves sustainability of materials, energy use, operating cost and lifecycle replacement and natural environmental impact.
-) The City shall incorporate best practices for stormwater retention in new park development and in the renovation of existing parks.
-) New development should have a provision for public/private open space.
-) Park land acquisition will be on a willing seller basis.
-) Sloped areas in parks will be naturalized with native plants to minimize maintenance costs and to beautify parks.
-) Planned facility improvements and lifecycle replacement will be made based on demonstrated need.
-) Adequate seating, shade and trail loops of varying lengths should be provided in parks to encourage active living for an aging population.
-) Provide public safety improvements as needed to ensure park and trail users' well being.
-) Provide park and recreation facilities that are handicap accessible.

Utilities

Water System Goals:

-) *Provide residents and businesses with affordable potable water that is safe and of high quality.*

-) *Provide a low-maintenance, efficient water system that supplies the long-term needs of residents and businesses.*
-) *Provide adequate water supply and pressure for residents and businesses.*
-) *Provide adequate water supply and pressure for residents and businesses.*
-) *Work with surrounding communities to provide an assured source of water in case of emergencies.*
-) *Provide adequate water services for areas designated for redevelopment.*
-) *Promote water conservation and sustainability by reducing water demand, reducing the waste of water, improving the efficiency of the existing system, and educating the public on water conservation.*
-) *Protect the groundwater supply from contamination.*

Policies:

-) Design and construct improvements to the water system that meet demands of redevelopment for sufficient fire protection for the entire community.
-) Provide a minimal hydrostatic pressure of 50 psi. Selectively increase the size of pipes in the distribution system for areas within the City where low water pressures exist.
-) Conduct a water rate study to adopt a conservation rate structure that promotes water conservation.
-) Support and appropriate level of State funding for interconnections and other physical water system improvements to ensure water supply reliability, natural resource protection, and/or safety and security, including economic security, of the region and State.
-) Investigate interconnection options with neighboring cities.

Surface Water Goals:

-) *Protect surface water quality by reducing the use of pesticides and chemical turf treatments that contribute to water pollution.*
-) *Provide a public education program to alert the public on the importance of protecting storm ponds from harmful pollutants and ensure the proper disposal of solid and liquid wastes.*
-) *Perform a regular maintenance program of existing storm drainage facilities, including sump, catch basin and retention basin cleaning, to protect private property from flood damage and maintain high water quality.*
-) *Explore innovative ways to improve the quality of surface water and evaluate the effectiveness of existing treatment methods at reasonable cost.*

Policies:

-) Sweep all streets at least twice each year.
-) Design conveyance structures to accommodate a ten-year storm event and storage facilities to accommodate a one hundred year event.
-) Demonstrate chemical treatment of surface waters as an innovative way to improve their quality and minimize their harm to the environment.

-) Complete stormwater improvements scheduled for First Avenue and 73rd Street, a Lift Station/Outlet for Augsburg Pond to limit flooding in central Richfield, the treatment pond around Richfield Lake and increase storm drainage that will be needed when I-494 is reconstructed.
-) Research a variety of treatment methods to assess their effectiveness to improve water quality at a reasonable cost.
-) Continue regular maintenance of storm ponds and drainage facilities to reduce damage to property and protect water quality.
-) Educate residents in responsible water quality management and ensure property disposal of solid and liquid wastes.
-) Eliminate illegal connections to the storm water system.

Sanitary Sewer Goals:

-) *Provide high quality sanitary sewer service to the residents and businesses of Richfield in the most economical manner possible.*
-) *Provide sanitary sewer service that meets the requirements of the 2030 population and employment forecasts of the City.*
-) *Take all necessary measures to maintain the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services Design Peak Hour to Average Daily Flow (P/A) Ratio of 2.5 to avoid paying an MCES surcharge.*

Policies:

-) The City will take all measures necessary to protect the capacity of the interceptor sewers that service the residents and businesses of Richfield in the most economical manner possible.
-) The City will work with MCES staff to monitor the metered flows from the Richfield system.
-) The City will continually monitor the sanitary sewer system to identify points of Inflow/Infiltration.
-) The City will continue to eliminate points of Inflow/Infiltration to the sanitary sewer system on public property, and require the elimination of Inflow/Infiltration on private property.
-) Design trunk sewer expansions in relation to the proposed land use intensities outlined in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
-) Provisions for sufficient sewer system capacity must be made to serve the intensity of new development and redevelopment before final development approvals are granted by the City.
-) Periodically review and evaluate the sewer collection system, MCES treatment plant capacity, and the accuracy of metered flow data provided by MCES in relation to the confirmed community growth and development.
-) A determination of who is responsible for the payment of reconstruction of sewer facilities will be made if insufficient capacity is available to serve the intensity of new development or redevelopment.
-) Funding priorities will be placed on maintaining the existing municipal sanitary sewer system.

-) Consider replacing old sanitary sewer pipe at the time of road reconstruction or redevelopment.
-) A financial analysis will be prepared prior to the reconstruction of any portion of the sanitary sewer system.
-) Funding future sewer facility improvements will continue to be identified in the Capital Improvements Plan.
-) To maintain operating efficiency, minimize sewage blockage, and reduce the potential for illness.
-) Continue to improve the City's maintenance and inspection program.

Private Utility Goals:

-) *Encourage the placement of private utilities underground whenever streets are reconstructed or new private development occurs.*
-) *Develop a policy on financing the cost to place utilities underground.*
-) *Reevaluate utility placement policy as part of City's Arterial Streets Study.*

THIS PAGE WAS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

SECTION TWO

SECTION TWO

FINANCING THE 2019 - 2022 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Richfield's planning for public improvements in the Capital Improvement Plan gives recognition both to community needs and to the City's ability to pay. A summary of each of the major revenue sources for the 2019-2022 Capital Improvement Plan is included below.

Source	Amount
Federal Funding	\$ 7,000,000
State Grants	400,000
Municipal State Aid	5,420,000
State Bonding	10,000,000
County	18,500,000
Other Agencies	200,000
General Tax Levy	3,325,000
Issuance of Debt	30,700,000
Internal Funding	500,000
Franchise Fees	6,500,000
Special Revenues	2,158,800
User Fees	15,515,000
TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS	\$100,218,800

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

The special revenue fund consists of profits from the Richfield Liquor stores. These funds are used for Capital Improvement Plan projects in lieu of issuing general obligation bonds and paying interest on the bonds. This source of funding is the backbone of the City's "pay-as-you-go" policy. A ten-year history of the transfers from the Municipal Liquor Fund and the interest earned on those funds is included below.

