

CITY OF RICHFIELD

MINNESOTA



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET AND PLAN

2016 - 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD	1
Capital Plan Process	2
Legal Framework	3
Document Organization	4
Capital Plan Summary	4
SECTION ONE: GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	
Land Use	7
Housing	8
Transportation	9
Parks	11
Utilities	11
SECTION TWO:	
FINANCING THE 2017-2020 CAPITAL PLAN	17
Special Revenue Funds	17
Industrial/Commercial Revenue Bonds	17
Capital Improvement Bonds	18
Federal & State Grants/County & Local Governments	18
Municipal State Aid	18
Tax Increment Financing	18
General Obligation Redevelopment Bonds	19
General Obligation Improvement Bonds	20
User Fees	20
General Obligation Bonds	21
Debt Policies for the City of Richfield	22
SECTION THREE:	
Capital Improvement Budget & Plan Overview	25
Plan Summary - Estimated Costs and Funding Sources	26
Project Descriptions	35
Recreation and Open Space	36
Right of Way Improvements	49
Public Facilities	60

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 2017 - 2020 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 2017-2020 Capital Improvement Plan is included below.

Source	Amount
Federal and State Grants	\$ 20,090,000
Municipal State Aid	5,200,000
County	46,350,000
Other Agencies	400,000
General Tax Levy	3,000,000
Issuance of Debt	33,410,000
Franchise Fees	16,250,000
Special Revenues	2,975,000
User Fees	7,210,000
TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS	\$134,885,000

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	
2004	500,000	1,262	501,262
2005	500,000	2,555	502,555
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

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. Projects that are planned to be funded by federal and state monies include the 66th Street Reconstruction project and 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 \$1,518,743 of which \$315,000 is for maintenance and \$1,203,743 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, 2015 is shown below.

GENERAL OBLIGATION REDEVELOPMENT BONDS
SCHEDULE DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

12/31/15
ANNUAL PAYMENTS

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PRINCIPAL</u>	<u>INTEREST</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>UNPAID PRINCIPAL</u>
				7,020,000
2016	680,000	188,451	868,451	6,340,000
2017	695,000	177,156	872,156	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>7,020,000</u>	<u>1,081,214</u>	<u>8,101,214</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 \$31,660,000 of G. O. Improvement bonds outstanding as of December 31, 2015. Annual debt service requirements for the bonds are shown below.

GENERAL OBLIGATION IMPROVEMENT BONDS
SCHEDULED DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

12/31/15
ANNUAL PAYMENTS

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PRINCIPAL</u>	<u>INTEREST</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>UNPAID PRINCIPAL</u>
				\$31,660,000
2016	1,445,000	1,170,722	2,615,722	30,215,000
2017	1,610,000	1,078,440	2,688,440	28,605,000
2018	1,655,000	1,024,543	2,679,949	26,950,000
2019	1,710,000	966,946	2,676,949	25,240,000
2020	1,780,000	905,160	2,685,160	23,460,000
2021	1,855,000	838,696	2,693,696	21,605,000
2022	1,900,000	767,786	2,667,786	19,705,000
2023	1,980,000	692,442	2,672,442	17,725,000
2024	2,060,000	611,956	2,671,956	15,665,000
2025	2,150,000	529,309	2,679,309	13,515,000
2026	2,235,000	444,379	2,679,379	11,280,000
2027	2,330,000	355,051	2,685,051	8,950,000
2028	2,430,000	260,853	2,690,853	6,520,000
2029	1,855,000	175,452	2,030,452	4,665,000
2030	750,000	128,129	878,129	3,915,000
2031	775,000	106,691	881,691	3,140,000
2032	790,000	83,950	873,950	2,350,000
2033	810,000	60,275	870,275	1,540,000
2034	705,000	37,713	742,713	835,000
2035	575,000	17,793	592,793	260,000
2036	260,000	4,225	264,225	-
	<u>\$31,660,000</u>	<u>\$10,260,514</u>	<u>\$41,920,514</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 \$30,960,349, 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 \$48,480,000, not all of this is applicable to the debt limit.

