

**CAPITAL LONG-RANGE IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE**  
A Citizen Advisory Committee to the Mayor and City Council

Presents

# THE CLIC REPORT

A Summary of Recommendations for the

## CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS



### FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR YEARS 2006 – 2010

July 2005

# CAPITAL LONG-RANGE IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE CLIC

July 15th, 2005

Mayor R.T. Rybak and City Council Members  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor - City Hall  
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Dear Mayor Rybak and City Council Members:

The Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee (CLIC) respectfully submits our report and recommendations for your consideration in developing the City's Five Year Capital Improvements Program for 2006 – 2010. The committee received and reviewed proposals with City funding sources valued at \$559 million and approved \$469 million for the 2006 – 2010 timeframe. The key proposals/issues discussed and considered at length were:

- |                                                     |               |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| • Heritage Park Redevelopment                       | CDA01         |
| • Public Works Facilities Program (Hiawatha Campus) | PSD02         |
| • Business Information System Technology Projects   | BIS02 – BIS11 |
| • Sewer – Environmental Water Quality Projects      | Various       |
| • Water - Minneapolis/St. Paul Interconnection      | WTR16         |

In addition to discussing specific projects, the committee spent time thinking creatively about ways to fund operating costs related to capital projects associated with Public Art and Bike Trails. Please see our comments on these and other projects in the body of this report.

We are pleased to have participated in the discussion and decision processes that will ultimately help shape the 2006 – 2010 adopted Capital Improvements Program for the City of Minneapolis. CLIC looks forward to discussing our recommendations with you. Questions about this report can be addressed to me at (612) 781-1502 or to the City's Director of Capital & Debt Management, Michael Abeln at (612) 673-3496 who serves as CLIC's Executive Secretary.

Sincerely,

Tony A. Hofstede  
CLIC Chair

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX INDEX .....	5
INTRODUCTION TO THE CLIC PROCESS .....	6
GLOSSARY OF CAPITAL TERMS & ACRONYMS .....	7
CLIC MEMBERSHIP .....	8
CLIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE .....	9
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS STAFF SUPPORT FOR THE CLIC PROCESS .....	9
2006 – 2010 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CLIC .....	10
(Note: All financial numbers in this report are expressed in thousands.)	
2006 – 2010 CAPITAL RESOURCE ASSUMPTIONS USED BY CLIC .....	15
2006 BOND REDEMPTION LEVY FOR CAPITAL PROGRAM .....	15
PROPERTY TAX SUPPORTED CAPITAL ALLOCATION .....	16
2006 – 2010 CLIC CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATION .....	17
CLIC COMPREHENSIVE PROJECT RATINGS FOR 2006 - 2010 .....	22
CLIC PROJECT RATINGS BY COMMISSION/BOARD/DEPARTMENT	
MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION .....	25
LIBRARY BOARD .....	25
PARK BOARD .....	25
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT .....	25
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS .....	28
2005 CLIC GENERAL COMMENTS .....	29
2005 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE COMMENTS .....	32
2005 TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE COMMENTS .....	36

# TABLE OF CONTENTS – continued

## CLIC RECOMMENDED CAPITAL BUDGET BY COMMISSION/BOARD/DEPARTMENT

MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM .....	42
LIBRARY BOARD FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM .....	43
PARK BOARD FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM .....	45
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM	
• FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS .....	47
• STREET PAVING .....	48
• SIDEWALK PROGRAM .....	52
• HERITAGE PARK INFRASTRUCTURE .....	52
• BRIDGES .....	53
• TRAFFIC CONTROL & STREET LIGHTING .....	55
• BIKE TRAILS .....	57
• GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING SUMMARY .....	59
• SEWER FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM .....	60
• WATER FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM .....	63
• PARKING FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM .....	65
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT – FIVE YEAR CAPITAL FUNDING SUMMARY .....	66
WATER & SEWER UTILITY RATE STRUCTURE .....	67
WATER FUND CASH BASIS PRO FORMA .....	68
SANITARY SEWER FUND CASH BASIS PRO FORMA .....	69
STORMWATER FUND CASH BASIS PRO FORMA .....	70
COMBINED SEWER FUND CASH BASIS PRO FORMAS .....	71
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS IN THE FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM .....	72
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS - FIVE YEAR CAPITAL FUNDING SUMMARY .....	75
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS – FIVE YEAR CAPITAL INVESTMENT ALLOCATION .....	76

# APPENDIX INDEX

CLIC 2005 CAPITAL GUIDELINES .....	APPENDIX A.....	77
2005 CLIC SCHEDULE .....	APPENDIX B.....	84
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES .....	APPENDIX C.....	86
LOCATION & DESIGN REVIEW – 2006 – 2010 PROPOSALS .....	APPENDIX D.....	92

# Introduction to the CLIC Process

The Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee is a citizen advisory committee to the Mayor and City Council. The committee is authorized to have 33 appointed members, composed of two members per Council Ward and seven at-large members for the Mayor. The committee elects a Chair and Vice Chair of the whole group and also breaks into two programmatic task forces with approximately an equal number of members in each. Each task force elects a Chair and Vice Chair. Collectively, these six elected members form the Executive Committee and represent CLIC in meetings with the Mayor and City Council.

The two task forces are officially titled "Transportation and Property Services" and "Government Management, Health and Safety and Human Development". They are commonly referred to as the Transportation task force and the Human Development task force. The task forces receive and review all Capital Budget Requests (CBR's) for their program areas as submitted by the various City departments, independent boards and commissions. During several half day or full day meetings, employees who prepared the capital requests formally present their needs and answer any CLIC member follow up questions. Task force members then rate all proposals using a rating system with several specific criteria and create a numerical rating for each project. Highest rated priorities are then balanced against available resources by year to arrive at a cohesive five year capital improvements program recommendation to the Mayor & City Council.

For the five years covering 2006 - 2010, there were 111 CBR's reviewed and rated and six items not rated. The total requested capital budget for City funding sources for the five years was \$559,457,000. This report provides ratings by project and summarizes the recommendations and comments made related to specific projects.

**For more specifics on the process, please review the CLIC 2005 Capital Guidelines – Appendix A.**

The CLIC committee appreciates the excellent efforts put forth by staff of the various City departments, independent boards and commissions in recommending capital investments in the City of Minneapolis.

# Glossary of Capital Terms & Acronyms

**CLIC** - Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee

**Main Body** - refers to the whole group of CLIC committee members.

**T** - Transportation and Property Services task force, a sub-set of the main body. Reviews and rates capital projects for Public Works improvements including Paving, Bridges, Sidewalks, Traffic Control & Street Lighting, Bike Trails, Sewer, Water and Parking projects.

**HD** - Government Management, Health & Safety and Human Development task force, a sub-set of the main body. Reviews and rates capital projects for the City's public building infrastructure including the Municipal Building Commission, Library Board, Park Board, Public Works, Police and Fire Departments and also Public Art and Technology investments.

**CBR** - Capital Budget Request – official form prepared by city departments and independent boards and commissions to define their needs for capital funds.

## Revenue Source Related Descriptions:

**NDB** - Net Debt Bonds - bonds issued to finance general City capital improvements not associated with enterprise activities. Debt service is paid for out of the annual Bond Redemption Tax Levy.

**Park Levy** – A portion of the Park Board's tax levy dedicated to Capital Improvements.

**MSA** - Municipal State Aid - refers to gas tax dollars distributed to local governments for use on State designated Municipal State Aid streets - major thoroughfares.

**ASSM** - Assessments - improvements paid for partially or wholly by property owners.

**Other/Transfers** – refers to all other categories of resources that are used to support the capital programs. These sources include NRP (Neighborhood Revitalization Program), Library referendum taxes, grants from other governmental agencies or private foundations, transfers from within City funds or use of existing fund balances, land sale proceeds, etc.

**NON APPROP** - Non Appropriated – refers to cost participation from County, State or Federal dollars. For these projects, the City of Minneapolis is often not the lead agency and therefore only needs an appropriation to pay for the City's local share of cost.

**Enterprise Bonds/Revenue** - bonds related to the Sewer, Water and Parking enterprises of the City. Debt Service is paid for by user fees charged for these enterprise services. Enterprise revenues are “pay as you go” cash sources planned for in the enterprise funds.

**REIMB** - refers to Capital work performed by divisions of Public Works for which reimbursements are received from other City departments, outside government agencies or private businesses.

# CLIC Membership

## February 1, 2005 through January 31, 2007

<u>Council Ward #</u>	<u>Council Member</u>	<u>2005 CLIC Members</u>	<u>Task Force Assignment</u>
1	Paul Ostrow	Vacant	HD
1	Paul Ostrow	Ginger Derosier	T
2	Paul Zerby	Dean Lund	T
2	Paul Zerby	Ann Jaede	HD
3	Donald Samuels	Greg Baumgartner	HD
3	Donald Samuels	Tony Hofstede	T
4	Barbara Johnson	Jeffrey Strand	T
4	Barbara Johnson	Roberta Englund	HD
5	Natalie Johnson Lee	Booker Hodges	HD
5	Natalie Johnson Lee	Michael Paul Weber	T
6	Dean Zimmerman	Michelle Redmond	HD
6	Dean Zimmerman	William Kingsbury	T
7	Lisa Goodman	Bengt Sohlen	T
7	Lisa Goodman	Bruce Shnider	HD
8	Robert Lilligren	Robinson Cook	T
8	Robert Lilligren	Beth Hart	HD
9	Gary Schiff	Kris Brogan	HD
9	Gary Schiff	Brad Pass	T
10	Dan Niziolek	Gary Thaden	T
10	Dan Niziolek	Gail Manning	HD
11	Scott Benson	Mary Ubl	T
11	Scott Benson	Willie Bridges	HD
12	Sandy Colvin Roy	Randall Kindley	HD
12	Sandy Colvin Roy	John Barron	T
13	Barret Lane	Robert Gustafson	HD
13	Barret Lane	Charles Follen	T
Mayor	R.T. Rybak	David Fisher	HD
Mayor	R.T. Rybak	Peter Taylor	T
Mayor	R.T. Rybak	Amy Alexander	T
Mayor	R.T. Rybak	Richard K. Anderson	T
Mayor	R.T. Rybak	Duane Reed	HD
Mayor	R.T. Rybak	Trish Schilling	T
Mayor	R.T. Rybak	Charles Vanek	T

# CLIC Executive Committee

## For Term February 1, 2005 through January 31, 2007

<u>Leadership Position</u>	<u>Member Name</u>	<u>Appointment of</u>
Main Body Chair	Anthony Hofstede	Donald Samuels - Ward 3
Main Body Vice Chair	Gary Thaden	Dan Niziolek-Ward 10
Task Forces:		
T - Chair	Jeffrey Strand	Barbara Johnson-Ward 4
T - Vice Chair	Trish Schilling	Mayor Rybak
HD - Chair	Robert Gustafson	Barret Lane-Ward 13
HD - Vice Chair	Duane Reed	Mayor Rybak

---

## City of Minneapolis Staff Support for the CLIC Process

<u>Name / Department</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Phone Number</u>
Michael Abeln / Finance	Executive Secretary	612-673-3496
Pamela Miner/ CPED Planning	Planning Support	612-673-3240
Ray Waaraniemi / Finance	HD - Task Force Support	612-673-3775
William Schroeder/ Finance	T - Task Force Support	612-673-2413

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CLIC**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION</b>							
MBC01	Life Safety Improvements	125	200	200	300	300	<b>1,125</b>
MBC02	Mechanical Systems Upgrade	500	535	500	500	600	<b>2,635</b>
MBC04	Tower & Interior Court Elevators	0	0	0	95	100	<b>195</b>
MBC05	Moat /Inner Court Water Proofing	635	0	0	0	0	<b>635</b>
MBC06	Clock Tower Upgrade	0	0	0	95	100	<b>195</b>
MBC08	Interior Court Green Roof Project	200	0	0	0	0	<b>200</b>
<b>Total Municipal Building Commission</b>		<b>1,460</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>4,985</b>
<b>LIBRARY BOARD*</b>							
MPL09	Nokomis Library Capital Improvements	0	500	1,900	2,320	280	<b>5,000</b>
MPL10	North Regional Capital Improvements	2,870	0	0	0	0	<b>2,870</b>
MPL11	Walker Community Library Capital Improvements	0	0	60	0	440	<b>500</b>
MPL13	Hosmer Library Capital Improvements	0	0	0	60	440	<b>500</b>
MPL14	Roosevelt Community Library Capital Improvements	0	903	0	0	0	<b>903</b>
MPL15	Southeast Community Library Capital Improvements	200	2,460	0	0	0	<b>2,660</b>
MPL16	Washburn Community Library Capital Improvements	0	0	0	60	440	<b>500</b>
<b>Total Library Board (Community Libraries)</b>		<b>3,070</b>	<b>3,863</b>	<b>1,960</b>	<b>2,440</b>	<b>1,600</b>	<b>12,933</b>
* - Includes \$4,933 of Library Referendum Levy and \$8,000 of City property tax funding.							
<b>PARK BOARD</b>							
PRK01	Community and Neighborhood Center Rehabilitation	250	700	600	350	1,000	<b>2,900</b>
PRK02	Site and Totlot Rehabilitation	0	0	230	1,000	300	<b>1,530</b>
PRK04	Athletic Field Renovation	1,000	1,380	870	0	1,000	<b>4,250</b>
PRK05	Tier 2 Athletic Fields	235	0	0	0	0	<b>235</b>
PRK06	Service Center Rehabilitation	300	0	0	350	0	<b>650</b>
PRK07	Tennis Court Rehabilitation	150	150	150	150	200	<b>800</b>
PRK09	HVAC	100	100	100	100	0	<b>400</b>
PRK11	Roof Replacement	100	100	100	100	0	<b>400</b>
PRKDT	Diseased Tree Removal	500	500	500	500	500	<b>2,500</b>
<b>Total Park Board</b>		<b>2,635</b>	<b>2,930</b>	<b>2,550</b>	<b>2,550</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>13,665</b>

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CLIC**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT</b>							
<b>FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS</b>							
PSD01	Facilities - Repair and Improvements	1,500	1,000	1,000	1,250	2,000	<b>6,750</b>
PSD02	Public Works Facilities Program	4,500	3,500	3,062	0	0	<b>11,062</b>
PSD06	Pioneer & Soldiers Memorial Cemetery Fencing Rehab	0	0	0	0	250	<b>250</b>
<b>Total Facility Improvements</b>		<b>6,000</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>4,062</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>2,250</b>	<b>18,062</b>
<b>STREET PAVING</b>							
PV001	Parkway Paving	400	770	550	725	1,250	<b>3,695</b>
PV003	Street Renovation Program	2,055	1,638	1,781	2,875	4,916	<b>13,265</b>
PV004	CSAH Paving Program	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	<b>5,000</b>
PV005	Snelling Ave Extension	0	599	973	0	0	<b>1,572</b>
PV006	Alley Renovation	313	267	267	500	500	<b>1,847</b>
PV007	University Research Park	2,526	4,058	0	0	0	<b>6,584</b>
PV008	I-35W & Lake St. Interchange Reconstruction	0	0	0	2,100	553	<b>2,653</b>
PV009	I-35W Crosstown Interchange Reconstruction	485	485	485	318	0	<b>1,773</b>
PV015	27th Ave S	7,264	0	0	0	0	<b>7,264</b>
PV019	6th Ave North	0	0	0	1,788	0	<b>1,788</b>
PV020	Loring Greenway	0	0	0	0	1,503	<b>1,503</b>
PV021	33rd Ave SE and Talmage Ave	0	0	0	3,181	0	<b>3,181</b>
PV022	Lyndale Ave N	3,104	0	0	0	0	<b>3,104</b>
PV023	28th Ave S	0	5,529	0	0	0	<b>5,529</b>
PV026	Cedar Lake Road	0	0	0	0	3,014	<b>3,014</b>
PV027	Hennepin/Lyndale West	0	0	0	3,124	0	<b>3,124</b>
PV028	E22 & Snelling	0	0	0	828	0	<b>828</b>
PV029	Chicago Ave S (E 14th St to E 28th St)	0	0	6,278	0	0	<b>6,278</b>
PV031	27th Ave NE (RR Crossing)	0	188	0	0	0	<b>188</b>
PV032	LaSalle Ave S	0	0	0	0	6,478	<b>6,478</b>
PV034	Elliot & 10th Ave S Cul-de-sacs	570	0	0	0	0	<b>570</b>
PV035	TH121/Lyndale Ave S	0	0	0	0	8,322	<b>8,322</b>
PV036	Mid-City Industrial	0	0	0	0	3,403	<b>3,403</b>
PV037	Miscellaneous I-35W Frontage Roads	0	0	680	680	680	<b>2,040</b>
PV038	Winter St NE	0	0	0	0	3,719	<b>3,719</b>
PV00R	Reimbursable Paving Projects	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	<b>17,500</b>
<b>Total Street Paving Projects</b>		<b>21,217</b>	<b>18,034</b>	<b>15,514</b>	<b>20,619</b>	<b>38,838</b>	<b>114,222</b>

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CLIC**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>SIDEWALK PROGRAM</b>							
SWK01	Defective Hazardous Sidewalks	2,200	2,325	2,440	2,560	2,690	12,215
<b>HERITAGE PARK INFRASTRUCTURE</b>							
CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project	3,897	3,750	750	750	0	9,147
<b>BRIDGES</b>							
BR101	Major Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation	200	200	200	200	200	1,000
BR102	East River Parkway Bridge over Bridal Veil Falls	1,971	0	0	0	0	1,971
BR105	Fremont Ave S Bridge	0	274	0	0	0	274
BR109	Camden Bridge Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	6,099	6,099
BR111	10th Ave SE Bridge Arch Rehabilitation	0	0	0	5,265	0	5,265
BR112	Nicollet Ave from Lake St to 29th	0	0	0	3,515	0	3,515
BR114	29th St Corridor Bridge Rehab Program	0	0	0	500	500	1,000
BR116	Bikeway/Bike Bridge 94246 Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	6,408	6,408
<b>Total Bridge Projects</b>		<b>2,171</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>9,480</b>	<b>13,207</b>	<b>25,532</b>
<b>TRAFFIC CONTROL &amp; STREET LIGHTING</b>							
TR001	New Traffic Signals	0	0	0	130	135	265
TR003	LED Replacement Program	200	300	0	475	0	975
TR004	Computerized Traffic Control Communication	0	0	0	136	13	149
TR005	Controller Conversion	300	400	400	500	400	2,000
TR006	Priority Vehicle Control System	425	413	425	325	425	2,013
TR007	Traffic & Pedestrian Safety Improvements	341	536	842	549	597	2,865
TR008	Parkway Street Light Replacement	345	175	300	0	150	970
TR010	Traffic System Management	0	0	2,100	0	0	2,100
TR011	City Street Light Renovation	0	0	0	300	150	450
TR013	Railroad Crossing Safety Improvements	234	783	4,027	1,557	48	6,649
TR014	LRT TOD Improvements	400	400	400	0	0	1,200
TR00R	Reimbursable Transportation Projects	600	600	600	600	600	3,000
<b>Total Traffic Control &amp; Street Lighting Projects</b>		<b>2,845</b>	<b>3,607</b>	<b>9,094</b>	<b>4,572</b>	<b>2,518</b>	<b>22,636</b>
<b>BIKE TRAILS</b>							
BIK01	Cedar Lake Trail (Phase 3)	583	4,782	0	0	0	5,365
BIK04	18th Ave NE Bikeway	0	50	0	3,900	100	4,050
BIK08	Hiawatha Trail Connections	487	0	0	0	0	487
BIK13	RiverLake Greenway (East of I-35W)	0	0	950	0	50	1,000
BIK14	Midtown Greenway Bridge over the Mississippi River	0	0	1,950	150	0	2,100
BIK17	Upper River Trails - Phase 1	0	4,500	0	0	200	4,700
BIK18	Hennepin/1st Ave NE Bike Lanes	0	0	0	0	100	100
<b>Total Bike Trail Projects</b>		<b>1,070</b>	<b>9,332</b>	<b>2,900</b>	<b>4,050</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>17,802</b>

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CLIC**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>SEWER</b>							
SW001	Storm and Sanitary Tunnel and Sewer Rehabilitation	2,500	2,500	2,800	4,000	2,500	<b>14,300</b>
SW002	Miscellaneous Storm Drains	220	220	220	220	220	<b>1,100</b>
SW004	Implementation of US EPA Storm Water Regulations	150	150	150	150	150	<b>750</b>
SW005	Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements	2,000	2,000	0	0	0	<b>4,000</b>
SW008	Facilities - CSO Separation	400	0	0	0	0	<b>400</b>
SW028	Diamond Lake 35W/62 Water Quality Improvements	497	0	0	0	0	<b>497</b>
SW030	Alternative Stormwater Management Strategies	500	500	500	500	500	<b>2,500</b>
SW031	Lake Hiawatha / Blue Water Partnership	688	1,520	1,711	0	0	<b>3,919</b>
SW032	I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconstruction	0	0	7,938	7,938	3,175	<b>19,051</b>
SW00R	Reimbursable Sewer and Storm Drain Projects	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	<b>15,000</b>
BR112	Nicollet Ave from Lake St to 29th	0	0	0	110	0	<b>110</b>
CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project	250	250	0	0	0	<b>500</b>
PV003	Street Renovation Program	115	115	115	115	0	<b>460</b>
PV007	University Research Park	495	0	0	0	0	<b>495</b>
PV015	27th Ave S	666	0	0	0	0	<b>666</b>
PV022	Lyndale Ave N	249	0	0	0	0	<b>249</b>
PV029	Chicago Ave S (E 14th St to E 28th St)	0	0	95	0	0	<b>95</b>
PV032	LaSalle Ave S	0	0	0	0	424	<b>424</b>
<b>Total Sewer Fund Projects</b>		<b>11,730</b>	<b>10,255</b>	<b>16,529</b>	<b>16,033</b>	<b>9,969</b>	<b>64,516</b>
<b>WATER</b>							
WTR02	New 40 Million Gallon SW Reservoir/Pump Station	3,000	11,000	11,000	6,000	0	<b>31,000</b>
WTR09	Ultrafiltration Program	17,000	20,000	35,000	13,000	1,000	<b>86,000</b>
WTR12	Water Distribution Improvements	4,500	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,500	<b>22,200</b>
WTR14	The MWW Facilities Security Improvement	2,000	3,000	0	0	0	<b>5,000</b>
WTR15	Pump Station No. 4 Rehabilitation	6,000	5,000	4,000	0	0	<b>15,000</b>
WTR16	Minneapolis/St. Paul Interconnection	3,000	7,000	6,000	3,000	0	<b>19,000</b>
WTR17	Treatment Modifications Based on New Regulations	0	0	0	0	1,000	<b>1,000</b>
WTR0R	Reimbursable Watermain Projects	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	<b>10,000</b>
CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project	250	250	0	0	0	<b>500</b>
<b>Total Water Fund Projects</b>		<b>37,750</b>	<b>52,650</b>	<b>62,400</b>	<b>28,400</b>	<b>8,500</b>	<b>189,700</b>
<b>PARKING</b>							
RMP01	Parking Facilities - Repair and Improvements	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	<b>8,500</b>
RMP03	Bicycle Parking	35	40	35	40	40	<b>190</b>
<b>Total Parking Fund Projects</b>		<b>1,735</b>	<b>1,740</b>	<b>1,735</b>	<b>1,740</b>	<b>1,740</b>	<b>8,690</b>
<b>Total Public Works Department Projects</b>		<b>90,615</b>	<b>106,667</b>	<b>115,624</b>	<b>89,454</b>	<b>80,162</b>	<b>482,522</b>