Year	SPECIAL REVENUE		Total
	Liquor Profits	Interest Earnings	
2006	500,000	4,695	504,695
2007	500,000	5,699	505,699
2008	500,000	4,384	504,384
2009	450,000	943	450,943
2010	450,000	878	450,878
2011	450,000	439	450,439
2012	450,000	314	450,314
2013	450,000	135	450,135
2014	450,000	321	450,321
2015	450,000	207	450,207
2016	99,500	721	100,221

INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL REVENUE BONDS

In past years, the City has issued Industrial/Commercial Revenue Bonds to finance development within the City. The Industrial/Commercial Revenue Bond or tax exempt notes are placed in the name of the City to promote economic development and increase the tax base of

the City. The proceeds of the bonds or notes are used to purchase plants and equipment. The bonds are repaid from the payments of the Industrial/Commercial Company.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS

Under Minnesota Statute, Section 475.521, a municipality may issue bonds to finance capital improvements, under an approved capital improvement plan. Capital improvements are defined in the statute as the acquisition or betterment of public lands, buildings, or other improvements for the purpose of a city hall, town hall, library, public safety facility, and public works facility. Finally, an improvement must have an expected useful life of five years or more to qualify.

FEDERAL AND STATE GRANTS/COUNTY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

It is the City's policy to explore available sources of federal, state, county, and local funds and to use these funds whenever possible. In recent years, the City has received a significant level of federal and state funding relating to the Penn Avenue and Lyndale Avenue Bridge reconstruction projects for example. It is anticipated that this use of federal and state funding will continue. One project that is planned to be funded by federal and state monies is the 77th Street Underpass project.

MUNICIPAL STATE AID

The State of Minnesota provides funds for both construction and maintenance of certain streets in Richfield. The policy of the City is to finance traffic control improvements, and to partially finance street improvements, with municipal state aid construction funds. The state aid maintenance funds are used for designated maintenance purposes. With the completion of improvements on municipal state aid roadways, construction funds may be transferred to maintenance. The most recent annual allotment of these funds to the City of Richfield total approximately \$1,512,452 of which \$315,000 is for maintenance and \$1,197,452 for construction.

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING

The State Housing and Redevelopment Act has established a method of financing improvements in a renewal area. This statute enables a local Housing and Redevelopment Authority or City to finance redevelopment activities and public improvements through a tax increment program, without federal assistance and without additional burdens on the community's tax dollar. Since 1975, the City has created twenty-six tax increment districts. The tax increment receipts are used to pay the debt service on the City's General Obligation Redevelopment Bonds and to fund redevelopment activities such as land acquisition, relocation and demolition. Remaining debt service on General Obligation Redevelopment Bonds as of December 31, 2017 is shown below.

GENERAL OBLIGATION REDEVELOPMENT BONDS
SCHEDULE DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

12/31/17
ANNUAL PAYMENTS

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PRINCIPAL</u>	<u>INTEREST</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>UNPAID PRINCIPAL</u>
				5,645,000
2018	705,000	163,416	868,416	4,940,000
2019	720,000	147,146	867,146	4,220,000
2020	745,000	128,321	873,321	3,475,000
2021	760,000	107,430	867,430	2,715,000
2022	790,000	84,528	874,528	1,925,000
2023	815,000	56,772	871,772	1,110,000
2024	850,000	24,256	874,256	260,000
2025	260,000	3,738	263,738	-
	<u>5,645,000</u>	<u>715,607</u>	<u>6,360,607</u>	

General Obligation Improvement Bonds

It is the policy of the City to assess property for improvements that directly benefit the property. Such improvements include alleys, sidewalks, permanent streets, and street lighting. A minimum of twenty percent of the cost of a project must be assessed to the benefited property for assessment bond eligibility.

The City has \$43,115,000 of G. O. Improvement bonds outstanding as of December 31, 2017. Annual debt service requirements for the bonds are shown below.

GENERAL OBLIGATION IMPROVEMENT BONDS
SCHEDULED DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

12/31/17
ANNUAL PAYMENTS

YEAR	PRINCIPAL	INTEREST	TOTAL	UNPAID PRINCIPAL
				\$43,115,000
2018	1,600,000	1,369,016	2,969,016	41,515,000
2019	8,095,000	1,105,583	9,200,583	33,420,000
2020	2,155,000	907,581	3,062,581	31,265,000
2021	2,220,000	849,005	3,069,005	29,045,000
2022	2,260,000	784,693	3,044,693	26,785,000
2023	2,340,000	717,264	3,057,264	24,445,000
2024	2,415,000	645,603	3,060,603	22,030,000
2025	2,495,000	572,816	3,067,816	19,535,000
2026	2,565,000	502,942	3,067,942	16,970,000
2027	2,635,000	434,114	3,069,114	14,335,000
2028	2,710,000	362,259	3,082,259	11,615,000
2029	2,255,000	292,077	2,547,077	9,360,000
2030	1,220,000	242,504	1,462,504	8,140,000
2031	1,260,000	209,128	1,469,128	6,880,000
2032	1,285,000	174,138	1,459,138	5,595,000
2033	1,320,000	137,900	1,457,900	4,275,000
2034	1,225,000	102,462	1,327,462	3,050,000
2035	1,110,000	69,356	1,179,356	1,940,000
2036	805,000	42,287	847,287	1,135,000
2037	560,000	24,250	584,250	575,000
2038	575,000	8,625	583,625	-
	<u>\$43,115,000</u>	<u>\$9,553,603</u>	<u>\$52,668,603</u>	

The debt service funding for general obligation improvement bonds are typically accomplished through debt service tax levies or special assessment levies or a combination of both. The current outstanding general obligation improvement debt is planned to be funded by debt service tax levies, cash on hand, special assessment collections and interest earnings.

USER FEES

User fees are collected by the City for direct services provided to its residents, including water, sewer, and storm sewer service, and fees for recreational activities such as swimming, ice skating, and miniature golfing. The charges in these funds are structured to cover current operations and the depreciation of the fixed assets such as buildings and fixtures. The portion of the fees which covers depreciation is retained in the fund as cash and retained earnings to use when the replacement of fixed assets becomes necessary.

The City also charges user fees internally for services provided by the Central Garage, Information Technology (IT), Self Insurance, and Government Buildings operations. The user fees are also structured to cover current operations and depreciation.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

The City may sell special assessment bonds, general obligation bonds, capital improvement bonds, revenue bonds, or gross revenue bonds to finance Capital Improvements. The City can attach the designation general obligation bonds to all types of bonds except gross revenue bonds. The effect of such designation is the ability to sell bonds at a lower interest rate and the City pledges its full faith and credit on the bonds.

The City's current bond rating is AA+ bond rating from Standard and Poor's for issues since 2010 and Aa2 rating on issues from Moody's Investor Services prior to 2010. The ratings from both services are excellent ratings for a suburban community like Richfield. The City's total net tax capacity value on real and personal property is an estimated \$33,179,862, including the value base obtained from the Metropolitan Area Fiscal Disparity Program. The City may issue general obligation bonds equal to a debt limit of 3% of market value of taxable property. Although the present total bonded debt is \$60,170,000, not all of this is applicable to the debt limit.