COMPUTATION OF LEGAL DEBT MARGIN

Market Value of Taxable Property		<u>\$2,856,175,000</u>
Debt Limit 3% of Market Value of Taxable Property		<u>\$ 85,685,265</u>
Amount of Debt Applicable to Debt Limit:		
Total Bonded Debt	\$48,480,000	
Less:		
Redevelopment Bonds	\$7,020,000	
Special Assessment Bonds	750,000	
Water & Sewer Revenue Bonds	4,210,000	
Water Revenue Bonds	1,305,000	
Storm Sewer Revenue Bonds	4,285,000	
	<u>\$17,570,000</u>	
Total Debt Applicable to Debt Limit		<u>\$ 30,910,000</u>
Legal Debt Margin		<u>\$ 54,775,265</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>\$ 38,680,000</u>	100%	<u>\$ 38,680,000</u>
Hennepin County	\$ 753,266,880	1.82%	\$ 13,709,457
ISD #280, Richfield, MN	19,690,000	69.51%	13,686,519
Hennepin Suburb Park District	52,209,049	2.47%	1,289,564
Hennepin Regional RR Authority	35,200,157	2.47%	869,444
Metropolitan Council	93,953,739	.93%	873,770
	<u>\$ 954,319,825</u>		<u>\$ 30,428,753</u>
Total	<u>\$ 992,999,825</u>		<u>\$ 69,108,753</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 2016 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB) along with the 2017-2020 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 2015 Revised/2016 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.

2016 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB)

The 2016 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB) reflects funding for numerous improvement projects throughout the city. 2016 is the first year of the 66th Street reconstruction project, which is planned to cover three years and extend the length of the City east to west. In addition, work is scheduled to continue on the 77th Street Underpass project along with year two in the six year mill and overlay program.

Finally, the 2016 CIB recommends projects totaling \$450,000 of Special Revenue funding. The funding will be used for several projects. Some of the projects are the replacement of the Community Center boiler and air conditioner, sealcoating of the Community Center parking lot, rest room improvements at Wood Lake Nature Center, the purchase of new pool heaters for the swimming pool, funds for general park maintenance and the final loan payment on the Lincoln Field renovation. Finally, in formulating the City Manager's 2016 CIB within the available funding, it was necessary to defer or reduce funding for some projects.

2017-2020 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Over the next several years, most major arterial roads in the City will be reconstructed or improved. As noted, 2016 will be the beginning of the 66th Street project that will continue into 2018, work on the 77th Street Underpass will continue and Nicollet Avenue will be reconstructed followed by 65th Street. Furthermore, Humboldt Avenue & Lakeshore Drive, Lyndale Avenue and Penn Avenue are planned to be reconstructed sometime after 2020. Along with these projects, the City plans to continue to implement its six year mill & overlay program.

Finally, the recommended CIP includes the beginning of 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

2016 Capital Improvement Budget

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Lincoln Field Loan Repay	156,700	R
Community Center Boiler and Air Conditioning	143,800	R
Community Center Parking Lot Sealcoating	10,000	R
Swimming Pool Heaters	52,500	R
Wood Lake Nature Center Rest Room Improvements	37,000	R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 450,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 2,500,000	M
76th Street Reconstruction	100,000	FF
77th Street Underpass	7,750,000	SB
Mill and Overlay Program	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 13,600,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 625,000	T
Technology Replacement	125,000	T
Wood Lake Lift Station Renovation	30,000	U
Public Works Facility Concrete Sealing	140,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	70,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 990,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 15,040,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(FF) Franchise Fees	\$ 3,350,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	2,500,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(SB) State Bonding	7,750,000	
(T) Property Taxes	750,000	
(U) User Fees	240,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 15,040,000	