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CLIC**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS</b>							
ART01	Art in Public Places	200	200	200	200	200	<b>1,000</b>
BIS02	Central Traffic Signal Computer Replacement	400	100	100	50	0	<b>650</b>
BIS03	Enterprise Document Management	275	175	100	0	0	<b>550</b>
BIS04	Enterprise Infrastructure Capacity Upgrade	350	350	350	0	0	<b>1,050</b>
BIS05	Enterprise Reporting	150	300	300	0	0	<b>750</b>
BIS06	GIS Application Infrastructure Upgrade	250	200	150	150	500	<b>1,250</b>
BIS07	HRIS Upgrade	250	0	0	500	500	<b>1,250</b>
BIS08	Property System Assessment & Consolidation/Upgrade	300	300	1,200	1,500	0	<b>3,300</b>
BIS09	Enterprise Timekeeping Consolidation	500	250	0	0	0	<b>750</b>
BIS10	Finance System Consolidation/Upgrade	1,700	1,800	0	0	1,000	<b>4,500</b>
BIS11	Citywide Electronic Citations System	425	475	0	0	0	<b>900</b>
FIR01	City/County EOC/Training Facility	1,490	3,920	2,160	2,060	0	<b>9,630</b>
FIR02	Facility Improvements - Fire Station #17	725	395	0	0	0	<b>1,120</b>
MPD01	Minneapolis Police Department Forensic Laboratory	0	0	832	6,190	3,199	<b>10,221</b>
MPD02	Minneapolis Police Department Evidence Unit	0	3,090	500	0	0	<b>3,590</b>
PSD03	Facilities - Space Improvements	440	453	467	481	500	<b>2,341</b>
PSD04	Facilities - Security Management	500	500	500	500	500	<b>2,500</b>
<b>Total Miscellaneous Projects</b>		<b>7,955</b>	<b>12,508</b>	<b>6,859</b>	<b>11,631</b>	<b>6,399</b>	<b>45,352</b>
<b>TOTAL DEPARTMENT SUBMITTED CAPITAL BUDGET</b>		<b>105,735</b>	<b>126,703</b>	<b>127,693</b>	<b>107,065</b>	<b>92,261</b>	<b>559,457</b>

Note: The totals above represent City funding and grant sources only. The funding detail pages that follow show additional leveraging with other units of government as Non Appropriated. The CLIC Report for years 2001 - 2003 included both City sources and other governmental unit sources on this summary report.

# 2006 - 2010 Capital Resource Assumptions Used by CLIC For Property Tax Supported Infrastructure Improvements

As approved by Ways & Means Committee for 2006 - 2010

Recommended Resources by Category	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Totals
	(In thousands)					
Net Debt Bond Authorizations	23,250	18,750	17,250	17,250	17,595	94,095
Park Board Capital Infrastructure Levy	860	1,075	1,290	1,500	1,500	6,225
	<u>24,110</u>	<u>19,825</u>	<u>18,540</u>	<u>18,750</u>	<u>19,095</u>	<u>100,320</u>
Prior Year Adjustments - by Mayor and Council*	-176	64	144	144	0	176
<b>2006 - 2010 Resource Assumptions for CLIC</b>	<b><u>23,934</u></b>	<b><u>19,889</u></b>	<b><u>18,684</u></b>	<b><u>18,894</u></b>	<b><u>19,095</u></b>	<b><u>100,496</u></b>

Notes:

\* - Adjustments represent dollars advanced to or from projects in the Capital programs for prior years.

This resource summary represents the City's commitment for General Infrastructure assets. General Infrastructure includes public buildings, roads, bridges, bike trails, street lights, traffic signals, parks & libraries.

## 2006 Bond Redemption Levy for Capital Program

**Amount Notes**  
**(In thousands)**

Tax Levy Certified for Bond Redemption in 2005	22,764	For supporting Capital Program only
Bond Redemption Levy Reduction for 2006	-2,979	Per Revised Five Year Financial Direction
Tax Levy Certified for Bond Redemption in 2006	<u><u>19,785</u></u>	For supporting Capital Program only

## Property Tax Supported Capital Allocation - CLIC Recommended Summarized by Major Type of Infrastructure

Description of Category	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Totals
	Amounts in thousands					
Municipal Building Commission - City Hall	1,260	735	700	895	1,000	4,590
Percentage allocated to MBC	5.26%	3.70%	3.75%	4.74%	5.24%	4.57%
Library Board Capital Program	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	8,000
Percentage allocated to Library	6.69%	8.04%	8.56%	8.47%	8.38%	7.96%
Park Board Capital Program - including Park Levy*	1,830	1,900	1,900	1,550	2,300	9,480
Percentage allocated to Park Board	7.65%	9.55%	10.17%	8.20%	12.05%	9.43%
Public Works Department:						
Facility Improvements	1,500	5,500	4,500	4,312	1,250	17,062
Street Paving	8,696	3,631	4,481	4,477	6,927	28,212
Sidewalk Program	160	170	180	185	195	890
Heritage Park	2,000	750	1,250	0	0	4,000
Bridges	1,345	200	413	878	2,243	5,079
Traffic Control & Street Lighting	1,477	1,251	1,200	1,987	2,430	8,345
Bike Trails	806	632	100	550	450	2,538
Subtotal Public Works	15,984	12,134	12,124	12,389	13,495	66,126
Percentage allocated to Public Works	66.78%	61.01%	64.89%	65.57%	70.67%	65.80%
Miscellaneous Projects/Other City Departments	3,260	3,520	2,360	2,460	700	12,300
Percentage allocated to Other City Departments	13.62%	17.70%	12.63%	13.02%	3.67%	12.24%
Percentage allocated to City Departments	80.40%	78.71%	77.52%	78.59%	74.34%	78.04%
<b>Grand Total - Property Tax Supported Capital</b>	<b>23,934</b>	<b>19,889</b>	<b>18,684</b>	<b>18,894</b>	<b>19,095</b>	<b>100,496</b>
*Park Capital Levy of \$6,225 is included above as follows->	860	1,075	1,290	1,500	1,500	6,225

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CLIC CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATION**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION</b>							
MBC01	Life Safety Improvements	125	200	200	300	300	<b>1,125</b>
MBC02	Mechanical Systems Upgrade	500	535	500	500	600	<b>2,635</b>
MBC04	Tower & Interior Court Elevators	0	0	0	95	100	<b>195</b>
MBC05	Moat /Inner Court Water Proofing	635	0	0	0	0	<b>635</b>
MBC06	Clock Tower Upgrade	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
MBC08	Interior Court Green Roof Project	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Municipal Building Commission</b>		<b>1,260</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>4,590</b>
<b>LIBRARY BOARD*</b>							
MPL09	Nokomis Library Capital Improvements	0	500	1,900	2,320	280	<b>5,000</b>
MPL10	North Regional Capital Improvements	2,870	0	0	0	0	<b>2,870</b>
MPL11	Walker Community Library Capital Improvements	0	0	60	0	440	<b>500</b>
MPL13	Hosmer Library Capital Improvements	0	0	0	60	440	<b>500</b>
MPL14	Roosevelt Community Library Capital Improvements	0	903	0	0	0	<b>903</b>
MPL15	Southeast Community Library Capital Improvements	200	2,460	0	0	0	<b>2,660</b>
MPL16	Washburn Community Library Capital Improvements	0	0	0	60	440	<b>500</b>
<b>Total Library Board (Community Libraries)</b>		<b>3,070</b>	<b>3,863</b>	<b>1,960</b>	<b>2,440</b>	<b>1,600</b>	<b>12,933</b>
* - Includes \$4,933 of Library Referendum Levy and \$8,000 of City property tax funding.							
<b>PARK BOARD</b>							
PRK01	Community and Neighborhood Center Rehabilitation	250	700	600	350	1,000	<b>2,900</b>
PRK02	Site and Totlot Rehabilitation	0	0	230	1,000	300	<b>1,530</b>
PRK04	Athletic Field Renovation	1,380	1,000	870	0	1,000	<b>4,250</b>
PRK05	Tier 2 Athletic Fields	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PRK06	Service Center Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PRK07	Tennis Court Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PRK09	HVAC	100	100	100	100	0	<b>400</b>
PRK11	Roof Replacement	100	100	100	100	0	<b>400</b>
PRKDT	Diseased Tree Removal	500	500	500	500	500	<b>2,500</b>
<b>Total Park Board</b>		<b>2,330</b>	<b>2,400</b>	<b>2,400</b>	<b>2,050</b>	<b>2,800</b>	<b>11,980</b>

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CLIC CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATION**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT</b>							
<b>FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS</b>							
PSD01	Facilities - Repair and Improvements	1,500	1,000	1,000	1,250	1,000	<b>5,750</b>
PSD02	Public Works Facilities Program	0	4,500	3,500	3,062	0	<b>11,062</b>
PSD06	Pioneer & Soldiers Memorial Cemetery Fencing Rehab	0	0	0	0	250	<b>250</b>
<b>Total Facility Improvements</b>		<b>1,500</b>	<b>5,500</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>4,312</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>17,062</b>
<b>STREET PAVING</b>							
PV001	Parkway Paving	400	770	550	725	1,250	<b>3,695</b>
PV003	Street Renovation Program	2,016	1,352	1,773	2,788	4,296	<b>12,225</b>
PV004	CSAH Paving Program	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	<b>5,000</b>
PV005	Snelling Ave Extension	0	599	973	0	0	<b>1,572</b>
PV006	Alley Renovation	313	267	267	500	500	<b>1,847</b>
PV007	University Research Park	2,526	4,058	0	0	0	<b>6,584</b>
PV008	I-35W & Lake St. Interchange Reconstruction	0	0	0	2,100	553	<b>2,653</b>
PV009	I-35W Crosstown Interchange Reconstruction	485	485	485	318	0	<b>1,773</b>
PV015	27th Ave S	7,264	0	0	0	0	<b>7,264</b>
PV019	6th Ave North	0	0	0	1,788	0	<b>1,788</b>
PV020	Loring Greenway	1,503	0	0	0	0	<b>1,503</b>
PV021	33rd Ave SE and Talmage Ave	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PV022	Lyndale Ave N	3,104	0	0	0	0	<b>3,104</b>
PV023	28th Ave S	0	5,529	0	0	0	<b>5,529</b>
PV026	Cedar Lake Road	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PV027	Hennepin/Lyndale West	0	0	0	3,124	0	<b>3,124</b>
PV028	E22 & Snelling	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PV029	Chicago Ave S (E 14th St to E 28th St)	0	0	6,278	0	0	<b>6,278</b>
PV031	27th Ave NE (RR Crossing)	0	188	0	0	0	<b>188</b>
PV032	LaSalle Ave S	0	0	0	0	6,478	<b>6,478</b>
PV034	Elliot & 10th Ave S Cul-de-sacs	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PV035	TH121/Lyndale Ave S	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PV036	Mid-City Industrial	3,403	0	0	0	0	<b>3,403</b>
PV037	Miscellaneous I-35W Frontage Roads	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PV038	Winter St NE	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PV00R	Reimbursable Paving Projects	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	<b>17,500</b>
<b>Total Street Paving Projects</b>		<b>25,514</b>	<b>17,748</b>	<b>14,826</b>	<b>15,843</b>	<b>17,577</b>	<b>91,508</b>

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CLIC CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATION**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>SIDEWALK PROGRAM</b>							
SWK01	Defective Hazardous Sidewalks	2,200	2,325	2,440	2,560	2,690	12,215
<b>HERITAGE PARK INFRASTRUCTURE</b>							
CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project	4,147	2,750	1,250	0	0	8,147
<b>BRIDGES</b>							
BR101	Major Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation	200	200	200	200	200	1,000
BR102	East River Parkway Bridge over Bridal Veil Falls	1,971	0	0	0	0	1,971
BR105	Fremont Ave S Bridge	0	0	0	0	0	0
BR109	Camden Bridge Rehabilitation	0	0	6,099	0	0	6,099
BR111	10th Ave SE Bridge Arch Rehabilitation	0	0	0	5,265	0	5,265
BR112	Nicollet Ave from Lake St to 29th	0	0	0	0	0	0
BR114	29th St Corridor Bridge Rehab Program	0	0	0	500	500	1,000
BR116	Bikeway/Bike Bridge 94246 Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	6,408	6,408
<b>Total Bridge Projects</b>		<b>2,171</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>6,299</b>	<b>5,965</b>	<b>7,108</b>	<b>21,743</b>
<b>TRAFFIC CONTROL &amp; STREET LIGHTING</b>							
TR001	New Traffic Signals	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR003	LED Replacement Program	200	300	0	475	0	975
TR004	Computerized Traffic Control Communication	0	0	0	136	13	149
TR005	Controller Conversion	300	400	400	500	400	2,000
TR006	Priority Vehicle Control System	425	413	425	325	425	2,013
TR007	Traffic & Pedestrian Safety Improvements	341	536	842	549	597	2,865
TR008	Parkway Street Light Replacement	345	175	300	0	150	970
TR010	Traffic System Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
TR011	City Street Light Renovation	300	0	0	0	150	450
TR013	Railroad Crossing Safety Improvements	234	783	3,452	915	1,265	6,649
TR014	LRT TOD Improvements	400	400	400	0	0	1,200
TR00R	Reimbursable Transportation Projects	600	600	600	600	600	3,000
<b>Total Traffic Control &amp; Street Lighting Projects</b>		<b>3,145</b>	<b>3,607</b>	<b>6,419</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>3,600</b>	<b>20,271</b>
<b>BIKE TRAILS</b>							
BIK01	Cedar Lake Trail (Phase 3)	583	4,782	0	0	0	5,365
BIK04	18th Ave NE Bikeway	0	50	0	3,900	100	4,050
BIK08	Hiawatha Trail Connections	487	0	0	0	0	487
BIK13	RiverLake Greenway (East of I-35W)	0	0	950	0	50	1,000
BIK14	Midtown Greenway Bridge over the Mississippi River	0	0	1,950	150	0	2,100
BIK17	Upper River Trails - Phase 1	0	4,500	0	0	200	4,700
BIK18	Hennepin/1st Ave NE Bike Lanes	0	0	0	0	100	100
<b>Total Bike Trail Projects</b>		<b>1,070</b>	<b>9,332</b>	<b>2,900</b>	<b>4,050</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>17,802</b>

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CLIC CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATION**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>SEWER</b>							
SW001	Storm and Sanitary Tunnel and Sewer Rehabilitation	2,500	2,500	2,800	4,000	2,500	<b>14,300</b>
SW002	Miscellaneous Storm Drains	220	220	220	220	220	<b>1,100</b>
SW004	Implementation of US EPA Storm Water Regulations	150	150	150	150	150	<b>750</b>
SW005	Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements	0	2,000	2,000	0	0	<b>4,000</b>
SW008	Facilities - CSO Separation	400	0	0	0	0	<b>400</b>
SW028	Diamond Lake 35W/62 Water Quality Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
SW030	Alternative Stormwater Management Strategies	300	400	500	600	700	<b>2,500</b>
SW031	Lake Hiawatha / Blue Water Partnership	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
SW032	I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconstruction	0	0	7,938	7,938	3,175	<b>19,051</b>
SW00R	Reimbursable Sewer and Storm Drain Projects	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	<b>15,000</b>
BR112	Nicollet Ave from Lake St to 29th	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project	250	250	0	0	0	<b>500</b>
PV003	Street Renovation Program	115	115	115	115	0	<b>460</b>
PV007	University Research Park	495	0	0	0	0	<b>495</b>
PV015	27th Ave S	666	0	0	0	0	<b>666</b>
PV022	Lyndale Ave N	249	0	0	0	0	<b>249</b>
PV029	Chicago Ave S (E 14th St to E 28th St)	0	0	95	0	0	<b>95</b>
PV032	LaSalle Ave S	0	0	0	0	424	<b>424</b>
<b>Total Sewer Fund Projects</b>		<b>8,345</b>	<b>8,635</b>	<b>16,818</b>	<b>16,023</b>	<b>10,169</b>	<b>59,990</b>
<b>WATER</b>							
WTR02	New 40 Million Gallon SW Reservoir/Pump Station	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
WTR09	Ultrafiltration Program	15,000	9,500	27,700	31,500	1,300	<b>85,000</b>
WTR12	Water Distribution Improvements	4,500	5,000	5,500	6,000	6,500	<b>27,500</b>
WTR14	The MWW Facilities Security Improvement	2,000	3,000	0	0	0	<b>5,000</b>
WTR15	Pump Station No. 4 Rehabilitation	6,000	5,000	4,000	0	0	<b>15,000</b>
WTR16	Minneapolis/St. Paul Interconnection	1,500	3,500	3,000	2,250	8,750	<b>19,000</b>
WTR17	Treatment Modifications Based on New Regulations	0	0	0	0	1,000	<b>1,000</b>
WTR0R	Reimbursable Watermain Projects	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	<b>10,000</b>
CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project	250	250	0	0	0	<b>500</b>
<b>Total Water Fund Projects</b>		<b>31,250</b>	<b>28,250</b>	<b>42,200</b>	<b>41,750</b>	<b>19,550</b>	<b>163,000</b>
<b>PARKING</b>							
RMP01	Parking Facilities - Repair and Improvements	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	<b>8,500</b>
RMP03	Bicycle Parking	35	40	35	40	40	<b>190</b>
<b>Total Parking Fund Projects</b>		<b>1,735</b>	<b>1,740</b>	<b>1,735</b>	<b>1,740</b>	<b>1,740</b>	<b>8,690</b>
<b>Total Public Works Department Projects</b>		<b>81,077</b>	<b>80,087</b>	<b>99,387</b>	<b>95,743</b>	<b>64,134</b>	<b>420,428</b>

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
2006 - 2010 CLIC CAPITAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATION**

<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
							(in thousands)
<b>MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS</b>							
ART01	Art in Public Places	200	200	200	200	200	<b>1,000</b>
BIS02	Central Traffic Signal Computer Replacement	400	100	100	50	0	<b>650</b>
BIS03	Enterprise Document Management	275	175	100	0	0	<b>550</b>
BIS04	Enterprise Infrastructure Capacity Upgrade	350	350	350	0	0	<b>1,050</b>
BIS05	Enterprise Reporting	150	300	300	0	0	<b>750</b>
BIS06	GIS Application Infrastructure Upgrade	250	200	150	150	500	<b>1,250</b>
BIS07	HRIS Upgrade	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
BIS08	Property System Assessment & Consolidation/Upgrade	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
BIS09	Enterprise Timekeeping Consolidation	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
BIS10	Finance System Consolidation/Upgrade	1,700	1,800	0	0	0	<b>3,500</b>
BIS11	Citywide Electronic Citations System	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
FIR01	City/County EOC/Training Facility	1,490	3,920	2,160	2,060	0	<b>9,630</b>
FIR02	Facility Improvements - Fire Station #17	1,120	0	0	0	0	<b>1,120</b>
MPD01	Minneapolis Police Department Forensic Laboratory	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
MPD02	Minneapolis Police Department Evidence Unit	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PSD03	Facilities - Space Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
PSD04	Facilities - Security Management	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Miscellaneous Projects</b>		<b>5,935</b>	<b>7,045</b>	<b>3,360</b>	<b>2,460</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>19,500</b>
<b>TOTAL CLIC RECOMMENDED CAPITAL BUDGET</b>		<b>93,672</b>	<b>94,130</b>	<b>107,807</b>	<b>103,588</b>	<b>70,234</b>	<b>469,431</b>

Note: The totals above represent City funding and grant sources only. The funding detail pages that follow show additional leveraging with other units of government as Non Appropriated. The CLIC Report for years 2001 - 2003 included both City sources and other governmental unit sources on this summary report.