COMPUTATION OF LEGAL DEBT MARGIN

Market Value of Taxable Property		<u>\$3,104,661,534</u>
Debt Limit 3% of Market Value of Taxable Property		<u>\$ 93,139,846</u>
Amount of Debt Applicable to Debt Limit:		
Total Bonded Debt	\$60,170,000	
Less:		
Redevelopment Bonds	\$5,645,000	
Special Assessment Bonds	609,000	
Water Revenue Bonds	4,695,000	
Storm Sewer Revenue Bonds	6,715,000	<u>\$17,664,000</u>
Total Debt Applicable to Debt Limit		<u>\$ 42,506,000</u>
Legal Debt Margin		<u>\$ 50,633,846</u>

The computation of direct and overlapping debt is a computation that shows debt of another unit of government that at least some of the reporting government's taxpayers will also have to pay in whole or in part. The City of Richfield's level of overlapping debt is calculated below.

COMPUTATION OF DIRECT AND OVERLAPPING DEBT

Jurisdiction	Net Debt Outstanding	Percentage Applicable to City of Richfield	Amount Applicable to City of Richfield
City of Richfield	<u>\$ 39,885,000</u>	100%	<u>\$ 38,680,000</u>
Hennepin County	\$ 811,375,883	1.77%	\$ 14,361,353
ISD #280, Richfield, MN	24,664,879	69.55%	17,154,423
Hennepin Suburb Park District	47,787,952	2.46%	1,175,584
Hennepin Regional RR Authority	32,848,204	2.46%	808,066
Metropolitan Council	38,874,706	.90%	349,872
	<u>\$ 955,551,624</u>		<u>\$ 33,849,298</u>
Total	<u>\$ 995,436,624</u>		<u>\$ 73,734,298</u>

The City's debt policies as stated in the annual budget are included at the end of this section. There are several projects currently included in the Capital Improvement Plan that are planning on the issuance of general obligation special assessment debt to fund all or part of a project.

DEBT POLICIES

I. Debt Limits

a. Legal Limits:

- i. Minnesota Statutes, Section 475 prescribes the statutory debt limit that outstanding principal of debt cannot exceed 3% of taxable market value. This limitation applies to "Net Debt" as defined in Section 475.51, Minnesota Statutes, as well as lease purchases or installment contracts (465.71) greater than or equal to \$1,000,000. HRA public project revenue bonds or lease revenue bonds with financing lease agreement with a city or county also count against the statutory debt limit.
- ii. The City's ability to issue debt will conform to the City Charter.

b. Policy Limits:

- i. The City will weigh the benefits and costs of long-term borrowing for planned capital improvements and short-term debt for capital outlay. In addition, when considering financing of capital expenditures, the City may consider paying cash for capital financing as well as debt financing.
- ii. Uses of Debt: Debt will be used only for capital improvements, projects, or acquisitions that cannot be financed from current revenue. The City will not utilize debt for cash flow borrowing or to support current operations.
- iii. In the in event of some unforeseen cause where taxes or other sources become insufficient or a natural disaster or public emergency should subject the City to making extraordinary expenditures, the City may by resolution issue debt emergency certificates on a short term basis.
- iv. CIP and Financial Planning: The City's capital improvement plan shall contain debt assumptions which match this policy and requires a commitment to long range financial planning which looks at multiple years of capital and debt needs.
- v. Tax Increment Bonds: The City shall use G.O. Tax Increment Bonds only when the project meets statutory requirements.
- vi. When capital improvements/projects are financed by issuing debt, the debt will be paid back within a period not to exceed the expected useful life of the project, with at least 50% of the principal retired within 2/3 of the term of the bond issue.
- vii. Where possible the City will use special assessment, revenue or other self supporting debt not counting against statutory imposed limitations.
- viii. The City will retire any tax anticipation debt annually and will retire bond anticipation debt within six months after completion of the project.

c. Financial Limits:

- i. Direct debt is the amount of general obligation principal or lease obligations supported by taxes which are outstanding for which the City is obligor. Indirect debt is the amount of the City's share of tax supported debt of other overlying taxing jurisdictions. Direct debt as a percentage of the City's taxable market value shall not exceed 6.67%.
- ii. Bond issues may require a special debt levy. The City's goal has been to maintain the amount of the property tax levy dedicated to debt service (principal and interest plus 5% for G.O. bonds) will not exceed 25% of total annual locally generated operating expenditures.

II. Use of Variable Rate Debt and Derivatives

- a. Variable Rate Debt. The City will shall use variable rate debt only if total principal and interest of the debt constitutes less than 20% of the City's total debt payments and only if circumstances dictate the need for a short term call date.
- b. Derivatives. The City will not use derivative based debt.

III. Debt Structuring Practices

- a. Term: State law limits general obligation debt to 30 years in most circumstances. The City will attempt to keep the stated maturity of debt at or below 20 years.
- b. Term of Equipment: State law allows cities to issue debt (known as equipment certificates or capital notes) up to a term of 10 years for the purpose of purchasing equipment. The City will utilize the issuance of capital notes when the option of funding equipment purchases with other resources is not available. The term of any debt issue for purposes of acquiring equipment shall not exceed the useful life of the assets financed.

IV. Debt Issuance Practices

- a. Rating Agencies: The City will maintain good communications with bond rating agencies regarding its financial condition. The City will follow a policy of full disclosure in every financial report and bond prospectus.
- b. Bondholders: The City will maintain good communications with its bondholders regarding its financial condition.
- c. Method of Sale: The City shall use competitive bidding for all of its debt unless the debt is so specialized in its nature that it will not attract more than 2 bids.
- d. Refunding:
 - i. The City with the assistance of a financial advisor will track and identify opportunities for restructuring or refinancing debt. Furthermore, when feasible, the City will use refunding mechanisms to reduce interest and evaluate the use of debt reserves or other accumulated balances to lower overall debt service where possible.
 - ii. Advance refunding bonds shall not be utilized unless present value savings of 3% of refunded principal is achieved and unless the call date is within 4 years. This is in accordance with state law.
 - iii. Current refunding bonds shall not be utilized unless present value savings of 3% of refunded principal is achieved or in concert with other bond issues to save costs of issuance.
 - iv. Special assessment or revenue debt will not be refunded unless it is determined that special assessments or other sufficient revenues will not be collected soon enough to pay off the debt fully at the call date.
- e. Professional Services. The City shall use an outside bond attorney, an independent financial advisor to structure the sale of debt, and a paying agent for book entry transactions.