2017 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	170,000	R
Ice Arena Parking Lot Sealcoating	15,000	R
Ice Arena Rink 1 Dasher board Replacement	160,000	R
Wood Lake Nature Center Carpet	30,000	R
Community Center Carpet	25,000	R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 450,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 9,000,000	B
	29,550,000	C
	7,840,000	F
	1,000,000	M
	750,000	X
77th Street Underpass	4,750,000	SB
	2,000,000	C
	600,000	M
	200,000	MA
	200,000	TR
Mill and Overlay Program	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 59,140,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 625,000	TL
Technology Replacement	125,000	TL
Public Works Facility Concrete Sealing	110,000	U
Emergency Water Interconnect w/Neighboring Comm.	500,000	U
Water Plant Roof Replacement	350,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	70,000	U
Liquor Operation Capital Improvements	50,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 1,830,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 61,420,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 9,000,000	
(C) Hennepin County	31,550,000	
(F) Federal Funding	7,840,000	
(FF) Franchise Fees	3,250,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	1,600,000	
(MA) Metropolitan Airports Commission	200,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(SB) State Bonding	4,750,000	
(TL) Tax Levy	750,000	
(TR) Three Rivers Park District	200,000	
(U) User Fees	1,080,000	
(X) Xcel Energy Rate Payers	750,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 61,420,000	

2018 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	400,000	R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 450,000	
 RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 2,000,000	B
	1,000,000	M
77th Street Underpass	7,000,000	F
Mill and Overlay Program	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 13,250,000	
 PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 625,000	TL
Technology Replacement	125,000	TL
Water main(s) replacement under I-35W	500,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	70,000	U
Penn Avenue Liquor Store Relocation	2,500,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 3,820,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 17,520,000	
 ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 2,000,000	
(F) Federal Funding	7,000,000	
(FF) Franchise Fees	3,250,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	1,000,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(TL) General Tax Levy	750,000	
(U) User Fees	3,070,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 17,520,000	

2019 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal	5,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	400,000	R
	500,000	S
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 950,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 1,000,000	M
Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction	4,200,000	B
	7,500,000	C
Mill and Overlay Program	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 15,950,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 625,000	TL
Technology Replacement	125,000	TL
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	70,000	U
Liquor Operation Capital Improvements	50,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 870,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 17,770,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 4,200,000	
(C) Hennepin County	7,500,000	
(FF) Franchise Fees	3,250,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	1,000,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(S) State Grants	500,000	
(TL) General Tax Levy	750,000	
(U) User Fees	120,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 17,770,000	

2020 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$	45,000 R
Wood Lake Fence Repair and Tree Removal		5,000 R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration		400,000 R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$	450,000
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
65th Street Reconstruction	\$	3,800,000 B
		1,600,000 M
Mill and Overlay Program		3,250,000 FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$	8,650,000
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$	625,000 TL
Technology Replacement		125,000 TL
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining		70,000 U
Liquor Operation Capital Improvements		50,000 U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$	870,000
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS		
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$	9,970,000
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$	3,800,000
(FF) Franchise Fees		3,250,000
(M) Municipal State Aids		1,600,000
(R) Special Revenue		450,000
(TL) General Tax Levy		750,000
(U) User Fees		120,000
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$	9,970,000
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$	9,970,000

Capital Improvement Plan - Beyond 2020

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance	\$ 45,000	R
Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	1,130,000	R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 1,175,000	
 RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
76th Street West	1,600,000	B
	700,000	CP
	900,000	X
Humboldt Ave/Lakeshore Drive Reconstruction	3,000,000	B
Lyndale Avenue Improvements	6,060,000	B
Penn Avenue Reconstruction	3,750,000	B
	7,300,000	C
	400,000	X
Mill and Overlay Program	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 26,960,000	
 PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	70,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 70,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 28,205,000	
 ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 14,410,000	
(C) Hennepin County	7,300,000	
(CP) CenterPoint Rate Payers	700,000	
(FF) Franchise Fees	3,250,000	
(R) Special Revenue	1,175,000	
(U) User Fees	70,000	
(X) Xcel Energy Rate Payers	1,300,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 28,205,000	

2017 - 2020 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN - CITY OF RICHFIELD, MINNESOTA