**CLIC Comprehensive Project Ratings for 2006 - 2010**  
**Highest to Lowest Score - 111 Projects Rated**

Project ID	Project Name	Score	Rank
		<b>(Max 300)</b>	
	<b>Top Third of Projects</b>		
CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project	226.74	1
PV009	I-35W Crosstown Interchange Reconstruction	224.25	2
PV007	SEMI (South East Minneapolis Industrial)	220.08	3
PV004	CSAH Paving Program	219.58	4
WTR09	Ultrafiltration Program	215.75	5
BR101	Major Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation	211.96	6
SWK01	Defective Hazardous Sidewalks	211.25	7
MBC01	Life Safety Improvements	210.64	8
MPL10	North Regional Capital Improvements	210.48	9
BR116	Bikeway/Bike Bridge 94246 Rehabilitation	209.88	10
BIS02	Central Traffic Signal Computer Replacement	209.67	11
SW005	Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements	208.67	12
TR003	LED Replacement Program	206.67	13
PV001	Parkway Paving	204.29	14
TR007	Traffic & Pedestrian Safety Improvements	204.00	15
MBC05	Moat /Inner Court Water Proofing	203.52	16
SW001	Storm and Sanitary Tunnel and Sewer Rehabilitation	202.67	17
PV003	Street Renovation Program	202.54	18
MBC02	Mechanical Systems Upgrade	201.96	19
PV022	Lyndale Ave N	201.83	20
SW008	Facilities - CSO Separation	200.63	21
BIK01	Cedar Lake Trail (Phase 3)	199.58	22
RMP03	Bicycle Parking	198.50	23
WTR12	Water Distribution Improvements	198.42	24
TR008	Parkway Street Light Replacement	197.71	25
PV020	Loring Greenway	197.08	26
WTR15	Pump Station No. 4 Rehabilitation	195.29	27
PV027	Hennepin/Lyndale West	194.67	28
BIK14	Midtown Greenway Bridge over the Mississippi River	193.50	29
BIS03	Enterprise Document Management	192.58	30
MPL09	Nokomis Library Capital Improvements	192.36	31
PV029	Chicago Ave S (E 14th St to E 28th St)	192.00	32
TR011	City Street Light Renovation	191.58	33
BR111	10th Avenue S.E. Bridge Arch Rehabilitation	188.33	34
SW002	Miscellaneous Storm Drains	187.33	35
WTR16	St. Paul/Minneapolis Interconnection	187.33	36
BIK04	18th Avenue NE Bikeway	187.25	37

**CLIC Comprehensive Project Ratings for 2006 - 2010**  
**Highest to Lowest Score - 111 Projects Rated**

Project ID	Project Name	Score	Rank
	<b>Middle Third of Projects</b>		
PSD02	Public Works Facilities Program	186.64	38
PV031	27th Ave NE (RR Crossing)	186.29	39
FIR01	Fire Training Campus - Phase IV	186.00	40
PV023	28th Avenue South	185.38	41
BIK13	RiverLake Greenway (East of I-35W)	184.00	42
BR109	Camden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation	181.29	43
ART01	Art in Public Places	181.04	44
BIS04	Enterprise Infrastructure Capacity Upgrade	180.67	45
PRK02	Site and Totlot Rehabilitation	179.68	46
FIR02	Facility Improvements - Fire Station #17	179.28	47
MPL13	Hosmer Library Capital Improvements	179.04	48
PV032	LaSalle Avenue South	178.50	49
PRK01	Community and Neighborhood Center Rehabilitation	178.28	50
MPL16	Washburn Community Library Capital Improvements	177.28	51
PV006	Alley Renovation	175.83	52
TR006	Priority Vehicle Control System	175.46	53
BR114	29th Street Corridor Bridge Rehab Program	175.25	54
PRK04	Athletic Field Renovation	174.84	55
BIK18	Hennepin/1st Ave NE Bike Lanes	173.42	56
MPL11	Walker Community Library Capital Improvements	172.04	57
MPL15	Southeast Community Library Capital Improvements	171.76	58
MBC04	Tower & Interior Court Elevators	171.32	59
TR005	Controller Conversion	171.13	60
MPL14	Roosevelt Community Library Capital Improvements	169.68	61
SW004	Implementation of US EPA Storm Water Regulations	168.88	62
BIK08	Hiawatha Trail Connections	168.25	63
BIK17	Upper River Trails - Phase 1	167.63	64
BR112	Nicollet Ave. from Lake St. to 29th	167.00	65
WTR02	New 40 Million Gallon SW Reservoir	166.33	66
WTR17	Treatment Modifications Based on New Regulations	165.79	67
BIS09	Enterprise Timekeeping Consolidation	163.50	68
BIS06	GIS Application Infrastructure Upgrade	162.96	69
PRK09	HVAC	162.16	70
TR013	Railroad Crossing Safety Improvements	162.08	71
BIS05	Enterprise Reporting	161.46	72
SW032	I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconst	160.75	73
BR102	East River Parkway Bridge over Bridal Veil Falls	158.13	74

**CLIC Comprehensive Project Ratings for 2006 - 2010**  
**Highest to Lowest Score - 111 Projects Rated**

Project ID	Project Name	Score	Rank
	<b>Bottom Third of Projects</b>		
PV015	27th Ave S	158.08	75
PRK11	Roof Replacement	157.00	76
PV008	I-35W & Lake St. Interchange Reconstruction	156.08	77
WTR14	The MWW Facilities Security Improvement	156.08	78
PV005	Snelling Ave Extension	155.13	79
BIS07	HRIS Upgrade	152.63	80
PSD01	Facilities - Repair and Improvements	151.92	81
BIS10	Finance System Consolidation/Upgrade	151.08	82
TR004	Computerized Traffic Control Communication	149.13	83
MPD01	Minneapolis Police Department Forensic Laboratory	145.56	84
MPD02	Minneapolis Police Department Evidence Unit	145.36	85
PV019	Sixth Avenue North	144.92	86
BIS08	Property System Assessment & Consolidation/Upgrade	144.92	87
TR010	Traffic System Management	143.17	88
BIS11	Citywide Electronic Citations System	142.21	89
BR105	Fremont Ave South Bridge	137.21	90
PSD06	Pioneer & Soldiers Memorial Cemetery Fencing Rehab	134.32	91
SW028	Diamond Lake 35W/62 Water Quality Improvements	134.13	92
TR014	LRT TOD Improvements	131.22	93
MBC06	Clock Tower Upgrade	130.68	94
SW031	Lake Hiawatha / Blue Water Partnership	129.29	95
PV037	Miscellaneous I-35W Frontage Roads	128.13	96
RMP01	Parking Systems Repair and Improvements	127.79	97
PRK06	Service Center Rehabilitation	126.80	98
PRK05	Tier 2 Athletic Fields	126.52	99
SW030	Alternative Stormwater Management Strategies	126.21	100
PRK07	Tennis Court Rehabilitation	125.04	101
PV026	Cedar Lake Road	123.08	102
PV038	Winter Street NE	121.63	103
MBC08	Interior Court Green Roof Project	119.84	104
PV021	33rd Ave SE and Talmage Avenue	119.71	105
PV036	Mid-City Industrial	116.46	106
PSD03	Facilities - Space Improvements	113.00	107
PV034	Elliot & 10th Ave S Cul-de-sacs	107.38	108
PSD04	Facilities - Security Management	105.72	109
PV028	E22 & Snelling	103.58	110
TR001	New Traffic Signals	94.00	111

## CLIC Project Ratings by Commission/Board/Department

### Maximum Score of 300, Rank out of 111 Projects Rated

#### MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
MBC01	Life Safety Improvements	210.64	8
MBC02	Mechanical Systems Upgrade	201.96	19
MBC04	Tower & Interior Court Elevators	171.32	59
MBC05	Moat /Inner Court Water Proofing	203.52	16
MBC06	Clock Tower Upgrade	130.68	94
MBC08	Interior Court Green Roof Project	119.84	104

#### LIBRARY BOARD

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
MPL09	Nokomis Library Capital Improvements	192.36	31
MPL10	North Regional Capital Improvements	210.48	9
MPL11	Walker Community Library Capital Improvements	172.04	57
MPL13	Hosmer Library Capital Improvements	179.04	48
MPL14	Roosevelt Community Library Capital Improvements	169.68	61
MPL15	Southeast Community Library Capital Improvements	171.76	58
MPL16	Washburn Community Library Capital Improvements	177.28	51

#### PARK BOARD

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
PRK01	Community and Neighborhood Center Rehabilitation	178.28	50
PRK02	Site and Totlot Rehabilitation	179.68	46
PRK04	Athletic Field Renovation	174.84	55
PRK05	Tier 2 Athletic Fields	126.52	99
PRK06	Service Center Rehabilitation	126.80	98
PRK07	Tennis Court Rehabilitation	125.04	101
PRK09	HVAC	162.16	70
PRK11	Roof Replacement	157.00	76

#### PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
PSD01	Facilities - Repair and Improvements	151.92	81
PSD02	Public Works Facilities Program	186.64	38
PSD06	Pioneer & Soldiers Memorial Cemetery Fencing Rehab	134.32	91

## CLIC Project Ratings by Commission/Board/Department

### Maximum Score of 300, Rank out of 111 Projects Rated

#### STREET PAVING

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
PV001	Parkway Paving	204.29	14
PV003	Street Renovation Program	202.54	18
PV004	CSAH Paving Program	219.58	4
PV005	Snelling Ave Extension	155.13	79
PV006	Alley Renovation	175.83	52
PV007	SEMI (South East Minneapolis Industrial)	220.08	3
PV008	I-35W & Lake St. Interchange Reconstruction	156.08	77
PV009	I-35W Crosstown Interchange Reconstruction	224.25	2
PV015	27th Ave S	158.08	75
PV019	Sixth Avenue North	144.92	86
PV020	Loring Greenway	197.08	26
PV021	33rd Ave SE and Talmage Avenue	119.71	105
PV022	Lyndale Ave N	201.83	20
PV023	28th Avenue South	185.38	41
PV026	Cedar Lake Road	123.08	102
PV027	Hennepin/Lyndale West	194.67	28
PV028	E22 & Snelling	103.58	110
PV029	Chicago Ave S (E 14th St to E 28th St)	192.00	32
PV031	27th Ave NE (RR Crossing)	186.29	39
PV032	LaSalle Avenue South	178.50	49
PV034	Elliot & 10th Ave S Cul-de-sacs	107.38	108
PV036	Mid-City Industrial	116.46	106
PV037	Miscellaneous I-35W Frontage Roads	128.13	96
PV038	Winter Street NE	121.63	103

#### SIDEWALK PROGRAM

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
SWK01	Defective Hazardous Sidewalks	211.25	7

#### HERITAGE PARK INFRASTRUCTURE

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project	226.74	1

#### BRIDGES

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
BR101	Major Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation	211.96	6
BR102	East River Parkway Bridge over Bridal Veil Falls	158.13	74
BR105	Fremont Ave South Bridge	137.21	90
BR109	Camden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation	181.29	43
BR111	10th Avenue S.E. Bridge Arch Rehabilitation	188.33	34
BR112	Nicollet Ave. from Lake St. to 29th	167.00	65
BR114	29th Street Corridor Bridge Rehab Program	175.25	54
BR116	Bikeway/Bike Bridge 94246 Rehabilitation	209.88	10

## CLIC Project Ratings by Commission/Board/Department

### Maximum Score of 300, Rank out of 111 Projects Rated

#### TRAFFIC CONTROL AND STREET LIGHTING

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
TR001	New Traffic Signals	94.00	111
TR003	LED Replacement Program	206.67	13
TR004	Computerized Traffic Control Communication	149.13	83
TR005	Controller Conversion	171.13	60
TR006	Priority Vehicle Control System	175.46	53
TR007	Traffic & Pedestrian Safety Improvements	204.00	15
TR008	Parkway Street Light Replacement	197.71	25
TR010	Traffic System Management	143.17	88
TR011	City Street Light Renovation	191.58	33
TR013	Railroad Crossing Safety Improvements	162.08	71
TR014	LRT TOD Improvements	131.22	93

#### BIKE TRAILS

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
BIK01	Cedar Lake Trail (Phase 3)	199.58	22
BIK04	18th Avenue NE Bikeway	187.25	37
BIK08	Hiawatha Trail Connections	168.25	63
BIK13	RiverLake Greenway (East of I-35W)	184.00	42
BIK14	Midtown Greenway Bridge over the Mississippi River	193.50	29
BIK17	Upper River Trails - Phase 1	167.63	64
BIK18	Hennepin/1st Ave NE Bike Lanes	173.42	56

#### SEWER

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
SW001	Storm and Sanitary Tunnel and Sewer Rehabilitation	202.67	17
SW002	Miscellaneous Storm Drains	187.33	35
SW004	Implementation of US EPA Storm Water Regulations	168.88	62
SW005	Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements	208.67	12
SW008	Facilities - CSO Separation	200.63	21
SW028	Diamond Lake 35W/62 Water Quality Improvements	134.13	92
SW030	Alternative Stormwater Management Strategies	126.21	100
SW031	Lake Hiawatha / Blue Water Partnership	129.29	95
SW032	I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconst	160.75	73

#### WATER

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
WTR02	New 40 Million Gallon SW Reservoir	166.33	66
WTR09	Ultrafiltration Program	215.75	5
WTR12	Water Distribution Improvements	198.42	24
WTR14	The MWW Facilities Security Improvement	156.08	78
WTR15	Pump Station No. 4 Rehabilitation	195.29	27
WTR16	St. Paul/Minneapolis Interconnection	187.33	36
WTR17	Treatment Modifications Based on New Regulations	165.79	67

## CLIC Project Ratings by Commission/Board/Department

### Maximum Score of 300, Rank out of 111 Projects Rated

#### PARKING

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
RMP01	Parking Systems Repair and Improvements	127.79	97
RMP03	Bicycle Parking	198.50	23

#### MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

Project ID	Project Title	Score	Rank
ART01	Art in Public Places	181.04	44
BIS02	Central Traffic Signal Computer Replacement	209.67	11
BIS03	Enterprise Document Management	192.58	30
BIS04	Enterprise Infrastructure Capacity Upgrade	180.67	45
BIS05	Enterprise Reporting	161.46	72
BIS06	GIS Application Infrastructure Upgrade	162.96	69
BIS07	HRIS Upgrade	152.63	80
BIS08	Property System Assessment & Consolidation/Upgrade	144.92	87
BIS09	Enterprise Timekeeping Consolidation	163.50	68
BIS10	Finance System Consolidation/Upgrade	151.08	82
BIS11	Citywide Electronic Citations System	142.21	89
FIR01	Fire Training Campus - Phase IV	186.00	40
FIR02	Facility Improvements - Fire Station #17	179.28	47
MPD01	Minneapolis Police Department Forensic Laboratory	145.56	84
MPD02	Minneapolis Police Department Evidence Unit	145.36	85
PSD03	Facilities - Space Improvements	113.00	107
PSD04	Facilities - Security Management	105.72	109

# 2005 CLIC GENERAL COMMENTS

## **BIK (All) Bicycle Related Projects**

The Bicycle proposals are extremely well leveraged, with the federal government, the state, the county and NRP funding contributing \$19.5 million over five years with the request for Net Debt funding being \$2.7 million over this same period. However, the seven proposals presented result in a yearly increase of \$111,000.00 in operating cost with no clear plan of how to obtain or reduce these additional operating expenses. The Minneapolis Bicycle Advisory Board (BAC) and the state BAC are studying ways to generate operating funds. Although these studies have been proceeding for the last few years, they have not been completed. CLIC would request that proposals from these committees be prepared for the Mayor and the City Council by September or October of this year and begin implementation January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006.

Please refer to the citywide bike path map to view the underserved North and Northeast side of the city. This discrepancy in service must be addressed at a faster pace. Also, it is necessary to determine whether bike paths and bike street striping are a necessary part of the city's multi-modal transportation plan or merely desirable. If they are necessary, then it is time to find a way to pay for maintenance of the paths. Asking bicycle enthusiasts to find a solution to operating costs is not enough.

As an option, CLIC would like to suggest a \$0.05 surcharge be levied on hourly parking in the city ramps that would be used entirely to fund Bicycle operating costs. The city cannot afford to put in place infrastructure that cannot be properly maintained without a viable operating funding plan, which we believe is doable.

## **BIS Capital Program**

CLIC believes BIS should be commended for breaking up projects into separate requests and using departmental dollars to assist in the work. CLIC supports BIS projects as long overdue for efficient and effective city functioning. CLIC recommends that BIS look for outside dollars for some of the proposed projects. For example, exploring federal or state funding to assist with some of the traffic management system needs, etc.

## **Library Board**

CLIC Commends the Library Board for more careful consideration they have given to the improvement of public libraries in Minneapolis. CLIC is especially pleased that the Board is reaching out to other entities (NRP, private organizations, citizens) to better improve libraries. However, CLIC is concerned about the future when all of the community libraries and the main library will be built and operational. At this time it appears there will not be sufficient funds to provide adequate services for Minneapolis patrons. CLIC recommends that the Library Board continually update it's vision for more collaboration and efficiencies, and to look for ways to better fund needed services.

## **Park Board**

### **CLIC will follow closely the change into districts for park administration.**

CLIC is concerned that a decentralized, district administration configuration could lead to decentralized planning for capital improvements, without appropriate regard for coordinating and/or combining improvement projects to achieve maximum return for tax dollars invested.

# 2005 CLIC GENERAL COMMENTS

## **Comment on Collaboration and Leveraging**

CLIC has addressed in the past the scarcity of resources and funding for maintaining common areas, such as meeting rooms and recreational fields. In particular, we have addressed these comments to the Library Board and the Park Board, as well as other City departments, insofar as each serves the community at large by providing congregation and meeting areas. We recognize there is a high public demand for such facilities, and do not question the need to support continued maintenance and construction as appropriate to meet this demand. As CLIC reviews capital improvement request for parks, athletic fields, and service centers this year, however, we do not yet see the degree of collaboration we had expected, based upon our comments of prior years. For instance, we have advised in the past the importance of the Park and Library Boards to find more creative ways to combine their public service delivery where they have common interests, better leveraging their budgeted dollars. While in the past, and this year, we follow a ranking process that will mark down in priority those individual projects we feel could be combined, or jointly planned, CLIC will need to see a different approach next year. Starting with the 2007 - 2011 CLIC cycle, CLIC will require that the Park Board and the Library Board make joint presentations on any public park, athletic field or meeting facility, and advise CLIC the extent to which efforts have been made to combine budget resources on each project. For any project not so presented, CLIC will apply an appropriate ranking.

**PV022 & Lyndale Ave N**  
**PV029 & Chicago Ave S (E 14<sup>th</sup> St to E 28<sup>th</sup> St)**  
**PV032 & LaSalle Ave S**

Paving Projects General Comment: CLIC did not fail to observe the statement “complete street reconstruction is needed because the street has deteriorated to the point where routine maintenance cannot preserve a safe pothole free driving surface” included in the referenced paving CBRs. It appears the City is now paying the price for excessive deferred capital investments. CLIC suggests the significant operating costs savings be programmed into effective interim maintenance to help close the apparent infrastructure gap in the paving program.

## **Overall Capital Program Cost**

CLIC needs more information about what is an appropriate level of capital funding on an annual and on a 5-year program basis so that it does not facilitate future funding gaps. The 1997 Public Works Department’s report on the state of the public infrastructure and subsequent Park Board infrastructure gap report illuminated the consequences of inadequate funding. In response to the reports and outcry about lack of funding, a supplemental program to fund half the gap closure cost was initiated by the city. Over time the commitment has faltered.

In the 2003 CLIC Report, the Transportation Task Force commented that it “awaits an updated report on the Public Works’ infrastructure gap. In times of tight budget restraints, the task force wants current information as it considers projects which do not further exacerbate longstanding gaps in the city’s capital renovation program.” No satisfactory update has been forthcoming. CLIC questions the wisdom of inadequately funding infrastructure gap closure, or alternatively not reevaluating the extent of the infrastructure gap. The State of the Public Infrastructure is in many instances weak. CLIC may from time-to-time choose to think “outside the box” in recommending capital projects or funding levels. Lacking information about necessary and appropriate annual expenditures to responsibly repair and replace existing capital infrastructure, much less fund new infrastructure, increases the challenge that CLIC faces when meeting its

## **2005 CLIC GENERAL COMMENTS**

charge to the City Council, the Mayor, and the Independent Boards. CLIC suggests that more research be performed and the capital budgeting process better informed as to best practices and proper funding levels to ensure that our city is not once again creating a huge infrastructure gap, the burden to fund that will fall on the next generation of taxpayers and ratepayers.

# 2005 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE COMMENTS

## **ART01 Art in Public Places**

CLIC continues to support art in public places, but is again disappointed that the Art in Public Places Program continues to use capital funds for salaries and related benefits. The presentation this year was laced with “legal opinions” about how it was legitimate to consider salaries and related expenses as capital expenditures. While they are expenses to the City, CLIC recognizes these as operational expenses, not capital expenses and they should be handled like other operational expense. After all, we don’t use capital dollars to pay salaries of Police and Fire Fighters when we invest in new or improve Police and Fire stations.

Therefore: CLIC recommends that the City Council and the Mayor revisit the comments from the 2004 CLIC report and think long and hard before restoring this portion of the funding. At a minimum, CLIC recommends a determination of an appropriate percentage breakdown of dollars used for operating costs versus capital expenditures. CLIC further recommends that the City pursue outside sources of funding for this component of the Art in Public Places Program.

**CLIC also recommends** that the City Council and Mayor institute a policy that each future public and private development incorporate a specified-dollar art component of 1% within its own capital proposal budget.

## **CDA01 Heritage Park Redevelopment Project**

While CLIC recognizes that the City is under federal order to address this area, the project requests a large amount of funding considering the use. But, Empowerment Zone funding that was allocated to this project should be used for this project.

In the future, for this project and similar projects involving significant infrastructure development and very large capital investment, CLIC expects to see a cost-benefit analysis based on planned objectives and performance to the current date against these objectives, to assure that taxpayer dollars are being effectively allocated and invested.

## **FIR01 City/County EOC/Training Facility**

CLIC Recommends that the City look for additional collaboration in funding from communities that use this type of facility. This should be a shared project, in addition to Hennepin County.

## **MBC06 Clock Tower Upgrade**

This project clearly needs to be done, but **CLIC highly recommends** that the City pursue private dollars before committing net debt bond funds to the project. CLIC suggests that the City consider a public campaign as an additional option. CLIC also commends the Rotary Clubs of Minneapolis for considering this project as a possible funding target for their 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary commemoration celebration in 2010.