V. Debt Management Practices

- a. Investment of bond proceeds. The City shall invest bond proceeds in a separate account in order to account for earnings on invested proceeds for the purposes of complying with arbitrage regulations.
- b. Disclosure: The City shall comply with SEC rule 15(c)2(12) on primary and continuing disclosure. Continuing disclosure reports shall be filed no later than 180 days after the end of the fiscal year.
- c. Arbitrage Rebate: The City shall complete an arbitrage rebate report for each issue no less than every five years after its date of issuance.
- d. The City will transfer any residual balances in matured debt service funds to the Closed Bond Fund.

VI. Updates of Policy

- a. The Finance Manager will be responsible for reviewing and amending this policy as dictated by changes in related statutes and bring these updates to the City Council for approval.

SECTION THREE

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET & PLAN

OVERVIEW

The final CIB/CIP document reflects a wide ranging group of projects which are designed to meet the most pressing capital needs of the community. The 2018 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB) along with the 2019-2022 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as generated by the City Manager is presented to a meeting of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission then reviews the CIB/CIP for conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Upon approval by the Planning Commission, the CIB/CIP is returned to the City Manager. The City Manager then incorporates the CIB/CIP into the 2017 Revised/2018 Proposed Budget, to be considered by the City Council.

In consideration of the CIP, it is important that the total project proposals, which will require Special Revenue funding, be viewed with a \$500,000 annual cap.

2018 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB)

The 2018 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB) reflects funding for numerous improvement projects throughout the city. In 2018 construction will continue on the 66th Street reconstruction project, which is planned to be completed in 2019 and will extend the length of the City from east to west. In addition, design work is estimated to be completed on the 77th Street Underpass project along with year four in the six year mill and overlay program.

Finally, the 2018 CIB recommends projects totaling \$450,000 of Special Revenue funding. The funding will be used for park maintenance projects, master parks plan improvements and the accumulation of funds for the ice arena indirect refrigeration project. Finally, in formulating the City Manager's 2018 CIB within the available funding, it was necessary to defer or reduce funding for some projects.

2019-2022 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Over the next several years, most major arterial roads in the City will be reconstructed or improved. As noted, in 2018 will be the second year of construction on the 66th Street project that will continue into 2019, in addition, construction work on the 77th Street Underpass is forecasted to begin in 2019, along with the reconstruction of Lyndale Avenue, followed by 65th Street in 2020. Finally, 70th Street, 76th Street West, Humboldt Avenue & Lakeshore Drive, Penn Avenue and Nicollet Avenue are planned to be reconstructed sometime after 2021. Along with these projects, the City plans to continue to implement its six year mill & overlay program.

Finally, the recommended CIP includes the continued accumulation funds for the conversion to indirect refrigeration at the Ice Arena, funding of major park maintenance projects, the replacement of the City's rolling stock and technology equipment.

Other Considerations

Finally, an annual systematic review of all the City's park structures, ballfields, lighting and related infrastructure will continue to be undertaken to project the future maintenance and major repair of those facilities that may be needed in the next CIP period.

PLAN SUMMARY

ESTIMATED COSTS
AND
FUNDING SOURCES

2018 Capital Improvement Budget

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Parks Master Plan Improvements	100,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	300,000	R
	400,000	S
	100,000	I
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 950,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 4,000,000	B
	1,000,000	M
77th Street Underpass	1,000,000	SB
Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements	40,000	M
Mill and Overlay Program	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 9,290,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 655,000	TL
Technology Replacement	130,000	TL
Water Plant Roof Replacement	450,000	U
Wood Lake Lift Station Renovation	35,000	U
Lift Station No. 2 Control Panel	25,000	U
Lime Slaker Replacement	125,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	200,000	U
Penn Liquor Store Remodel	1,200,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 2,820,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 13,060,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 4,000,000	
(FF) Franchise Fees	3,250,000	
(I) Internal Funding	100,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	1,040,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(S) State Grants	400,000	
(SB) State Bonding	1,000,000	
(TL) Tax Levy	785,000	
(U) User Fees	2,035,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 13,060,000	

2019 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Parks Master Plan Improvements	100,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	300,000	R
	400,000	S
	100,000	I
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 950,000	
 RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 2,200,000	B
	1,500,000	M
77th Street Underpass	8,000,000	SB
	2,500,000	C
	200,000	TR
Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements	40,000	M
Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction	7,500,000	B
	450,000	M
	50,000	X
Mill and Overlay Program	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 25,690,000	
 PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 665,000	TL
Technology Replacement	135,000	TL
Water Meter Upgrade	500,000	U
Emergency Water Connection	500,000	U
Emerson Lift Station	500,000	U
Lift Station No. 3 Control Panel	25,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	200,000	U
Liquor Operation Capital Improvements	50,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 2,575,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 29,215,000	
 ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 9,700,000	
(C) Hennepin County	2,500,000	
(FF) Franchise Fees	3,250,000	
(I) Internal Funding	100,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	1,990,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(S) State Grants	400,000	
(SB) State Bonding	8,000,000	
(TL) Tax Levy	800,000	
(TR) Three Rivers Park District	200,000	
(U) User Fees	1,775,000	
(X) Xcel Energy Rate Payers	50,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 29,215,000	

2020 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Parks Master Plan Improvements	100,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	300,000	R
	100,000	I
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 550,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 1,850,000	M
77th Street Underpass	7,000,000	F
	2,000,000	SB
Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements	40,000	M
Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction	2,000,000	U
65th Street Reconstruction	3,500,000	B
	4,000,000	U
Mill and Overlay Program	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 23,640,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 690,000	TL
Technology Replacement	135,000	TL
Water Meter Upgrade	500,000	U
Roof Replacement on Wells 2 and 3	30,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	200,000	U
Liquor Operation Capital Improvements	50,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 1,605,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 25,795,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 3,500,000	
(F) Federal Funding	7,000,000	
(FF) Franchise Fees	3,250,000	
(I) Internal Funding	100,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	1,890,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(SB) State Bonding	2,000,000	
(TL) General Tax Levy	825,000	
(U) User Fees	6,780,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 25,795,000	

2021 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Parks Master Plan Improvements	100,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	300,000	R
	100,000	I
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 550,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
77th Street Underpass	\$ 500,000	M
Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements	40,000	M
65th Street Reconstruction	500,000	U
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 1,040,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 715,000	TL
Technology Replacement	135,000	TL
Water Meter Upgrade	1,500,000	U
Water main(s) replacement under I-35W	750,000	U
Wells 4, 5, and 6 Roof Replacement	60,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	200,000	U
Liquor Operation Capital Improvements	50,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 3,410,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 5,000,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(I) Internal Funding	\$ 100,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	540,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(TL) General Tax Levy	850,000	
(U) User Fees	3,060,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 5,000,000	