Recommended and Scheduled for Four Year Period

PROJECTS	TOTAL*	2017		2018		2019		2020		Beyond 2020	
	CIP COST										
RECREATION											
OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT											
1 Park Maintenance	\$ 225,000	\$ 45,000	R	\$ 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 Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration	\$ 2,500,000	170,000	R	400,000	R	400,000	R	400,000	R	1,130,000	R
4	\$ 500,000	-		-		500,000	S	-		-	
5 Ice Arena Parking Lot Sealcoating	\$ 15,000	15,000	R	-		-		-		-	
6 Ice Arena Rink 1 Dasher Board Replacement	\$ 160,000	160,000	R	-		-		-		-	
7 Wood Lake Nature Center Carpet	\$ 30,000	30,000	R	-		-		-		-	
8 Community Center Carpet	\$ 25,000	25,000	R	-		-		-		-	
TOTAL RECREATION & OPEN SPACE	\$ 3,475,000	\$ 450,000		\$ 450,000		\$ 950,000		\$ 450,000		\$ 1,175,000	
(R) Special Revenue	\$ 2,975,000	\$ 450,000		\$ 450,000		\$ 450,000		\$ 450,000		\$ 1,175,000	
(S) State Grants	\$ 500,000	-		-		500,000		-		-	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 3,475,000	\$ 450,000		\$ 450,000		\$ 950,000		\$ 450,000		\$ 1,175,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS											
9 66th Street Reconstruction	\$ 12,000,000	9,000,000	B	2,000,000	B	1,000,000	M	-		-	
10	\$ 30,550,000	29,550,000	C	1,000,000	M	-		-		-	
11	\$ 7,840,000	7,840,000	F	-		-		-		-	
12	\$ 1,000,000	1,000,000	M	-		-		-		-	
13	\$ 750,000	750,000	X	-		-		-		-	
77th Street Underpass of TH 77	\$ 11,750,000	4,750,000	SB	7,000,000	F	-		-		-	
	\$ 2,000,000	2,000,000	C	-		-		-		-	
	\$ 600,000	600,000	M	-		-		-		-	
	\$ 200,000	200,000	MA	-		-		-		-	
	\$ 200,000	200,000	TR	-		-		-		-	
14 Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction	\$ 4,200,000	-		-		4,200,000	B	-		-	
15	\$ 7,500,000	-		-		7,500,000	C	-		-	
16 65th Street Reconstruction	\$ 3,800,000	-		-		-		3,800,000	B	-	
17	\$ 1,600,000	-		-		-		1,600,000	M	-	
22 76th Street West Reconstruction	\$ 1,600,000	-		-		-		-		1,600,000	B
23	\$ 700,000	-		-		-		-		700,000	CP
24	\$ 900,000	-		-		-		-		900,000	X
25 Humboldt Ave/Lakeshore Drive Recon.	\$ 3,000,000	-		-		-		-		3,000,000	B
26 Lyndale Avenue Improvements	\$ 6,060,000	-		-		-		-		6,060,000	B
27 Penn Avenue Reconstruction	\$ 3,750,000	-		-		-		-		3,750,000	B
28	\$ 7,300,000	-		-		-		-		7,300,000	C
29	\$ 400,000	-		-		-		-		400,000	X
30 Mill and Overlay Project	\$ 16,250,000	3,250,000	FF	3,250,000	FF	3,250,000	FF	3,250,000	FF	3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 123,950,000	\$ 59,140,000		\$ 13,250,000		\$ 15,950,000		\$ 8,650,000		\$ 26,960,000	
(B) G.O. Improvement Bonds	\$ 33,410,000	\$ 9,000,000		\$ 2,000,000		\$ 4,200,000		\$ 3,800,000		\$ 14,410,000	
(C) Hennepin County	\$ 46,350,000	31,550,000		-		7,500,000		-		7,300,000	
(CP) CenterPoint Rate Payers	\$ 700,000	-		-		-		-		700,000	
(F) Federal Funding	\$ 14,840,000	7,840,000		7,000,000		-		-		-	
(FF) Franchise Fees	\$ 16,250,000	3,250,000		3,250,000		3,250,000		3,250,000		3,250,000	
(M) Municipal State Aid	\$ 5,200,000	1,600,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,600,000		-	
(MA) Metropolitan Airports Commission	\$ 200,000	200,000		-		-		-		-	
(S) State Grants	\$ -	-		-		-		-		-	
(SB) State Bonding	\$ 4,750,000	4,750,000		-		-		-		-	
(TR) Three Rivers Park District	\$ 200,000	200,000		-		-		-		-	
(X) Xcel Energy Rate Payers	\$ 2,050,000	750,000		-		-		-		1,300,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 123,950,000	\$ 59,140,000		\$ 13,250,000		\$ 15,950,000		\$ 8,650,000		\$ 26,960,000	