## **MBC08 Interior Court Green Roof Project**

Again, an interesting project, but here too, private dollars should be used before, or with public dollars.

# 2005 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE COMMENTS

**MPD01 & Minneapolis Police Department Forensic Laboratory**  
**MPD02 Minneapolis Police Department Property and Evidence Unit**

The police department requests, on the one hand, a significant share of the capital resources at our disposal. On the other hand, the department fails to provide adequate justification for these facilities or the minimum in background project proposal development. While CLIC feels there is a need, given these shortcomings, we clearly would be negligent in our duty were we to recommend funding.

There have been several consistent themes in CLIC's deliberations that have emerged over the life of these proposals, all of which have stressed the need for more collaboration and big picture thinking with other project partners:

1. Given the strain on capital resources, genuine collaboration either among city departments, between departments and independent boards and organizations, or among government jurisdictions, is one of the keys to obtaining a favorable recommendation. In the case of both the forensics lab and the evidence unit, not only were such possibilities not aggressively pursued, instead, they seem to have been dismissed out of hand.
2. Given the continued rationalization and redundancy of real property throughout the city and metro area, especially properties owned by departments and independent boards, another key to obtaining a favorable recommendation is the recommendation of opportunities for re-purposing those properties and the aggressive pursuit of those possibilities. Especially in the case of the evidence unit, but not exempting the forensics lab, these appear not to have been pursued sufficient to present a specific plan to the committee upon which we could deliberate.
3. Given the increasing demand by both citizens and those to whom CLIC answers, explicit performance to objectives and statistical evidence of need are also keys to obtaining a favorable recommendation. Ironically, neither the evidence unit proposal nor the forensic lab proposal offered more than anecdotal evidence of need (e.g., cases dismissed as a result of mishandled evidence). Neither did we observe any suggestion that the department would be able, in the future, to show how the new facilities had favorably impacted the need data (capital outlay evaluation).

**MPL11 & Walker Community Library Capital Improvements**  
**MPL14 & Roosevelt Community Library Capital Improvements**  
**MPL15 Southeast Community Library Capital Improvements**

These library buildings are in need of major upgrades and renovations. However, the sizes and locations of the structures warrant considerable consideration for new facilities. A planning process that includes site location and building design that incorporates other uses should be implemented with suggested goals of maintaining the library as the center piece of the development, utilizing other public land/buildings, and pursuing the option of additional uses i.e. retail and housing to off-set the costs of library construction and to create new tax revenue on the site.

# 2005 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE COMMENTS

## **PRK04 Athletic Field Renovation**

CLIC approves of the Minneapolis Park Board proposals to upgrade Parade Stadium, Bossen Park and other athletic fields.

There is a shortage of soccer fields available for use by soccer leagues across the metro area. We are losing out on a potentially large revenue stream when the City of Minneapolis has fields that are banned for use by the MRSL (Minnesota Recreational Soccer League - 104 teams), MWSL - (Minnesota Women's Soccer League - 10 teams) and MYSA (Minnesota Youth Soccer Association which has several hundred teams).

Also, Astro Play is the latest technology in artificial grass and is coveted by all players because it is better than natural grass. Facilities that have installed it, say it is very low maintenance and it can be used year around for indoor soccer, football, golf and any other sports that are played on grass. As Parade Stadium is a central location, it makes sense that the Astro Play upgrade is installed and given a chance to generate some income.

CLIC suggests Park Board staff consider consulting with Public Works Sewer Division on whether the runoff from artificial turf will result in increased demand on the storm drain system.

## **PRK07 Tennis Court Rehabilitation**

CLIC recommends that the Park Board ensure that the communities surrounding the courts want the courts continued. There may be other needs that the neighborhood would prefer. This could also be a test of the district model.

## **PRK09 HVAC**

The HVAC improvements suggested in this funding request are essential updates. The park buildings are central community gathering places in our communities. Given the weather extremes of the Minnesota climate, the improvements will provide comfortable indoor environments for park staff and the tens of thousands of community members who use the park buildings.

## **PSD01 Facilities – Repair and Improvements**

The CLIC Committee recommends that Public Works identify the specific projects slated for repairs and the scope of work by location for at least the first two years of this program as an attachment to their capital budget request. For 2006, Public Works should advise the Mayor and City Council about what projects are going to be done.

## **PSD02 Public Works Facilities Program**

Last year, CLIC unequivocally recommended this project. This year it again received high ratings. The existing facility at Hiawatha is obsolete and requires replacement. As directed by the Council in previous years, nearly \$4 million has been appropriated towards this project, but not spent. This delay is probably an acknowledgement of the fact that the LRT has changed the Hiawatha corridor from a primarily industrial area to one that is increasingly residential, commercial and light industrial. This has resulted in increasing opposition from residents and other neighbors to some of the operations that have been carried on at this site in the past. CLIC would suggest carefully considering the residential neighbors surrounding the Hiawatha facility. Decreasing livability in a community that is seeing a renaissance due to the LRT transit line is undesirable. For example, the noxious fumes and increased truck traffic that result from

# 2005 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE COMMENTS

asphalt production and hot-mix storage has a distinctly negative impact on residential neighbors, as well as future residential and commercial development in this transit oriented development area.

CLIC has another concern. During Public Works presentation to CLIC, staff failed to mention the Council action of March 11<sup>th</sup>, in which the Council authorized Public Works to prepare an RFP to continue the production/storage of asphalt at the Hiawatha site. Whether the City should be in the asphalt business and whether it should be done at the Hiawatha site is the subject of much debate and strong opinions. What troubles CLIC is that we were never told of the Council's March 11<sup>th</sup> action, nor do we have any information about how this RFP affects the schedule and makeup of this PSD02. It does not bode well for the CLIC process when we are not fully apprised of all pertinent facts concerning a project.

**CLIC recommends that the production and storage of asphalt and concrete be permanently abandoned on this site.**

CLIC recommends that prior to a final decision related to this capital project, Public Works and CPED undertake and publish an evaluation to ensure that the Hiawatha Campus remains the best location for the city functions to be housed there or if current or future development, including light rail transit, mitigates locating the Public Works campus #2 at this site.

## **PSD06 Pioneer and Soldiers Memorial Cemetery**

Minneapolis has an "oldest cemetery" dating back to 1853! With increasing pedestrian and even tourist traffic hoped for on Lake Street, is it prudent to wait until 2010 to repair and replace the rod iron fence surrounding this cemetery? Beautification efforts (chain link out/historic rod iron in) such as these increase community pride. This location is a tourist attraction in itself. Spending \$250K for the rehab is reasonable. Saving \$500K over the next 50 years in maintenance expense is smart. Taking proper care of this historic site—priceless!

# 2005 TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE COMMENTS

## **BR102 East River Parkway Bridge Over Bridal Veil Falls**

This year CLIC recommends that this project receive a high priority for implementation in 2006. In several previous years, CLIC has suggested that the City explore alternatives to replacing this bridge. In the past twelve months, ten improvement options were developed and analyzed by Public Works, the Park Board, the Mayor's Office, the Council Member from the area and the neighborhood. There was unanimous agreement by the interested parties that replacing the bridge, on a slightly different alignment, is the best option.

## **BR105 Fremont Ave S Bridge**

CLIC recommends that this project be folded into BR114, 29<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Bridge Rehab Program.

## **BR109 Camden Bridge Rehabilitation**

In the 2004 process, CLIC members scored this project 7<sup>th</sup> highest among 119 projects rated and supported the bridge rehabilitation scheduled for 2005. Neighborhood organizations had already been engaged in the planning process for the bridge rehabilitation. Regrettably, residents and businesses now endure a 3-week bridge closure in May 2005 and Public Works' must further stretch its maintenance resources to perform restoration work on the Camden Bridge. Public Works has now resubmitted the project for 2010, with only 3.5% of total project costs of \$6.1 million supported by property taxes.

The azure blue bridge spans the Mississippi River, Interstate 94, and a CP Rail line and is utilized by 13,000 people daily. The bridge links Camden and Northeast for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles and provides important connections to the North Mississippi Regional Park and Kroening Interpretive Center. Complete superstructure bridge replacement may cost over \$15 million. CLIC strongly recommends that Public Works secure the needed MSA, federal and state bridge resources to preserve this significant existing infrastructure element in the 2008 construction year to achieve the \$35,000 reduction in annual operating costs, preserve the municipal asset from further deterioration and protect the public from harm.

## **BR112 Nicollet Ave from Lake Street to 29<sup>th</sup>**

This bridge is a key element in potential reopening of Nicollet Avenue through the Kmart site and under normal circumstances would deserve a high priority. However, in view of the very formidable obstacles to obtaining the necessary right-of-way for the street, CLIC recommends that the project not be funded until a plausible strategy has been developed by CPED and Public Works with adequate funding sources identified.

In this instance, capital funding is being sought while there remain serious questions about the viability of the conceptual economic redevelopment scheme. The CBR for BR112 states that the "purchase and re-orienting of the Kmart site will require significant public funding" but does not elaborate as to redevelopment project costs or sources of funds. CLIC is asked to program a \$3.5 million 2009 project for a bridge the city does not own (the HCRRA owns it) and not currently open to traffic. While the proposal to reopen Nicollet Avenue and improve the urban environment is a worthy one, CLIC questions whether the City can afford this type of speculative project in the current budget climate. BR112 may be programmed along with other 29<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor bridge projects if it is incorporated into the BR114 bridge program.

# 2005 TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE COMMENTS

## **BR114      29<sup>th</sup> St Corridor Bridge Rehab Program**

CLIC recommends that CPED and Public Works soon provide a joint assessment of the present and future need for vehicular and pedestrian bridges over the Midtown Greenway, along the 29<sup>th</sup> Street corridor between Hennepin and Cedar Avenues.

## **PV005      Snelling Ave Extension**

Much progress has been made to refine this capital request since Council Member Colvin Roy introduced it to the CLIC process three or four years ago. CLIC acknowledges as stated in the CBR “this proposal plays a key role in the implementation of the 46<sup>th</sup> Street LRT Station Area Master Plan.” CLIC’s bylaws place community development programs or projects generally outside its purview, but the committee is desirous to support the City building public infrastructure necessary and appurtenant to growing the City through housing and economic development projects.

It should be noted that the CBR for PV005 states that the “project cost does not include land acquisition that is needed” and does not include “estimated cost to purchase and relocate the existing business” located on the proposed roadway. The Snelling Ave Extension proposal requires further clarification from CPED as to additional funding sources since the estimated \$1.6 million project cost does not include land acquisition or the cost to purchase and relocate the existing business.

CLIC is also concerned that any additional development in this area will necessarily increase traffic congestion at the 46<sup>th</sup> Street and Hiawatha Avenue intersection, only serving to exacerbate the challenges already presented to pedestrians and bicyclists. It is recommended that renewed consideration be given to safely accommodating walkers and cyclists with a dedicated pathway, either by tunneling under or bridging over Hiawatha Avenue.

## **PV007      University Research Park**

This year CLIC recommends that a high priority be given to funding infrastructure improvements (i.e., streets and storm water management facilities) in the SEMI Area that will make it more attractive to private developers. This area, located immediately adjacent to the East Bank Campus of the University, is one of the best opportunities Minneapolis has to convert idle or under utilized, polluted land into valuable tax base and employment opportunities. Over the last decade, this area has attracted the development of nearly a million square feet of office and light industrial space and over 1,500 jobs. However, more recently, adverse court decisions and inadequate funding for infrastructure improvements have hampered development.

## **PV020      Loring Greenway**

Originally, renovation of the Loring Greenway was scheduled for 2006. It was then moved to 2008 and this year moved again to 2010. With an estimated savings of \$150,000 in annual operating costs after renovations are completed, CLIC cannot understand what justification Minneapolis Public Works Department has to again delay this project. If anything, this project should be moved forward in the CIP not backward.

In their 2006-2010 proposed Capital Plan, Minneapolis Public Works Department has moved PV020 Loring Greenway to the year 2010 and rated it #46 out of 56 submitted projects. Renovation to the Loring Greenway cannot wait this long. Current conditions to paving materials on a walkway that is traversed by thousands of people every day present a liability hazard to the

# 2005 TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE COMMENTS

City as well as creating a visual blight on an architecturally premier piece of a dynamic downtown neighborhood.

The proposed renovation of the Loring Greenway has had strong support by CLIC since it was first submitted in the CIP a number of years ago. In our 2004 CLIC Report the Loring Greenway proposal ranked #29 with a score of 177.70 out of 119 total projects rated.

An active neighborhood group of residents and property owners along the Loring Greenway have attempted to work closely with Minneapolis Public Works Department to create a Master Plan for improvements, contributed \$59,500 in NRP funding for a new playground, raised private funding for flowers and plantings and at CLIC's insistence is working to devise a fair way to assess adjacent property owners for a portion of the total project cost and/or raise private capital from the community.

## **PV022 Lyndale Ave N**

This roadway cuts through the community and is walled off by fencing on both sides. This roadway does nothing to enhance the community and the community should not be assessed for it. The roadway is apparently designed to move traffic through the community as quickly as possible. There will be two covered bus shelters in the current design. Otherwise, this street renovation does not consider possibilities for increasing the livability or economy of the area.

## **PV035 TH121/Lyndale Ave S**

This is the first year that the project was presented to the CLIC Committee. Multiple jurisdictions are involved with the road realignment including CPED, MNDOT, and Hennepin County. However, the scope of the project and the funding has not been fully defined or secured. Currently, the neighborhoods are working with CPED to develop a master plan for the area, which should be completed by the end of 2005. It would be prudent for the Public Works Department to incorporate the results of the master plan in its capital proposal. CLIC's recommendation is to not rate this project until a definitive proposal can be completed.

## **PV036 Mid-City Industrial**

Although this project was rated too low to receive consideration for funding in the CLIC process, CLIC did choose to recommend funding in 2006. This recommendation was based on information received regarding the condition and use of the roadways after the CLIC rating process was completed.

## **PV037 Miscellaneous I-35W Frontage Roads**

This proposal indicates that MNDOT is a project partner. However, MNDOT has not contributed to the funding of this project! CLIC recommends that Public Works seek some funding from MNDOT.

## **RMP01 Parking Facilities – Repair and Improvements**

CLIC recommends the City use parking ramp generated revenue to preserve our Parking Ramps rather than transferring the money to the City's General Fund. Parking Revenue should be spent on preserving our parking structures before it is spent on general operations of the City.

# 2005 TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE COMMENTS

## **SW001 Storm & Sanitary Tunnel and Sewer Rehabilitation**

The Minneapolis Sewer Department has referenced the condition rating and priority action report for the past few years, a report that will identify and help prioritize deficiencies and repairs. CLIC requests that this document be completed by September for review by the Mayor and City Council. This is a \$30 million dollar project and the next 5-year planning cycle is programmed for \$13.5 million. Is this adequate or is it too much? The report should assist in discerning this answer. In addition, the pro forma for customer rates has been based on this schedule. Again, are these schedule rates, too low or too high?

## **SW005 Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements**

CLIC is concerned that \$4.8 million is unspent on this project. Therefore, CLIC proposes that no additional funding be appropriated until the past projects are completed. In addition, the pro forma or rate impact on customers should be adjusted accordingly.

## **SW032 I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconstruction**

CLIC would suggest that this project not be funded until the report is completed about the adequate tunnel size. In addition, funding for this project should include MNDOT and Federal Government dollars.

## **Sewer - Environmental Water Quality Projects**

Several storm sewer projects relating to environmental water quality were discussed at length by CLIC, but were either not funded or received low levels of funding.

Diamond Lake 35W/62 Water Quality Improvements	SW028
Alternative Storm Water Management Strategies	SW030
Lake Hiawatha / Blue Water Partnership	SW031
Interior Court Green Roof Project	MBC08

CLIC feels strongly about protecting and enhancing the quality of our environment, especially those involving our water resources. Given our concern, we feel it necessary to explain why these projects did not fare better and how that can be changed in the next CLIC cycle.

The CLIC process forces the committee to choose among competing requests for finite funding using a detailed ranking system. While individual assessments are confidential, discussions suggest these projects may have received low marks on several qualitative criteria as well as providing only a moderate contribution to City Goals.

These indicators make it rather clear that these projects suffered not because they are of no merit, but because of the way they were contextualized and presented. A recurring theme in CLIC deliberations this year has been our desire for a clear vision in issue areas and the establishment of a specific set of goals and means (the projects and their priorities) to achieve that vision. Projects that articulated that vision and couched a particular project in that broader, more strategic context fared well. Projects that additionally demonstrate, and present or suggest measures for progress to the vision's constituent goals (i.e., ROI) also fared well. The committee seems to be saying that responsible capital funding requires clarity of purpose and expected return.

# 2005 TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE COMMENTS

If we look at how the committee rated and discussed the projects above, it is obvious that shortcomings in the preparation and presentation of these proposals prevented the committee from giving arguably deserving projects a higher relative rank.

- The projects were not usually couched in broader terms (reference for instance the map accompanying SW031 where the red highlighted streets cover only a five block stretch rather than illustrating the project's broader contribution to the Hiawatha area specifically and any city environment vision or plan).
- Nor in one case (Diamond Lake) was it clear in which direction the project should proceed. The proposal states the delta would be removed, but in the presentation that remedy was somewhat hedged.
- In another, the Green Roof, a promising project was not well defined as to what could be an innovative pilot project with ramifications city-wide and which creates a possible new general runoff strategy.

This comment is thus an invitation to interested parties to establish a clear and well publicized vision that links these kinds of related projects and to provide the leadership necessary to articulate the kind of broader, more strategic environmental plan, for which this committee would happily recommend capital funding.

## **TR001, TR004, TR005, TR006, TR007 Ongoing Transportation Projects**

Traffic projects are waiting to be implemented. According to the project outlines, the following \$2.1MM is to be spent in 2005:

- TR001, four new traffic signal locations, has \$336K of unspent funding.
- TR005, has \$980K (three years worth of funding) in unspent controller conversions.
- TR006, has \$825K, over two years of funding at the requested level, in the priority vehicle control system project.

In addition, there is \$150K unspent on computerized traffic control communications projects (TR004) that are planned out through 2010. There is \$732K in unspent traffic and pedestrian safety improvement projects (TR007) and it is difficult to discern the "completion status" of these projects.

Why are transportation projects delayed and why is over \$3MM sitting unused? Traffic improvement projects improve the quality of life for everyone. They are designed to reduce traffic accidents, reduce delays and wait times (therefore reducing driver aggression), increase visibility, get emergency vehicles through the streets faster and make our roads safer in general. Please help the traffic department complete these projects. Give this department what it needs, in resources other than dollars, to get caught up!

## **TR013 Railroad Crossing Safety Improvements**

CLIC believes that this is a high priority project IF failure to proceed with it will absolutely mean the loss of quiet zones (whistle ban requirements). Absent this consideration, the high cost of the project relative to the benefit renders it considerably less important. The threat of lost quiet zones makes this federal requirement for safety upgrades essentially an unfunded mandate. CLIC suggests the City explore other, less expensive options for addressing this federal issue.

# 2005 TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE COMMENTS

## **WTR02 New 40-Million Gallon SW Reservoir/Pump Station**

CLIC recommends that no funding be provided for the construction of a new 40-Million gallon reservoir until the Interconnection between the Minneapolis Water Works and the St. Paul Regional Water Services has been implemented or rejected. The Interconnection likely eliminates the need for this proposed reservoir. CLIC again requests details about the acreage and market value and other potential future uses of the Edina/St. Louis Park site at 40<sup>th</sup> and France Ave. S. However, in no uncertain terms, CLIC agrees that the site for the proposed SW Reservoir should not be sold or otherwise disposed of until a decision to move forward on the Interconnection has been reached. As it did in 2004, CLIC requests more information about the cost for the Pump Station component of WTR02 if the 40-million gallon reservoir project is deferred or cancelled. To give improved service to the Southwest area, the 32-year-old pump station will require upgrading in the future.

## **WTR12 Water Distribution Improvements**

Top priority should be given to cleaning and repairing the ENTIRE water distribution system faster. At the current pace of this project, it will take 80 years to clean and line the Minneapolis water pipes and pipes are chosen for the program based on a complaint driven system. CLIC recommends that water distribution improvements be provided in a more standardized manner assuring that all parts of the city are equally served and that the program move forward at an increased pace.

## **WTR14 Water Facilities Security Improvement**

The security impact and the vulnerability of the Minneapolis water supply are a state and federal concern. Therefore, CLIC strongly recommends that the Minneapolis Water Department negotiate with the state and federal governments for complementary funding.

## **WTR16 Minneapolis/St. Paul Interconnection**

CLIC agrees with the findings of the Minneapolis Water Works Citizen Advisory Committee and supports completing the Interconnection between the St. Paul Regional Water Services and Minneapolis Water Works for several reasons. The proposed Interconnection creates a 60 million gallons per day (MGD) reserve water capacity if needed due to emergency situations from natural or man-made disasters or plant outage, it develops at moderate cost a 20 MGD finished water storage facility at the Dale Street Reservoir, it enhances flexibility and construction and repair cost savings by allowing for managed shut down of the water plants, and it furthers a regional perspective on drinking water management.

CLIC recommends that Minneapolis initiate a concerted effort to reach agreement with the St. Paul Regional Water Services to conclude joint powers agreement for the interconnection of the municipal water utilities. Both cities need additional storage capacity for finished water in case of emergency conditions and for large scale scheduled repairs, improvements and maintenance. Strong leadership is now needed to formalize and implement the Interconnection as the most cost effective means to achieve reserve water capacity for each city and its utility customers.

**MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	MBC01	Life Safety Improvements	125	0	0	0	125	125
2007			200	0	0	0	200	200
2008			200	0	0	0	200	200
2009			300	0	0	0	300	300
2010			300	0	0	0	300	300
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,125</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,125</b>	<b>1,125</b>
2006	MBC02	Mechanical Systems Upgrade	500	0	0	0	500	500
2007			535	0	0	0	535	535
2008			500	0	0	0	500	500
2009			500	0	0	0	500	500
2010			600	0	0	0	600	600
<b>Total</b>			<b>2,635</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,635</b>	<b>2,635</b>
2006	MBC04	Tower & Interior Court Elevators	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			95	0	0	0	95	90
2010			100	0	0	0	100	100
<b>Total</b>			<b>195</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>190</b>
2006	MBC05	Moat/Inner Court Water Proofing	635	0	0	0	635	600
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>635</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>600</b>
2006	MBC06	Clock Tower Upgrade	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009		Since CLIC has not funded this project, the	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010		Hennepin County match is zeroed out also.	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	MBC08	Interior Court Green Roof Project	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009		Since CLIC has not funded this project, the	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010		Hennepin County match is zeroed out also.	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	1,260	0	0	0	1,260	1,225
<b>2007</b>	735	0	0	0	735	735
<b>2008</b>	700	0	0	0	700	700
<b>2009</b>	895	0	0	0	895	890
<b>2010</b>	1,000	0	0	0	1,000	1,000
<b>Total Municipal Bldg Commission</b>	<b>4,590</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,590</b>	<b>4,550</b>

**LIBRARY BOARD FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	MPL09	Nokomis Library Capital	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007		Improvements	0	0	0	500	500	0
2008		Note: Other funding for all	1,600	0	0	300	1,900	0
2009		Library projects refers to	1,600	0	0	720	2,320	0
2010		Library Referendum dollars.	280	0	0	0	280	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>3,480</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,520</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	MPL10	North Regional Capital	1,600	0	0	1,270	2,870	0
2007		Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,270</b>	<b>2,870</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	MPL11	Walker Community Library	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007		Capital Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	60	60	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			440	0	0	0	440	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>440</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	MPL13	Hosmer Library Capital	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007		Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	60	60	0
2010			440	0	0	0	440	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>440</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	MPL14	Roosevelt Community Library	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007		Capital Improvements	750	0	0	153	903	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>903</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	MPL15	Southeast Community Library	0	0	0	200	200	0
2007		Capital Improvements	850	0	0	1,610	2,460	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>850</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,810</b>	<b>2,660</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	MPL16	Washburn Community Library	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007		Capital Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	60	60	0
2010			440	0	0	0	440	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>440</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>

**LIBRARY BOARD FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
------	------------	---------------	-----	-----	------	------------------	------------	------------

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	1,600	0	0	1,470	3,070	0
2007	1,600	0	0	2,263	3,863	0
2008	1,600	0	0	360	1,960	0
2009	1,600	0	0	840	2,440	0
2010	1,600	0	0	0	1,600	0
<b>Total Library Board</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,933</b>	<b>12,933</b>	<b>0</b>

**PARK BOARD FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB & Park Levy	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	PRK01	Community and Neighborhood Center Rehabilitation Park Board requests were submitted as Net Debt Bonds, but to be consistent, CLIC treated them as NDB & Park Capital Levy.	250	0	0	0	250	0
2007			700	0	0	0	700	0
2008			600	0	0	0	600	0
2009			350	0	0	0	350	0
2010			1,000	0	0	0	1,000	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>2,900</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,900</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PRK02	Site & Totlot Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			230	0	0	0	230	0
2009			1,000	0	0	0	1,000	0
2010			300	0	0	0	300	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,530</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,530</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PRK04	Athletic Field Renovation	1,380	0	0	0	1,380	0
2007			1,000	0	0	0	1,000	0
2008			870	0	0	0	870	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			1,000	0	0	0	1,000	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>4,250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,250</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PRK05	Tier 2 Athletic Fields	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PRK06	Service Center Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PRK07	Tennis Court Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PRK09	HVAC Improvements	100	0	0	0	100	0
2007			100	0	0	0	100	0
2008			100	0	0	0	100	0
2009			100	0	0	0	100	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>

**PARK BOARD FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB & Park Levy	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	PRK11	Roof Replacement	100	0	0	0	100	0
2007			100	0	0	0	100	0
2008			100	0	0	0	100	0
2009			100	0	0	0	100	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PRKDT	Diseased Tree Removal	0	0	500	0	500	0
2007			0	0	500	0	500	0
2008			0	0	500	0	500	0
2009			0	0	500	0	500	0
2010			0	0	500	0	500	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>0</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB & Park Levy	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	1,830	0	500	0	2,330	0
<b>2007</b>	1,900	0	500	0	2,400	0
<b>2008</b>	1,900	0	500	0	2,400	0
<b>2009</b>	1,550	0	500	0	2,050	0
<b>2010</b>	2,300	0	500	0	2,800	0
<b>Total Park Board</b>	<b>9,480</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11,980</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	PSD01	Facilities - Repair and Improvements	1,500	0	0	0	1,500	0
2007			1,000	0	0	0	1,000	0
2008			1,000	0	0	0	1,000	0
2009			1,250	0	0	0	1,250	0
2010			1,000	0	0	0	1,000	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>5,750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,750</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PSD02	Public Works Facilities Program	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			4,500	0	0	0	4,500	0
2008			3,500	0	0	0	3,500	0
2009			3,062	0	0	0	3,062	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>11,062</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11,062</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PSD06	Pioneer & Soldiers Memorial Cemetery Fencing Rehab	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			250	0	0	0	250	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>0</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	1,500	0	0	0	1,500	0
<b>2007</b>	5,500	0	0	0	5,500	0
<b>2008</b>	4,500	0	0	0	4,500	0
<b>2009</b>	4,312	0	0	0	4,312	0
<b>2010</b>	1,250	0	0	0	1,250	0
<b>Total Facility Improvements</b>	<b>17,062</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17,062</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
**(GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)**

**STREET PAVING**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	PV001	Parkway Paving	350	0	50	0	400	0
2007			720	0	50	0	770	0
2008			500	0	50	0	550	0
2009			675	0	50	0	725	0
2010			1,200	0	50	0	1,250	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>3,445</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,695</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV003	Street Renovation Program	1,735	0	281	0	2,016	0
2007			1,041	0	311	0	1,352	0
2008			1,492	0	281	0	1,773	0
2009		(See Sewer section for Storm	2,410	0	378	0	2,788	0
2010		Sewer related work.)	3,523	0	773	0	4,296	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>10,201</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,024</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,225</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV004	CSAH Paving Program	250	0	750	0	1,000	3,000
2007		(County State Aid Highway)	250	0	750	0	1,000	3,000
2008			250	0	750	0	1,000	3,000
2009			250	0	750	0	1,000	3,000
2010			250	0	750	0	1,000	3,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>
2006	PV005	Snelling Ave Extension	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			599	0	0	0	599	0
2008			460	0	513	0	973	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,059</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,572</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV006	Alley Renovation	234	0	79	0	313	0
2007			200	0	67	0	267	0
2008			200	0	67	0	267	0
2009			374	0	126	0	500	0
2010			374	0	126	0	500	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,382</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,847</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV007	University Research Park	183	0	56	2,287	2,526	0
2007		Previously SEMI (South East	26	2,019	1,541	472	4,058	0
2008		Minneapolis Industrial)	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009		(See Sewer section for Storm	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010		Sewer related work.)	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>209</b>	<b>2,019</b>	<b>1,597</b>	<b>2,759</b>	<b>6,584</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV008	I-35W & Lake St Interchange	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007		Reconstruction	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	2,100	0	0	2,100	0
2010			0	553	0	0	553	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>2,653</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,653</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
**(GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)**

**STREET PAVING**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	PV009	I-35W Crosstown Interchange Reconstruction	17	468	0	0	485	0
2007			17	468	0	0	485	0
2008			17	468	0	0	485	0
2009			17	301	0	0	318	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>68</b>	<b>1,705</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,773</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV015	27th Ave S (See Sewer section for Storm Sewer related work.)	2199	4277	788	0	7264	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>2,199</b>	<b>4,277</b>	<b>788</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,264</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV019	6th Ave N	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			290	1,269	229	0	1,788	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>290</b>	<b>1,269</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,788</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV020	Loring Greenway	1,103	0	400	0	1,503	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,103</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,503</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV021	33rd Ave SE and Talmage Ave	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV022	Lyndale Ave N (Plymouth - Broadway)  (See Sewer section for Storm Sewer related work.)	1,032	1,770	302	0	3,104	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,032</b>	<b>1,770</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,104</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV023	28th Ave S	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			771	3,918	840	0	5,529	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>771</b>	<b>3,918</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,529</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**STREET PAVING**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	PV026	Cedar Lake Road	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
2006	PV027	Hennepin/Lyndale West	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			461	0	345	2,318	3,124	3,124
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>461</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>2,318</b>	<b>3,124</b>	
2006	PV028	E 22nd and Snelling	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
2006	PV029	Chicago Ave S (E 14th St to E 28th St)	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			1,562	4,285	431	0	6,278	0
2009			(See Sewer section for Storm Sewer related work.)	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,562</b>	<b>4,285</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,278</b>	
2006	PV031	27th Ave NE (RR Crossing)	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			7	24	0	157	188	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>188</b>	
2006	PV032	Lasalle Ave S	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			(See Sewer section for Storm Sewer related work.)	0	0	0	0	0
2010			1,580	4,410	488	0	6,478	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,580</b>	<b>4,410</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,478</b>	
2006	PV034	Elliot & 10th Ave S Cul-de-sacs	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**STREET PAVING**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	PV035	TH121/Lyndale Ave S	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV036	Mid-City Industrial	1,593	0	1,810	0	3,403	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,593</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,810</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,403</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV037	Miscellaneous I-35W Frontage Roads	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV038	Winter St NE	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV00R	Reimbursable Paving Projects	0	0	0	3,500	3,500	0
2007			0	0	0	3,500	3,500	0
2008			0	0	0	3,500	3,500	0
2009			0	0	0	3,500	3,500	0
2010			0	0	0	3,500	3,500	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17,500</b>	<b>17,500</b>	<b>0</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	8,696	6,515	4,516	5,787	25,514	3,000
<b>2007</b>	3,631	6,429	3,559	4,129	17,748	3,000
<b>2008</b>	4,481	4,753	2,092	3,500	14,826	3,000
<b>2009</b>	4,477	3,670	1,878	5,818	15,843	6,124
<b>2010</b>	6,927	4,963	2,187	3,500	17,577	3,000
<b>Total Street Paving</b>	<b>28,212</b>	<b>26,330</b>	<b>14,232</b>	<b>22,734</b>	<b>91,508</b>	<b>18,124</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**SIDEWALK PROGRAM**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	SWK01	Defective Hazardous Sidewalks	160	0	2,040	0	2,200	0
2007			170	0	2,155	0	2,325	0
2008			180	0	2,260	0	2,440	0
2009			185	0	2,375	0	2,560	0
2010			195	0	2,495	0	2,690	0
<b>Total</b>				<b>890</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11,325</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,215</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	160	0	2,040	0	2,200	0
2007	170	0	2,155	0	2,325	0
2008	180	0	2,260	0	2,440	0
2009	185	0	2,375	0	2,560	0
2010	195	0	2,495	0	2,690	0
<b>Total Sidewalk Program</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11,325</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,215</b>	<b>0</b>

**HERITAGE PARK INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project (See also Water & Sewer sections for contributions to this project for 2006 - 2007)	2,000	0	2,147	0	4,147	14,100
2007			750	0	2,000	0	2,750	9,000
2008			1,250	0	0	0	1,250	1,500
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>				<b>4,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,147</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8,147</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	2,000	0	2,147	0	4,147	14,100
2007	750	0	2,000	0	2,750	9,000
2008	1,250	0	0	0	1,250	1,500
2009	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Heritage Park Redevelopment</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,147</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8,147</b>	<b>24,600</b>

Note: Non Appropriated amounts will be appropriated as other funding agreements are finalized.

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**BRIDGES**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	BR101	Major Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation	200	0	0	0	200	0
2007			200	0	0	0	200	0
2008			200	0	0	0	200	0
2009			200	0	0	0	200	0
2010			200	0	0	0	200	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BR102	East River Parkway Bridge "Other" = State Bridge Bonds	1,145	0	0	826	1,971	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,145</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>1,971</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BR105	Fremont Ave S Bridge	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BR109	Camden Bridge Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			213	1,617	0	4,269	6,099	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>213</b>	<b>1,617</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,269</b>	<b>6,099</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BR111	10th Ave SE Bridge Arch Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			178	1,031	0	4,056	5,265	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>178</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,056</b>	<b>5,265</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BR112	Nicollet Ave Bridge from Lake St to 29th St	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BR114	29th St Corridor Bridge Rehab Program	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			500	0	0	0	500	0
2010			500	0	0	0	500	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>0</b>

# PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

(GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

## BRIDGES

### CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	BR116	Bikeway/Bike Bridge 94246 Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			1,543	0	0	4,865	6,408	0
<b>Total</b>					<b>1,543</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,865</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	1,345	0	0	826	2,171	0
<b>2007</b>	200	0	0	0	200	0
<b>2008</b>	413	1,617	0	4,269	6,299	0
<b>2009</b>	878	1,031	0	4,056	5,965	0
<b>2010</b>	2,243	0	0	4,865	7,108	0
<b>Total Bridges</b>	<b>5,079</b>	<b>2,648</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14,016</b>	<b>21,743</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**TRAFFIC CONTROL & STREET LIGHTING**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	TR001	New Traffic Signals	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR003	LED Replacement Program	200	0	0	0	200	0
2007			300	0	0	0	300	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			475	0	0	0	475	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>975</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR004	Computerized Traffic Control Communication	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			6	130	0	0	136	0
2010			1	12	0	0	13	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>7</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR005	Controller Conversion	300	0	0	0	300	0
2007			400	0	0	0	400	0
2008			400	0	0	0	400	0
2009			500	0	0	0	500	0
2010			400	0	0	0	400	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>2,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR006	Priority Vehicle Control System	25	400	0	0	425	0
2007			25	388	0	0	413	0
2008			25	400	0	0	425	0
2009			25	300	0	0	325	0
2010			25	400	0	0	425	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>125</b>	<b>1,888</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,013</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR007	Traffic & Pedestrian Safety Improvements	307	17	0	17	341	0
2007			351	50	0	135	536	0
2008			475	132	0	235	842	0
2009			406	44	0	99	549	0
2010			487	55	0	55	597	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>2,026</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>2,865</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR008	Parkway Street Light Replacement	345	0	0	0	345	0
2007			175	0	0	0	175	0
2008			300	0	0	0	300	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			150	0	0	0	150	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>970</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**TRAFFIC CONTROL & STREET LIGHTING**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	TR010	Traffic System Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR011	City Street Light Renovation	300	0	0	0	300	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			150	0	0	0	150	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>450</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR013	Railroad Crossing Safety Improvements	0	186	0	48	234	0
2007			0	511	0	272	783	0
2008			0	1,934	0	1,518	3,452	0
2009			575	0	0	340	915	0
2010			1,217	0	0	48	1,265	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,792</b>	<b>2,631</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,226</b>	<b>6,649</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR014	LRT TOD Improvements	0	0	100	300	400	0
2007			0	0	100	300	400	0
2008			0	0	100	300	400	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	TR00R	Reimbursable Transportation Projects	0	0	0	600	600	0
2007			0	0	0	600	600	0
2008			0	0	0	600	600	0
2009			0	0	0	600	600	0
2010			0	0	0	600	600	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>0</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	1,477	603	100	965	3,145	0
<b>2007</b>	1,251	949	100	1,307	3,607	0
<b>2008</b>	1,200	2,466	100	2,653	6,419	0
<b>2009</b>	1,987	474	0	1,039	3,500	0
<b>2010</b>	2,430	467	0	703	3,600	0
<b>Total Traffic Control &amp; Street Lighting</b>	<b>8,345</b>	<b>4,959</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>6,667</b>	<b>20,271</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**BIKE TRAILS**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	BIK01	Cedar Lake Trail (Phase 3)	583	0	0	0	583	0
2007			582	0	0	4,200	4,782	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,165</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,200</b>	<b>5,365</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BIK04	18th Ave NE Bikeway	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			50	0	0	0	50	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			400	0	0	3,500	3,900	0
2010			100	0	0	0	100	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>550</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>4,050</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BIK08	Hiawatha Trail Connections	223	0	0	264	487	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>223</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BIK13	RiverLake Greenway (East of I-35W)	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008		Other = \$300 NRP, \$600 Fed	50	0	0	900	950	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			50	0	0	0	50	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BIK14	Midtown Greenway Bridge over the Mississippi River	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			50	0	0	1,900	1,950	0
2009			150	0	0	0	150	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,900</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BIK17	Upper River Trails - Phase 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	4,500	4,500	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			200	0	0	0	200	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>4,700</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM**  
 (GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE)

**BIKE TRAILS**  
**CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	BIK18	Hennepin/1st Ave NE Bike	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007		Lanes	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			100	0	0	0	100	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	806	0	0	264	1,070	0
<b>2007</b>	632	0	0	8,700	9,332	0
<b>2008</b>	100	0	0	2,800	2,900	0
<b>2009</b>	550	0	0	3,500	4,050	0
<b>2010</b>	450	0	0	0	450	0
<b>Total Bike Trails</b>	<b>2,538</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15,264</b>	<b>17,802</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING SUMMARY  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

<b>FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR</b>	<b>NDB</b>	<b>MSA</b>	<b>ASSM</b>	<b>OTHER/ TRANSFERS</b>	<b>CITY TOTAL</b>	<b>NON APPROP</b>
<b>2006</b>	15,984	7,118	8,803	7,842	39,747	17,100
<b>2007</b>	12,134	7,378	7,814	14,136	41,462	12,000
<b>2008</b>	12,124	8,836	4,452	13,222	38,634	4,500
<b>2009</b>	12,389	5,175	4,253	14,413	36,230	6,124
<b>2010</b>	13,495	5,430	4,682	9,068	32,675	3,000
<b>Total PW General Infrastructure</b>	<b>66,126</b>	<b>33,937</b>	<b>30,004</b>	<b>58,681</b>	<b>188,748</b>	<b>42,724</b>

**SEWER FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	SEWER BONDS	SEWER REVENUE	REIMB	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	SW001	Storm & Sanitary Tunnel and Sewer Rehabilitation	2,500	0	0	2,500	0
2007			2,500	0	0	2,500	0
2008			2,500	300	0	2,800	0
2009			3,500	500	0	4,000	0
2010			2,500	0	0	2,500	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>13,500</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14,300</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	SW002	Miscellaneous Storm Drains	0	220	0	220	0
2007			0	220	0	220	0
2008			0	220	0	220	0
2009			0	220	0	220	0
2010			0	220	0	220	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	SW004	Implementation of US EPA Storm Water Regulations	0	150	0	150	0
2007			0	150	0	150	0
2008			0	150	0	150	0
2009			0	150	0	150	0
2010			0	150	0	150	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	SW005	Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
2007			2,000	0	0	2,000	0
2008			2,000	0	0	2,000	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>4,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	SW008	City Facilities - CSO Separation	0	400	0	400	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	SW028	Diamond Lake 35W/62 Water Quality Improvements	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	SW030	Alternative Storm Water Management Strategies	0	300	0	300	0
2007			0	400	0	400	0
2008			0	500	0	500	0
2009			0	600	0	600	0
2010			0	700	0	700	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>0</b>

**SEWER FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	SEWER BONDS	SEWER REVENUE	REIMB	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	SW031	Lake Hiawatha / Blue Water Partnership	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	SW032	I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconstruction	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			7,938	0	0	7,938	0
2009			7,938	0	0	7,938	0
2010			3,175	0	0	3,175	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>19,051</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19,051</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	SW00R	Reimbursable Sewer and Storm Drain Projects	0	0	3,000	3,000	0
2007			0	0	3,000	3,000	0
2008			0	0	3,000	3,000	0
2009			0	0	3,000	3,000	0
2010			0	0	3,000	3,000	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	BR112	Nicollet Ave Bridge from Lake St to 29th St	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project - new infrastructure contribution	0	250	0	250	0
2007			0	250	0	250	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV003	Street Renovation Program	0	115	0	115	0
2007			0	115	0	115	0
2008			0	115	0	115	0
2009			0	115	0	115	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV007	University Research Park	0	495	0	495	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008		Name changed from:	0	0	0	0	0
2009		SEMI (Southeast Minneapolis Industrial)	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>0</b>

**SEWER FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	SEWER BONDS	SEWER REVENUE	REIMB	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	PV015	27th Ave S	0	666	0	666	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV022	Lyndale Ave N (Plymouth - Broadway)	0	249	0	249	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV029	Chicago Ave S (E 14th St to E 28th St)	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	95	0	95	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PV032	LaSalle Ave S	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	424	0	424	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>0</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	SEWER BONDS	SEWER REVENUE	REIMB	TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	2,500	2,845	3,000	8,345	0
<b>2007</b>	4,500	1,135	3,000	8,635	0
<b>2008</b>	12,438	1,380	3,000	16,818	0
<b>2009</b>	11,438	1,585	3,000	16,023	0
<b>2010</b>	5,675	1,494	3,000	10,169	0
<b>Total Sewer Fund</b>	<b>36,551</b>	<b>8,439</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>59,990</b>	<b>0</b>

**WATER FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	WATER BONDS	WATER REVENUE	OTHER/ REIMB	TOTAL
2006	WTR02	New 40 Million Gallon Southwest Reservoir/Pump Station	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	WTR09	Ultrafiltration Program	13,500	1,500	0	15,000
2007			9,500	0	0	9,500
2008			27,700	0	0	27,700
2009			31,500	0	0	31,500
2010			1,300	0	0	1,300
<b>Total</b>			<b>83,500</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85,000</b>
2006	WTR12	Water Distribution Improvements	0	4,500	0	4,500
2007			500	4,500	0	5,000
2008			1,000	4,500	0	5,500
2009			1,000	5,000	0	6,000
2010			1,500	5,000	0	6,500
<b>Total</b>			<b>4,000</b>	<b>23,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27,500</b>
2006	WTR14	The MWW Facilities Security Improvement	2,000	0	0	2,000
2007			3,000	0	0	3,000
2008			0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>5,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,000</b>
2006	WTR15	Pump Station No. 4 Rehabilitation	6,000	0	0	6,000
2007			5,000	0	0	5,000
2008			4,000	0	0	4,000
2009			0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>15,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15,000</b>
2006	WTR16	Minneapolis/St. Paul Inter-connection Other = Minneapolis share of State Grants applied for by the State Health Department to help fund.	750	0	750	1,500
2007			1,750	0	1,750	3,500
2008			1,500	0	1,500	3,000
2009			750	0	1,500	2,250
2010			8,750	0	0	8,750
<b>Total</b>			<b>13,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,500</b>	<b>19,000</b>
2006	WTR17	Treatment Modifications Based on New Regulations	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0
2010			0	1,000	0	1,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>

**WATER FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	WATER BONDS	WATER REVENUE	OTHER/ REIMB	TOTAL
2006	WTR0R	Reimbursable Water Projects	0	0	2,000	2,000
2007			0	0	2,000	2,000
2008			0	0	2,000	2,000
2009			0	0	2,000	2,000
2010			0	0	2,000	2,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>
2006	CDA01	Heritage Park Redevelopment Project - new infrastructure contribution	0	250	0	250
2007			0	250	0	250
2008			0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	WATER BONDS	WATER REVENUE	REIMB	TOTAL
<b>2006</b>	22,250	6,250	2,750	31,250
<b>2007</b>	19,750	4,750	3,750	28,250
<b>2008</b>	34,200	4,500	3,500	42,200
<b>2009</b>	33,250	5,000	3,500	41,750
<b>2010</b>	11,550	6,000	2,000	19,550
<b>Total Water Fund</b>	<b>121,000</b>	<b>26,500</b>	<b>15,500</b>	<b>163,000</b>

# PARKING FUND FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

## CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	PARKING BONDS	PARKING REVENUE	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	RMP01	Parking Facilities - Repair and Improvements	1,700	0	1,700	0
2007			1,700	0	1,700	0
2008			1,700	0	1,700	0
2009			1,700	0	1,700	0
2010			1,700	0	1,700	0
<b>Total</b>					<b>8,500</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	RMP03	Bicycle Parking	0	35	35	0
2007			0	40	40	0
2008			0	35	35	0
2009			0	40	40	0
2010			0	40	40	0
<b>Total</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>190</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	PARKING BONDS	PARKING REVENUE	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	1,700	35	1,735	0
2007	1,700	40	1,740	0
2008	1,700	35	1,735	0
2009	1,700	40	1,740	0
2010	1,700	40	1,740	0
<b>Total Parking Fund</b>	<b>8,500</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>8,690</b>	<b>0</b>

# PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FIVE YEAR CAPITAL FUNDING SUMMARY CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET

GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR				NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006				15,984	7,118	8,803	7,842	39,747	17,100
2007				12,134	7,378	7,814	14,136	41,462	12,000
2008				12,124	8,836	4,452	13,222	38,634	4,500
2009				12,389	5,175	4,253	14,413	36,230	6,124
2010				13,495	5,430	4,682	9,068	32,675	3,000
<b>Total Public Works General Infrastructure Improvements</b>				<b>66,126</b>	<b>33,937</b>	<b>30,004</b>	<b>58,681</b>	<b>188,748</b>	<b>42,724</b>

ENTERPRISE FUND CAPITAL* FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	ENTERPRISE BONDS	ENTERPRISE REVENUES	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ REIMB	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	26,450	9,130				5,750	41,330	0
2007	25,950	5,925				6,750	38,625	0
2008	48,338	5,915				6,500	60,753	0
2009	46,388	6,625				6,500	59,513	0
2010	18,925	7,534				5,000	31,459	0
<b>Total Public Works Enterprise Fund Capital</b>	<b>166,051</b>	<b>35,129</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30,500</b>	<b>231,680</b>	<b>0</b>

\* - Enterprise funds include Sewer, Water and Parking.

CONSOLIDATED PUBLIC WORKS FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	ENTERPRISE BONDS	ENTERPRISE REVENUES	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ REIMB	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	26,450	9,130	15,984	7,118	8,803	13,592	81,077	17,100
2007	25,950	5,925	12,134	7,378	7,814	20,886	80,087	12,000
2008	48,338	5,915	12,124	8,836	4,452	19,722	99,387	4,500
2009	46,388	6,625	12,389	5,175	4,253	20,913	95,743	6,124
2010	18,925	7,534	13,495	5,430	4,682	14,068	64,134	3,000
<b>Total Public Works Department Projects</b>	<b>166,051</b>	<b>35,129</b>	<b>66,126</b>	<b>33,937</b>	<b>30,004</b>	<b>89,181</b>	<b>420,428</b>	<b>42,724</b>

<b>Funding Breakdown by Major Revenue Source (City Funded Portion Only)</b>	<b>39.50%</b>	<b>8.36%</b>	<b>15.73%</b>	<b>8.07%</b>	<b>7.14%</b>	<b>21.21%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

## CLIC RECOMMENDED Water and Sewer Utility Rate Structure

Water & Sewer Utility Rates were held to the same combined rate increase percentages as adopted by the City Council in December 2004.

Rate increases recommended accomplish the desired goal of three months of Operating cash reserves by 2010.

Rate increases for 2006 - 2010 reflect inflationary increases in Operating costs of approximately 3% per year.

These rates will fund all CLIC Recommended Water & Sewer Operating Costs, Capital Plans and associated Debt Service requirements.  
Stormwater Rates fund Park Board related storm sewer maintenance and construction work to be performed by the Public Works Department.  
Stormwater Rates fully fund the Street Sweeping Program.

### Water Rates Expressed in \$/100 Cubic Feet

Effective Date	Increase	Total Rate	% Change
01/01/00	0.12	1.65	7.8%
01/01/01	0.16	1.81	9.7%
01/01/02	0.18	1.99	9.9%
01/01/03	0.22	2.21	11.1%
01/01/04	0.17	2.38	7.7%
01/01/05	0.12	2.50	5.0%
01/01/06	0.12	2.62	4.8%
01/01/07	0.05	2.67	1.9%
01/01/08	0.08	2.75	3.0%
01/01/09	0.10	2.85	3.6%
01/01/10	0.12	2.97	4.2%

### Sewer Rates - Prior to 2005 Expressed in \$/100 Cubic Feet

Effective Date	Increase	Total Rate	% Change
01/01/00	0.20	2.87	7.5%
01/01/01	0.17	3.04	5.9%
01/01/02	0.12	3.16	3.9%
01/01/03	0.13	3.29	4.1%
01/01/04	0.14	3.43	4.3%

### Combined Rate Impacts - Prior to 2005 Expressed in \$/100 Cubic Feet

Effective Date	Increase	Total Rate	% Change
01/01/00	0.32	4.52	7.6%
01/01/01	0.33	4.85	7.3%
01/01/02	0.30	5.15	6.2%
01/01/03	0.35	5.50	6.8%
01/01/04	0.31	5.81	5.6%

Note: Starting in 2005, Sewer rates have been broken into two components. One component is for the costs involved with running and maintaining the Sanitary Sewer Systems and the other component is for the costs involved in managing and maintaining Stormwater Systems.

### Sanitary Sewer System Rates Expressed in \$/100 Cubic Feet

Effective Date	Increase	Total Rate	% Change
01/01/05	Base Year	2.00	
01/01/06	0.10	2.10	5.2%
01/01/07	0.09	2.20	4.4%
01/01/08	0.08	2.27	3.5%
01/01/09	0.08	2.35	3.4%
01/01/10	0.07	2.42	3.0%

### Stormwater System Rates Expressed in \$/Equivalent Stormwater Unit (ESU)

Effective Date	Increase	Total Rate	% Change
01/01/05	Base Year	8.72	
01/01/06	0.45	9.17	5.2%
01/01/07	0.40	9.58	4.4%
01/01/08	0.34	9.91	3.5%
01/01/09	0.34	10.25	3.4%
01/01/10	0.31	10.56	3.0%

1 ESU = 1,530 square feet of impervious (hard surface) area on a property.

**For more details - See Water & Sewer Funds Cash Basis Pro Formas**

## Water Fund Cash Basis Pro Forma - CLIC Recommended

	Actual 2004	Budget 2005	Plan 2006	Plan 2007	Plan 2008	Plan 2009	Plan 2010
<b>Operating Revenues:</b>							
Utility Charges Mpls	46,338,566	50,833,275	53,273,272	54,289,938	55,916,602	57,949,933	60,389,931
Utility Charges Suburb	7,393,763	9,562,005	10,103,772	10,338,843	10,662,681	11,020,803	11,450,550
All other operating revenue	3,930,590	5,077,773	4,200,106	4,326,110	4,455,893	4,589,570	4,727,257
Adjusted for revised revenue estimate	-	(1,000,000)					
<b>Total Operating Revenues</b>	<b>57,662,919</b>	<b>64,473,053</b>	<b>67,577,150</b>	<b>68,954,890</b>	<b>71,035,176</b>	<b>73,560,307</b>	<b>76,567,738</b>
<b>Operating Expenses:</b>							
Security Personnel	1,138,129	1,149,816	1,257,954	1,295,693	1,334,563	1,374,600	1,415,838
Water Design	794,184	1,098,114	1,131,080	1,165,012	1,199,963	1,235,962	1,273,041
General Fund Overhead	1,339,447	2,292,130	1,730,429	1,782,342	1,835,812	1,890,886	1,947,613
General Fund Overhead-Utility Billing	245,851	1,677,522	1,999,458	2,059,442	2,121,225	2,184,862	2,250,408
Government Service Fee	1,495,000	1,651,883	2,072,122	2,134,286	2,198,314	2,264,264	2,332,192
Administration & Permits	813,989	1,283,764	1,124,850	1,158,596	1,193,353	1,229,154	1,266,029
Treatment - Operations	11,956,169	14,342,302	14,423,342	14,856,042	15,301,724	15,760,775	16,233,598
Treatment - Maintenance	6,391,285	7,407,604	6,714,430	6,915,863	7,123,339	7,337,039	7,557,150
Distribution	7,708,540	7,644,143	8,166,055	8,411,037	8,663,368	8,923,269	9,190,967
Major Repairs & Replacement	7,024,416	6,973,945	6,722,141	6,923,805	7,131,519	7,345,465	7,565,829
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>38,907,010</b>	<b>45,521,223</b>	<b>45,341,861</b>	<b>46,702,117</b>	<b>48,103,180</b>	<b>49,546,276</b>	<b>51,032,664</b>
<b>Operating Margin</b>	<b>18,755,909</b>	<b>18,951,830</b>	<b>22,235,289</b>	<b>22,252,773</b>	<b>22,931,996</b>	<b>24,014,031</b>	<b>25,535,074</b>
<b>Non-Operating Revenues/(Expenses)</b>							
Capital Related							
Bond Proceeds	31,752,441	16,000,000	22,250,000	19,750,000	34,200,000	33,250,000	11,550,000
Reimbursed Capital Revenue	1,120,242	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Grant Proceeds	-	-	750,000	1,750,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	-
<b>Total Capital Related Revenue (Expenses)</b>	<b>32,872,683</b>	<b>18,000,000</b>	<b>25,000,000</b>	<b>23,500,000</b>	<b>37,700,000</b>	<b>36,750,000</b>	<b>13,550,000</b>
Non-Capital Related							
Transfers from Other Funds	198,562	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transfers to Other Funds/MERF Debt Service	(3,619,261)	(583,603)	(274,517)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)
<b>Total Non-Capital Related Revenue (Expenses)</b>	<b>(3,420,699)</b>	<b>(583,603)</b>	<b>(274,517)</b>	<b>(500,000)</b>	<b>(500,000)</b>	<b>(500,000)</b>	<b>(500,000)</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>48,207,892</b>	<b>36,368,227</b>	<b>46,960,772</b>	<b>45,252,773</b>	<b>60,131,996</b>	<b>60,264,031</b>	<b>38,585,074</b>
<b>WATER - CAPITAL PROGRAM</b>							
Pay As You Go Capital - Reimbursed/Assessed	(772,602)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
Capital Expenditures - Bonds	(31,752,441)	(16,000,000)	(22,250,000)	(19,750,000)	(34,200,000)	(33,250,000)	(11,550,000)
Capital Expenditures - Water Revenue	(2,340,000)	(2,891,000)	(6,250,000)	(4,750,000)	(4,500,000)	(5,000,000)	(6,000,000)
Capital Expenditures- Interconnect (grant)	-	-	(750,000)	(1,750,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	-
Carry-Over Pay As You Go Capital Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Capital ( Expenditures)</b>	<b>(34,865,043)</b>	<b>(20,891,000)</b>	<b>(31,250,000)</b>	<b>(28,250,000)</b>	<b>(42,200,000)</b>	<b>(41,750,000)</b>	<b>(19,550,000)</b>
<b>WATER - DEBT SERVICE PLANS</b>							
Debt Service Payments - Currently Structured Debt	(14,739,758)	(15,013,906)	(12,763,094)	(10,657,297)	(9,159,822)	(7,097,601)	(7,129,824)
Debt Service-Future Bond Funded Capital Program	-	-	(2,201,317)	(4,401,470)	(7,019,825)	(9,298,446)	(10,421,410)
<b>Total Debt Service</b>	<b>(14,739,758)</b>	<b>(15,013,906)</b>	<b>(14,964,411)</b>	<b>(15,058,767)</b>	<b>(16,179,646)</b>	<b>(16,396,048)</b>	<b>(17,551,234)</b>
<b>Net Income (loss) after Debt &amp; Capital Expenditures</b>	<b>(1,396,909)</b>	<b>463,322</b>	<b>746,362</b>	<b>1,944,006</b>	<b>1,752,350</b>	<b>2,117,983</b>	<b>1,483,840</b>
<b>Cash</b>							
Beginning Balance	14,472,923	6,786,447	7,249,768	7,996,130	9,940,136	11,692,486	13,810,469
Reconciling Adjustment - Collections/Timing/CAFR	<u>9,808,821</u>	<u>463,322</u>	<u>746,362</u>	<u>1,944,006</u>	<u>1,752,350</u>	<u>2,117,983</u>	<u>1,483,840</u>
Ending Balance	6,786,447	7,249,768	7,996,130	9,940,136	11,692,486	13,810,469	15,294,309

# Sanitary Sewer Fund Cash Basis Pro Forma - CLIC Recommended

	Budget 2005	Budget 2006	Plan 2007	Plan 2008	Plan 2009	Plan 2010
<b>Operating Revenues</b>						
Utility Charges	34,247,202	36,028,057	37,613,291	38,929,756	40,253,368	41,460,969
Sewer Availability Charges	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Design & Misc. Revenue	358,300	364,141	376,886	390,077	403,730	417,860
Total Operating Revenues	36,105,502	37,892,198	39,490,177	40,819,833	42,157,098	43,378,829
<b>Operating Expenditures:</b>						
Sewer Design	393,525	384,422	395,955	407,833	420,068	432,670
Sewer Maintenance	6,387,818	5,743,691	5,916,002	6,093,482	6,276,286	6,464,575
Metropolitan Council Environmental Services	25,479,548	27,073,853	27,939,482	28,831,079	29,749,424	30,695,320
General Fund Overhead	2,332,625	1,045,499	1,076,864	1,109,170	1,142,445	1,176,718
General Fund Overhead - Utility Billing	989,738	1,179,680	1,215,071	1,251,523	1,289,068	1,327,740
Government Service Fee	1,672,133	990,193	1,019,899	1,050,496	1,082,011	1,114,471
Budget vs Actual Spending Adjustment (2%)						
Total Operating Expenses	37,255,387	36,417,338	37,563,271	38,743,582	39,959,303	41,211,495
<b>Non-Operating Revenues/(Expenses)</b>						
Non-Capital Related						
Transfers to Other Funds/MERF Debt Svc.	(203,236)	(82,710)	(112,000)	(112,000)	(112,000)	(112,000)
Total Non-Capital Related Revenues/Expenses	(203,236)	(82,710)	(112,000)	(112,000)	(112,000)	(112,000)
<b>Net Income</b>	(1,353,121)	1,392,150	1,814,906	1,964,251	2,085,795	2,055,334
<b>SEWER CAPITAL PROGRAM</b>						
Capital Expenditures-Sewer Revenue		(682,500)	(682,500)	(757,500)	(1,057,500)	(625,000)
Total Capital Expenditures	-	(682,500)	(682,500)	(757,500)	(1,057,500)	(625,000)
Net Income (Loss) after Debt & Capital Expenditures	(1,353,121)	709,650	1,132,406	1,206,751	1,028,295	1,430,334
<b>Cash</b>						
Beginning Balance	8,562,863	7,209,742	7,919,392	9,051,797	10,258,548	11,286,843
Net Increase/(Decrease)	(1,353,121)	709,650	1,132,406	1,206,751	1,028,295	1,430,334
Ending Balance	7,209,742	7,919,392	9,051,797	10,258,548	11,286,843	12,717,177

## Stormwater Fund Cash Basis Pro Forma - CLIC Recommended

	Budget 2005	Budget 2006	Plan 2007	Plan 2008	Plan 2009	Plan 2010
<b>Operating Revenues</b>						
Utility Charges	30,000,000	30,508,000	31,850,352	32,965,114	34,085,928	35,108,506
Less Credits	(1,000,000)		-	-	-	-
State/Cty/Other Maintenance Agreement	1,086,666	964,455	964,455	964,455	964,455	964,455
Design & Misc. Revenue	1,192,368	884,368	930,355	978,734	1,029,628	1,083,168
<b>Total Operating Revenues</b>	<b>31,279,034</b>	<b>32,356,823</b>	<b>33,745,162</b>	<b>34,908,303</b>	<b>36,080,011</b>	<b>37,156,129</b>
<b>Operating Expenses:</b>						
Sewer Design	2,379,961	2,526,533	2,602,329	2,680,399	2,760,811	2,843,635
Sewer Maintenance	2,244,367	2,771,036	2,854,167	2,939,792	3,027,986	3,118,825
Metropolitan Council Environmental Services	1,421,054	1,780,434	1,780,434	1,780,434	1,780,434	1,780,434
General Fund Overhead	733,137	278,426	286,779	295,382	304,244	313,371
General Fund Overhead - Utility Billing	687,784	819,778	844,371	869,702	895,793	922,667
Combined Sewer Overflow	2,066,175	2,284,675	2,353,215	2,423,812	2,496,526	2,571,422
Street Cleaning	6,556,393	6,124,354	6,308,085	6,497,327	6,692,247	6,893,014
Government Service Fee	1,364,519	1,973,571	2,032,778	2,093,761	2,156,574	2,221,272
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>17,453,390</b>	<b>18,558,807</b>	<b>19,062,158</b>	<b>19,580,610</b>	<b>20,114,615</b>	<b>20,664,641</b>
<b>Non-Operating Revenues/(Expenses)</b>						
Capital Related						
Bond Proceeds		2,500,000	4,500,000	12,438,000	11,438,000	5,675,000
Reimbursed Capital Revenue	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
<b>Total Capital Related Revenues/Expenses</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>5,500,000</b>	<b>7,500,000</b>	<b>15,438,000</b>	<b>14,438,000</b>	<b>8,675,000</b>
Non-Capital Related						
Special Assessment	115,000	115,000	125,103	130,482	136,093	141,945
Transfers to Other Funds/MERF Debt Svc.	(138,590)	(64,986)	(88,000)	(88,000)	(88,000)	(88,000)
<b>Total Non-Capital Related Revenues/Expenses</b>	<b>(23,590)</b>	<b>50,014</b>	<b>37,103</b>	<b>42,482</b>	<b>48,093</b>	<b>53,945</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>16,802,054</b>	<b>19,348,030</b>	<b>22,220,107</b>	<b>30,808,175</b>	<b>30,451,489</b>	<b>25,220,434</b>
<b>SEWER CAPITAL PROGRAM</b>						
Capital Expenditures-Bonds Funded.		(2,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(12,438,000)	(11,438,000)	(5,675,000)
Pay As You Go Capital-Reimbursed	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
Capital Expenditures-Sewer Revenue	(995,000)	(2,162,500)	(452,500)	(622,500)	(527,500)	(869,000)
<b>Total Capital Expenditures</b>	<b>(3,995,000)</b>	<b>(7,662,500)</b>	<b>(7,952,500)</b>	<b>(16,060,500)</b>	<b>(14,965,500)</b>	<b>(9,544,000)</b>
<b>SEWER - DEBT SERVICE PLANS</b>						
Debt Service Payments - Currently Structured	(12,030,134)	(10,750,057)	(9,015,138)	(10,195,048)	(4,410,037)	(2,201,052)
Debt Service-Future Bond Funded Capital	-	(432,050)	(1,209,739)	(3,359,272)	(5,335,985)	(6,316,737)
<b>Total Debt Service</b>	<b>(12,030,134)</b>	<b>(11,182,107)</b>	<b>(10,224,877)</b>	<b>(13,554,320)</b>	<b>(9,746,022)</b>	<b>(8,517,789)</b>
<b>Net Income (Loss) after Debt &amp; Capital Expenditures:</b>	<b>776,920</b>	<b>503,423</b>	<b>4,042,730</b>	<b>1,193,355</b>	<b>5,739,967</b>	<b>7,158,645</b>

<b>Cash</b>						
Beginning Balance	5,839,181	6,616,101	7,119,524	11,162,254	12,355,609	18,095,576
Net Increase/(Decrease)	776,920	503,423	4,042,730	1,193,355	5,739,967	7,158,645
<b>Ending Balance</b>	<b>6,616,101</b>	<b>7,119,524</b>	<b>11,162,254</b>	<b>12,355,609</b>	<b>18,095,576</b>	<b>25,254,221</b>