2022 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Parks Master Plan Improvements	100,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	300,000	R
	100,000	I
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 550,000	
 RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
70th Street Reconstruction	\$ 2,500,000	U
	\$ 100,000	X
76th Street West Reconstruction	3,500,000	B
	1,000,000	M
	800,000	X
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 7,900,000	
 PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 715,000	TL
Technology Replacement	135,000	TL
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	200,000	U
Liquor Operation Capital Improvements	50,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 1,100,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 9,550,000	
 ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 3,500,000	
(I) Internal Funding	100,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	1,000,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(TL) General Tax Levy	850,000	
(U) User Fees	2,750,000	
(X) Xcel Energy Rate Payers	900,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 9,550,000	

Capital Improvement Plan - Beyond 2022

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	\$ 358,800	R
	100,000	I
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 458,800	
 RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
Humboldt Ave/Lakeshore Drive Reconstruction	\$ 4,000,000	B
Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction	5,000,000	B
	8,000,000	C
Penn Avenue Reconstruction	5,000,000	B
	8,000,000	C
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 30,000,000	
 PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	\$ 200,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 200,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 30,658,800	
 ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 14,000,000	
(C) Hennepin County	16,000,000	
(I) Internal Funding	100,000	
(R) Special Revenue	358,800	
(U) User Fees	200,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 30,658,800	

2019 - 2022 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN - CITY OF RICHFIELD, MINNESOTA

Recommended and Scheduled for Four Year Period

PROJECTS	TOTAL*	Recommended and Scheduled for Four Year Period				
	CIP COST	2019	2020	2021	2022	Beyond 2022
RECREATION						
OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT						
1 Park Maintenance	\$ 180,000	\$ 45,000 R	\$ 45,000 R	\$ 45,000 R	\$ 45,000 R	\$ -
2 Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	\$ 20,000	\$ 5,000 R	\$ 5,000 R	\$ 5,000 R	\$ 5,000 R	\$ -
3 Parks Master Plan Improvements	\$ 400,000	100,000 R	100,000 R	100,000 R	100,000 R	-
4 Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration Ph. 1	\$ 1,558,800	300,000 R	300,000 R	300,000 R	300,000 R	358,800 R
5	\$ 800,000	400,000 S	100,000 I	100,000 I	100,000 I	100,000 I
6	\$ 100,000	100,000 I	-	-	-	-
7 TOTAL RECREATION & OPEN SPACE	\$ 3,058,800	\$ 950,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 458,800
8						
9 (R) Special Revenue	\$ 2,158,800	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 358,800
10 (S) State Grants	\$ 400,000	400,000	-	-	-	-
11 (I) Internal Funding	\$ 500,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
12 TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 3,058,800	\$ 950,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 458,800
13						
14						
15						
PROJECTS						
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS						
16						
17 RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS						
18 66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 4,050,000	\$ 2,200,000 B	\$ 1,850,000 M	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
19	\$ 1,500,000	1,500,000 M	-	-	-	-
20 77th Street Underpass	\$ 10,500,000	8,000,000 SB	2,000,000 SB	500,000 M	-	-
21	\$ 9,500,000	2,500,000 C	7,000,000 F	-	-	-
	\$ 200,000	200,000 TR	-	-	-	-
22 Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 120,000	40,000 M	40,000 M	40,000 M	-	-
23 Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction	\$ 7,500,000	7,500,000 B	-	-	-	-
24	\$ 450,000	450,000 M	-	-	-	-
25	\$ 50,000	50,000 X	-	-	-	-
26	\$ 2,000,000	-	2,000,000 U	-	-	-
27 65th Street Reconstruction	\$ 3,500,000	-	3,500,000 B	-	-	-
28	\$ 4,500,000	-	4,000,000 U	500,000 U	-	-
29 70th Street Reconstruction	\$ 2,500,000	-	-	-	2,500,000 U	-
30	\$ 100,000	-	-	-	100,000 X	-
31 76th Street West Reconstruction	\$ 3,500,000	-	-	-	3,500,000 B	-
32	\$ 1,000,000	-	-	-	1,000,000 M	-
33	\$ 800,000	-	-	-	800,000 X	-
34 Humboldt Ave/Lakeshore Drive Recon.	\$ 4,000,000	-	-	-	-	4,000,000 B
35 Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction	\$ 5,000,000	-	-	-	-	5,000,000 B
36	\$ 8,000,000	-	-	-	-	8,000,000 C
37 Penn Avenue Reconstruction	\$ 5,000,000	-	-	-	-	5,000,000 B
38	\$ 8,000,000	-	-	-	-	8,000,000 C
39 Mill and Overlay Project	\$ 6,500,000	3,250,000 FF	3,250,000 FF	-	-	-
40						
41	\$ 88,270,000	\$ 25,690,000	\$ 23,640,000	\$ 1,040,000	\$ 7,900,000	\$ 30,000,000
42						
43 (B) G.O. Improvement Bonds	\$ 30,700,000	\$ 9,700,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 14,000,000
44 (C) Hennepin County	\$ 18,500,000	2,500,000	-	-	-	16,000,000
45 (F) Federal Funding	\$ 7,000,000	-	7,000,000	-	-	-
46 (FF) Franchise Fees	\$ 6,500,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	-	-	-
47 (M) Municipal State Aid	\$ 5,420,000	1,990,000	1,890,000	540,000	1,000,000	-
48 (SB) State Bonding	\$ 10,000,000	8,000,000	2,000,000	-	-	-
49 (TR) Three Rivers Park District	\$ 200,000	200,000	-	-	-	-
50 (U) User Fees	\$ 9,000,000	-	6,000,000	500,000	2,500,000	-
51 (X) Xcel Energy Rate Payers	\$ 950,000	50,000	-	-	900,000	-
52 TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 88,270,000	\$ 25,690,000	\$ 23,640,000	\$ 1,040,000	\$ 7,900,000	\$ 30,000,000
53						
54						
PROJECTS						
PUBLIC FACILITIES						
55						
56						
57 Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 2,785,000	\$ 665,000 TL	\$ 690,000 TL	\$ 715,000 TL	\$ 715,000 TL	\$ -
58 Technology Replacement	\$ 540,000	135,000 TL	135,000 TL	135,000 TL	135,000 TL	-
59 Water Meter Upgrade	\$ 2,500,000	500,000 U	500,000 U	1,500,000 U	-	-
60 Interconnect with Neighboring Communities	\$ 500,000	500,000 U	-	-	-	-
61 Emerson Lift Station	\$ 500,000	500,000 U	-	-	-	-
62 Lift Station #3 Control Panel	\$ 25,000	25,000 U	-	-	-	-
63 Water Main(s) Replacement Under I-35W	\$ 750,000	-	-	750,000 U	-	-
64 Roof Replacement Wells 2 and 3	\$ 30,000	-	30,000 U	-	-	-
65 Roof Replacement Wells 4, 5, and 6	\$ 60,000	-	-	60,000 U	-	-
66 Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	\$ 1,000,000	200,000 U	200,000 U	200,000 U	200,000 U	200,000 U
67 Liquor Operation Capital Improvements	\$ 200,000	50,000 U	50,000 U	50,000 U	50,000 U	-
68 TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 8,890,000	\$ 2,575,000	\$ 1,605,000	\$ 3,410,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 200,000
69						
70 (TL) Tax Levy	\$ 3,325,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 825,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 850,000	\$ -
71 (U) User Fees	\$ 5,565,000	1,775,000	780,000	2,560,000	250,000	200,000
72 TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 8,890,000	\$ 2,575,000	\$ 1,605,000	\$ 3,410,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 200,000