2017 - 2020 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN - CITY OF RICHFIELD, MINNESOTA

<u>PROJECTS</u>	<u>TOTAL*</u>					
	<u>CIP COSTS</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Beyond 2020</u>
<u>PUBLIC FACILITIES</u>						
31 Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 625,000 TL	\$ 625,000 TL	\$ 625,000 TL	\$ 625,000 TL	\$ -
32 Technology Replacement	\$ 500,000	125,000 TL	125,000 TL	125,000 TL	125,000 TL	-
33 Public Works Facility Concrete Sealing	\$ 110,000	110,000 U	-	-	-	-
34 Interconnect with Neighboring Communities	\$ 500,000	500,000 U	-	-	-	-
35 Water Plan Roof Replacement	\$ 350,000	350,000 U	-	-	-	-
36 Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	\$ 350,000	70,000 U	70,000 U	70,000 U	70,000 U	70,000 U
37 Water Main(s) Replacement Under I-35W	\$ 500,000	-	500,000 U	-	-	-
38 Relocate Penn Avenue Liquor Store	\$ 2,500,000	-	2,500,000 U	-	-	-
39 Liquor Operation Capital Improvements	\$ 150,000	50,000 U	-	50,000 U	50,000 U	-
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 7,460,000	\$ 1,830,000	\$ 3,820,000	\$ 870,000	\$ 870,000	\$ 70,000
(TL) Tax Levy	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ -
(U) User Fees	\$ 4,460,000	1,080,000	3,070,000	120,000	120,000	70,000
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 7,460,000	\$ 1,830,000	\$ 3,820,000	\$ 870,000	\$ 870,000	\$ 70,000
<u>SUMMARY PROJECTS</u>						
Recreation/Open Space Development	\$ 3,475,000	450,000	450,000	950,000	450,000	1,175,000
Right of Way Improvements	\$ 123,950,000	59,140,000	13,250,000	15,950,000	8,650,000	26,960,000
Public Facilities	\$ 7,460,000	1,830,000	3,820,000	870,000	870,000	70,000
TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECTS	\$ 134,885,000	\$ 61,420,000	\$ 17,520,000	\$ 17,770,000	\$ 9,970,000	\$ 28,205,000
(B) G.O. Improvement Bonds	\$ 33,410,000	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 3,800,000	\$ 14,410,000
(C) Hennepin County	\$ 46,350,000	31,550,000	-	7,500,000	-	7,300,000
(C) CenterPoint Rate Payers	\$ 700,000	-	-	-	-	700,000
(F) Federal Funding	\$ 14,840,000	7,840,000	7,000,000	-	-	-
(FF) Franchise Fees	\$ 16,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
(M) Municipal State Aid	\$ 5,200,000	1,600,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,600,000	-
(MA) Metropolitan Airports Commission	\$ 200,000	200,000	-	-	-	-
(R) Special Revenue	\$ 2,975,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	1,175,000
(S) State Grants	\$ 500,000	-	-	500,000	-	-
(SB) State Bonding	\$ 4,750,000	4,750,000	-	-	-	-
(TL) Tax Levy	\$ 3,000,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	-
(TR) Three Rivers Park District	\$ 200,000	200,000	-	-	-	-
(U) User Fees	\$ 4,460,000	1,080,000	3,070,000	120,000	120,000	70,000
(X) Xcel Energy Rate Payers	\$ 2,050,000	750,000	-	-	-	1,300,000
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES	\$ 134,885,000	\$ 61,420,000	\$ 17,520,000	\$ 17,770,000	\$ 9,970,000	\$ 28,205,000