# Combined Sewer Fund Cash Basis Pro Formas - CLIC Recommended

	Actual 2004	Budget 2005	Plan 2006	Plan 2007	Plan 2008	Plan 2009	Plan 2010
<b>Operating Revenues:</b>							
Utility Charges	58,330,313	64,247,202	66,536,057	69,463,643	71,894,870	74,339,296	76,569,475
Less Credits		(1,000,000)					
Sewer Availability Charges	2,563,875	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
State/Cty/Other Maintenance Agreement	1,045,409	1,086,666	964,455	964,455	964,455	964,455	964,455
Design & Misc. Revenue	<u>1,524,558</u>	<u>1,550,668</u>	<u>1,248,509</u>	<u>1,307,241</u>	<u>1,368,811</u>	<u>1,433,357</u>	<u>1,501,029</u>
Total Operating Revenues	63,464,155	67,384,536	70,249,021	73,235,339	75,728,136	78,237,108	80,534,959
<b>Operating Expenses:</b>							
Sewer Design	2,568,068	2,773,486	2,910,955	2,998,284	3,088,232	3,180,879	3,276,305
Sewer Maintenance	6,718,685	8,632,185	8,514,727	8,770,169	9,033,274	9,304,272	9,583,400
Metropolitan Council Environmental Services	27,332,957	26,900,602	28,854,287	29,719,916	30,611,513	31,529,858	32,475,754
General Fund Overhead	2,909,836	3,065,762	1,323,925	1,363,643	1,404,552	1,446,689	1,490,089
General Fund Overhead - Utility Billing	0	1,677,522	1,999,458	2,059,442	2,121,225	2,184,862	2,250,408
Combined Sewer Overflow	1,158,205	2,066,175	2,284,675	2,353,215	2,423,812	2,496,526	2,571,422
Street Cleaning	5,684,013	6,556,393	6,124,354	6,308,085	6,497,327	6,692,247	6,893,014
Government Service Fee	3,055,000	3,036,652	2,963,764	3,052,677	3,144,257	3,238,585	3,335,742
Total Operating Expenses	49,426,764	54,708,777	54,976,145	56,625,429	58,324,192	60,073,918	61,876,136
<b>Non-Operating Revenues/(Expenses)</b>							
<b>Capital Related</b>							
Bond Proceeds			2,500,000	4,500,000	12,438,000	11,438,000	5,675,000
Reimbursed Capital Revenue	-	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total Capital Related Revenues/Expenses	-	3,000,000	5,500,000	7,500,000	15,438,000	14,438,000	8,675,000
<b>Non-Capital Related</b>							
Special Assessment	119,243	115,000	119,945	125,103	130,482	136,093	141,945
Transfers to Other Funds/MERF Debt Svc.	(867,106)	(341,826)	(147,696)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)
Total Non-Capital Related Revenues/Expenses	(747,864)	(226,826)	(27,751)	(74,897)	(69,518)	(63,907)	(58,055)
<b>Net Income</b>	13,289,527	15,448,933	20,745,125	24,035,012	32,772,426	32,537,283	27,275,768
<b>SEWER CAPITAL PROGRAM</b>							
Capital Expenditures-Bonds Funded.			(2,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(12,438,000)	(11,438,000)	(5,675,000)
Pay As You Go Capital-Reimbursed	(2,525,445)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
Capital Expenditures-Sewer Revenue	(1,087,358)	(995,000)	(2,845,000)	(1,135,000)	(1,380,000)	(1,585,000)	(1,494,000)
Total Capital Expenditures	(3,612,803)	(3,995,000)	(8,345,000)	(8,635,000)	(16,818,000)	(16,023,000)	(10,169,000)
<b>SEWER - DEBT SERVICE PLANS</b>							
Debt Service Payments - Currently Structured	(11,512,343)	(12,030,134)	(10,750,057)	(9,015,138)	(10,195,048)	(4,410,037)	(2,201,052)
Debt Service-Future Bond Funded Capital	-	-	(432,050)	(1,209,739)	(3,359,272)	(5,335,985)	(6,316,737)
Total Debt Service	(11,512,343)	(12,030,134)	(11,182,107)	(10,224,877)	(13,554,320)	(9,746,022)	(8,517,789)
<b>Net Income (Loss) after Debt &amp; Capital Expenditures</b>	<u>(1,835,620)</u>	<u>(576,201)</u>	<u>1,218,018</u>	<u>5,175,136</u>	<u>2,400,106</u>	<u>6,768,262</u>	<u>8,588,979</u>
<b>Cash</b>							
Beginning Balance	7,835,663	14,402,043	13,825,842	15,043,860	20,218,996	22,619,102	29,387,364
Net Increase/(Decrease)	<u>(1,835,620)</u>	<u>(576,201)</u>	<u>1,218,018</u>	<u>5,175,136</u>	<u>2,400,106</u>	<u>6,768,262</u>	<u>8,588,979</u>
Ending Balance	14,402,043	13,825,842	15,043,860	20,218,996	22,619,102	29,387,364	37,976,343





**MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS IN THE FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

YEAR	PROJECT ID	PROJECT TITLE	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	MPD02	MPD Evidence Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PSD03	Facilities-Space Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2006	PSD04	Facilities - Security Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007			0	0	0	0	0	0
2008			0	0	0	0	0	0
2009			0	0	0	0	0	0
2010			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
<b>2006</b>	3,260	0	0	2,675	5,935	0
<b>2007</b>	3,520	0	0	3,525	7,045	0
<b>2008</b>	2,360	0	0	1,000	3,360	0
<b>2009</b>	2,460	0	0	0	2,460	0
<b>2010</b>	700	0	0	0	700	0
<b>Total Miscellaneous Projects</b>	<b>12,300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,200</b>	<b>19,500</b>	<b>0</b>

## FIVE YEAR CAPITAL FUNDING SUMMARY CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET

GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR		NDB & Park Levy	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ TRANSFERS	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006		23,934	7,118	9,303	11,987	52,342	18,325
2007		19,889	7,378	8,314	19,924	55,505	12,735
2008		18,684	8,836	4,952	14,582	47,054	5,200
2009		18,894	5,175	4,753	15,253	44,075	7,014
2010		19,095	5,430	5,182	9,068	38,775	4,000
<b>Total General Infrastructure Improvements</b>		<b>100,496</b>	<b>33,937</b>	<b>32,504</b>	<b>70,814</b>	<b>237,751</b>	<b>47,274</b>

ENTERPRISE FUND CAPITAL* FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	ENTERPRISE BONDS	ENTERPRISE REVENUES	NDB	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ REIMB	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	26,450	9,130				5,750	41,330	0
2007	25,950	5,925				6,750	38,625	0
2008	48,338	5,915				6,500	60,753	0
2009	46,388	6,625				6,500	59,513	0
2010	18,925	7,534				5,000	31,459	0
<b>Total Enterprise Fund Capital</b>	<b>166,051</b>	<b>35,129</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30,500</b>	<b>231,680</b>	<b>0</b>

\* - Enterprise funds include Sewer, Water and Parking.

CONSOLIDATED CITY-WIDE CAPITAL FUNDING SUMMARY BY YEAR	ENTERPRISE BONDS	ENTERPRISE REVENUES	NDB & Park Levy	MSA	ASSM	OTHER/ REIMB	CITY TOTAL	NON APPROP
2006	26,450	9,130	23,934	7,118	9,303	17,737	93,672	18,325
2007	25,950	5,925	19,889	7,378	8,314	26,674	94,130	12,735
2008	48,338	5,915	18,684	8,836	4,952	21,082	107,807	5,200
2009	46,388	6,625	18,894	5,175	4,753	21,753	103,588	7,014
2010	18,925	7,534	19,095	5,430	5,182	14,068	70,234	4,000
<b>Total City-Wide Capital - All Sources</b>	<b>166,051</b>	<b>35,129</b>	<b>100,496</b>	<b>33,937</b>	<b>32,504</b>	<b>101,314</b>	<b>469,431</b>	<b>47,274</b>

Funding Breakdown by Major Revenue Source (City Funded Portion Only)	35.37%	7.48%	21.41%	7.23%	6.92%	21.58%	100.00%
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	-------	--------	-------	-------	--------	---------

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS  
FIVE YEAR CAPITAL INVESTMENT ALLOCATION  
CLIC RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

<b>COMMISSION/BOARD/DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>2006-2010 TOTAL*</b>	<b>PERCENT OF TOTAL</b>
	(in thousands)	
MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION	4,590	1.0%
LIBRARY BOARD	12,933	2.8%
PARK BOARD	11,980	2.6%
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT		
- FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS	17,062	3.6%
- STREET PAVING	91,508	19.5%
- SIDEWALK PROGRAM	12,215	2.6%
- HERITAGE PARK INFRASTRUCTURE	8,147	1.7%
- BRIDGES	21,743	4.6%
- TRAFFIC CONTROL & STREET LIGHTING	20,271	4.3%
- BIKE TRAILS	17,802	3.8%
- SEWER	59,990	12.8%
- WATER	163,000	34.7%
- PARKING	8,690	1.9%
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT TOTAL	420,428	89.6%
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS	19,500	4.2%
<b>TOTAL CLIC RECOMMENDED CAPITAL PROGRAM</b>	<b>469,431</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* - Represents the total Five Year CLIC Recommended Budget from City funding sources only.

# CLIC

**Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee**

# 2005 Capital Guidelines

CITY GOALS

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

CLIC RATING FORM

# CITY GOALS

The Adopted Minneapolis City Goals and Expectations and the policies of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan will be used by the Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee (CLIC) in the evaluation of capital requests and in developing recommendations for the City's 2006-2010 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The eight City Goals are:

1. Build communities where all people feel safe and trust the City's public safety professionals and systems.
2. Maintain the physical infrastructure to ensure a healthy, vital and safe City.
3. Deliver consistently high quality City services at a good value to our taxpayers.
4. Create an environment that maximizes economic development opportunities within Minneapolis by focusing on the City's physical and human assets.
5. Foster the development and preservation of a mix of quality housing types that is available, affordable, meets current needs, and promotes future growth.
6. Preserve and enhance our natural and historic environment and promote a clean, sustainable Minneapolis.
7. Promote public, community and private partnerships to address disparities and to support strong, healthy families and communities.
8. Strengthen City government management and enhance community engagement.

For details about Minneapolis City Goals & Expectations, see hyperlink below. To activate link, hold down Ctrl key and click on the link.

<http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/council/goals/>

## City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan

The City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan provides guidance to elected officials, city staff, businesses, neighborhoods and other constituents. This document outlines the details of the City's vision, by focusing on the physical, social and economic attributes of the city and is used by elected officials to ensure that decisions contribute to and not detract from achievement of the City's vision. The plan can be found on the City's web site at the following address:

<http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/citywork/planning/planpubs/mpsplan/index.html>

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following evaluation system *adopted by the City Council and Mayor* will be used by CLIC as the basis for evaluating all requests for capital improvements. This system shall be uniformly applied in evaluating and rating all capital improvement requests submitted for each year of the five year plan.

The Evaluation System has three sections as follows:

	<b>Point Allocation</b>
<b>I. PROJECT PRIORITY</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>II. CONTRIBUTION TO CITY GOALS OPERATING COST CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<b>70 -25 to +25</b>
<b>III. QUALITATIVE CRITERIA</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Total Possible Points</b>	<hr style="width: 100%;"/> <b>300</b>

## I. PROJECT PRIORITY

**Project Priority** provides preferential evaluation based on the following attributes:

1. Capital projects defined in terms of **Level of Need** - 0 to 60 points.
2. Capital projects **In Adopted Five Year Plan** - 0 to 30 points.
3. Coordinated planning and prioritized funding for an **Integrated Project** – 10 points.

**Level of Need Definitions** - The level of need is the primary criteria defining a capital request's priority. Requests are determined to be *critical, significant, important* or *desirable* for delivering municipal services.

**Critical** - Describes a capital proposal as indispensable and demanding attention due to an immediate need or public endangerment if not corrected. Few projects can qualify for this high an evaluation. Failure to fund a critical project generally would result in suspension of a municipal service to minimize risk to the public.  
Point Range 51 - 60

**Significant** - Describes a capital proposal deemed to have a high priority in addressing a need or service as previously indicated by policymakers and/or submitting agency priority rankings. This designation may also pertain to a proposal that is an integral and/or inseparable part of achieving completeness of a larger improvement or series of improvements.  
Point Range 41 - 50

**Important** - Describes a capital proposal addressing a pressing need that can be evaluated as a standalone project. Proposals may be considered “important” if they are required to maintain an expected standard of service, achieve equity in service delivery or increase efficiency in providing public services. Failure to fund an “important” proposal would mean some level of service is still possible.

Point Range 21 - 40

**Desirable** - Describes a capital proposal that would provide increased public benefits, enhancement of municipal services or other upgrading of public infrastructure. Failure to fund a “desirable” project would not immediately impair current municipal services.

Point Range 0 - 20

**In Adopted Five Year Plan**

Is the project currently funded in the adopted 2005-2009 Capital Improvement Program?

Point Allocation -

- Identified for funding as a 2006 project .....30
- Identified for funding as a 2007-2009 project .....20
- New proposal for 2010 funding..... 10
- New proposal for 2006-2009, not in the current Five Year Plan ... 0

**Integrated Project** - 10 points

The intent of this category is to encourage joint project planning and funding efforts with other City Departments, Independent Boards and Commissions, other Governmental Units or private developments.

Awarded to capital requests meeting **both** of the following criteria:

- Integral part of a multi-faceted or multi-jurisdictional project or an inseparable part of a larger improvement or series of improvements; and
- Completion of the whole multi-faceted project would be jeopardized if this project is not funded.

**II. CONTRIBUTION TO CITY GOALS**

**Contribution to City Goals** is defined as the extent to which capital improvement proposals contribute to achieving the City’s Goals and the detailed expectations applicable to each. In addition, projects must support the policies of the City of Minneapolis’ Comprehensive Plan as cited in this document, as well as help to ensure the overall maintenance and improvement of the City’s infrastructure systems.

Capital improvement proposals will be evaluated for their overall ability to:

- achieve City goals and support the policies of the City of Minneapolis’ Comprehensive Plan
- ensure maintenance of City infrastructure systems and equitable delivery of municipal services
- encourage coordinated planning efforts with project partners and the community

Point ranges for meeting the above objectives will be as follows:

Strong Contribution	46 - 70
Moderate Contribution	16 - 45
Little or No Contribution	0 - 15

**Operating Cost Considerations** will be analyzed in evaluating all capital requests. Emphasis will be placed on whether the request will maintain or reduce current operating and maintenance costs or would add to or create new operating or maintenance costs. Accuracy and completeness of information provided to operating cost questions and ability to demonstrate progress made with resources provided in prior years will be factored into points allocated for this major category. Operating cost implications should also be discussed at the CLIC Presentations. Points for this category will range from minus 25 to plus 25.

### III. QUALITATIVE CRITERIA

**Qualitative Criteria** provide for evaluation of proposals related to the seven attributes described below. Evaluators should allocate points in this area using the definitions described below as well as by considering the impact these areas have in helping to achieve City Goals. Each of these criteria will be used to score proposals within a point range from 0 to 15. It is likely that most capital requests will not receive points for all attributes.

1. **Neighborhood Livability & Community Life** -- Extent proposal serves to preserve or improve the quality, safety and security of neighborhoods in order to retain and attract residents and engage community members. Consideration shall be given to proposals that are included in an NRP neighborhood action plan approved by the City Council and/or proposals that include NRP as a funding source.

Intent: to reward proposals that demonstrate potential to enhance the quality of life and public safety in neighborhoods and the community at large and to reward proposals in approved NRP Neighborhood Actions Plans or that include NRP funds.

2. **Public Benefit** -- Extent proposal directly benefits a portion of the City's population by provision of certain services or facilities.

Intent: to award points based on the percentage of the city's population (382,618) that will benefit.

3. **Capital Cost & Customer Service Delivery** -- Extent proposal delivers consistently high quality City services at a good value to taxpayers and that City infrastructure investment is appropriately sized for effective service delivery.

Intent: to reward proposals that improve the quality, cost effectiveness and equity of municipal services delivered to all residents.

4. **Environmental Quality** -- Extent proposal would preserve or improve the quality of the urban environment, including visual and other sensory attributes as well as natural resources.

Intent: to reward proposals contributing positively to the city's physical environment and/or conservation of natural resources.

5. **Collaboration & Leveraging Public/Private Investment** -- Extent proposal reflects collaboration between two or more public or public-private organizations to more effectively and efficiently attain common goals and for which costs can be met with non-City funds or generate private investment in the City.

Intent: to reward proposals that represent collaborative efforts with multiple project partners and possibly conserve municipal funds through generating public and/or private investment in the City.

6. **Effect on Tax Base and/or Job Creation** -- Extent proposal can be expected to preserve or increase the City's tax base and serve as a catalyst for job creation by the private sector.

Intent: to reward proposals that may have a positive effect on property values and thus have the potential for preserving or expanding the City's tax base and supporting job-intensive industries that provide living-wage jobs, especially for hard to employ populations.

7. **Intellectual & Cultural Implications** -- Extent proposal would strengthen or expand educational, cultural, architectural or historic opportunities.

Intent: to reward proposals contributing to the City's intellectual and cultural growth, including promotion of historical preservation or architectural significance.

# CLIC RATING FORM

<b>Project ID Number</b>						
	Points					
<b>Project Priority:</b>						
<b>Level of Need</b>						
Critical	51-60					
Significant	41-50					
Important	21-40					
Desirable	0-20					
<b>In Adopted Five Year Plan</b>						
2006	30					
2007-2009	20					
2010	10					
New for 2006-2009	0					
<b>Integrated Project</b>	10					
<b>Sub-Total Project Priority</b>						
<b>Contribution to City Goals:</b>						
Strong Contribution	46 - 70					
Moderate Contribution	16 – 45					
Little or No Contribution	0 - 15					
<b>Operating Costs:</b>	-25 to +25					
<b>Sub-Total Goals &amp; Operating Costs</b>						
<b>Qualitative Criteria:</b>						
Neighborhood Livability & Community Life	0 – 15					
Public Benefit	0 – 15					
Capital Cost/Customer Service Delivery	0 – 15					
Environmental Quality	0 – 15					
Collaboration & Leveraging	0 – 15					
Effect on Tax Base & Job Creation	0 – 15					
Intellectual & Cultural Implications	0 – 15					
<b>Sub-Total Qualitative Criteria</b>						
<b>Total Rating Points</b>	300 Possible					

## 2005 CLIC Schedule For the 2006 - 2010 Capital Budget Process

Working Group	Subject	Agenda/Topic(s) of Discussion	Date / Time	Location
CLIC Main Body & Staff  CLIC members bring binders back from last year.	1st CLIC Mtg	Welcoming Kickoff & Introductions of CLIC Committee members & Staff Description of CLIC Process for 2006 - 2010 Discuss 2005 CLIC Schedule Establish CLIC Task Forces Introduction to 2005 CLIC Guidelines & CLIC Bylaws Discussion of Capital Resources	Tuesday March 15th Noon to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall
CLIC Main Body & Staff  CLIC members bring binders back from last year.	2nd CLIC Mtg	Welcome meeting with Mayor Rybak & City Council President Ostrow  Establish CLIC Executive Committee/Task Force Chairs Prepare for presentations - questions you should ask presenters  Detailed discussion of CLIC Guidelines & Rating System - new members only Case Study Training on how to rate an actual capital request	Tuesday March 22nd Noon to 12:30 p.m.  12:30 to 1:00 p.m.  1:00 to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall
CLIC Main Body & Staff	3rd CLIC Mtg	Behind the Scenes Tour of the new Columbia Heights Ultrafiltration Plant Overview of Water Capital Program - History, Current & Future Plans, Rates	Tuesday March 29th 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Columbia Hts Water Facility
Capital Budget Preparers	Capital Requests Due	Turn in 2 hard copies of capital submittals - no more changes in database	Friday April 1st - Noon	325M
CLIC Main Body & Staff	4th CLIC Mtg	CLIC members receive binder of completed capital submittals Questions about ratings, presentations, process Break into task forces, discuss group rating process Prepare for presentations, select task force secretaries for written comments Homework Assignment - Read proposals prior to presentations	Tuesday April 12th Noon to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall
CLIC Main Body & Staff	5th CLIC Mtg	First (All Day) Presentation Session Establish Group Ratings for the day	Tuesday April 19th 8:15 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Sumner Library Cargill Room
CLIC Main Body & Staff	6th CLIC Mtg	Second (Half Day) Presentation Session Establish Group Ratings for the day	Tuesday April 26th 5:30 - 9:00 p.m.	Sumner Library Cargill Room
CLIC Main Body & Staff	7th CLIC Mtg	Third (Half Day) Presentation Session Establish Group Ratings for the day	Tuesday May 3rd 5:30 - 9:00 p.m.	Sumner Library Cargill Room
CLIC Task Force Members CLIC Task Force Staff	8th CLIC Mtg	Task Forces work on individual and group comments Answer questions about ratings, presentations, process	Tuesday May 10th Noon to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall & Fire Conf Rm

## 2005 CLIC Schedule For the 2006 - 2010 Capital Budget Process

Working Group	Subject	Agenda/Topic(s) of Discussion	Date / Time	Location
CLIC Main Body & Staff	9th CLIC Mtg	Fourth & Final (Half Day) Presentation Session Establish Group Ratings for the day	Tuesday May 17th Noon - 6:00 p.m.	Sumner Library Cargill Room
CLIC Task Force Members CLIC Task Force Staff	10th CLIC Mtg	Task forces work on individual and group comments	Tuesday May 24th Noon to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall & Fire Conf Rm
All CLIC Members	Submit Ratings	Ratings submitted to Executive Secretary and CLIC Staff - June 1st or earlier	Wednesday June 1st	E-mail
CLIC Task Force Members CLIC Task Force Staff	11th CLIC Mtg Ratings Done	Task forces finalize individual & group comments - approve all comments Final Summarized Ratings provided to CLIC members & discussed	Tuesday June 7th Noon to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall & Fire Conf Rm
CLIC Task Force Chairs	Submit Comments	Final Comments provided to Executive Secretary	Friday June 10th - Noon	E-mail
CLIC Main Body & Executive Secretary	12th CLIC Mtg Comments Done	Work on CLIC NDB Recommendation - review funding plan prioritized by Rating Distribute Final Comments to CLIC members Handout Sewer & Water Details to be discussed on June 21st	Tuesday June 14th Noon to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall
CLIC Executive Committee & Executive Secretary (Optional for other CLIC members)	Joint Public Hearing	CLIC & Planning Commission - Joint Public Hearing on 2006 Capital Plan	Thursday June 16th 5:05 p.m.	220 City Hall
CLIC Main Body & Executive Secretary	13th CLIC Mtg	Continue Work on CLIC NDB Recommendation Review Sewer & Water Recommendation for CLIC Report	Tuesday June 21st Noon to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall
CLIC Main Body & Executive Secretary	14th CLIC Mtg	Finalize CLIC Recommendation for NDB & Sewer & Water	Tuesday June 28th Noon to 1:30 p.m.	220 City Hall
CLIC Executive Committee & Executive Secretary	CLIC Executives - Pre-Meeting Meeting with R.T. Rybak	Discuss presentation strategy - review draft CLIC Report sections to be used in discussion with Mayor Executive Committee presents the 2006 - 2010 CLIC Recommendation to Mayor Rybak	Tuesday July 12th Noon to 1:00 p.m. 1:00 to 2:00 p.m.	325M - Conf A  Mayor's Conf Room
Executive Secretary	CLIC Report Done	Distribute CLIC Report to CLIC Members, Mayor & City Council members	Friday July 22nd	
Executive Secretary & CLIC Executive Committee	Council Overview on Capital	Mayor / CLIC Capital Overview presentation to W&M Committee with full City Council present	Thursday October 20th	Council Chambers

## Joint Public Hearing Minutes

### Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee And Minneapolis City Planning Commission

June 20, 2005  
5:05 p.m.

#### Attendance:

Planning Commissioners: Judith Martin, Rod Kruger, Ted Tucker, Bob LaShomb, David Motzenbecker, Gary Schiff.

CLIC members: Anthony Hofstede, Jeff Strand, Trish Schilling, Greg Baumgartner  
Mike Abeln, Finance Department  
Barb Sporlein and Pam Miner, CPED Planning.

Barbara Sporlein stated that there are new members it would be helpful to give an explanation of why we meet.

#### Anthony Hofstede, CLIC Chair –

Several years ago it was decided that CLIC and the Planning Commission should meet together and talk about things that CLIC is involved with and open it up to the public to see if there is any interest in capital projects having a life greater than 5 years that CLIC is reviewing. Projects that CLIC is reviewing are presented to the Planning Commission. The goal of CLIC is to advise the City Council and the Mayor in terms of what capital projects should be funded and what the City should be thinking about for the future. CLIC presents to the Planning Commission so that both entities are aware of and could be coordinated in a different fashion. The proposals being considered by CLIC for this year are for the years 2006 to 2010. A total of 111 projects have been reviewed and rated. In the last two CLIC cycles, all members have rated all the projects and reviewed every proposal that is submitted by all the departments. The purpose of this is so all CLIC members have an understanding of what the situation is citywide, and how what the department is asking for coincides with other needs.

#### Barbara Sporlein, Planning Director –

Reported that staff has started a few other new things to try to coordinate earlier on the process. Primarily, Community Planning staff has completed their preliminary review of all projects submitted for consistency with comprehensive plan. The comments from this early review were provided to CLIC members before they heard details of each proposal. Community Planning staff also provided a brief education and discussion for CLIC members regarding the comprehensive plan and how capital programming should be a part of implementing the City's plan.

#### Public Comment opened:

#### Mike Abeln –

I wanted to draw attention to the total magnitude of the five year plan on the last page of the handout. Total projects add up to about \$557 million dollars. CLIC will critique every thing

such as sewer and water rates and what they feel would be a reasonable rate increase. This also determines how many sewer and water projects are funded or recommended to City Council for funding. This number will get boiled down to the \$90 to \$100 million per year range. There are a couple of large water works projects going through the process now - one is the filtration plant which is an \$86 million project; the total amount requested would be smaller if not for the filtration project. Due to budget cuts and LGA funding cuts, resources to the five year plan were reduced by 17.5 million over the five years. This reduction was taken into account last year and this year it continues to be reflected at the same level of resources. That makes CLIC's job difficult because it gives them less money to program. CLIC is now more important than ever to help advise the Mayor and City Council on priorities.

Gary Schiff –

What dollar amount does CLIC have to get down to?

Mike Abeln –

For the net debt bond program CLIC received \$556 or \$557 million worth of project requests. That includes all sources, sewer and water revenue as well as dollars through Municipal State Aid and grants from the County and other sources. The property tax support portion of that which CLIC will program during the five years is about \$100 million – an average of about \$20 million a year. The City has what he calls one good year left and there is about \$23 million and change for 2006. After 2006, it declines to about \$17.5 million ongoing new funding. In 2010 the plan is to actually start building resources back at a two percent increase from 2009. The Mayor recognized last year that capital projects took this cut but needed to start thinking about inflation. The total requests received were around \$137 million; CLIC will reduce this down by about \$37 million. This happens through a lot of prioritization to get it down.

Barbara Sporlein –

When is report due to the Mayor?

Mike Abeln –

The CLIC Executive Committee meets with the Mayor on July 12<sup>th</sup>, then to Council some time around October 20<sup>th</sup> - after the Mayor's review.

Barb Sporlein –

Another change was instituted in the CLIC process this year. In the past, when a department submitted its application for funding, they typically would simply answer 'yes' to the question, "Is this project consistent with the comprehensive plan." Everyone just answered "yes" without even knowing what the comprehensive plan was but it seemed like a question you should say "yes" to. The submission form has now been changed to "What policies of the comprehensive plan does this project serve to support?" We have expected them to contact the community planners to help with that and to stimulate a little more connection within the policy framework. That was Pam Miner's idea. Consensus - Good idea.

Mike Abeln –

In terms of net debt dollars, the biggest dollar amounts are going to the public works Hiawatha site and into Heritage Park CDA01. The proposed FIR01 City/County Training facility is another large project.

2009-2010 Bridge Project BR114 – 29<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Bridges – all of those are part of the grid system and the question is it cost millions to rehab those. So, there is one million set aside in CLIC, I think mostly for a study or to do something to come back probably next year to determine which bridges are in the worst condition and/or what we should do. This would be a multi-million dollar project going out beyond 2010.

David Motzenbecker –

These numbers do not reflect projects that are funded by state or county funds?

Mike Abeln –

They do in the detailed sheets, but they don't here. We can, in the future, do that.

David Motzenbecker –

I see a note at the bottom of page – one of the things I would be curious about seeing is that if we take this much farther, can we identify whether other sources of funding other than state or city revenue bonds or capital bonds are used? For example, there is a facilities improvement for the police department's forensics laboratory – is that going to be funded under property taxes or is that a homeland security grant?

Mike Abeln –

Right now, no. And leveraging outside funding is one of the things that CLIC tries to do.

David Motzenbecker –

And in spite of that, if there is a source of funding other than property tax bond payoffs, do those kinds of projects get a higher ranking by CLIC? So, for example, if the Feds say they are going to build this forensic laboratory or write the check for it, is that moving up the scale with CLIC or are you guys looking at this without looking at the funding.

Mike Abeln –

No. We still look at the funding. It is a critical part of what we do, but it is also looking at what critical part it is playing in the whole infrastructure. I don't think we are looking at just the funding itself. We may think a project is certainly well deserving of funding, but the funding itself was all net debt bonds – and this may not be something we would want to pursue – we'd say, why don't you go for it, you know, whether state, federal or other funding. And some times they say they are pursuing it.

Bob Lashomb –

Projects do get extra points for leveraging resource accounts or somebody else is paying for it?

Judith Martin –

That is surely the way we operate at the University and we have a 5-year capital budget and somebody shows up with 40 million for a building, they get their building at the top of the list.

Bob Lashomb –

Is that how the art museum got there?

Judith Martin –

It is how lots of things have gotten there.

Barbara Sporlein –

It is pretty rare to be able to finance any capital improvements without multiple sources and not just...it's just like any development deal. You pull together whatever you can.

Jeff Strand –

As the Water Works Citizen Advisory Committee representative from CLIC I just wanted to highlight that the water works CAC delivered to CLIC and to Council Members Johnson and Colvin-Roy the review of the interconnect and SW Reservoir Project, so if there is no objection I would like to introduce it here at the public hearing. I don't need to testify but I would just like to enter that for the record. Fremont Avenue Bridge decommissioning and the 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue South cul-de-sacs there may be some commentary on that or some reference to *The Minneapolis Plan*. One other element is the Snelling Avenue extension that I think the Planning Commission and CLIC would have further dialog about possible infrastructure and developments and economic development projects since economic development is outside the purview of CLIC under the bylaws. You know, if the bridge leads does developer move first and the infrastructure follow or vice versa? For example, perhaps that project, or perhaps the Nicollet & 29<sup>th</sup> St. Bridge discussing the potential for reorienting K-Mart. Those are questions that CLIC and the Planning Commission and CPED Planning can have further dialog about and the CLIC process should be important in the process.

Judith Martin –

Open Public Hearing.

Mike Abeln –

A letter was submitted by the Shingle Creek Neighborhood Association. It is basically support for the Camden Avenue Bridge project encouraging that it be moved further up in the cycle.

Judith Martin –

Is process working better, Pam?

Pam Miner –

Yes. We need to be able to get projects in the CLIC cycle in order to start working on it in Public Works, but we don't have the money lined up yet because we don't know what is happening yet with project details, so it is really difficult to know what leads what and how do we get that built into the system a little more.

Judith Martin –

In the parts of the City where we have had significant new development, on the riverfront or in parts of the City where we are expecting new development in the Stinson Blvd or the LRT station area plan; there's not much in here that reflects that, right?

Pamela Miner –

46<sup>th</sup> Street/Snelling Avenue extension and the 29<sup>th</sup> and Lake Street/Nicollet Avenue reopening are in the requests this year. Midtown Plan you'll see next We also have SEMI projects in here that have been programmed for quite a few years. And, Heritage Park as well, so, we have some of the plans in mind. We have that going and the process is working to get those things going.

Judith Martin –

I guess what I'm asking is there is a difference between the projects that are kind of incremental like SEMI and projects like on the Riverfront or the station areas when they start to pop – are they just going to start to pop and aren't going to really want to be waiting for a five-year plan incentive to get their streets in and so the question is how do you line those things up?

Anthony Hofstede –

One idea would be that it would be great when we come before CLIC to just give us an overview of what they are doing before we start. It is great to have someone check off and go over the plan. All of the members of CLIC are not going to have time to go back and check what the plan is. So, I think if we had an overview of that before we start, even if it's something that you hand out or whatever you are doing.

Barb Sporlein –

I think there are two dynamics. We could do recently adopted plans that we would like to get implemented which have an infrastructure component that needs to happen first in order to stimulate development and then, what are we going to do in 2006. What efforts are we going to be doing, and not just planning but planning and economic development. The two different dynamics we talked about in CPED, something like the SEMI area – it really needs infrastructure in order to attract development and get it going. So that is more proactive to get the development we want and then there's the more reactive – the markets happening – we need to make sure we have the infrastructure to accommodate that growth.

Anthony Hofstede –

CLIC doesn't always understand how all that comes together. So, this is what we have to react to or this is what we want to be proactive to. I just think that is helpful to give us an overview of the kinds of things that you are looking at.

Barb Sporlein –

Perhaps at the end of this year – a year-end review and lay out a work plan.

Anthony Hofstede –

It may not actually work at the tail of the end of this year – but we are on a 2-year term and this is the first year of our term. It would be worthwhile to do it after that.

Barb Sporlein –

Ok.

Jeff Strand –

The Mayor had an initiative to have 4-5 neighborhood board chairs or staff overview of the process. I don't know if there are any residents to testify or it didn't appear that there were. I'm disappointed that there is no other public testimony as there has been in the past several years. More effort needed to get word out.

Gary Schiff –

I think it makes more sense to do a public hearing after your report is issued.

Judith Martin –

Would it be useful for there to be a more formal CLIC presentation to CPC if they were open to it? Most don't know about COW meetings.

Jeff Strand –

Open to do anything we can to educate the public. The Mayor may have other facts that come up.

Meeting ended.

## Location & Design Review – 2006 – 2010 Proposals

Based on an initial review of the proposals submitted for 2006-2010 capital funding, the following proposals are very likely to require further in-depth review by the Planning Commission.

<b>MPL09</b>	<b>Nokomis Library Capital Improvements</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“...one option is to construct a new library in the neighborhood...”</i>
Planning review comments	If a new library is to be constructed, early consultation should occur with Planning staff to assist in selecting appropriate location, design and placement of a new structure.
<b>MPL14</b>	<b>Roosevelt Community Library Capital Improvements</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“...one option is to construct a new library in the neighborhood...”</i>
Planning review comments	If a new library is to be constructed, early consultation should occur with Planning staff to assist in selecting appropriate location, design and placement of a new structure.
	Current Roosevelt Library is a designated historic site by HPC. What are the plans for this building if a new facility is built?
<b>MPL15</b>	<b>Southeast Community Library Capital Improvements</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“...one option is to construct a new library in the neighborhood...”</i>
Planning review comments	If a new library is to be constructed, early consultation should occur with Planning staff to assist in selecting appropriate location, design and placement of a new structure.
<b>PSD02</b>	<b>Public Works Facilities Program</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“The project would then provide for the construction of a new facility that would accommodate primarily the Public Works Departments construction and maintenance functions.”</i>
Planning review comments	If a new facility is to be constructed, early consultation should occur with Planning staff to assist in selecting appropriate location, design and placement of a new structure.
<b>WTR16</b>	<b>St. Paul/Minneapolis Interconnection</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“The new pipelines will be connected to the MMW distribution system and to existing SPRWS reservoir and a new pump station.”</i>
Planning review comments	Will the new pump station be in Minneapolis or St. Paul? If in Minneapolis, an early consultation with Planning staff regarding location and design is suggested.

## Location & Design Review – 2006 – 2010 Proposals

<b>BIK13</b>	<b>RiverLake Greenway (East of I-35W)</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“The first segment between I-35W and 30<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. entails converting 40<sup>th</sup> St. east to a one-way street with two-directional bike lanes and parking removed along one side of the roadway.”</i>
Planning review comments	Converting to a one-way street needs to be examined within the context of maintaining connectivity of the street grid.
<b>BIK17</b>	<b>Upper River Trails – Phase I</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“This project consists of grading, aggregate base, bituminous trail, signage, striping, retaining walls, storm sewer, seeding/sodding, lighting, fencing, ROW acquisition and concrete work. West River Road will be reconstructed in places to accommodate the trail and to accommodate stormwater capacity needs.”</i>  <i>“This project must be coordinated with adjacent development Projects.”</i>
Planning review comments	The location and design of these trails need to be carefully coordinated with potential future developments according to the guidance provided in adopted small area plans.
<b>BR105</b>	<b>Fremont Ave. S. Bridge</b>
Planning review comments	Cul-de-sacs are not a preferred option according to The Minneapolis Plan policies, which include a policy to re-connect the street grid whenever possible.  How does the master plan for greenway bridges comply with The Minneapolis Plan? Has it been reviewed by Planning staff?  Item 2b: If this project is part of a coordinated development effort, additional details will need to be provided. With what agency/department is it being coordinated? What is the rest of the project that will be coordinated with this one?  Item 2c: Further explanation of how this project is consistent with The Minneapolis Plan is requested. Being “part of the comprehensive master bridge plan over the Midtown Greenway” does not respond to the question.
<b>BR112</b>	<b>Nicollet Ave Bridge from Lake to 29<sup>th</sup> St.</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“If the City and CPED decide to move forward, this proposal will provide for the infrastructure (bridge and street) costs related to re-opening Nicollet Ave. through the K-Mart site (Lake to 29<sup>th</sup> streets). The objective is to re-create the city grid network, improve the urban environment, and to foster commercial traffic on Nicollet Avenue while retaining residential traffic on 1<sup>st</sup> and Blaisdell avenues.”</i>
Planning review comments	This is a good example of how a project can serve to implement a small area plan. The soon-to-be-presented for adoption Midtown Minneapolis small area plan calls for this re-opening of Nicollet Avenue. Work on design, etc., should be coordinated early with Planning staff to ensure compatibility with this plan for the area.

## Location & Design Review – 2006 – 2010 Proposals

<b>PV005</b>	<b>Snelling Avenue extension</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<p>“...extends Snelling Avenue south of E. 46<sup>th</sup> St. &amp; Hiawatha Ave...”</p> <p>“The project includes new roadway, landscaping, storm drain, sanitary sewer, water service and possibly a signal at Snelling Ave. S. and E. 46<sup>th</sup> St.”</p> <p>“The project is part of the 46<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Master Plan.”</p>
Planning review comments	This is a <u>perfect example</u> of how a project can serve to implement a small area plan. This capital project is a direct result of the community planning effort that took place to produce the 46 <sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Master Plan.
<b>PV007</b>	<b>SEMI</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	“...infrastructure improvements...”
Planning review comments	More detail is needed on what activity is to be undertaken to ensure conformance to the adopted SEMI plan. Continuing consultation and coordination with Planning through the SEED committee is needed. This is also a good example of the City’s capital programming serving to implement an adopted small area plan.
<b>PV027</b>	<b>Hennepin/Lyndale West (Dunwoody to Franklin)</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	“Reconstruction of a 35-year old Municipal State Aid Route with a PCI rating of 44. This project includes streetscape elements.”
Planning review comments	Planning for design and visual impacts should be coordinated early with Planning staff.
<b>PV034</b>	<b>Elliott &amp; 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue cul-de-sacs (3000 blocks of Elliott, 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.)</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<p>“This project would install traffic calming devices on Elliott, 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> avenue south near Lake Street. Cul-de-sacs would be built on Elliott and 10<sup>th</sup> avenues, while throating and speed humps would be added on 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue.”</p> <p>“..the cul-de-sacs on the 3000 blocks of Elliott and 10<sup>th</sup> avenues will eliminate the cut-through traffic and cause these roadways to be used only for local traffic.”</p> <p>“The reconstruction of East Lake Street and the development of the Midtown Exchange building make this the appropriate time to install a permanent closure.”</p>
Planning review comments	Planning staff is aware of the fact that these areas have been blocked temporarily for some period of time. However, creating cul-de-sacs is not support by The Minneapolis Plan policies to increase connectivity and to retain/re-create the street grid. How does the reconstruction of East Lake Street and the development of the Midtown Exchange building make this the appropriate time for these closures?

## Location & Design Review – 2006 – 2010 Proposals

<b>PV035</b>	<b>TH 121/Lyndale Avenue South</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“This will enable the City to reconstruct TH 121 down from a multi-lane divided section to a lower speed urban street from the Crosstown Freeway to 58<sup>th</sup> Street West and redevelop this area. The project includes the reconstruction of TH 121 from the Crosstown Freeway to 58<sup>th</sup> Street West; traditional street grid extension/connection of 57<sup>th</sup> Street West, 59<sup>th</sup> Street West, and 60<sup>th</sup> Street West; and the reconstruction of Lyndale Avenue from 56<sup>th</sup> Street West to the Crosstown Freeway.”</i>
Planning review comments	This capital project is a direct result of discussions with Planning staff. It serves to directly further several policies of The Minneapolis Plan as well as City goals.
	<b>Please note for all Repaving/Street Reconstruction Projects:</b> After the initial review has been completed by the Planning Commission to allow the issuance of bonds, there needs to continue to be coordination on the design of these projects if they will affect the public realm. If sidewalks, streetscapes, lighting etc. are part of a repaving or reconstruction project, Planning staff should offer input as the design is in progress.
<b>TR013</b>	<b>Railroad Crossing Safety Improvements</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“The improvements expected to meet quiet zone requirements at these 89 crossings are as follows: Do Nothing (34 crossings), Close Roadway (12)...”</i>
Planning review comments	Planning staff would review what 12 roadways are proposed for closure.
<b>TR014</b>	<b>LRT TOD Improvements</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“...construct pedestrian improvements around three of the most active neighborhood LRT stations located in South Minneapolis (46<sup>th</sup> St., 38<sup>th</sup> St., Franklin Ave.)”</i>  <i>“...will include pedestrian lighting, improvements to pedestrian paths and street crossings, wayfinding signage, safety improvements and other pedestrian enhancements.”</i>
Planning review comments	This is another example of how a project can serve to implement small area plans. Each of these station areas has a master plan which calls for this type of improvement.

## Location & Design Review – 2006 – 2010 Proposals

<b>FIR02</b>	<b>Facility Improvements Fire Station #17 (330 38<sup>th</sup> St. E.)</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“This proposal is for the building of an expansion to the existing Fire Station 17, which is located at 330 E. 38<sup>th</sup> St. The proposed expansion is to add on an apparatus bay, 5 bedrooms and bathrooms and administrative space to Fire Station 17.”</i>
Planning review comments	Building expansion should be reviewed by Planning for design and location on the site.
<b>MPD01</b>	<b>Minneapolis Police Department Forensic Laboratory</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“To acquire a site and provide suitable facilities for a Forensic Laboratory...”</i>
Planning review comments	In deciding on a suitable site, consultation with Planning should occur as to potentially appropriate locations.
<b>MPD02</b>	<b>Minneapolis Police Department Evidence Unit</b>
<i>Proposal language</i>	<i>“To acquire a site and provide suitable facilities for a Property and Evidence Storage Unit to be operated...”</i>
Planning review comments	In deciding on a suitable site, consultation with Planning should occur as to potentially appropriate locations.