Recommended and Scheduled for Four Year Period

PROJECTS	TOTAL*	Recommended and Scheduled for Four Year Period				
	CIP COST	2019	2020	2021	2022	Beyond 2022
73						
2019 - 2022 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN - CITY OF RICHFIELD, MINNESOTA						
74						
75	<u>SUMMARY PROJECTS</u>					
76						
77 Recreation/Open Space Development	\$ 3,058,800	\$ 950,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 458,800
78 Right of Way Improvements	\$ 88,270,000	25,690,000	23,640,000	1,040,000	7,900,000	30,000,000
79 Public Facilities	\$ 8,890,000	2,575,000	1,605,000	3,410,000	1,100,000	200,000
80 TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECTS	<u>\$ 100,218,800</u>	<u>\$ 29,215,000</u>	<u>\$ 25,795,000</u>	<u>\$ 5,000,000</u>	<u>\$ 9,550,000</u>	<u>\$ 30,658,800</u>
81						
82 (B) G.O. Improvement Bonds	\$ 30,700,000	\$ 9,700,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 14,000,000
83 (C) Hennepin County	\$ 18,500,000	2,500,000	-	-	-	16,000,000
84 (F) Federal Funding	\$ 7,000,000	-	7,000,000	-	-	-
85 (FF) Franchise Fees	\$ 6,500,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	-	-	-
86 (I) Internal Funding	\$ 500,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
87 (M) Municipal State Aid	\$ 5,420,000	1,990,000	1,890,000	540,000	1,000,000	-
88 (R) Special Revenue	\$ 2,158,800	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	358,800
89 (S) State Grants	\$ 400,000	400,000	-	-	-	-
90 (SB) State Bonding	\$ 10,000,000	8,000,000	2,000,000	-	-	-
91 (TL) Tax Levy	\$ 3,325,000	800,000	825,000	850,000	850,000	-
92 (TR) Three Rivers Park District	\$ 200,000	200,000	-	-	-	-
93 (U) User Fees	\$ 14,565,000	1,775,000	6,780,000	3,060,000	2,750,000	200,000
94 (X) Xcel Energy Rate Payers	\$ 950,000	50,000	-	-	900,000	-
95 TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES	<u>\$ 100,218,800</u>	<u>\$ 29,215,000</u>	<u>\$ 25,795,000</u>	<u>\$ 5,000,000</u>	<u>\$ 9,550,000</u>	<u>\$ 30,658,800</u>

96 * Total CIP costs do not include any project costs reflected in the 2018 CIB.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Major Park Maintenance
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Major Repair of Park Facilities
2. Total project cost:	\$45,000 per year
3. Years to complete:	Yearly major maintenance
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2000
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$45,000	2022 CIP	\$45,000
2019 CIP	\$45,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$45,000		
2021 CIP	\$45,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$45,000 per year	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$45,000 per year		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Various projects relating to the upkeep of existing park infrastructure are planned throughout the year by Recreation Department staff and Public Works Maintenance staff, and prioritized by the Community Services Commission on an annual basis. Project examples include tennis/basketball court resurfacing, trail resurfacing, roof replacement, parking lot reconstruction, field renovation and other replacement of existing park capital items.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve X	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
-------------------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal
2. Total project cost:	\$25,000
3. Years to complete:	Annual
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2015
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$5,000	2022 CIP	\$5,000
2019 CIP	\$5,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$5,000		
2021 CIP	\$5,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$5,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$5,000 per year		100%

8. Brief summary of project: A chain-link fence was installed around the perimeter of Wood Lake Nature Center over 30 years ago. The fence is often a target for fallen trees. Ongoing funds are needed to keep the fence in good repair.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Manage <input type="checkbox"/>	Replace/Improve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Expand <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	--	--

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Parks Master Plan Improvements
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Parks Master Plan Improvements
2. Total project cost:	\$100,000 per year
3. Years to complete:	Annual
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$100,000	2022 CIP	\$100,000
2018 CIP	\$100,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$100,000		
2021 CIP	\$100,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$100,000 per year	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$100,000 per year		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The City's Parks Master Plan will be updated in conjunction with the Comprehensive Guide Plan in 2018. A community wide engagement process will identify various projects in the parks system, including upgrades, replacement of outdated equipment, enhancements to existing facilities, and other projects that may, as yet, be unidentified.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve X	Manage X	Replace/Improve X	Expand X
-------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	X

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration
2. Total project cost:	\$3,658,800
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2017
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$800,000	2022 CIP	\$400,000
2019 CIP	\$800,000	Beyond 2022	\$458,800
2020 CIP	\$400,000		
2021 CIP	\$400,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$2,158,800	% of total	59%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants	\$8		
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$800,000	% of total	22%
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Internal Funding	\$700,000	% of total	19%
TOTAL	\$3,658,800		100%

8. Brief summary of project: By the year 2020, R-22 refrigerant will no longer be produced or imported. The City currently has R-22 direct refrigeration systems in both rinks at the Richfield Ice Arena. Staff has found that a single ammonia-based refrigeration system to serve the two existing ice rinks is the most efficient and cost effective solution. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$3,658,800, including design costs. Staff recommends splitting the project into two phases with Phase One dedicated to replacing the piping in the floor of rink two and constructing the combined refrigeration equipment for both rinks. Phase Two includes the replacement of piping in rink one and connecting to the ammonia-based system that was installed in Phase One.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? No

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	
Meets multiple objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	X

RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 66th Street Reconstruction
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	66 th Street Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$61,292,000
3. Years to complete:	4
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2017
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP	\$5,000,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$3,700,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$1,850,000		
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$15,200,000	% of total	25%
Mun. State Aid	\$8,200,000	% of total	13%
Grants			
Federal	\$9,632,000	% of total	16%
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$26,500,000	% of total	43%
Other	\$435,000	% of total	1%
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$1,325,000	% of total	2%
TOTAL	\$61,292,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of 66th Street (CR 53) from Xerxes Avenue east to 16th Avenue, including replacement of City utilities, undergrounding of parallel overhead utility lines, and improved bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. The City cost share includes 25% of road construction, 66% of storm sewer, 100% of water/sewer utility replacement, and any additional streetscape elements not cost shared by the County. Design was approved by the City Council in 2015, following a public input process.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	X