* Total CIP costs do not include any project costs reflected in the 2016 CIB.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Major Park Maintenance
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 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:

2016 CIB	\$45,000	2020 CIP	\$45,000
2017 CIP	\$45,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP	\$45,000		
2019 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	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
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 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?	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:

2016 CIB	\$5,000	2020 CIP	\$5,000
2017 CIP	\$5,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP	\$5,000		
2019 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		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 X	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:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Lincoln Athletic Complex Internal Loan
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Lincoln Athletic Complex Internal Loan
2. Total project cost:	\$1,190,440
3. Years to complete:	No additional years remaining
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2003
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB	\$156,700	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 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	\$240,000	% of total	20%
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Previous Balance	\$793,700	% of total	49%
Internal Loan	\$156,740	% of total	31%
TOTAL	\$1,190,440		100%

8. Brief summary of project:

A taskforce was formed to plan remaining ballfield improvements as a result of the loss of ballfields from airport expansion. The Taskforce concluded that Lincoln Fields should be renovated into a multi-purpose facility. The project was bid out in 2009 at an estimated cost of \$1,190,440. Funds accumulated from Special Revenue funds total \$579,940 through 2011 and a grant from Hennepin County in 2010 in the amount of \$240,000. After 2016, there will be no remaining balance on the internal loan.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Community Center Boiler and Air Conditioning
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Community Center Boiler and Air Conditioning
2. Total project cost:	\$143,800
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB	\$143,800	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$143,800	% 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	\$143,800		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The boiler and cooling tower at the Community Center are original equipment installed in 1961. They are inefficient and in need of replacement. The upper air handling equipment will also be replaced to change the system over to a condenser which is much more efficient than the existing water-cooled 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:	
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	X

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Community Center Parking Lot Sealcoating
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Community Center Parking Lot Sealcoating
2. Total project cost:	\$10,000
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB	\$10,000	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$10,000	% 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	\$10,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The parking lot at the Community Center is scheduled to be sealcoated in 2016. Curbing and reconstruction are not 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	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:	

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Pool Heaters
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Pool Heaters
2. Total project cost:	\$52,500
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB	\$52,500	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$52,500	% 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	\$52,500		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The two existing outdoor pool heaters are original equipment and were installed 35 years ago. The tired heaters are well beyond their life expectancy. New energy efficient heater will be installed.

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Wood Lake Restroom Renovation
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Wood Lake Restroom Renovation
2. Total project cost:	\$37,000
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB	\$37,000	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$37,000	% 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	\$37,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The existing restroom light fixtures, sink fixtures and partitions are original equipment and were installed 35 years ago. New fixtures and partitions will be installed to improve the condition of the restrooms.

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:	X
Cost effectiveness:	

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Ice Arena Conversion to Indirect Refrigeration
2. Total project cost:	\$3,000,000
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	\$400,000
2017 CIP	\$170,000	Beyond 2020	\$1,130,000
2018 CIP	\$400,000		
2019 CIP	\$900,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$2,500,000	% of total	83%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants	\$500,000		17%
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	\$3,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Richfield is one of 120 ice arenas that is required to change its refrigeration system by the year 2020 to avoid the use of R22 refrigerant. The cost to convert to another system is about \$3,000,000. An internal loan will be set up and repaid back from future liquor store proceeds to fund this major project. The project is scheduled in 2019.

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

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 multiple objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	X
Cost effectiveness:	X

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Ice Arena Parking Lot Sealcoating
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Ice Arena Parking Lot Sealcoating
2. Total project cost:	\$15,000
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$15,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$15,000	% 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	\$15,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The parking lot at the Ice Arena is scheduled to be sealcoated in 2017. Curbing and reconstruction are not 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	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:	

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Ice Arena Rink One Dasherboard Replacement
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Ice Arena Rink One Dasherboard Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$160,000
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$160,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$160,000	% 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	\$160,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The existing dasher boards are the original wooden structures that surround the ice. They are rotting and in need of replacement with a more suitable material.