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 77th Street Underpass
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	77 th Street Underpass
2. Total project cost:	\$23,800,000
3. Years to complete:	4
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2016
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP	\$1,000,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$10,700,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$9,000,000		
2021 CIP	\$500,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$500,000 (2021)	% of total	2%
Grants			
Federal	\$7,000,000 (2020)	% of total	29%
State	\$12,100,000 (2017-2020) 2017- \$1,100,000 2018- \$1,000,000 2019- \$8,000,000 2020- \$2,000,000	% of total	51%
County	\$4,000,000 (2017, 2019) 2017-\$1,500,000 2019-\$2,500,000	% of total	17%
Other (TRPD)	\$200,000 (2019)	% of total	1%
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$23,800,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The project would extend 77th Street under Highway 77 to connect to the 24th Avenue Interchange at I-494. Right-of-way acquisition is required to complete the project. The underpass would include bike and pedestrian accommodations.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve	Expand X
----------	--------	-----------------	-----------------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Multi-Year Bike/Ped Improvements
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
2. Total project cost:	\$160,000
3. Years to complete:	5
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$40,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$40,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$40,000		
2021 CIP	\$40,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
MSA – Sweet Streets	\$160,000	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
Franchise Fees	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$160,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: As part of the implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan following the Mill and Overlay Program, bike and pedestrian facilities would be installed in the year following the overlay. Each route would go through a public input process prior to implementation. Spot pedestrian improvements, such as refuge islands, would be constructed as well where potential for the largest safety improvements are identified.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve X	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
--------------------------	---------------	---------------------------------	---------------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$10,000,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$8,000,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$2,000,000		
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

UF – Utility Bond	\$2,000,000	% of total	20%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds (Street)	\$7,500,000	% of total	75%
Mun. State Aid	\$450,000	% of total	4.5%
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$50,000	% of total	0.5%
TOTAL	\$10,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of Lyndale Avenue between 67th Street and 76th Street. The new roadway cross-section would be consistent with the recommended alternative identified in the 2009 Arterial Roads Study (3-lane section) with the exact design to be determined through a public input process. The project includes the replacement of City utilities.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 65th Street Reconstruction
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	65 th Street Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$8,000,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$7,500,000		
2021 CIP	\$500,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

UF – Utility Bond	\$4,500,000	% of total	56%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds (Street)	\$3,500,000	% of total	44%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$8,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of 65th Street between Nicollet Avenue and 66th Street and Lyndale Avenue from 64th Street to the 66th Street reconstruction limits to accommodate replacement of large water main. The project also includes replacement of other City utilities and intersection control at Lyndale Avenue. The project will include a public input process to identify the future streetscape.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 70th Street Reconstruction
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	70 th Street Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$2,600,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP		2022 CIP	\$2,600,000
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds – Storm Util.	\$2,500,000	% of total	96%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$100,000	% of total	4%
TOTAL	\$2,600,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of 70th Street between 2nd Avenue to 5th Avenue, including sidewalk, curb, and gutter as well as undergrounding of parallel utilities. The reconstruction will include replacement of City utilities including an 84” storm sewer pipe that will connect to the storm system installed with the Portland Avenue project. Design of the roadway will include a public participation process.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 76th Street Reconstruction
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	76 th Street West Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$5,300,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP		2022 CIP	\$5,300,000
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$3,500,000	% of total	66%
Mun. State Aid	\$1,000,000	% of total	19%
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
CenterPoint Energy	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$800,000	% of total	15%
TOTAL	\$5,300,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of 76th Street between Sheridan Avenue and Xerxes Avenue, including replacement of City utilities, undergrounding of overhead utilities, retaining wall and sidewalk replacement. The exact design of the roadway will be determined through a public input process. A mill & overlay took place in 2016 that upgraded pavement condition until the full reconstruction can take place in 2022.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Humboldt/Lake Shore Reconstruction
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Humboldt Avenue/Lake Shore Drive Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$4,000,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	\$4,000,000
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$4,000,000	% of total	100%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$4,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of Humboldt Avenue and Lake Shore Drive between 69th Street and 75th Street, including a public input process to identify the future road section and continuity. The reconstruction will include replacement of City utilities.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$13,000,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	\$13,000,000
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$5,000,000	% of total	36%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$8,000,000	% of total	64%
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$13,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: This project consists of the reconstruction of Nicollet Avenue from 62nd Street south to 77th Street/I-494 bridge. The new roadway cross-section would be consistent with the recommended alternative identified in the 2009 Arterial Roads Study (3-lane section) with the exact design to be determined through a public input process. The project includes the replacement of City utilities.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Penn Avenue Reconstruction
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Penn Avenue Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$13,000,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIP		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	\$13,000,000
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$5,000,000	% of total	38%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$8,000,000	% of total	62%
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$13,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: This project consists of the reconstruction of Penn Avenue from 62nd Street south to 76th Street. The new roadway cross-section would be consistent with the recommended alternative identified in the 2009 Arterial Roads Study (3-lane section) with the exact design to be determined through a public input process. The project includes the replacement of City utilities.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	X
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 6 Year Mill and Overlay Project
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	6 Year Mill and Overlay
2. Total project cost:	\$19,500,000
3. Years to complete:	6
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2015
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$3,250,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$3,250,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$3,250,000		
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
Franchise Fees	\$19,500,000	% of total	100%
TOTAL	\$19,500,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: As part of the City's Accelerated Mill and Overlay Program, bituminous (asphalt) streets will be milled and receive a bituminous overlay as a way to extend the life of a street. This process is done at a fraction of the cost of completely reconstructing the street. The project will mill and overlay 85 miles of residential roads as well as repair catch basins and manholes and replace curb and gutter, as needed.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve X	Manage	Replace/Improve	Expand
--------------------------	---------------	------------------------	---------------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	X
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	X

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Central Garage Equipment Replacement
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Replacement of Central Garage Equipment
2. Total project cost:	\$3,440,000
3. Years to complete:	Ongoing
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	N/A
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	N/A
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$655,000	2022 CIP	\$715,000
2019 CIP	\$665,000	Beyond 2022	\$Ongoing
2020 CIP	\$690,000		
2021 CIP	\$715,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other – Tax Levy	\$3,440,000	% of total	100%
TOTAL	\$3,440,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: This request covers the necessary replacement of rolling stock equipment accounted for in the Central Garage Fund.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No X

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	-------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	X

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Technology Replacement
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Technology Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$670,000
3. Years to complete:	Ongoing
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	N/A
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	N/A
5. Responsible department:	Administrative Services

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$130,000	2022 CIP	\$135,000
2019 CIP	\$135,000	Beyond 2022	Ongoing
2020 CIP	\$135,000		
2021 CIP	\$135,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other – Tax Levy	\$670,000	% of total	100%
TOTAL	\$670,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: This request involves the updating of City technology equipment in order to keep pace with the ongoing changes in technology and to replace old outdated equipment.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No X

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	-------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	X

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Water Plant Roof Replacement
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Water Plant Roof Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$450,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$450,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$450,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$450,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The Water Treatment Plant roof was last replaced in 2002 and is in need of replacement. Annual inspections are scheduled so that repairs and maintenance can occur as needed until the roof is replaced.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Wood Lake Lift Station Renovation
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Wood Lake Lift Station Renovation
2. Total project cost:	\$35,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Wastewater

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$35,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$35,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$35,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The Wood Lake Nature Center Lift Station has not had any major improvement since being installed in the 1970's. The renovation would bring the station up to code and add to the SCADA system for continuous monitoring.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No X

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	-------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Lift Station #2 Control Panel
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Lift Station #2 Control Panel
2. Total project cost:	\$25,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Wastewater

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$25,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$25,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$25,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Upgrading the control cabinet at Lift Station #2 would include separating the high voltage equipment from the low voltage equipment in the same cabinet, as well as standardizing all of the City's lift stations.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Lime Slaker (s) Replacement
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Lime Slaker (s) Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$350,000
3. Years to complete:	2
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2017
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$125,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$350,000	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$350,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The lime softening water treatment plant was built in 1963. The slaker converts the pebble lime into lime slurry, which is then fed into the reactor where it is blended with the raw water, creating softened water. The slakers require periodic replacement (every 10-15 years) and were last replaced in 2003. The Slaker replacement project will be 75% completed in 2017 and 25% fully in 2018.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Penn Avenue Liquor Store Upgrade
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Penn Avenue Liquor Store Upgrade
2. Total project cost:	\$ 1,200,000
3. Years to complete:	Less than one year.
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Liquor Operations/Administrative Services

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$ 1,200,000	2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$ 1,200,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$1,200,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The current Penn Avenue Liquor Store structure is over forty years old. Few improvements have been made recently and the store is in need of multiple improvements and mechanical components.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Water Meter Upgrade
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Water Meter Up-Grade
2. Total project cost:	\$2,500,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$500,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$500,000		
2021 CIP	\$1,500,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$2,500,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$2,500,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the City's existing 11,000 water meters. The current system was installed in 2007 and requires employees to drive by each property to obtain meter readings. The old system is failing and time consuming. The new system will have signal read radio device which will eliminate the driving by each property as well as updated equipment to read the meters.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Emergency Water Connection
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Emergency Water Connection
2. Total project cost:	\$500,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$500,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$500,000	% of total	1000%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$500,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The Water Treatment Plant (WTP) was built in 1963 and to-date has been a standalone system. If the WTP were to have a catastrophic failure and be unable to produce water, the city is not equipped with an emergency backup water source. Constructing an emergency backup water source would allow pumping of non-softened water to the water tower. As part of the DNR's water supply plan, they encourage all cities to have an emergency backup water source.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Emerson Lift Station
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Emerson Lift Station
2. Total project cost:	\$500,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water/Wastewater

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$500,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$500,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$500,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The residents of the 7400 block of Emerson Avenue have lift stations in their homes that are pumping wastewater up the street to the 73rd and Emerson manhole while sharing the same force main. The construction of a new lift station would allow independent gravity flow sanitary sewer system, appropriate equipment to handle the needs, and a more efficient system.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Lift Station #3 Control Panel
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Lift Station #3 Control Panel
2. Total project cost:	\$25,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Wastewater

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP	\$25,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$25,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$25,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Upgrading the control cabinet at Lift Station #3 would include separating the high voltage equipment from the low voltage equipment in the same cabinets as well as standardizing all of the City's lift stations.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Roof Replacement on Wells 2 and 3
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Roof Replacement on Wells 2 and 3
2. Total project cost:	\$30,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$30,000		
2021 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$30,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$30,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Wells 2 and 3 were originally built in 1963 and the roof is in need of routine replacement. Annual inspections are scheduled so that repairs and maintenance can occur as needed until the roof is replaced.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Water Main Replacements under Hwy 35W
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Replace (2) Water Mains under Interstate Highway 35W
2. Total project cost:	\$750,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP	\$750,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$750,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$750,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The water distribution system has three water mains that supply water west of Highway 35W. One of which was updated in the 1990's, the two other water mains date back to the 1960's. Replacing the water mains and associated valves would reduce aging infrastructure within the City.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No X

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	-------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Wells 4, 5, and 6 Roof Replacement
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Wells 4, 5, and 6 Roof Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$60,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB		2022 CIP	
2019 CIP		Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP			
2021 CIP	\$60,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$60,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$60,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Wells 4, 5, and 6 were originally built in 1963 and the roofs are in need of routine replacement. Annual inspections are scheduled so that repairs and maintenance can occur as needed until the roof is replaced.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Sewer Main Lining
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Sewer Main Lining
2. Total project cost:	\$1,200,000
3. Years to complete:	On-going
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Wastewater

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$200,000	2022 CIP	\$200,000
2019 CIP	\$200,000	Beyond 2022	\$200,000
2020 CIP	\$200,000		
2021 CIP	\$200,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$1,200,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$1,200,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The wastewater collection system was installed in the late 1950's and mainly consists of VCP (Vitrified Clay Pipe). As staff does ongoing maintenance and television inspections they encounter areas with tree root intrusion or pipes that have cracks; these sewer mains are then re-lined. Lining consist of installation of a liner in the existing clay pipe, expanding/heating then occurs, and it adheres to the existing clay pipe. Once it cools, the liner hardens to a consistency of schedule 40 PVC. This technique is widely used in the industry and is done at a fraction of the cost of open cutting a street to replace the line.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No **X**

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	--------------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	X

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Liquor Operations Capital Improvements
2018 Capital Budget (CIB)
2019-2022 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Liquor Operations Capital Improvements
2. Total project cost:	\$200,000
3. Years to complete:	Ongoing
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	N/A
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	N/A
5. Responsible department:	Liquor Operations

6. Please list below the annual cost for each of the following years for this project:

2018 CIB	\$	2022 CIP	\$50,000
2019 CIP	\$50,000	Beyond 2022	
2020 CIP	\$50,000		
2021 CIP	\$50,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$200,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$200,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Three of the four liquor stores are over 25 years old and as such are in need of updating and ongoing repairs. Projects have been identified and included in the current CIB/CIP Plan. This request will allow funding to maintain operations and provide for updating and repairs.

9. Does the project conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan? Yes No X

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve X	Expand
----------	--------	-------------------	--------

B. Indicate points for the following:

Protect existing resources:	X
Health/safety:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	X