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:	

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Wood Lake Nature Center Carpet
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Wood Lake Nature Center Carpet
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$30,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$30,000	% 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	\$30,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replacement of worn carpet of Wood Lake Nature Center is scheduled in 2017.

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

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 multiple objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Community Center Carpet
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Community Center Carpet
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:	Recreation Services

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

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$25,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$25,000	% 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	\$25,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replacement of worn carpet of the Community Center is scheduled in 2017.

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

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 multiple objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	

THIS PAGE WAS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 66th Street Reconstruction
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	66 th Street Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$54,640,000
3. Years to complete:	4
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
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:

2016 CIB	\$2,500,000	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$48,140,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP	\$3,000,000		
2019 CIP	\$1,000,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$9,000,000 (2017) \$2,000,000 (2018)	% of total	20%
Mun. State Aid	\$2,500,000 (2016) \$1,000,000 (2017) \$1,000,000 (2018) \$1,000,000 (2019)	% of total	10%
Grants			
Federal	\$7,840,000 (2017)	% of total	14%
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$29,550,000 (2017)	% of total	55%
Other	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$750,000 (2017)		1%
TOTAL	\$54,640,000		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 10% of road construction, 50% 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 – 76th Street Reconstruction
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	76 th Street West Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$3,300,000
3. Years to complete:	One
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:

2016 CIB	\$100,000	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	\$3,200,000
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$1,600,000	% of total	48%
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	
Franchise Fees	\$100,000	% of total	3%
CenterPoint Energy	\$700,000	% of total	22%
Xcel Rate Payers	\$900,000	% of total	27%
TOTAL	\$3,300,000		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. Total cost includes a mill & overlay in 2016 to upgrade pavement condition until the full reconstruction can take place, the mill and overlay may include a 4-to-3 lane conversion if feasible and approved.

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
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	77 th Street Underpass
2. Total project cost:	\$22,500,000
3. Years to complete:	3
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:

2016 CIB	\$7,750,000	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$7,750,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP	\$7,000,000		
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$600,000	% of total	3%
Grants			
Federal	\$7,000,000	% of total	31%
State	\$12,500,000	% of total	55%
County	\$2,000,000	% of total	9%
Other	\$400,000	% of total	2%
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$22,500,000		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:	X

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 6 Year Mill and Overlay Project
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 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:

2016 CIB	\$3,250,000	2020 CIP	\$3,250,000
2017 CIP	\$3,250,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP	\$3,250,000		
2019 CIP	\$3,250,000		

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	
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.

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$11,700,000
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:

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP	\$11,700,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$4,200,000	% of total	36%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$7,500,000	% of total	64%
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
CenterPoint Energy	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$11,700,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: This project consists of the reconstruction of Nicollet Avenue from 62nd Street south to 77th 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:	X

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 65th Street Reconstruction
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	65 th Street Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$5,400,000
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:

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	\$5,400,000
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Reconstruction Bonds	\$3,800,000	% of total	70%
Mun. State Aid	\$1,600,000	% of total	30%
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	\$5,400,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of 65th Street between Nicollet Avenue and 66th Street. The project will include a public input process to identify the future streetscape and includes 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:	X

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Humboldt/Lakeshore Reconstruction
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Humboldt Avenue/Lakeshore Drive Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$3,000,000
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:

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	\$3,000,000
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$3,000,000	% 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	\$3,000,000		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 – Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$6,060,000
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:

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	\$6,060,000
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$6,060,000	% 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	\$6,060,000		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:	X

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Penn Avenue Reconstruction
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Penn Avenue Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$11,475,000
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:

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	\$11,475,000
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$3,750,000	% of total	33%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$7,300,000	% of total	64%
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$400,000	% of total	3%
TOTAL	\$11,450,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: This project consists of the reconstruction of Penn Avenue from 62nd Street south to 77th 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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form –Central Garage Equipment Replacement
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Replacement of Central Garage Equipment
2. Total project cost:	\$3,125,000
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:

2016 CIB	\$625,000	2020 CIP	\$625,000
2017 CIP	\$625,000	Beyond 2020	\$Ongoing
2018 CIP	\$625,000		
2019 CIP	\$625,000		

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	\$3,125,000	% of total	100%
TOTAL	\$3,125,000		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
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Technology Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$625,000
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:

2016 CIB	\$125,000	2020 CIP	\$125,000
2017 CIP	\$125,000	Beyond 2020	Ongoing
2018 CIP	\$125,000		
2019 CIP	\$125,000		

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	\$625,000	% of total	100%
TOTAL	\$625,000		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 – Sewer Main Lining
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Sewer Main Lining
2. Total project cost:	\$420,000
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:

2016 CIB	\$70,000	2020 CIP	\$70,000
2017 CIP	\$70,000	Beyond 2020	\$70,000
2018 CIP	\$70,000		
2019 CIP	\$70,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$420,000	% 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	\$420,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The wastewater collection system was installed in the late 1950's and it mainly consists of VCP (Vitrified Clay Pipe). As staff does ongoing maintenance and television inspections they encounter areas with tree root intrusion or pipe 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:	X
Cost effectiveness:	X

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Woodlake Lift Station Renovation

2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Woodlake Lift Station Renovation
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/Wastewater

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

2016 CIB	\$30,000	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 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: This lift station only serves the Nature Center and it has original controls and pump in it. The renovation will update the controls, pumps, valves, and guide rails. This lift station will be added to our SCADA system for better 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:	X

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Public Works Facility Concrete Sealing
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Public Works Facility Concrete Sealing
2. Total project cost:	\$250,000
3. Years to complete:	2
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:

2016 CIB	\$140,000	2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$110,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$250,000	% 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	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$250,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Sealing of the concrete vehicle storage areas and mechanics area at the PW Maintenance Facility is needed to extend the life of the concrete and to protect the surface from cracking and water damage to the basement. Sealing the concrete surface will eliminate the need for large scale floor replacement projects in the future.

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:	X
Meets objectives in Comprehensive Plan:	
Land use compatibility:	
Community support:	
Cost effectiveness:	X

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Interconnect with Neighboring Community
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Emergency Water Interconnect with Neighboring Community
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:

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$500,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 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: Richfield's water treatment plant was originally built in 1963 and to-date has been a standalone system. If the water treatment plant were to have a catastrophic failure and be unable to produce water, the city is not equipped with an emergency backup water source. 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	Expand X
----------	--------	-----------------	-----------------

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:	X

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Water Plant Roof Replacement
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Water Plant Roof Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$350,000
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:

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP	\$350,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP			
2019 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$350,000	% 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	\$350,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Richfield's water treatment plant was originally built in 1963. The roof was last replaced in 2002 and is beginning to need routine repairs. 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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 – Water Main(s) replacement under Hwy 35W
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Replace (2) water mains under Interstate Highway 35W
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:

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP	\$500,000		
2019 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 water distribution system has three water mains that supply water west of Highway 35W. One of these mains was replaced in the early 1990's and the other two are original cast iron pipe, which date back to the 1960's. Replacing the other two water mains (16" and 12") and associated valves would eliminate a major part of this aging infrastructure.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

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:	X

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Penn Avenue Liugor Store Relocation
2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Penn Avenue Liquor Store Relocation
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:	Liquor Operations

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

2016 CIB		2020 CIP	
2017 CIP		Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP	\$2,500,000		
2019 CIP			

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:

The Penn Avenue Liquor Store was constructed in 1976. No major infrastructure Improvements have been made besides minor cosmetic projects. A larger, more visible location is desired to maximize sales and profitability.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve XX	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

2016 Capital Budget (CIB)
2017-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Liquor Operations Capital Improvements
2. Total project cost:	\$150,000
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:

2016 CIB	\$	2020 CIP	\$50,000
2017 CIP	\$50,000	Beyond 2020	
2018 CIP	\$		
2019 CIP	\$50,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$150,000	% 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	\$150,000		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

THIS PAGE WAS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY