2015 - 2019 Capital Budget Requests
Table of Contents

	CLIC TASK FORCE
MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION	
MBC01 Life Safety Improvements	Human Development
MBC02 Mechanical Systems Upgrade	Human Development
MBC04 MBC Elevators	Human Development
MBC09 Critical Power Capital Project	Human Development
MBC10 Exterior Improvements	Human Development
PARK BOARD	
PRK02 Playground and Site Improvements Program	Human Development
PRK03 Shelter - Pool - Site Improvements Program	Human Development
PRK04 Athletic Fields and Site Improvements Program	Human Development
PRK30 Service Area Improvement Program	Human Development
PRK31 Bossen Park Field Improvements	Human Development
PRK33 Bryn Mawr Meadows Field Improvements	Human Development
PRKCP Neighborhood Parks Capital Infrastructure	Human Development
PRKDT Diseased Tree Removal	Human Development
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT	
STREET PAVING	
PV001 Parkway Paving Program	Transportation
PV006 Alley Renovation Program	Transportation
PV019 6th Ave N (5th St N to dead end north of Wash Ave N)	Transportation
PV027 Hennepin/Lyndale	Transportation
PV054 8th St S (Hennepin Ave to Chicago Ave)	Transportation
PV056 Asphalt Pavement Resurfacing Program	Transportation
PV059 Major Pavement Maintenance Program	Transportation
PV061 High Volume Corridor Reconditioning Program	Transportation
PV063 Unpaved Alley Construction	Transportation
PV068 LaSalle Ave (Grant to 8th)	Transportation
PV070 Riverside Extension - 4th St/15th Ave	Transportation
PV072 Pedestrian Improvement Project	Transportation
PV073 26th Ave N (W Broadway to Lyndale Ave N)	Transportation
PV074 CSAH & MnDOT Cooperative Projects	Transportation
PV076 38th St E (Hiawatha to Minnehaha)	Transportation
PV080 18th Ave NE (Monroe to Johnson St NE)	Transportation
PV083 Minnehaha Ave (24th to 26th St E)	Transportation
PV084 54th St W (Penn to Lyndale Ave S)	Transportation
PV086 26th Ave N (Wirth Pkwy to Brdwy/Lyndale to River)	Transportation
PV087 34th Ave S (54th St E to Minnehaha Pkwy)	Transportation
PV094 4th St SE (25th to 29th Ave SE)	Transportation
PV095 4th St N & S (2nd Ave N to 4th Ave S)	Transportation
PV096 42nd Ave N (Xerxes to Lyndale Ave N)	Transportation
PV097 18th Ave NE Trail Gap	Transportation
PV098 Hiawatha Trail Gap (28th to 32nd St E)	Transportation
PV099 26th & 28th St Buffered Bike Lanes (Hia to 35W)	Transportation

2015 - 2019 Capital Budget Requests
Table of Contents

	CLIC TASK FORCE
STREET PAVING - continued	
PV101 29th St W Pedestrian Connection	Transportation
PV103 61st St W (Lyndale Ave S to Nicollet Ave S)	Transportation
PV104 ADA Ramp Replacement Program	Transportation
PV99R Reimbursable Paving Projects	Transportation
SIDEWALKS	
SWK01 Defective Hazardous Sidewalks	Transportation
BRIDGES	
BR101 Major Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation	Transportation
BR106 1st Ave S over HCRRA	Transportation
BR117 1st St N Bridge over Bassett's Creek	Transportation
BR123 28th Ave S over Minnehaha Creek	Transportation
BR126 40th St Pedestrian & Bicycle Bridge over 35W	Transportation
BR127 Nicollet Ave over Minnehaha Creek	Transportation
BR130 7th St Ramp Bridge over 35W	Transportation
TRAFFIC CONTROL & STREET LIGHTING	
TR008 Parkway Street Light Replacement	Transportation
TR010 Traffic Management Systems	Transportation
TR011 City Street Light Renovation	Transportation
TR021 Traffic Signals	Transportation
TR022 Traffic Safety Improvements	Transportation
TR024 Pedestrian Level Lighting Program	Transportation
TR025 Sign Replacement Program	Transportation
TR99R Reimbursable Transportation Projects	Transportation
SANITARY SEWERS	
SA001 Sanitary Tunnel & Sewer Rehabilitation Program	Human Development
SA036 Infiltration & Inflow Removal Program	Human Development
SA99R Reimbursable Sanitary Sewer Projects	Human Development
STORM SEWERS	
SW004 Implementation of US EPA Storm Water Regulations	Human Development
SW005 Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements	Human Development
SW011 Storm Drains and Tunnels Rehabilitation Program	Human Development
SW018 Flood Area 29 & 30 - Fulton Neighborhood	Human Development
SW032 I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconstruction	Human Development
SW033 Flood Area 22 - Sibley Field	Human Development
SW034 Flood Area 21 - Bloomington Pond	Human Development
SW039 Flood Mitigation with Alternative Stormwater Mgmt	Human Development
SW99R Reimbursable Sewer & Storm Drain Projects	Human Development

2015 - 2019 Capital Budget Requests
Table of Contents

	CLIC TASK FORCE
WATER INFRASTRUCTURE	
WTR12 Water Distribution Improvements	Transportation
WTR18 Water Distribution Facility	Transportation
WTR23 Treatment Infrastructure Improvements	Transportation
WTR24 Fridley Filter Plant Rehabilitation	Transportation
WTR25 Ground Water Supply	Transportation
WTR26 Recarbonation System Replacement	Transportation
WTR27 Meter Replacement Program	Transportation
WTR28 Ultrafiltration Module Replacement	Transportation
WTR9R Reimbursable Watermain Projects	Transportation
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	
IT003 Enterprise Content Management	Human Development
IT004 Enterprise Infrastructure Modernization	Human Development
IT031 Geographical Information System (GIS)	Human Development
IT033 Police Report Management System Upgrade	Human Development
PUBLIC GROUNDS & FACILITIES	
FIR11 New Fire Station No. 11	Human Development
FIR12 Fire Station No. 1 Renovation & Expansion	Human Development
MPD03 Hamilton School Acquisition & Facility Improvement	Human Development
PSD15 Traffic Maintenance Facility Improvement	Human Development
PSD16 Farmer's Market Improvements	Human Development
PSD17 New Solid Waste & Recycling Facility	Human Development
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS	
91101 911 Telephone System Replacement	Human Development
ART01 Art in Public Places	Human Development
RAD01 Public Safety Radio System Replacement	Human Development

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Life Safety Improvements **Project ID:** MBC01

Project Location: City Hall / Courthouse, 350 S 5th Street, Mpls
City Sector: Downtown
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2013
Project Start Date: 1/1/99
Submitting Department: MBC
Contact Person: Erin Delaney

Affected Wards: 5
Affected Neighborhood(s): Downtown West
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/21
Department Priority: 1 of 5
Contact Phone Number: (612)-596-9517
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $108,393

Project Description:

The MBC life safety program includes installation of building sprinkler, fire alarm, smoke detection, and public address systems, update of building exits and stairs, and installation of fireproofing, smoke barriers and purge systems. In 1989 a consulting study in cooperation with the City of Minneapolis Inspections and Fire Departments was completed and is still used as a comprehensive guide for these installations.

The project is being coordinated with several projects including the MBC's Mechanical Systems Upgrade, removal of asbestos, space reconfiguration and computer infrastructure upgrades by the City and County. MBC initiatives to upgrade the electrical wiring, plumbing, lighting, floor coverings, wall coverings and ceilings are also being completed in the spaces during the Life Safety project.

Purpose and Justification:

A serious fire in the City Hall / Courthouse could have a significant effect on critical public services housed in the building including police, fire, emergency communications (911), jails and courts. The interruption of 911 services due to a fire in the building, for instance, could have citywide impact. Other important functions include offices for the Mayor, City Council, Finance Department and Public Works. The City Hall / Courthouse building's non-compliance with life safety codes has also been a negative public relations issue for City staff enforcing life safety codes in private buildings throughout the City.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	955	100	100	50	50	50	1,305
Totals by Year	955	100	100	50	50	50	1,305

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The project is coordinated with the Hennepin County Capital Funding program. By agreement, both City and County Capital Programs must fund the project on a dollar for dollar basis for the project to proceed.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Installation of sprinkler, smoke, and fire alarm systems will reduce insurance premiums for the building and also reduce the risk of property loss and potential lawsuits to the City and County. In 2005, property insurance costs for

the building were reduced from $57,500 to $51,510. A portion of this savings can be attributed to the Life Safety Project.

No cost savings has been assigned for reduced risk of property loss.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

The Life Safety Project, if consistently funded on an annual basis, is scheduled for completion in 2021.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	90	90	45	45	45	314
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	5	5	3	3	3	20
City Administration	5	5	2	2	2	17
Total Expenses with Admin	100	100	50	50	50	350

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains City Hall, a key public facility, contributing to a more effective and efficient municipal government—in furtherance of the following City Goals:

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
* Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
*All Mineapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
*We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
*The City's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
*We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community is serves
*Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
*City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven and customer focused
*Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project

implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.
5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.
5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.
5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.
Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.1 Increase usage of renewable energy systems consistent with adopted city policy.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.
6.3.1 Encourage developments to implement sustainable design practices during programming and design, deconstruction and construction, and operations and maintenance.
6.3.5 Support the development of sustainable site and building standards on a citywide basis.
6.3.9 Develop regulations to further reduce the heat island effect in the city by increasing green urban spaces for parks and open spaces, including shading of parking lots, sidewalks and other impervious surfaces, promoting installation and maintenance of green roofs and utilization of highly reflective roofing and paving materials.
6.3.10 Promote climate sensitive site and building design practices.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and design review cannot be waived for projects. Location and design review for this project was conducted April 2008. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan. No additional review is required by the City Planning Commission.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The project is coordinated with Hennepin County Capital Program throughout the five year capital funding cycle. City

facility management staff are collaborating on office reconfigurations to improve space allocation efficiencies. Other upgrades including plumbing, electrical, lighting, and communications infrastructure upgrades occur during each stage. Maintenance items including painting, ceiling tiles, and carpet have also been incorporated into the project. Nearly all of these other items are funded outside of the Capital Project but they have been coordinated with the Mechanical and Life Safety Upgrade for economies of scale and to reduce relocation expense and swing space rental.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The project partner, Hennepin County originally proposed a more rapid schedule.
Delaying the project increases swing space rental costs, eliminate savings from energy efficiency and life safety improvements. With the 2014 City Capital Contribution, the Hennepin County Life Safety contributions are now closely matched, making all previous capital funding allocated by each partner fully available for this project through the end of 2014.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

On December 31, 2013, the unspent City portion of the balance of the Life Safety Project was $298,479. These funds along with the 2014 appropriation are committed and will be spent by the end of the project.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

In 2013, MBC staff reviewed and extended the timeline of the Life Safety and Mechanical project to December 2021. This extension to the schedule was conceived due to delays in some construction and to alleviate what was an accelerated schedule to begin with. MBC staff feels this schedule is more realistic and will allow for funding to possibly be spread over a longer period of time.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Mechanical Systems Upgrade **Project ID:** MBC02

Project Location: City Hall / Courthouse, 350 S 5th Street, Mpls
City Sector:
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan:
Project Start Date: 1/1/99
Submitting Department:
Contact Person: Erin Delaney

Affected Wards:
Affected Neighborhood(s):
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/21
Department Priority: 2 of 5
Contact Phone Number: (612) 596-9517
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $298,389

Project Description:

The MBC Mechanical Systems Upgrade includes renovation and upgrade of the heating, ventilating, and air conditioning systems in the Minneapolis City Hall / Courthouse. These upgrades are being completed based on a 1989 report prepared by Hammel Green and Abrahamson, Inc. The design includes air-handling units, a new distribution ductwork with VAV boxes, electronic controls, hot water finned tube radiation, and exhaust systems for smoke, toilet, and used ventilation air. The project will vacate and upgrade mechanical and life safety systems in average 15,000 square foot sections of the City Hall Courthouse every six to eight months through the year 2021. The project is being coordinated with several projects including the MBC's Life Safety Upgrade, removal of asbestos, space reconfiguration and computer infrastructure upgrades by the City and County. MBC initiatives to upgrade the electrical wiring, plumbing, lighting, floor coverings, wall coverings and ceilings are also being completed in the spaces during the project.

Purpose and Justification:

The 1989 engineering study reported the majority of the existing systems were antiquated and undersized. They provided inadequate ventilation and poor temperature control throughout the building. In some areas, heating piping is severely corroded and intermittent ruptures damage the building, equipment, and interrupt work for building tenants. There is concern that many components of the existing system will not function until their scheduled replacement. An aggressive schedule is required to replace equipment before it ceases functioning.

In 2009 through 2014, several energy efficiency improvements are scheduled which will save an estimated $160 thousand dollars in operating costs each year when they are completed. Operating cost saving are discussed in greater detail in a subsequent section.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	3,240	600	200	200	420	480	400	5,540
Totals by Year	3,240	600	200	200	420	480	400	5,540

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The project is coordinated with the Hennepin County Capital Funding program. By agreement, both City and County Capital Programs must fund the project on a dollar for dollar basis for the project to proceed.

In 2013, a Minnesota Historical Society 2014 Capital Grant was awarded in the amount of $75,000. Grant funds will be used to offset the cost of finishing system controls updates in previously finished stages.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure?

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (160,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Installation of four energy wheels have been completed or are in construction for the years 2009 through 2013. The energy wheels will capture energy from exhaust air and utilize that energy to heat, cool, or humidify incoming ventilation air. Originally the outside air intake units were scheduled at the end of the project. They have been rescheduled to capitalize on energy savings and to coordinate construction sequencing issues. It is estimated that each of the four energy wheels will save $40 thousand dollars per year for a total of $160 thousand dollars annually after completion of the project.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

The Mechanical Project is scheduled for completion in 2021. Additional funding was requested in 2014 to account for improvements to the mechanical program. Upgrade Building Automation System (BAS) head end controls for previously completed stages 1-11 ($125k in both 2013 and 2014). Install humidification and humidity controls in the air handling unit that serves the MECC ($50k in 2013). Revise stages 20 and 21 to include the replacement of AHU's 31 and 32 which serve 3rd floor state courts and Mpls City Clerk and finance ($200k in both 2015 and 2016). All additional funding in 2013-2016 is related to these upgrades. MBC staff also decelerated the schedule for completion out to 2021, decreasing the financial pressure on the project, spreading the funding requests out and providing a more realistic timeline for completion. In 2011, $145,000 from the MBC fund balance was utilized to match Hennepin County Mechanical Project Contributions and keep the project operating.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	28	12	12	28	25	103
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	501	154	155	342	402	1,555
Project Management	5	5	4	5	5	24
Contingency	38	20	20	25	25	128
City Administration	29	10	10	20	23	90
Total Expenses with Admin	600	200	200	420	480	1,900

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the sustainability of City Hall, a key public facility, contributing to a more cost-effective and effective municipal government—in furtherance of the following City Goals:

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
* Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
*All Mineapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
*We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy

*The City's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
*We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community is serves
*Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
*City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven and customer focused
*Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.
5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.
5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.
5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.
Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.1 Increase usage of renewable energy systems consistent with adopted city policy.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.
6.3.1 Encourage developments to implement sustainable design practices during programming and design, deconstruction and construction, and operations and maintenance.
6.3.5 Support the development of sustainable site and building standards on a citywide basis.

6.3.9 Develop regulations to further reduce the heat island effect in the city by increasing green urban spaces for parks and open spaces, including shading of parking lots, sidewalks and other impervious surfaces, promoting installation and maintenance of green roofs and utilization of highly reflective roofing and paving materials.
6.3.10 Promote climate sensitive site and building design practices.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location & Design Review was conducted in 2008. The City Planning Commission found the project consistent with the comprehensive plan; no additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The project is coordinated with Hennepin County Capital Program. City facility management staff are collaborating on office reconfigurations to improve space allocation efficiencies. Other upgrades including plumbing, electrical, lighting, and communications infrastructure are completed during each stage. Maintenance items including painting, ceiling tiles, and carpet have also been incorporated into the project. Nearly all of these other items are funded outside of the Capital Project but they have been coordinated with the Mechanical and Life Safety Upgrade for economies of scale and to reduce relocation expense and swing space rental.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

This project has received a Minnesota Historical Society 2014 Capital Grant award in the amount of $75,000. Grants are required to be matched with MBC Capital dollars. The Capital Grant is to be used for updating BAC Controls in previously completed Stages 1 - 4.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The project partner, Hennepin County originally proposed a more rapid schedule.
Delaying the project will increase swing space rental, eliminate savings from energy efficiency and life safety improvements. In 2011, $145,000 from the MBC's fund balance was utilized to match Hennepin County Mechanical Contributions to keep the project operational.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

As of December 31, 2013, the unspent balance of the Mechanical Project was
$620,689. All of the available unspent balance at the end of 2013, along with the 2014 appropriation, is encumbered by commitments to existing contracts and will be spent throughout the life of this capital project.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

MBC staff reviewed and extended the timeline of the Life Safety and Mechanical project to December 2021. This extension to the schedule was conceived due to delays in some construction and to alleviate what was an accelerated schedule to begin with. MBC staff feels this schedule is more realistic and will allow for funding to be spread over a longer period of time. MBC staff expects additional funding requests in 2020-2021 in order to keep the project moving. Original estimates on the costs of this project were done many years ago and change orders plus current

day estimates have increased the overall cost of the project.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: MBC Elevators **Project ID:** MBC04

Project Location: City Hall / Courthouse, 350 S 5th Street, Mpls
City Sector:
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan:
Project Start Date: 4/1/09
Submitting Department:
Contact Person: Erin Delaney

Affected Wards:
Affected Neighborhood(s):
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/17
Department Priority: 3 of 5
Contact Phone Number: (612) 596-9517
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $358,474

Project Description:

The project is an ongoing elevator upgrade project originally established in 2005. To date three interior court elevator upgrades have been completed. Two additional elevators are currently included in the project. The 4th Street Tower elevator has been upgraded in 2012-2013. Plans also call for a worn out, functionally obsolescent freight elevator to be downsized and refurbished to serve as a three stop passenger elevator. A new freight elevator is proposed at an alternate location.

Complete modernization is required for these elevators. Modernization will include new car safety devices, car sling and platform, hoist ropes and governor cables, car enclosures, car and hall push button stations, hall lanterns and signal fixtures, and door operators. Hoistway door panel replacement is included to upgrade the assemblies to current fire and smoke requirements, and to accommodate new door operators.

Purpose and Justification:

Industry standards recommend elevators be totally modernized every 20 to 30 years. The proposed upgrades will refurbish elevators that have been in service 40 to 60 years. Rescue of trapped people on these specific elevators is becoming more frequent and numerous maintenance parts for these elevators are no longer available. It is quite possible that one or more of these elevators will need to be removed from service if the upgrade is delayed and parts are no longer available.

The 911 Call Center will not be accessible by elevator if these elevators cease operation.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	670	300	400	200	1,570
Totals by Year	670	300	400	200	1,570

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The project is coordinated with the Hennepin County Capital Funding program. By agreement, both City and County Capital Programs must fund the project on a dollar for dollar basis for the project to proceed.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure?
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating Costs for the MBC will be slightly reduced upon completion of the project. It is projected that elevator maintenance bids will be reduced slightly when elevator equipment is upgraded. There will be a slight reduction in energy consumption when the inefficient direct current equipment on the freight elevator is replaced. Please also note the discussion in Additional Supplemental Information.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

This capital project was established in 2005 with $160,000 in MBC emergency funds from the MBC fund balance and $160,000 in Hennepin County matching funds.

In the 2014-2018 Capital Funding cycle, CLIC recommended funding of $200,000 for 2014 and removed recommended capital funding in years 2015 through 2018. Should funding not be reinstated in the 2015-2019 capital cycle, the project will be required to be placed on hold after 2015.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	18	0	0	0	0	18
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	224	346	150	0	0	720
Project Management	10	15	25	0	0	50
Contingency	34	20	15	0	0	70
City Administration	14	19	10	0	0	43
Total Expenses with Admin	300	400	200	0	0	900

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the sustainability of City Hall, a key public facility, contributing to a more cost-effective and effective municipal government—in furtherance of the following City Goals:

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
* Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
*All Mineapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
*We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
*The City's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
*We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community is serves
*Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
*City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven and customer focused
*Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with

the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.
5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.
5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.
5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.
Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.1 Increase usage of renewable energy systems consistent with adopted city policy.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.
6.3.1 Encourage developments to implement sustainable design practices during programming and design, deconstruction and construction, and operations and maintenance.
6.3.5 Support the development of sustainable site and building standards on a citywide basis.
6.3.9 Develop regulations to further reduce the heat island effect in the city by increasing green urban spaces for parks and open spaces, including shading of parking lots, sidewalks and other impervious surfaces, promoting installation and maintenance of green roofs and utilization of highly reflective roofing and paving materials.
6.3.10 Promote climate sensitive site and building design practices.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

The City Planning Commission conducted Location & Design Review in April 2008. The project was found consistent with the city's comprehensive plan; no additional review required. However, consultations with the Heritage Preservation Commission may be in order on this and other facilities projects affecting this important cultural and historical resource.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The project is coordinated with Hennepin County Capital Program throughout the five year capital funding cycle.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Funding for this project has been requested for over a decade. After a high profile entrapment in 2005, funding was allocated from the MBC fund balance. Recommended funding was removed from the CLIC recommendation in 2008 and in 2014. To date the delays in the project have not resulted in significant additional costs to the City. Loss of elevator service to the Emergency Call Center could result in significant additional costs to the City as discussed in Additional Supplemental Information. Due to numerous previous delays in funding, the flexibility for this project has been severly limited. This years CLIC request reflects funding necessary to complete the project and to match the committment from Hennepin County.

The 2012-2016 request increased by $200,000 over the 2011-2015 request due to the following hoistway and elevator machine room deficiencies discovered during design of the 4th Street Tower Elevator Modernization:
1. Cleaning, tuckpointing, and waterproofing.
2. Mechanical heating, ventilation, and air conditioning.

$370,000 is scheduled to be funded in 2012 for the 4th Street Tower modernization.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

As of December 31, 2013, the unspent capital balance of the Elevator Project is
$143,749. The 2014 capital funding allocation was $200,000. All funds are encumbered or will be spent by the project in 2014 and 2015.

The tower elevator was completed in 2013 and the Freight / passenger elevator conversion will be completed in the 2016-2018 time frame if funding is approved for the project.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The MBC received a $100,000 funding grant from the Minnesota Historical Society in 2013.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Critical Power Project **Project ID:** MBC09

Project Location: City Hall / Courthouse, 350 S 5th Street, Mpls
City Sector:
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan:
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department:
Contact Person: Erin Delaney

Affected Wards:
Affected Neighborhood(s):
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 4 of 5
Contact Phone Number: (612) 596-9517
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $66,000

Project Description:

The project is located in the Minneapolis City Hall / Hennepin County Courthouse. The scope of work includes upgrade of emergency power systems for critical functions in the building. A preliminary consultant study was completed in February of 2008 to review options for replacing an existing emergency generator. Options for improving electrical redundancy for critical functions in the building have also been reviewed. When the proposed capital project has been completed, critical functions within the building will continue to receive power even after shutdown of the utility power grid and simultaneous failure of an existing emergency generator. Critical Power System components currently projected for installation include an additional electrical generator, switchgear, power conditioning equipment, uninterruptible backup systems, fuel storage upgrades and other associated equipment. The project has been structured to capitalize on existing critical power studies currently being conducted in the area. In the year 2010, the current local critical power studies were completed. A review of these critical power studies including scope, budget and preliminary engineering design is proposed at that time as a part of the proposed project.

Purpose and Justification:

Critical functions within the building include a large county jail, an emergency management call center, a natural disaster/emergency security operations center, and offices for the Hennepin County Sheriff and Minneapolis Chief of Police. Current emergency electrical systems supply only minimal requirements for evacuating the structure. The current system includes an uninterruptible power system (UPS) for voice / data 911 requirements. One of two existing emergency generators is at the end of its useful life. Systems such as HVAC, environmental controls, security monitoring, general lighting and power receptacles are not supported by the current emergency electrical configuration. Current power systems serving these critical functions are both physically and functionally obsolete. To maintain these several critical functions during a long term electrical outage, the critical power system must be updated. Existing equipment is old and should be replaced. The original system design is outdated by current standards. And finally, the standards themselves are evolving during this era of heightened awareness of homeland security and natural disasters. The proposed project has been structured to address these concerns.

In December 2013, the building experienced a power outage which effected safety concerns for building occupants, staff, and County inmates within the building.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	66	66	200	1,000	900	2,232
Totals by Year	66	66	200	1,000	900	2,232

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The project is coordinated with the Hennepin County Capital Funding program. By agreement, both City and County Capital Programs must fund the project on a dollar for dollar basis for the project to proceed.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure?

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating Costs for the MBC are projected to be substantially unchanged by the project. The addition of an electrical generator will slightly increase contract maintenance costs. Replacement of failing electrical equipment will reduce future maintenance costs. No cost has been assigned for reduced risk to the City or the public during a future natural disaster or homeland security event.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

It is currently projected that approximately $2,000,000 will be required from the City to complete the project in partnership with Hennepin County. MBC staff anticipates schematic design work to be completed in 2015; Design development, construction documents and bidding to occur in 2016; Construction and project completion by the end of 2019. Construction phasing is planned for this project as well.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	52	154	0	0	0	206
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	772	772	0	1,545
Project Management	4	13	67	0	0	85
Contingency	8	22	112	85	0	227
City Administration	3	10	48	43	0	103
Total Expenses with Admin	66	200	1,000	900	0	2,166

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the sustainability of City Hall, a key public facility, contributing to a more cost-effective and effective municipal government—in furtherance of the following City Goals:

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
* Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
*All Mineapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
*We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
*The City's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
*We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community is serves
*Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

*City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven and customer focused
*Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.
5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.
5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.
5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.
Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.1 Increase usage of renewable energy systems consistent with adopted city policy.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.
6.3.1 Encourage developments to implement sustainable design practices during programming and design, deconstruction and construction, and operations and maintenance.
6.3.5 Support the development of sustainable site and building standards on a citywide basis.
6.3.9 Develop regulations to further reduce the heat island effect in the city by increasing green urban spaces for parks and open spaces, including shading of parking lots, sidewalks and other impervious surfaces, promoting installation and maintenance of green roofs and utilization of highly reflective roofing and paving materials.
6.3.10 Promote climate sensitive site and building design practices.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location Design & Review was conducted for this project in April 2008. The City Planning Commission found the project consistent with the city's comprehensive plan. No additional review required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The project is coordinated with Hennepin County Capital Program throughout the five year capital funding cycle.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The 2011 feasibility / preliminary design study will be utilized to determine over all costs and scalability. The City has previously allocated $66,000 in capital funding. In 2015, MBC staff will pursue updates to the 2011 feasibility report to ensure that accurate, overall capital cost estimates are current.

Hennepin County Capital Program has expedited capital funding allocations.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This program is proposed to begin in 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Recent events have illustrated the need for prolonged operation of security operations centers. The proposed project would review and address that need. During the I35W bridge event, the security operations center in the City Hall Courthouse was staffed for an extended period. The proposed project would enable that function to continue even with the loss of power to the building.

In December 2013, the building experienced a power outage which effected safety concerns for building occupants, staff, and County inmates within the building.

Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Exterior Improvements **Project ID:** MBC10

Project Location: City Hall / Courthouse, 350 S 5th Street, Mpls	**Affected Wards:**
City Sector:	**Affected Neighborhood(s):**
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan:	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 12/31/19
Project Start Date: 1/1/16	**Department Priority:** 5 of 5
Submitting Department:	**Contact Phone Number:** (612) 596-9517
Contact Person: Erin Delaney	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $0

Project Description:

The City Hall / Courthouse is located at 350 South 5th Street in downtown Minneapolis. It houses approximately 60 percent City municipal offices and 40 percent County programs which are comprised of District Court, Sheriff's Administration Offices, and the Adult Detention Center (4th and 5th floors).

The Municipal Building is on the National Register of Historic places and it is an iconic historic landmark for Minneapolis, Hennepin County and Minnesota.

Preserving this asset involves addressing envelope issues on a regular basis. This project will include replacing waterproofing at various small locations around the building that has been in place for nearly 40 years; it will also address masonry issues at various locations around the exterior perimeter that should be addressed to avoid further deterioration to the building. Finally this project proposes replacement of the windows as recommended by a 2012 Braun Intertec Study.

Addressing these exterior issues is primarily a matter of asset preservation. Addressing these issues will also reduce energy consumption, reduce future operating costs repairs and utilities and prevent further deterioration.

Purpose and Justification:

Waterproofing/Sub-Basement Work
The areas of concern were last done in the 1960's and 1970's, putting them at twice the typical life span. Several of the locations have already had water leaks that has damaged the building and equipment therein. Most of the damges have been in County spaces. Repairs have been made, but will only address the problems temporarily.

Masonry
Missing mortar or sealant is currently allowing water in the wall at various locations around the building. Some of the water infiltration issues are leading to freezing behind the face of the masonry which then causes spalling. A portion of stone was pulled off by our roofing contractor in 2011 while they were in the process of doing gutter repairs. These spalling pieces are also a potential life safety issue as this particular piece could have injured or killed someone had it fallen. By addressing these issues we are mitigating potential risks. This portion of the work has been expanded to include treatment of the limestone foundation walls in the sub-basement.

The MBC is working with MacDonald and Mack Architects to identify the masonry problems and has developed a planned approach to address the facade repairs in phases and to coordinate this work with related roof (heat tape) and window work. In 2017, the 3rd Ave., 4th St. and 4th Ave. facades will be phase one and the interior court and 5th St. facades would be completed as the next phase in 2018. The MacDonald and Mack study is completed and available for review.

Windows
Air infiltration in the winter and excessive solar gains in the summer have been observed by the MBC and building tenants for some time. Braun Intertec was engaged to test the typical window installations at the Municipal Building to anaylize how our windows are performing verses the current standard. The study calculated the current energy

loss. Several solutions have been suggested along with the proposed energy and cost savings. This study does recommend window replacements. The study is complete and available for review. This work is also scheduled to be coordinated with waterproofing and masonry work above.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	100	625	1,900	1,225	3,850
Totals by Year	100	625	1,900	1,225	3,850

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The MBC may explore the Minnesota Historical Society Capital Grant for funding of this project.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure?
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 0
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The window replacement will reduce the annual operating expenses based on energy savings. The amount is described in the Braun Intertec report. Eliminating costs related to building repairs and equipment replacement will also reduce the operating costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

The MBC has completed initial studies for all three portions of the project. Since 2012, the MBC has completed the waterproofing including the work around shaft 2, the 4th Ave. Garage and the Generator Air Intake Well roof near 4th Ave. and 5th St., thus reducing the projected scope of work. The completed studies have allowed us to revise and reduce the project cost estimate.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	90	10	62	30	192
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	525	1,550	1,003	3,078
Project Management	0	0	10	67	19	95
Contingency	0	6	51	130	115	301
City Administration	0	5	30	90	58	183
Total Expenses with Admin	0	100	625	1,900	1,225	3,850

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the sustainability of City Hall, a key public facility, contributing to a more cost-effective and effective municipal government—in furtherance of the following City Goals:

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
* Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
*We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
*The City's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
*Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
*We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community is serves
*Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
*City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven and customer focused
*Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.
5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.
5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.
5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.
Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.1 Increase usage of renewable energy systems consistent with adopted city policy.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.

Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.
6.3.1 Encourage developments to implement sustainable design practices during programming and design, deconstruction and construction, and operations and maintenance.
6.3.5 Support the development of sustainable site and building standards on a citywide basis.
6.3.9 Develop regulations to further reduce the heat island effect in the city by increasing green urban spaces for parks and open spaces, including shading of parking lots, sidewalks and other impervious surfaces, promoting installation and maintenance of green roofs and utilization of highly reflective roofing and paving materials.
6.3.10 Promote climate sensitive site and building design practices.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The project is coordinated with Hennepin County Capital Program throughout the five year capital funding cycle.

This project receives a dollar for dollar match with Hennepin County Capital Funding. Funding source and expense breakdowns show City Funding only.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The Hennepin County Capital Program has provided capital funding starting in 2015. No project work can begin until there is City Capital Funding available according to the matching requirement for capital projects.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This is a new project with no prior funding and is scheduled to begin in 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Playground and Site Improvements Program **Project ID:** PRK02

Project Location: Powderhorn, Washburn Ave, Luxton, Bassett's Creek, Matthews, Lake Nokomis Rec Center, Phelps, Bryant Square, Linden Hills, Peavey, Sibley, Folwell, Cleveland, Farview, Holmes, Longfellow, Bryn Mawr Meadows, Keewaydin, Pearl, Whittier, Armatage, Cavell, Kenny, Loring, Lynnhurst, McRae, Northeast, Van Cleve, Bottineau

City Sector: Citywide

Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015

Project Start Date: 1/1/15

Submitting Department: Park Board

Contact Person: Jennifer Ringold

Affected Wards: Various

Affected Neighborhood(s): Various

Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/20

Department Priority: 2/7

Contact Phone Number: 612-230-6464

Prior Year Unspent Balances: $500,000

Project Description:

Typical playground and site improvements consist of reconfiguring playground containers (both pre-K and elementary age) and replacing the play equipment. As the budget allows, additional amenities such as walkways, picnic tables, benches, lighting improvements, landscaping, drinking fountains, etc. would be prioritized and included.

In all project areas except Powderhorn one playground will be improved. Powderhorn Park includes three playgrounds. This project would replace the play equipment in each play area. The goal is to time the funding for the playgrounds to match the upgrading of the wading pool to reduce mobilization costs and the amount of time the park is under construction.

Purpose and Justification:

The playgrounds are recommended for improvement based on conditional analysis and age. Playground improvements will address acute safety and security concerns as well as meet the need to replace outdated and worn playground equipment that does not meet current Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	775	800		500	500	2,400	4,975
Park Capital Levy	1,350	750	300	900	600		3,900
Totals by Year	2,125	1,550	300	1,400	1,100	2,400	8,875

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

None

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating costs are generally decreased, as replacement and updating of playgrounds reduce the need for spot repairs and removal of damaged or unsafe equipment.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

N/A

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	162	31	147	115	251	707
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	1,107	214	1,000	786	1,714	4,821
Project Management	59	11	53	42	91	257
Contingency	148	29	133	105	229	643
City Administration	74	14	67	52	114	321
Total Expenses with Admin	1,550	300	1,400	1,100	2,400	6,750

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project upgrades playgrounds and park site conditions to promote safety and support community use, in furtherance of the following City Goals.

LIVING WELL: MINNEAPOLIS IS SAFE AND LIVABLE AND HAS AN ACTIVE AND CONNECTED WAY OF LIFE

Amenities to support recreation opportunities for residents and visitors (strategy: residents and visitors alike have ample arts, cultural, entertainment and recreational opportunities) is a focus point of this city goal. Providing high quality, engaging playgrounds (identified as a 2003 City Pages Best of Twin Cities – Best Use of Taxpayer Dollars) helps ensure residents and visitors have a safe, cost-effective recreation opportunity within the city.

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

This goal focuses on the opportunity for built and natural environment of the city to create a sense of place (strategy: iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place). Playgrounds help create a sense of place for a community. They are where culture and recreation unite within a community as families, grandparents, caregivers and children meet on a regular basis to play and share stories. It is also common for the playground design to reflect a unique characteristic of the community it serves.

Additionally, the project contributes to the following city goals and strategies by improving infrastructure and focusing on sustainable design principles:

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board goals and objectives:

The MPRB's current goals and objectives are contained within its 2007-2020 Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, there will be some overlap in the response between this question and the following one. As a whole the playgrounds improvements contribute to the goal of "park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty."

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

All of the playground improvements will improve safety and accessibility and renew well-used public amenities. This is consistent with the following direction from the MPRB's 2007-2020 Comprehensive Plan:

Vision Statement: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.
Goal: Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty.
Strategy: Build or renew facilities to meet or exceed standards for accessibility.

These projects will address several policies outlined in the Open Space and Parks section of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan. The improvements will include areas suitable for relaxation as well as recreation (see policy 7.1.4 below) All of the projects will promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors through their intended purpose and the way they will be designed--compliant with safety and accessibility standards with special focus on Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (see policy 7.1 below).

Relevant City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan Polices:

Policy 7.1: Promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors by recognizing that safe outdoor amenities and spaces support exercise, play, relaxation and socializing.
Policy 7.1.4 Ensure open spaces provide peaceful, meditative, and relaxing areas as well as social, recreational, and exercise opportunities.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for these projects will take place in the spring or summer of each funding year.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Except for Powderhorn, projects funded within one year can be moved ahead or back a year depending on funding levels. Moving projects back can result in greater project costs or the need for costly emergency repairs. Net Debt Bond funding for Powderhorn playground in 2015 will match Capital Levy funding provided by the MPRB in 2014. Both funding sources will be required to move the project forward.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a

new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The community process and design development for 2015 projects--Bassett's Creek, Bryant Square, Lake Nokomis, Luxton, Matthews, and Washburn Aven -- is anticipated for the spring of 2015. The phases of these projects are consistent with the typical timing outlined below.

Playground Improvements

Phase Timing

Community Engagement.....First Quarter of Funded Year

Design/Engr.....Second Quarter of Funded Year

Construction begins.....Second and Third Quarter of Funded Year

Completion.....Fourth Quarter of Funded Year or First Quarter of Following Year

Planning for the combined playground and wading pool project at Powderhorn is expected to begin in winter of 2014. This project includes 2014 and 2015 funding. The overall phasing would be as follows:

Phase Timing

Community Engagement.....Fourth Quarter of 2014 and First quarter of 2015

Design/Engr.....Second Quarter of 2015

Construction begins.....Second and Third Quarter of 2015

Completion.....Fourth Quarter of 2015 or First Quarter of 2016

Unspent Balance: The unspent balance is for 2013 playground projects at Dickman, Steven's Square, and Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Parks. Schematic design is in progress for all of the playgrounds except Bryant Square. Playgrounds at Dickman and Steven's Square Parks will be built in 2014. The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Park playground will be built in 2015 to allow for additional fundraising.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Proposed projects with anticipated funding years and sources (2015-2019 MPRB Neighborhood Park Capital Program)

Project	Year	Amount	Funding Source
Bassett's Creek	2015	$350,000	Net Debt Bonds
Bryant Square	2015	$225,000	MPRB Capital Levy
Lake Nokomis	2015	$250,000	Net Debt Bonds
Luxton	2015	$200,000	MPRB Capital Levy
Matthews	2015	$150,000	MPRB Capital Levy
Powderhorn (2)	2015	$200,000	Net Debt Bonds
Washburn Ave	2015	$175,000	MPRB Capital Levy
Phelps	2016	$150,000	MPRB Capital Levy
Folwell	2016	$150,000	MPRB Capital Levy

Cleveland.....2017.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Farview.....2017.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Holmes .....2017.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Linden Hills.....2017.....$100,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Linden Hills.....2017.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Longfellow.....2017.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Peavey.....2017.....$200,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Sibley .....2017.....$200,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Bottineau.....2018.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Bryn Mawr Meadows.....2018.....$200,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Keewyadin.....2018.....$300,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Pearl.....2018.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Whittier.....2018.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Armatage.....2019.....$250,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Cavell.....2019.....$250,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Kenny.....2019.....$250,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Loring.....2019.....$300,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Lynnhurst.....2019.....$250,000.....Net Debt Bonds
McRae.....2019.....$250,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Marcy.....2019.....$250,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Northeast.....2019.....$350,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Van Cleve.....2019.....$250,000.....Net Debt Bonds

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Shelter - Pool - Site Improvements Program **Project ID:** PRK03

Project Location: Matthews, Sibley, Phelps, Keewaydin, Fuller, North Commons
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Park Board
Contact Person: Jennifer Ringold

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/20
Department Priority: 4/7
Contact Phone Number: 612-230-6464
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $1,400,000

Project Description:

Wading pool improvements may include replacement of entire pool facilities with new wading pools or splash pads, updating mechanicals of existing wading pools, adding shade structures and seating, providing additional spray features within existing pools, and updating associated site improvements such as paths and lighting.

Purpose and Justification:

Most pool and wading pool facilities in the park system are over 40 years old. Many are experiencing mechanical or structural failures. Improvements will provide safe, accessible, and efficient wading pools to Minneapolis residents. Additionally, the water parks within the Minneapolis park and recreation system at North Commons and Northeast Parks are being scheduled for updates to boilers, filter systems, splash pad features, and fencing.

In 2015, the wading pool at the pool at Matthews Park will be updated in combination with upgrades to the playground (see PRK02). The Powderhorn project will be combined with playground improvements that are funded in 2014 and 2015. Similarly, the 2016 Phelps, 2017 Sibley, and 2018 Keewaydin projects will be combined with the respective playground projects for each park. The 2019 project will provide upgrades to the water park at North Commons.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	5,500	500		1,000	500	350	7,850
Park Capital Levy	1,500		500				2,000
Totals by Year	7,000	500	500	1,000	500	350	9,850

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

None

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 40
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The current facilities are very old and use outdated mechanical systems. New equipment and facilities will use less water and energy. Final figures for cost savings will be determined as part of the design and engineering of the projects.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

New mechanical equipment every 25 years at $50,000 per replacement

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	52	52	105	52	37	299
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	357	357	714	357	250	2,036
Project Management	19	19	38	19	13	109
Contingency	48	48	95	48	33	271
City Administration	24	24	48	24	17	136
Total Expenses with Admin	500	500	1,000	500	350	2,850

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project upgrades wading pool facilities and related features for safety and to support community use—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

LIVING WELL: MINNEAPOLIS IS SAFE AND LIVABLE AND HAS AN ACTIVE AND CONNECTED WAY OF LIFE

This city goal focuses on recreation opportunities for residents and visitors (strategy: residents and visitors alike have ample arts, cultural, entertainment and recreational opportunities). Wading pool upgrades across the city will provide safe places for children to socialize with friends and participate in active recreation. They provide a location for caregivers to connect with their neighbors. Providing facilities for children and youth that are inspiring and challenging demonstrates the value the city and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board place on developing the next generation of well-balanced residents.

Additionally, the project contributes to the following city goal and strategy by improving infrastructure:

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board goals and objectives:

The MPRB's current goals and objectives are contained within its comprehensive plan. Therefore, there will be some overlap in the response between this question and the following one. This project contributes to the goal of "park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty." This goal includes focus on renewing facilities in a manner that meets or exceeds standards for accessibility. All of the wading pool projects will assist the MRPB in achieving this outcome.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

All of the wading pool improvements will improve safety and accessibility and renew well-used public amenities. This is consistent with the following direction from the MPRB's 2007-2020 Comprehensive Plan:

Vision Statement: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.
Goal: Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty.
Strategy: Build or renew facilities to meet or exceed standards for accessibility.

These projects will address several policies outlined in the Open Space and Parks section of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan. All of the projects will promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors through their intended purpose and the way that they will be designed to be compliant with safety and accessibility standards with special focus on Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (see policy 7.1 below).

Relevant City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan Polices:

Policy 7.1: Promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors by recognizing that safe outdoor amenities and spaces support exercise, play, relaxation and socializing.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for these projects will take place in the spring or summer of each funding year.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Projects funded within one year can be moved ahead or back a year depending on funding levels. Moving projects back can result in greater project costs or the need for costly emergency repairs.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Typical Wading Pool Improvements

Phase	Timing
Community Engagement	First Quarter of Funded Year
Design/Engr	Second Quarter of Funded Year
Construction begins	Second and Third Quarter of Funded Year
Completion	Fourth Quarter of Funded Year

Unspent Balance: The unspent balance is for 2013 wading pool projects at Logan, Waite, and Van Cleve Parks. Waite will be under construction in 2014. Community engagement is being initiated for Van Cleve and construction would be anticipated in late 2014 or early 2015. Community engagement is anticipated for Logan in the second half of 2014.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Proposed projects with anticipated funding years and sources (2015-2019 MPRB Neighborhood Park Capital Program)

Project	Year	Amount	Funding Source
Matthews Park	2015	$500,000	Net Debt Bonds
Phelps Park	2016	$500,000	MPRB Capital Levy
Fuller Park	2017	$500,000	Net Debt Bonds

Sibley Park.....2017.....$500,000.....Net Debt Bonds
Keewyadin Park.....2018.....$500,000.....Net Debt Bonds
North Commons.....2019.....$350,000.....Net Debt Bonds

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Athletic Fields and Site Improvements Program **Project ID:** PRK04

Project Location: Folwell Parks	**Affected Wards:** 4
City Sector: North	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** Fowell
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 12/31/16
Project Start Date: 1/1/15	**Department Priority:** 3/7
Submitting Department: Park Board	**Contact Phone Number:** 612-230-6464
Contact Person: Jennifer Ringold	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $225,000

Project Description:

Athletic Field improvements may include soil amendments, re-grading, re-seeding, irrigation, lighting, re-alignment of fields to improve drainage and reduce multiple uses, amenities for players and spectators, parking and other site improvements. Safety fencing, accessibility accommodations, and shade structures will also be installed where necessary. New systems to provide for reinforced turf to increase the amount of play that can occur on a field and to maximize the benefits of rainwater for irrigation will be explored. Proposed improvements to Folwell field will be initiated in 2015.

Purpose and Justification:

Already at a premium in Minneapolis – field availability is far outstripped by demand — athletic fields are a prime social and recreational resource in this city. Whether sponsored by the parks, public schools, private schools, clubs, or adult leagues, teams depend on Park Board fields for both practice and games. Because fields are in such high demand, they tend to be overused and their upkeep is especially challenging. Improving athletic fields so they are more durable, able to meet the demands of almost continuous programming needs, and need to rested or rehabilitated far less often will enhance the delivery of recreational services to the residents of Minneapolis.

Field improvements also are being funded in part through the Hennepin Youth Sports Grant program, a $2.4 million dollar annual program available through the Twins Stadium Sales Tax. The Board continues to partner with youth athletic associations in setting the priorities for field improvements. To date, the Hennepin Youth Sports Grant Program has funded 13 field projects for a total contribution of over $1.9 million since the program started in 2009.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	725	250	975
Park Capital Levy	1,700	250	1,950
Totals by Year	2,425	500	2,925

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant program will solicit project applications yearly. To date, the Hennepin Youth Sports Grant Program has funded 13 field projects for a total contribution of over $1.9 million since the program started in 2009.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 15
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 5,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This is based on costs of maintaining other upgraded neighborhood park fields, such as the field at Rev. Dr. Martin

Luther King Jr Park. Costs are associated with irrigation, aeration and fertilization of the turf.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

This project does not include adding infrastructure to the park system. It replaces existing infrastructure.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	52	0	0	0	0	52
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	357	0	0	0	0	357
Project Management	19	0	0	0	0	19
Contingency	48	0	0	0	0	48
City Administration	24	0	0	0	0	24
Total Expenses with Admin	500	0	0	0	0	500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project upgrades athletic fields and related features for safety and to support community use—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

LIVING WELL: MINNEAPOLIS IS SAFE AND LIVABLE AND HAS AN ACTIVE AND CONNECTED WAY OF LIFE

This city goal focuses on recreation opportunities for residents and visitors (strategy: residents and visitors alike have ample arts, cultural, entertainment and recreational opportunities). For residents and visitors, field sports provide opportunities to socialize, develop teamwork skills, and improve physical fitness. Field improvement projects will ensure the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board continues to provide healthy choices for residents and visitors. Through these resources the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board continues its commitment to developing the next generation of well-balanced residents.

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

This goal focuses on decisions that support the environment (strategy: the city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources). Improvements to athletic fields within the Minneapolis parks will focus on best management practices for field surfaces that contribute to healthy urban soil conditions. Healthy soil remediation will decrease use of mechanical inputs including frequency of aeration and irrigation, and provide increased absorbency and retention during storm events. Storm water may then slowly filter and be cleaned through properly graded and restored athletic field surfaces in advance of entering the city's discharge system and surface water bodies.

Additionally, the project contributes to the following city goals and strategies by improving infrastructure and recreational opportunities:

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board goals and objectives:

The MPRB's current goals and objectives are contained within its comprehensive plan. Therefore, there will be some overlap in the response between this question and the following one. These projects contribute primarily to the MPRB goal of "park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty." These projects renew the fields so that they can better accommodate the park and recreation needs of the community.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This funding source is essential to the basic capital improvements of the fields across the city. It will also be used as matching dollars to the Hennepin Youth Sports Grant program. Projects funded with these dollars are consistent with the following direction of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board 2007-2020 Comprehensive Plan:

Vision Statement: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.
Goal: Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty.

Strategy: Integrate sustainable practices, ecological design for landscapes, and green building techniques into new construction and renewal of all amenities, giving priority to those practices that meet or exceed established standards, improve ecological function, and minimize long-term maintenance and operating costs.

Strategy: Design and implement a community center hub model that serves community members, is sustainable, and taps the resources of areas neighborhood, community and regional parks.

Strategy: Implement a sustainable, long-term renewal plan based on a complete inventory of the system, life-cycle cost analysis, and condition assessment of all park facilities.

Strategy: Build or renew facilities to meet or exceed standards for accessibility.

Projects funded by this resource address several policies outlined in the Open Space and Parks section of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan.
Relevant City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan Polices:

Policy 7.1: Promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors by recognizing that safe outdoor amenities and spaces support exercise, play, relaxation and socializing.
Policy 7.1.4 Ensure open spaces provide peaceful, meditative, and relaxing areas as well as social, recreational, and exercise opportunities.
Policy 7.1.5 Provide equipment, programming, and other resources when possible that promote the physical and mental health of citizens.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for these projects will take place in the spring or summer of each funding year.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Throughout the city, athletic councils help provide youth athletic programs. They commonly help recruit volunteer coaches and collect funds to support field improvements.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among

the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Projects funded within one year can be moved ahead or back a year depending on funding levels. Moving projects back can result in greater project costs or the need for costly emergency repairs.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Typical Atheltic Field Improvements

Phase Timing
Community Engagement.....First Quarter of Funded Year
Design/Engr.....Second Quarter of Funded Year
Construction begins.....Second and Third Quarter of Funded Year
Completion.....Third Quarter of Year Two (to allow for grass to establish)

Unspent Balance: The unspent balance is from 2013 for Peavey Park. The planning for this improvement is expected to being as part of the South Service Area planning in the fall of 2014. Construction is anticipated for 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Proposed projects with anticipated funding years and sources (2015-2019 MPRB Neighborhood Park Capital Program)

Project.....Year.....Amount.....Funding Source
Folwell Park (1).....2015.....$250,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Folwell Park (2).....2015.....$250,000.....Net Debt Bonds

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Service Area Improvement Program **Project ID:** PRK30

Project Location: Southwest, Northeast/Southwest, North
City Sector: Multiple
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2017
Project Start Date: 1/2/17
Submitting Department: Park Board
Contact Person: Jennifer Ringold

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 5/7
Contact Phone Number: 612-230-6464
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $500,000

Project Description:

Per the direction of its 2007-2020 Comprehensive Plan, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) has been working to design and implement a program and service model that utilizes the resources of multiple parks to serve the recreation needs of a community. The MPRB has aligned the system into five service areas (SA).

A SA represents a geographic area of the city and the park and recreation resources within it. The primary goal in each SA is to tailor park and recreation resources to best meet the program and service needs of the community it serves. Park and recreation resources include the facilities (buildings and outdoor programmable spaces), employees designated to the area, and the funding assigned to it. Each SA may look different, programs and services may vary, and over time a its facilities may become more specialized. The intent is for the programs and services that best meet the recreational needs of the community to drive infrastructure changes within the SA.

Starting with funding allocated in 2013, the MPRB will begin planning for infrastructure improvements for the five SAs. Improvements may include updates to recreation centers and outdoor recreational amenities provided within the SA. This funding will supplement other capital improvements scheduled in the MPRB's capital improvement program.

Purpose and Justification:

Significant aspects of neighborhood parks in Minneapolis are designed to meet a 1960's philosophy of program and service delivery, as well as a 1960's demographics. During the MPRB's comprehensive planning process, community outreach indicated that programming for all age groups and recreation centers were moderately important to households. It is the desire of the MPRB that these programs and services become more important to Minneapolis residents. To achieve this, greater emphasis is being placed on delivering programs and services that are tailored to the park and recreation needs of each community. It is anticipated that new amenities will be proposed and some amenities will be determined no longer relevant within each SA. This work will help ensure that the infrastructure investment in each neighborhood park meets current recreation needs. this funding will help implement the phusical improvements needed in each area to better serve the unique needs of each community.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2017	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	500	1,000	500	2,000
Park Capital Levy	500			500
Totals by Year	1,000	1,000	500	2,500

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

None

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure?
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The planning process for each SA is expected to include preliminary operational modeling that will help determine if the recommended changes fit within existing operation budgets. The goal will be for no net increase in operating costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

The improvements that will be recommended in each SA will improve or replace existing amenities and the investment they need to realize the expected useful life will vary. Aside from recreation centers and wading pools, however, most amenities within the park system have a 15-25 year life expectancy.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	105	52	0	157
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	714	357	0	1,071
Project Management	0	0	38	19	0	57
Contingency	0	0	95	48	0	143
City Administration	0	0	48	24	0	71
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	1,000	500	0	1,500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains and rehabilitates park facilities, improving their utility, and contributing to their sustainability and cost-effectiveness—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

LIVING WELL: MINNEAPOLIS IS SAFE AND LIVABLE AND HAS AN ACTIVE AND CONNECTED WAY OF LIFE

This city goal focuses on recreation opportunities for residents and visitors (strategy: residents and visitors alike have ample arts, cultural, entertainment and recreational opportunities). Neighborhood and community parks provide a place for youth and adults to connect with their community and engage in recreation programming. Most of these programs are easy to access and are provided at a minimal cost to residents. Upgrading neighborhood and community recreation amenities will demonstrate the value the city and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board place on provide neighborhood amenities to meet daily needs and help residents and visitors live a healthy life.

Additionally, the project contributes to the following city goals and strategies by improving infrastructure and focusing on sustainable design principles:

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board goals and objectives:

The MPRB's current goals and objectives are contained within its comprehensive plan. Therefore, there will be some overlap in the response between this question and the following one. As a whole the SA improvements will contribute to the goal of "park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility,

flexibility and beauty." These projects renew or replace the park infrastructure so that they can better accommodate the park and recreation needs of their communities.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

SA improvements will help renew park facilities and balance the distribution of premier park and recreation facilities across the city. The project is consistent with the following direction of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board comprehensive plan:

Vision Statement: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.
Goal: Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty.
Strategy: Design and implement a community center hub model that serves community members, is sustainable, and taps the resources of area neighborhood, community and regional parks.

These projects will address Policy 7.1.5 of the Open Space and Parks section of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan. This policy focuses on providing equipment, programming and other resources that promote the physical and mental health of citizens. The recreation centers are facilities that support programming to enhance the well-being of Minneapolis residents.

Relevant City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan Polices:

7.1.5 Provide equipment, programming, and other resources when possible that promote the physical and mental health of citizens.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for these projects will take place in the spring or summer of each funding year.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Funding for a SA can be moved ahead or back a year.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

SA Planning and Implementation

Phase	Timing
Community Engagement	First, Second and Third Quarter of Funded Year
Design/Engr	Fourth Quarter of Funded Year
Construction begins	Second Quarter of Year Two
Completion	Fourth Quarter of Year Two

Unspent Balance: The unspent balance is for the 2013 Downtown/Regional Service Area project. The planning for this service area is expected to begin in June in collaboration with the City of Minneapolis. This will be an opportunity to

look at the park amenities and the public realm, colllectively, to determine how best to serve the growing downtown residental population.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Proposed projects with anticipated funding years and sources (2015-2019 MPRB Neighborhood Park Capital Program)

Project	Year	Amount	Funding Source
SA Northeast/Southeast	2017	$500,000	Net Debt Bonds
SA South	2017	$500,000	Net Debt Bonds
SA Southwest	2018	$500,000	Net Debt Bonds

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Bossen Park Field Improvements **Project ID:** PRK31

Project Location: 5601 28th Ave S
City Sector: South
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015
Project Start Date: 1/2/15
Submitting Department: Park Board
Contact Person: Jennifer Ringold
Affected Wards: 11
Affected Neighborhood(s): Wemonah
Estimated Project Completion Date: 10/31/17
Department Priority: 1/7
Contact Phone Number: 612-230-6464
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

If funds are available, the MPRB would pursue a complete renovation and a possible new design layout for fields at Bossen to better provide consolidated ball diamond opportunities and soccer field areas in the southern area of the city.

In total, improvements may include soil amendments, re-grading, re-seeding, irrigation, lighting, re-alignment of fields to improve drainage and reduce multiple uses, amenities for players and spectators, parking and other site improvements. Safety fencing, accessibility accommodations, and shade structures will also be installed where necessary. New systems to provide for reinforced turf to increase the amount of play that can occur on a field and to maximize the benefits of rainwater for irrigation will be explored.

Purpose and Justification:

Athletic fields are an integral part of the city's infrastructure. Already at a premium in Minneapolis – field availability is far outstripped by demand — athletic fields are a prime social and recreational resource in this city. Whether sponsored by the parks, public schools, private schools, clubs, or adult leagues, teams depend on Park Board fields for both practice and games. Because fields are in such high demand, they tend to be overused and their upkeep is especially challenging. Improving athletic fields so they are more durable, able to meet the demands of almost continuous programming needs, and need to be rested or rehabilitated far less often will enhance the delivery of recreational services to the residents of Minneapolis.

Planning for improvements to Bossen Field will begin in 2015, with additional funding in 2016. Dependent on the funds available, the MPRB would like to pursue a complete renovation and potentially new design layout of the fields at Bossen to better provide consolidated ball diamond opportunities and soccer field areas in the southern area of the city.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	950	2,500	3,450
Park Capital Levy		400	400
Totals by Year	950	2,900	3,850

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

None at this time.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This is based on costs of maintaining other upgraded neighborhood park fields, such as the field at Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Park. Costs are associated with irrigation, aeration and fertilization of the turf.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

This project will replace existing fields and will not be adding infrastructure to the park system.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	100	304	0	0	0	403
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	679	2,071	0	0	0	2,750
Project Management	36	110	0	0	0	147
Contingency	90	276	0	0	0	367
City Administration	45	138	0	0	0	183
Total Expenses with Admin	950	2,900	0	0	0	3,850

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project upgrades athletic fields and related features for safety and to support community use at Bossen—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

LIVING WELL: MINNEAPOLIS IS SAFE AND LIVABLE AND HAS AN ACTIVE AND CONNECTED WAY OF LIFE

This city goal focuses on recreation opportunities for residents and visitors (strategy: residents and visitors alike have ample arts, cultural, entertainment and recreational opportunities). Whether it is a team sport or a quick toss of a baseball, good quality athletic fields encourage youth and adults to be active in their communities. For residents and visitors, field sports provide opportunities to socialize, develop teamwork skills, and improve physical fitness. Field improvement projects will ensure the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board continues to provide healthy choices for residents and visitors. Through these resources the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board continues its commitment to developing the next generation of well-balanced residents.

A HUB OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND INNOVATION: BUSINESSES, BIG AND SMALL, START, MOVE, STAY AND GROW HERE

Amenities to support a vibrant community that retains business and workers are contributors to this city goal. Regular renovation of athletic fields ensures that the many families who participate in organized sports are not tempted to look to the suburbs for quality athletics, and that these fields continue to be seen as an amenity that helps to create and maintain a strong, positive image for the City of Lakes. These projects will help ensure that the community has safe, cost effective recreation opportunities so they don't need to leave the city to obtain a high quality of life.

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

This goal focuses on decisions that support the environment (strategy: the city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources). Improvements to athletic fields within the Minneapolis parks will focus on best management practices for field surfaces that contribute to healthy urban soil conditions. Healthy soil remediation will

decrease use of mechanical inputs including frequency of aeration and irrigation, and provide increased absorbency and retention during storm events. Storm water may then slowly filter and be cleaned through properly graded and restored athletic field surfaces in advance of entering the city's discharge system and surface water bodies.

Additionally, the project contributes to the following city goals and strategies by improving infrastructure and recreational opportunities:

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board goals and objectives:

The MPRB's current goals and objectives are contained within its comprehensive plan. Therefore, there will be some overlap in the response between this question and the following one. These projects contribute primarily to the MPRB goal of "park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty." These projects renew the fields so that they can better accommodate the park and recreation needs of the community.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This funding source is essential to the basic capital improvements of the fields across the city. Projects funded with these dollars are consistent with the following direction of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board 2007-2020 Comprehensive Plan:

Vision Statement: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.
Goal: Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty.

Strategy: Integrate sustainable practices, ecological design for landscapes, and green building techniques into new construction and renewal of all amenities, giving priority to those practices that meet or exceed established standards, improve ecological function, and minimize long-term maintenance and operating costs.

Strategy: Build or renew facilities to meet or exceed standards for accessibility.

Projects funded by this resource address several policies outlined in the Open Space and Parks section of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan.
Relevant City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan Polices:

Policy 7.1: Promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors by recognizing that safe outdoor amenities and spaces support exercise, play, relaxation and socializing.
Policy 7.1.4 Ensure open spaces provide peaceful, meditative, and relaxing areas as well as social, recreational, and exercise opportunities.
Policy 7.1.5 Provide equipment, programming, and other resources when possible that promote the physical and mental health of citizens.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project will take place in the spring or summer of the funding year (2015).

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Throughout the city, athletic councils help provide youth athletic programs. They commonly help recruit volunteer coaches and collect funds to support field improvements.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Moving projects back can result in greater project costs or the need for costly emergency repairs. Once started, full funding needs to be committed over the two year period to ensure completion of this project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Community engagement to plan the field improvements will begin as part of a master plan for the park in 2014. Plans will be completed and construction will begin in the fall of 2015 and continue into the spring and summer of 2016. Fields are expected to be ready for play by spring 2017.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Bryn Mawr Meadows Field Improvements **Project ID:** PRK33

Project Location: 601 Morgan Ave. S; Minneapolis, MN 55405
City Sector: North
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2018
Project Start Date: 1/1/18
Submitting Department: Park Board
Contact Person: Jennifer Ringold
Affected Wards: 7
Affected Neighborhood(s): Bryn Mawr
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/20
Department Priority: 6/7
Contact Phone Number: 612-230-6464
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

If funds are available, the MPRB would pursue a complete renovation and a possible new design layout for fields at Bryn Mawr Meadows to better provide consolidated ball diamond opportunities and soccer field areas in the central portion of the city.

In total, improvements may include soil amendments, re-grading, re-seeding, irrigation, lighting, re-alignment of fields to improve drainage and reduce multiple uses, amenities for players and spectators, parking and other site improvements. Safety fencing, accessibility accommodations, and shade structures will also be installed where necessary. New systems to provide for reinforced turf to increase the amount of play that can occur on a field and to maximize the benefits of rainwater for irrigation will be explored.

Purpose and Justification:

Athletic fields are an integral part of the city's infrastructure. Already at a premium in Minneapolis – field availability is far outstripped by demand — athletic fields are a prime social and recreational resource in this city. Whether sponsored by the parks, public schools, private schools, clubs, or adult leagues, teams depend on Park Board fields for both practice and games. Because fields are in such high demand, they tend to be overused and their upkeep is especially challenging. Improving athletic fields so they are more durable, able to meet the demands of almost continuous programming needs, and need to be rested or rehabilitated far less often will enhance the delivery of recreational services to the residents of Minneapolis.

Planning for improvements to Bryn Mawr Meadows would begin in 2018. Dependent on the funds available, the MPRB would like to pursue a complete renovation and potentially new design layout of the fields to better provide consolidated ball diamond opportunities and soccer field areas in the central portion of the city.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,500	250	1,750
Park Capital Levy	500	800	1,300
Totals by Year	2,000	1,050	3,050

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not at this time.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This is based on costs of maintaining other upgraded neighborhood park fields, such as the field at Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Park. Costs are associated with irrigation, aeration and fertilization of the turf.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

This project will replace existing fields and will not be adding infrastructure to the park system.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	210	110	320
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	1,429	750	2,179
Project Management	0	0	0	76	40	116
Contingency	0	0	0	190	100	290
City Administration	0	0	0	95	50	145
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	2,000	1,050	3,050

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project upgrades athletic fields and related features for safety and to support community use at Bryn Mawr Meadows — in furtherance of the following City Goals.

LIVING WELL: MINNEAPOLIS IS SAFE AND LIVABLE AND HAS AN ACTIVE AND CONNECTED WAY OF LIFE

This city goal focuses on recreation opportunities for residents and visitors (strategy: residents and visitors alike have ample arts, cultural, entertainment and recreational opportunities). Whether it is a team sport or a quick toss of a baseball, good quality athletic fields encourage youth and adults to be active in their communities. For residents and visitors, field sports provide opportunities to socialize, develop teamwork skills, and improve physical fitness. Field improvement projects will ensure the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board continues to provide healthy choices for residents and visitors. Through these resources the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board continues its commitment to developing the next generation of well-balanced residents.

A HUB OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND INNOVATION: BUSINESSES, BIG AND SMALL, START, MOVE, STAY AND GROW HERE

Amenities to support a vibrant community that retains business and workers are contributors to this city goal. Regular renovation of athletic fields ensures that the many families who participate in organized sports are not tempted to look to the suburbs for quality athletics, and that these fields continue to be seen as an amenity that helps to create and maintain a strong, positive image for the City of Lakes. These projects will help ensure that the community has safe, cost effective recreation opportunities so they don't need to leave the city to obtain a high quality of life.

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

This goal focuses on decisions that support the environment (strategy: the city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources). Improvements to athletic fields within the Minneapolis parks will focus on best management practices for field surfaces that contribute to healthy urban soil conditions. Healthy soil remediation will decrease use of mechanical inputs including frequency of aeration and irrigation, and provide increased absorbency and retention during storm events. Storm water may then slowly filter and be cleaned through properly graded and restored athletic field surfaces in advance of entering the city's discharge system and surface water bodies.

Additionally, the project contributes to the following city goals and strategies by improving infrastructure and recreational opportunities:

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board goals and objectives:

The MPRB's current goals and objectives are contained within its comprehensive plan. Therefore, there will be some overlap in the response between this question and the following one. These projects contribute primarily to the MPRB goal of "park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty." These projects renew the fields so that they can better accommodate the park and recreation needs of the community.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This funding source is essential to the basic capital improvements of the fields across the city. Projects funded with these dollars are consistent with the following direction of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board 2007-2020 Comprehensive Plan:

Vision Statement: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.
Goal: Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty.

Strategy: Integrate sustainable practices, ecological design for landscapes, and green building techniques into new construction and renewal of all amenities, giving priority to those practices that meet or exceed established standards, improve ecological function, and minimize long-term maintenance and operating costs.

Strategy: Build or renew facilities to meet or exceed standards for accessibility.

Projects funded by this resource address several policies outlined in the Open Space and Parks section of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan.
Relevant City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan Polices:

Policy 7.1: Promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors by recognizing that safe outdoor amenities and spaces support exercise, play, relaxation and socializing.
Policy 7.1.4 Ensure open spaces provide peaceful, meditative, and relaxing areas as well as social, recreational, and exercise opportunities.
Policy 7.1.5 Provide equipment, programming, and other resources when possible that promote the physical and mental health of citizens.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project will take place in the spring or summer of the funding year (2018).

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Throughout the city, athletic councils help provide youth athletic programs. They commonly help recruit volunteer coaches and collect funds to support field improvements.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Moving projects back can result in greater project costs or the need for costly emergency repairs.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Community engagement to plan the field improvements will begin in early 2018. Plans will be completed and construction will begin in the fall of 2018 and continue into the spring and summer of 2019. Fields are expected to be ready for play by spring 2020.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Neighborhood Parks Capital Infrastructure **Project ID:** PRKCP

Project Location: Throughout park system	**Affected Wards:** All
City Sector: Citywide	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** City-Wide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2014	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 12/31/19
Project Start Date: 1/1/15	**Department Priority:** 7/7
Submitting Department: Park Board	**Contact Phone Number:** 612-230-6464
Contact Person: Jennifer Ringold	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $0

Project Description:

Funded by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board's capital levy, this program provides annual funding for sidewalk and internal park path repair, grant matches to the Hennepin Youth Sports Grant program, additional ADA improvements, neighborhood rehabilitation (emergency) projects, operations facility rehabilitation, recreation center rehabilitation and synthetic turf replacement. In addition, it includes funding for acquisition and implementation of park and trail improvements along the Mississippi Riverfront or Grand Rounds Missing Link that may not be eligible for regional park funding.

Purpose and Justification:

Sidewalk/Interior Path Rehabilitation:
The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is establishing a replacement fund for the sidewalks and internal pedestrian paths within neighborhood and community parks. This will help the MPRB work collaboratively with the City of Minneapolis as it implements its annual replacement program for sidewalks across the city. As funds allow, it will also be used to replace or rehabilitate pathways within neighborhood and community parks.

Grant Match:
Starting in 2015 the MPRB intends to focus matching funds on non-field related projects that are eligible for the Hennepin Youth Sports Grant program. Projects for these grant applications will be identified through future capital program development.

Mississippi Riverfront and Grand Rounds Missing Link:
The MPRB is identifying non-regional park funding that can be used to implement the aspects of the plans for the Mississippi Riverfront and the Grand Rounds Missing Link that do not qualify for regional park funding.

ADA Improvements:
While all capital projects must meet ADA requirements, the MPRB recognizes that there are some improvements that need to be made to increase accessibility before a full capital project is scheduled for a particular park or amenity. The ADA improvement funding targets improvements to building and outdoor facilities that are not part of the current capital program.

Neighborhood Rehabilitation Fund:
The neighborhood park system contains over $100M in assets ranging from playgrounds and wading pools to recreation centers. Within a given year un-programmed improvements may need to be made, such as a failed boiler or leaky roof. At $100,000 per year, this fund ensures that .01% of the value of neighborhood park assets is reserved to address these types of emergency improvements to minimize further damage and reduced long-term costs.

Operational Facilities Rehabilitation:
The MPRB is initiating an operation facility plan that will guide future investments in the operations facilities throughout the system. Key focus on the plan will be to increase safety and efficiency.

Synthetic Turf:

The MPRB has installed several artificial turf fields over the past 5 years. Over time the turf will need to be replaced. This will be an ongoing funded dedicated to turf replacement.

Recreation Center Rehabilitation:
The MPRB owns 49 recreation centers. Most were built in the 1960's and 1970's. While the MPRB is working on a system-wide recreation center facility plan that will help determine long-term capital improvements to recreation centers, this funding will allow for improvements that are needed to sustain the buildings in the short-term. The initial years include $50,000 per year. In 2019, the allocation increases to $250,000.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Park Capital Levy	5,361	1,650	1,650	1,650	1,750	1,750	13,811
Totals by Year	5,361	1,650	1,650	1,650	1,750	1,750	13,811

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Grant requests that will utilize the 2015-2019 grant matching funds will be identified in the year prior to writing Hennepin Youth Sports Grant. For example, projects will be identified in the end of 2014 for the 2015 grant year.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The sidewalk/interior path replacement, operational facilities rehabilitation, synthetic turf rehabilitation, recreation center rehabilitation and neighborhood rehabilitation funds will be a direct replacement and will reduce the need for emergency fixes or patches.

The operating cost impacts of the grant match will depend on the projects that are selected for funding. If the project will result in an increase in operating cost, the grant request will require Park Board approval.

Riverfront master plans and the Grand Rounds Missing Link master plans will require a full analysis of the potential operating cost increases. This work is in progress and will need to be complete prior to finishing master plan updates for both future park areas.

ADA improvements will be applied to existing infrastructure and are not expected to increase operating costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Projects may range from sidewalks and paths to playgrounds in this program. The future capital investment required will depend on the type infrastructure. Sidewalks and paths will require capital investment every 15-20 years depending on location and soil conditions. Conversely, playgrounds are replaced every 20-25 years.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	173	173	173	183	183	885
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Construction Costs	1,179	1,179	1,179	1,250	1,250	6,036
Project Management	63	63	63	67	67	322
Contingency	157	157	157	167	167	805
City Administration	79	79	79	83	83	402
Total Expenses with Admin	1,650	1,650	1,650	1,750	1,750	8,450

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This program addresses improving sidewalks and interior park paths, seeking grant funding for neighborhood parks, replacing synthetic turf, improving operations facilities, providing ADA improvements, addressing emergency needs of neighborhood parks, and funding non-regional improvements to the Mississippi Riverfront and the Grand Rounds Missing Link—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

LIVING WELL: MINNEAPOLIS IS SAFE AND LIVABLE AND HAS AN ACTIVE AND CONNECTED WAY OF LIFE

- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
- Residents and visitors alike have ample arts, cultural, entertainment and recreational opportunities

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board goals and objectives:

The MPRB's current goals and objectives are contained within its comprehensive plan. Therefore, there will be some overlap in the response between this question and the following one. This funding source contributes primarily to the MPRB goal of "park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty."

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This program will fund regular replacement of sidewalks, provide matching dollars that attracts funding from other public or private entities and fund non-regional elements of the Grand Rounds Missing Link or Mississippi Riverfront projects. Projects funded with these dollars are consistent with the following direction of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board comprehensive plan:

Vision Statement: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.
Goal: Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility and beauty.

Strategy: Integrate sustainable practices, ecological design for landscapes, and green building techniques into new

construction and renewal of all amenities, giving priority to those practices that meet or exceed established standards, improve ecological function, and minimize long-term maintenance and operating costs.

Strategy: Implement a sustainable, long-term renewal plan based on a complete inventory of the system, life-cycle cost analysis, and condition assessment of all park facilities.

Strategy: Build or renew facilities to meet or exceed standards for accessibility.

Projects funded by this resource address several policies outlined in the Open Space and Parks section of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan.
Relevant City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan Polices:

Policy 7.1: Promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors by recognizing that safe outdoor amenities and spaces support exercise, play, relaxation and socializing.
7.1.3 Provide safe pedestrian and bike routes to open spaces and parks.
7.1.5 Provide equipment, programming, and other resources when possible that promote the physical and mental health of citizens.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This will be determined as projects are identified.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Funding within this program can be moved between years.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

N/A

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Proposed allocations with anticipated funding years and sources (2015-2019 MPRB Neighborhood Park Capital Program)

Sidewalks.....2015.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Hennepin County Grant Match...2015.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Riverfront, GRML.....2015.....$1,000,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
ADA Improvements.....2015.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Neighborhood Rehab.....2015.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Operation Facility.....2015.....$150,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Recreation Center Rehab.....2015.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Sidewalks.....2016.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Hennepin Cty Grant Match.....2016.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Riverfront, GRML.....2016.....$1,000,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
ADA Improvements.....2016.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Neighborhood Rehab.....2016.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy

Operation Facility.....2016.....$150,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Recreation Center Rehab.....2016.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Sidewalks.....2017.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Hennepin County Grant Match...2017.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Riverfront, GRML.....2017.....$1,300,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
ADA Improvements.....2017.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Neighborhood Rehab.....2017.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Operation Facility.....2017.....$150,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Recreation Center Rehab.....2017.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Sidewalks.....2018.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Hennepin County Grant Match...2018.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Riverfront, GRML.....2018.....$1,000,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
ADA Improvements.....2018.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Neighborhood Rehab.....2018.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Operation Facility.....2018.....$150,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Recreation Center Rehab.....2018.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Artificial Turf.....2018.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Sidewalks.....2019.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Hennepin County Grant Match...2019.....$200,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Riverfront, GRML.....2019.....$500,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
ADA Improvements.....2019.....$50,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Neighborhood Rehab.....2019.....$100,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Operation Facility.....2019.....$150,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Recreation Center Rehab.....2019.....$250,000.....MPRB Capital Levy
Artificial Turf.....2019.....$300,000.....MPRB Capital Levy

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Diseased Tree Removal **Project ID:** PRKDT

Project Location: Throughout the city
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2016
Project Start Date: 1/1/16
Submitting Department: Park Board
Contact Person: Ralph Sievert
Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: N/A
Contact Phone Number: 612-313-7735
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $1,033,936

Project Description:

This project entails removal of diseased trees from private property, outside of public street right of ways and other public lands. Invasive pests such as Dutch Elm disease and Emerald Ash Borer can, and have, wiped out whole regions of certain species, and more pests are threatening our region. Prompt removal is one of the best methods of control by proactively preventing spread of a disease from an already infected host.

Purpose and Justification:

This project is an extremely important part of the tool box for controlling tree diseases, and protecting our urban forest. Trees are desirable for both practical and aesthetic reasons. They intercept rainwater, remove carbon dioxide from the air, provide shade that helps to reduce energy needed for cooling, and reduce winds helping to lower winter heating costs. The urban forest also provides habitat and sustenance for local wildlife.

Trees also enhance and help maintain property values often being valued at thousands of dollars each for mature, healthy and well-formed specimens. Diseased trees can be a serious safety threat once they transition into a weakened state. Diseased trees may look fine on the outside, but can easily fall over from even a slight force, such as wind or impact, causing severe damage and extreme injury

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Special Assessments	2,100	300	300	300	300	3,300
Totals by Year	2,100	300	300	300	300	3,300

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

N/A

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 0
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

N/A

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

N/A

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	286	286	286	286	1,143
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	0	14	14	14	14	57
Total Expenses with Admin	0	300	300	300	300	1,200

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains the health of our urban forest—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED

- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board goals and objectives:

The MPRB's current goals and objectives are contained within its comprehensive plan. Therefore, there will be some overlap in the response between this question and the following one. This funding source contributes primarily to the MPRB goal of "sound management techniques provide healthy, diverse and sustainable natural resources." The Minneapolis tree canopy is dependent on the health of the urban forest. These funds help the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board remove disease trees throughout the city so that park and boulevard trees can continue to thrive.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This funding source is essential to the basic maintenance of the urban forest. It helps reduce the spread of disease that might otherwise continue to thrive among trees on private property and spread to boulevard or park trees. Projects funded with these dollars are consistent with the following direction of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board comprehensive plan:

Vision Statement: Urban forests, natural areas and waters that endure and captivate.
Goal: Sound management techniques provide healthy, diverse and sustainable natural resources.

Projects funded by this resource address policy from the Environment section of the City of Minneapolis' Comprehensive Plan. Removal of diseased trees helps ensure the entire urban tree canopy remains healthy (Policy 6.8).
Relevant City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan Polices:

Policy 6.8: Encourage a healthy thriving urban tree canopy and other desirable forms of vegetation.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

N/A

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

N/A

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This is an ongoing special assessment fund.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Ongoing - Unspent balance will be applied to future years. MPRB has reduced the annual request from $500,000 to $300,000 for 2016-2019 and removed its 2015 request to reduce the unspent balance.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Parkway Paving Program **Project ID:** PV001

Project Location: Various locations throughout the city.
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Paul W. Ogren
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 20 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-2456
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $500,000

Project Description:

The objective of the Parkway Paving Program is to re-evaluate the pavement condition and annual maintenance expenditures of all parkway paving areas that were constructed with a bituminous surface within the last two/three decades. The concrete portion, curb, gutter, sidewalks, and driveways have for the most part weathered the years better than the bituminous surface. The objective of this program is to perform a mill and overlay of the roadway surface instead of a total reconstruction. Mill and overlay allows the bituminous surface between the curb and gutters to be removed and a new roadway surface constructed. The rationale behind this approach is that the life of the existing roadway can be extended 10 years through the parkway paving program.

Purpose and Justification:

At this time the areas paved in the past are re-evaluated using the same consideration for roadway conditions used in the initial selection process: ride and condition of the roadway surface/section and the condition of the curb and gutter. The Parkway Paving Program was developed by the City Council and City Engineer, with significant input from the MPRB and their staff, with the intent of maintaining the quality of the parkway system.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,780	700	700	700	700	700	700	5,980
Special Assessments	150	50	50	50	50	50	50	450
Park Capital Levy	1,200		1,000					2,200
Transfer from Special Revenue Funds	450							450
Other Local Governments	1,000				1,000			2,000
Totals by Year	4,580	750	1,750	750	1,750	750	750	11,080

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

MPRB applies to the Metropolitan Council every other year. Typically the grant is known in June of the year requested. MPRB also has Park Capital Levy funding that is requested annually for this program. This funding along with the aforementioned Metropolitan Council Grant funding constitutes “Other Committed” for this program.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 10
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (15,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current estimate is approximately $1,500 per mile saved annually on a Parkway/Local roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	694	1,642	694	1,642	694	5,366
Project Management	20	25	20	25	20	110
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	36	83	36	83	36	274
Total Expenses with Admin	750	1,750	750	1,750	750	5,750

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure:

A CITY THAT WORKS
Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's

pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board plays a supporting and collaborating role in the projects by approving all projects included

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Unspent balances will be rolled forward to fund Parkway Paving in future years. The size and the scope of work can be adjusted to utilize all available funds.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

This program consists of various street segments. The parkway system is very narrow and bicycle facilities, if proposed, are generally off-street facilities.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes, on high volume pedestrian corridors, with concurrence by both the MPRB and public works staff, pedestrian ramps are upgraded.

Q3.Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

No

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

No

Parkway Paving Program

Map Date: February 2014

MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Subject to Change

NORTH

PAVING

SEALCOATING

N

MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	Parkway Paving	Proposed: 2014-2019	PV001
	Contact: Paul Ogren 612-673-2456	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Alley Renovation Program **Project ID:** PV006

Project Location: City-wide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Tracy Lindgren
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 21 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 290-5898
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $240,701

Project Description:

Repair and place a bituminous overlay on existing concrete and asphalt alleys that are rated in “poor” or “very poor” condition according to the “Pavement Condition Index” database. This will extend the operational life of an alley for approximately 10 years.

Purpose and Justification:

The City of Minneapolis’ residential alley system is a critical component of its transportation and storm water management systems. Alleys provide access to the off-street side of properties that are utilized for both parking and deliveries to businesses. The residential alleys provide access to the garages and/or off street parking and are used as primary locations for solid waste and recycling collection services. In addition, these alleys provide for both controlled surface drainage and temporary storage of storm water runoff. These improvements allow for maintaining a safe, healthy, and aesthetically appealing residential neighborhoods. For any city, providing and maintaining the city’s basic infrastructure at a level that attracts and maintains a strong business community as well as vibrant and livable neighborhoods is an essential element in making that city a place where people want to live, work, and visit. This project will help maintain this system at a high quality level.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	623	200	200	200	200	200	200	1,823
Special Assessments	435	50	50	50	50	50	50	735
Transfer from General Fund	800							800
Transfer from Special Revenue Funds	600							600
Totals by Year	2,458	250	250	250	250	250	250	3,958

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 10
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (1,380)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The current street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $1000 per mile for alleys in the City. This program averages 11 alleys renovated per year with an average length of 660 l.f. or approximately 1.38 miles, with an annual savings of $1,380.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	238	238	238	238	238	1,190
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	12	12	12	12	12	60
Total Expenses with Admin	250	250	250	250	250	1,250

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This program maintains existing alley infrastructure which also contributes to a walkable City because it minimizes driveway disruptions along the public sidewalk. This furthers the following City goals:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The size and scope of the work can be adjusted to utilize all available funds.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

These dollars are programmed to overlay additional alleys in 2014.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

A quality alley affects the respective values of the adjoining residential properties. Visual enhancement is obtained by overlaying alleys and repairing/replacing retaining walls. The alley system is a critical component for facilitating both residential solid waste pick up and timely snow removal.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.
Not Applicable

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.
Not Applicable

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
Not Applicable

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
Not Applicable

ALLEY RENOVATION PROGRAM

Map Date: February 2014

MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Subject to Change

NORTH



During Renovation

Before Renovation

After Renovation

2014 ALLEYS

- 8009 2nd Ave S, 3rd Ave S, 22nd St E, Franklin Ave E
- 6569 Irving Ave S, Humboldt Ave S, 35th St W, 34th St W
- 6749 Lincoln St NE, Johnson St NE, 23rd Ave NE, Lowry Ave NE
- 8598 18th Ave S, Cedar Ave S, 47th St E, 46th St E
- 8754 25th Ave SE, 26th Ave SE, Talmage Ave SE, E Hennepin Ave
- 8987 34th Ave S, 35th Ave S, 34th St E, 33rd St E
- 6399 Harriet Ave, Gladstone Ave, W Minnehaha Parkway, Elmwood Pl W
- 6796 Morgan Ave S, Logan Ave S, 50th St W, 49th St W
- 7336 Pleasant Ave, Pillsbury Ave, 48th ST W, 47th St W
- 7504 Sheridan Ave N, Russell Ave N, Oak Park Ave N, 12th Ave N
- 8006 2nd Ave S, 3rd Ave S, 18th St E, 17th St E
- 8862 29th Ave S, 30th Ave S, 40th St E, 39th St E
- 7462 42nd Ave N, 43rd Ave N, Queen Ave N, Russell Ave N

2015 Proposed Alley Resurfacing

- 6656 - 2015 Knox Ave S, James Ave S, 31st St W, Lake St W
- 6384 - 2015 Hennepin Ave, Girard Ave S, 33rd St W, 32nd St W
- 5817 - 2015 Central Ave NE, Polk St NE, 24th Ave NE, Lowry Ave NE
- 7036 - 2015 Oliver Ave S, Newton Ave S, 56th St W, 55th St W
- 7410 - 2015 Portland Ave, Oakland Ave, 49th St E, 48th St E
- 7682 - 2015 Upton Ave N, Thomas Ave N, 26th Ave N, 27th Ave N
- 8506 - 2015 15th Ave S, Bloomington Ave, 52nd St E, 51st St E
- 5624 - 2015 Pillsbury Ave, Blaisdell Ave, 22nd St W, Franklin Ave W

2016 Proposed Alley Resurfacing

- 5576 - 2015 Colfax Ave N, Aldrich Ave N, 31st Ave N, Lowry Ave N
- 7260 - 2015 Queen Ave N, Penn Ave N, 29th Ave N, 30th Ave N
- 8032 - 2015 2nd Ave S, 3rd Ave S, 48th St E, 47th St E
- 7172 - 2015 Penn AveN, Oliver Ave N, 23rd Ave N, West Broadway
- 7264 - 2015 Queen Ave N, Penn Ave N, 34th Ave N, 35th Ave N
- 8040 - 2015 Washington Ave N, 2nd St N, 1st Ave N, 2nd Ave N
- 8507 - 2015 15th Ave S, Bloomington Ave, 53rd St E, 52nd St E
- 9385 - 2015 Sheridan Ave N, Russell Ave N, 8th Ave N, Oak Park Ave N
- 6011 - 2015 Columbus Ave, Chicago AVe, 50th St E, 49th St E
- 8178 - 2015 5th St N, 4th St N, Lowry Ave N, 33rd Ave N

2017 Proposed Alley Resurfacing

- 8182 - 2015 6th St N, 4th St N, 36th Ave N, 37th Ave N
- 7105 - 2015 Nicollet Ave, 1st Ave S, 47th St E, 46th St E
- 7727 - 2015 Tyler St NE, Polk St NE, 35th Ave NE, 36th Ave NE
- 8641 - 2015 21st Ave S, 22nd Ave S, 24th St E, 22nd St E
- 5586 - 2015 Arthur St NE, Cleveland St NE, 23rd Ave NE, Lowry Ave NE
- 6763 - 2015 Morgan Ave N, Logan Ave N, Chestnut Ave W, 2nd Ave N
- 5881 - 2015 Drew Ave S, Chowen Ave S, 28th St W, Cedar Lake Ave
- 5882 - 2015 Drew Ave S, Chowen Ave S, Sunset Blvd, 28th St W
- 8499 - 2015 15th Ave S, Bloomington Ave, 45th St E, 44th St E
- 7819 - 2015 Washburn Ave N, Vincent Ave N, 21st Ave N, McNair Ave
- 6309 - 2015 Lyndale Ave S, Garfield Ave, Lake St W, HCRRA

2018 Proposed Alley Resurfacing

- 9581 - 2015 Logan Ave N, Elwood Ave N, Olson Memorial Hwy, Thomas Pl
- 9582 - 2015 Elwood Ave N, Irving Ave N, Elwood Ave N, 8th Ave N
- 4123 - 2015 James Ave N, Elwood Ave N, Olson Memorial Hwy, 7th Ave N
- 7809 - 2015 Washburn Ave N, Vincent Ave N, 2nd Ave N, Glenwood Ave
- 8090 - 2015 3rd Ave S, Clinton Ave, 49th St E, 48th St E
- 1027 - 2015 38th Ave S, 39th Ave S, 33rd St E, 32nd St E
- 6193 - 2015 Fremont Ave S, Emerson Ave S, 32nd St W, 31st St W
- 9052 - 2015 37th Ave S, 38th Ave S, 34th St E, 33rd St E
- 6861 - 2015 Aldrich Ave S, Lyndale ave S, 32nd St W, 31st St W
- 9029- 2015 36th Ave S, 37th Ave S, 33rd St E, 32nd St E
- 9077 - 2015 38th Ave S, 39th Ave S, 35th St E, 34th ST E

2019 Proposed Alley Resurfacing

- 6284 - 2015 Girard Ave S, Fremont Ave S, 27th St W, 26th St W
- 5602 - 2015 Chowen Ave S, Beard Ave S, 43rd St W, 42nd St W
- 5885 - 2015 Drew Ave S, Chowen Ave S, 40th St W, 39th St W
- 5685 - 2015 Bloomington, W Lake Nokomis Pkwy, 54th St E, Chateau Pl
- 8093 - 2015 3rd Ave S, Clinton Ave, 54th ST E, 53rd St E
- 9278 - 2015 46th Ave S, 47th Ave S, 38th St E, 37th St E
- 8804 - 2015 27th Ave S, 28th Ave S, 44th St E, 43rd St E
- 5859 - 2015 Chicago Ave, Elliot Ave, 39th St E, 38th St E

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 6th Ave N (5th St N to dead end north of Wash Ave N) Project ID: PV019

Project Location: 5th St N to the Dead End north of Wash Ave N
City Sector: Downtown
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2010
Project Start Date: 4/15/16
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Beverly Warmka

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): North Loop
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/17
Department Priority: 27 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3762
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The project is approximately 0.28 miles in length from 5th St N to the dead end north of Washington Ave N. The project was once in a primarily industrial and commercial area. However, the North Loop neighborhood has experienced, and continues to experience dramatic changes. Substantial redevelopment has occurred over the last decade including Target Field and the Interchange Project with significant residential and commercial developments.

This street segment has many areas of broken or non-existent curb, and the driving surface is a mixture of street pavers and asphalt patches. A consistent ADA compliant pedestrian walkway is non-existent due to the presence of many loading docks that are currently in use today. The current condition of the roadway requires frequent maintenance. Full reconstruction of the street would include compete removal and replacement of the driving surface along with the addition of a pedestrian walkway that would be ADA compliant. This project falls within a historically designated area, and design of the street would follow guidance contained in the Warehouse District Heritage Streets Plan. The Heritage Streets Plan provides guidance for historical preservation of the area as projects are proposed and implemented.

Purpose and Justification:

The current condition of the street pavement is poor and there is a complete lack of an accessible ADA compliant pedestrian walkway. The street segment was last constructed in 1926, and aside from extensive asphalt patching, it has not seen any other maintenance since. This street segment also lacks a clearly defined geometry and with both parrallel and angled on-street parking and active loading docks. There is a need to reduce the risks of unsafe conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.

With recent changes in land uses from industrial/commercial to residential and commercial, the construction of the Interchange project and opening of Target Field, there is a clear need to address pavement condition and pedestrian accessibility and safety. Improving pedestrian accessibility is especially important in this area which was not originally designed and built with the pedestrian in mind.

This project has been proposed in the past; however, without strong guidance on how to preserve the historic character of the street, it has failed to move forward. Completion of the Heritage Streets Plan gives us that strong guidance. Given the magnitude of planned transit infrastructure improvements and other developments in this neighborhood, it is important to ensure accessible pedestrian walkways, which are a large component of this project; every transit ride begins and ends with a pedestrian.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	150	150	300
Municipal State Aid	945	940	1,885
Special Assessments	165	270	435

Project Title: 6th Ave N (5th St N to dead end north of Wash Ave N) Project ID: PV019

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Water Revenue	80	85	165
State Government Grants	1,120		1,120
Totals by Year	2,460	1,445	3,905

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

This project has been awarded federal funding through the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Enhancements program. A total of $1,120,000 of federal funding was awarded for 2016 construction.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (1,675)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	450	0	0	0	450
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	1,648	1,111	0	0	2,759
Project Management	0	50	70	0	0	120
Contingency	0	195	195	0	0	390
City Administration	0	117	69	0	0	186
Total Expenses with Admin	0	2,460	1,445	0	0	3,905

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected

• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.
Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.
10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.
10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bump-outs.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that

analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 9th, 2011. The project was found to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project has been awarded federal funding through the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Enhancements program. The program year for this project is set to coincide with the availability of the federal funding.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is anticipated to be a one construction year project. Spreading the construction over two or more years decreases the cost effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The neighborhood engagement and design process will begin in late 2014 and be completed by mid 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Capital improvement projects such as this one, completes a corridor, enhances the commercial character of the area which helps preserve existing property values and enhances the City's tax base.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

No

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes. This is expected to be a high volume pedestrian corridor that will provide walk-up access to the Interchange and its LRT and Commuter Rail platforms as well as Target Field and other local destinations. The proposed improvements will greatly improve the corridor for pedestrians providing a consistent and ADA compliant route through the popular and growing North Loop neighborhood.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes, improving sidewalks, crosswalks, and providing ADA-compliant curb ramps is an integral part of this project, as described previously.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes, the right-of-way is constrained, and the roadway serves multiple purposes with active loading docks at several locations. There is also parking on the roadway. The proposed design is based on the City's Heritage Streets Plan.

Through this innovative design, adequate space is provided for pedestrians, traffic, parking and loading docks.

The southerly end point of this project abuts the project limits of The Interchange project. The Interchange is a project that will add a second LRT platform just west of the existing Target Field Station and include a large public plaza with potential opportunities for small and large scale development. The Interchange will accommodate the future Southwest and Bottineau transit corridors as well.







MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**6th Avenue North** 5th St N to Dead End north of Washington Ave N	**Proposed:** 2016-2017	**PV019**
	Contact: Bev Warmka 612-673-3762	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Hennepin/Lyndale **Project ID:** PV027

Project Location: "Bottleneck Area" between Franklin Ave. & Dunwoody Blvd.
City Sector: Multiple
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2011
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Ole Mersinger

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/16
Department Priority: 6 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3537
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project will reconstruct the Hennepin and Lyndale Avenues “bottleneck,” which also serves as the hazardous materials bypass around the I-94 Lowry Hill Tunnel. The project includes two segments of roadway: 0.2 miles of North-bound Hennepin Avenue beginning at Groveland Avenue and 0.6 miles of southbound Lyndale Avenue S between Dunwoody Blvd and the east-bound I-94 on-ramp (ramp # 5265) north of Summit Ave. The proposed project will reconstruct the pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks and install electronic lane signing. New street lighting, traffic signals, and improved pedestrian crossings at the Vineland Place and Groveland Terrace intersections will also be included.

Purpose and Justification:

This is an extremely heavily traveled section of roadway with traffic counts of over 25,000 vehicles per day (ADT) in each direction of travel through the Hennepin/Lyndale commons area. This roadway was last constructed in 1956, and has a pavement condition index between 28 and 45, which is considered very poor to poor. Due to vehicular lane changes in this area, sideswipe accidents are common. The accident rate exceeds the MnDOT average rates. Documented bicycle accidents are also more than would be statistically expected.

In addition, pedestrian improvements at the Vineland Place and Groveland Terrace intersections have been identified as a need in the City's 2009 Pedestrian Master Plan. An estimated 1069 pedestrians and bicyclists passed through the Groveland intersection during a 2011 (24 hour) count.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,085	625	1,710
Municipal State Aid	2,470	2,470	4,940
Special Assessments	195	195	390
Stormwater Revenue	250		250
Federal Government Grants	7,295		7,295
Totals by Year	11,295	3,290	14,585

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

This project has been awarded federal funding through the Metropolitan Council's Regional Solicitation Program. A total of $7,295,000 of federal funding has been awarded to this project for construction in 2015-2016.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (4,800)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	1,800	0	0	0	0	1,800
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	7,952	2,128	0	0	0	10,080
Project Management	350	350	0	0	0	700
Contingency	655	655	0	0	0	1,310
City Administration	538	157	0	0	0	695
Total Expenses with Admin	11,295	3,290	0	0	0	14,585

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure, and support a robust and safe pedestrian network, in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth – references
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 23, 2011. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Due to its location, State and County infrastructure will be impacted by the project. MnDOT and Hennepin County Transportation Department will be involved in the project design

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The high volume of traffic on these roadways will make reconstruction a challenging endeavor. The project will require a large amount of public outreach, coordination with other public agencies, and planning prior to construction. This project will likely be a two-year construction project. Due to the sensitive nature of the traffic flow in the area and the large traffic volume impacted by the project, the construction staging will be a critical issue requiring detailed coordination with Mn/DOT, Hennepin County, neighborhoods, and property owners.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a

new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

In order to meet the Federal Grant Funding Agreement timeline the following must occur.

Preliminary Design Begins: Spring 2014
Stakeholder Outreach Begins: Winter 2013/Spring 2014
Layout Approval: Spring 2014
Design Begins: Summer 2014
Construction Begins: Summer/Fall 2015 to coincide with federal grant funding.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

Yes, the existing Loring Bikeway is located along this corridor and will be restored where disturbed. The project will improve the bicycle crossing at the Vineland intersection.

Q2.Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes, Metro Transit High-Frequency routes 4 and 6 operate on this corridor. This is also a high volume pedestrian corridor adjacent to major pedestrian generators including Walker Art Center and Sculpture Garden and Loring Park.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes, existing bus stops along the corridor will be enhanced. Cross walks will be improved and pedestrian countdown timers will be installed. Bike accommodations will be included at Vineland/15th Street.

Q4.Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes, the right of way is extremely constrained by adjacent land uses. These roadways serve local traffic as well as traffic entering and exiting the freeway system and are a critical component to the local as well as regional transportation systems. Innovative design options will be explored during project development.



Aerial showing road condition



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Hennepin/Lyndale
Franklin Ave to Eastbound Ramp N of Dunwoody

Contact: Ole Mersinger 612-673-3537

Proposed:
2015-2016
Subject to Change

PV027

MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Hennepin/Lyndale
Franklin Ave to Eastbound Ramp N of Dunwoody

Contact: Ole Mersinger 612-673-3537

Proposed:
2015-2016

Subject to Change

PV027

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 8th St S **Project ID:** PV054

Project Location: Hennepin Ave to Chicago Ave
City Sector: Downtown
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2019
Project Start Date: 4/15/19
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Hay
Affected Wards: 7
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/20
Department Priority: 42 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3884
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project will reconstruct 0.72 miles of 8th Street in downtown from Hennepin Avenue to Chicago Avenue. This section of 8th Street is Municipal State Aid (MSA) Route 434. The project will consist of complete removal and replacement of the pavement, subgrade, curb and gutter, and driveways. The proposed project will also include landscaping, pedestrian level street lighting, and upgraded signals where warranted. Some sidewalks may also be replaced and sidewalks may be widened, particularly at bus stop locations.

Purpose and Justification:

This section of 8th Street was constructed in various segments from 1952 to 1971. From Hennepin Avenue to Nicollet was constructed in 1955, and has a PCI=24. From Nicollet to 2nd Avenue S was constructed in 1971, and has a PCI=67. From 2nd to 4th Avenues South was constructed in 1952 and has a PCI=27. From 4th Avenue to Chicago was constructed in 1967 and has a PCI=41-49. All of these segments were last seal coated in 1985. This roadway has considerable medium and high severity cracking and patching, and has developed severe potholes. Many sections of curb and gutter are also showing medium to high levels of deterioration. This is a very high volume corridor with traffic counts from 6,900-10,000 ADT. This is also a very high volume transit corridor. Metro Transit currently operates routes 5, 9, 19, and 22 on 8th Street.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	7,760	7,760
Special Assessments	1,040	1,040
Totals by Year	8,800	8,800

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (4,750)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	670	670
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	5,731	5,731
Project Management	0	0	0	0	490	490
Contingency	0	0	0	0	1,490	1,490
City Administration	0	0	0	0	419	419
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	0	8,800	8,800

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

City of Minneapolis Goals
Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
• Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with

land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.3: Encourage walking throughout the city by ensuring that routes are safe, comfortable, pleasant, and accessible.
2.3.1 Ensure that there are safe and accessible pedestrian routes to major destinations, including transit corridors, from nearby residential areas.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.
10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bump-outs.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project will be submitted for location and design review in 2014.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

8th Street South is a component of an ongoing initiative with Metro Transit known as the East-West Pedestrian and Transit Improvement Project.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project may be divided into shorter segments with construction phased over more than one year.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

No

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes. This is a high volume transit and pedestrian corridor.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes, improved and possibly widened sidewalks will be part of the project. Additional enhancements will include pedestrian level lighting, landscaping, and upgraded signal systems with countdown timers. Upgraded transit shelters may also be included from Metro Transit.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes, the right of way is constrained for this busy downtown Street. Sidewalk widening and other pedestrian and transit enhancements may be accomplished through peak-hour parking restrictions.





MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

8th Street South
Hennepin Ave to Chicago Ave

Proposed:
2019

Subject to Change

PV054

Contact: Steve Hay 612-919-3884

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Asphalt Pavement Resurfacing Program **Project ID:** PV056

Project Location: Various location throughout the City
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Hay
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 16 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3884
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $3,565,000

Project Description:

The objective of the Asphalt Pavement Resurfacing Program is to extend the life of the pavement and reduce annual maintenance expenditures of streets that were constructed with a bituminous surface 30 or more years ago. The concrete portions: curb, gutter, sidewalk, and driveways have weathered the years better than the bituminous pavement surface due to the added durability of the concrete. This program will consist of an edge mill and overlay instead of a total reconstruction of the roadway. The rationale behind this approach is that the life of the existing roadway can be extended at least 10 years thus delaying the need for a new roadway.

Purpose and Justification:

The resurfacing program was presented and approved on February 15, 2008 by the City Council and has the goal of extending the life of streets, reducing maintenance costs and delaying the reconstruction of these roadways.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	4,415	500	500	500	500	500	500	7,415
Municipal State Aid	2,000	500	500	500	500	500	500	5,000
Special Assessments	8,840	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	3,000	31,840
Transfer from General Fund	4,200							4,200
Transfer from Special Revenue Funds	5,000							5,000
Totals by Year	24,455	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	4,000	53,455

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

No grants or non-city funding sources are used in this program.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 10
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (50,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current estimate is approximately $2,500 per mile for residential streets. This program attempts to resurface approximately 20 miles per year.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	50	50	50	50	50	250
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	4,662	4,662	4,662	4,662	4,662	23,310
Project Management	50	50	50	50	50	250
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	238	238	238	238	238	1,190
Total Expenses with Admin	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	25,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

City of Minneapolis Goals
Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.

2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and design review for this project took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan by the City Planning Commission on April 23, 2009. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This is an ongoing pavement resurfacing program, funding allocations per year can be flexible and could result in more or less miles of pavement resurfacing as a result. The potential limiting factors, aside from funding levels, are workforce capacity and the limit of acceptance for disruption to the traveling public.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This program is currently carrying a balance. This unspent balance results from a compilation of several factors, including:
• Past estimating methodology that has proven to be inaccurate with respect to rate of return for special assessments. This methodology has since been revised.
• Past estimating assumptions for unit pricing that have proven to be high, especially given increased efficiencies with this type of work. These assumptions have since been revised.
• Delays in project delivery resulting from the desire for more community engagement, more time needed to coordinate overlapping initiatives or other unexpected factors.
Public Works is considering whether to reduce funding levels in the resurfacing programs until the unspent balances can be spent down, funds would be redirected to other paving needs. This action, should Public Works follow through, should not be misunderstood – current funding levels overall are not adequate to address the needs as described in the recent Infrastructure Report.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated. This program consists of various street segments and residential areas some of which may be identified in the Bicycle Master Plan. Public Works, with input from the Bicycle Advisory Committee, tries to implement bicycle facilities along these segments when the design can be accomplished in conjunction with the resurfacing project (i.e. no moving the curb lines) and funding is available for the added scope of work.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience. NA

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
NA

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
The available right-of-way varies, however, this program does not generally move curb lines; when bicycle facilities are considered in conjunction with a resurfacing project they are generally accomplished through pavement striping.

City of Minneapolis

2014 - 2018 Street Resurfacing Program



LEGEND

2014 RESURFACING

- Linden Hills
- Hay Northwest Area
- Burroughs North Area
- Dupont Ave S: W Mhaha Pkwy to 46th St W
- Franklin Hall
- Lyn-Park 3rd Add
- Lyn-Park 2nd Add
- 4th St N: 18th Ave N to Cul-de-sac
- 18th Ave N: Lyn Curve Ave N to 4th St N
- Lowry Hill East
- Edgewater
- Cedar Ave: 58th St E to Edgewater Blvd
- 5th St N, 5th Ave N, 8th Ave N
- 40th St W: LyndaleAve S to Stevens Ave S

2015 RESURFACING

- Powderhorn West
- Penn
- Penn East
- McKinley
- Girard Ave N: 26th Ave N to Lowry Ave N
- Humboldt Ave N: 26th to 29th Aves N
- Humboldt Ave N: 30th Ave N to Lowry

2016 RESURFACING

- Pershing Area
- Fulton Area North
  - Drew & Ewing from 47th to 48th)
- Fulton Area South
- Warrington (west of Chicago)
- Diamond Lake
- Diamond Lake Rd: Cul-de-sac - Hampshire Dr
- Bryant Ave N: 45th Ave N to 53rd Ave N

2017 RESURFACING

- Harriet Area
- Lakewood Area
- 38th St W: Bryant Ave S to Lyndale Ave S
- Sheridan Area North
- Sheridan Area South
- 22nd Ave NE: Marshall St NE - University
- 17th Ave NE: 2nd St NE to University Ave NE
- 2nd St NE: Broadway St NE to 17th Ave NE
- 42nd St W: Bryant Ave S to Nicollet Ave
- Emerson Ave N: Plymouth Ave - W Broadway
- Grand Ave S: 48th St W to Lake St

2018 RESURFACING

- Lyndale Area
- Armatage South Area
- Nokomis Area
- Kenny Area
- 56th St W: Penn Ave S to County 22N

MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Asphalt Pavement Resurfacing Program

Proposed: 2014-2019

PV056

Contact: Steve Hay 612-673-3884

Subject to Change

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Major Pavement Maintenance Program **Project ID:** PV059

Project Location: Various locations throughout the city.
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Larry Matsumoto

Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 10/15/19
Department Priority: 23 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 919-1148
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

Multiple capitol project work including; major street repair, preventative maintenance, focused street repair due to specific failures in a city street, concrete rehabilitation of city streets to extend the life of concrete streets.

Purpose and Justification:

Major street repair, concrete rehabilitation, preventative maintenance and localized repair and rehabilitation that don't rise to the level of a full reconstruction project. These are cost effective methods and are typical industry standards used to extend the life of asphalt and concrete pavements.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	300	250	250	250	250	250	250	1,800
Transfer from General Fund	2,000							2,000
Transfer from Special Revenue Funds	2,963							2,963
Totals by Year	5,263	250	250	250	250	250	250	6,763

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

No grants or non-city funding sources are used in this program.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 7
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (6,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating cost impacts are based on historical data from the Transportation Repair and Maintenance Division for this type of work.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	25	25	25	25	25	125
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	213	213	213	213	213	1,065
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	12	12	12	12	12	60
Total Expenses with Admin	250	250	250	250	250	1,250

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

City of Minneapolis Goal – references
Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

In addition, the following polices and implementation steps from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth support street maintenance:
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as a center of regional transportation network.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Not Applicable

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

Not Applicable

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Not Applicable

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Not Applicable

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Not Applicable





MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Major Pavement Maintenance
Citywide

Contact: Larry Matsumoto 612-919-1148

Proposed:
2014-2019

Subject to Change

PV059

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: High Volume Corridor Reconditioning Program **Project ID:** PV061

Project Location: City Wide	**Affected Wards:** All
City Sector: Citywide	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** City-Wide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 11/15/19
Project Start Date: 4/15/15	**Department Priority:** 17 of 44
Submitting Department: Public Works	**Contact Phone Number:** (612) 673-3884
Contact Person: Steve Hay	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $1,708,092

Project Description:

This program focuses on reconditioning the driving surface of the high volume corridors with an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) count above 5000. The entire driving surface will be milled and replaced. The surface removal will be done by a milling machine and the depth of the removal will be based on the condition of the base material beneath the roadway, the ADT and the types of vehicles that use the corridor. The new driving surface will have an expected life span of 10 years which is the same as the resurfacing program. Because of the higher volume and much heavier vehicles (busses and trucks) that these corridors experience, the program will require much more aggressive work and traffic control than the resurfacing program. This will result in a higher city cost than the resurfacing program but much less than a reconstruction project. Because of the expected 10 year life span of this reconditioning work is the same as the resurfacing program the assessment rate will be the same as the resurfacing program.

Purpose and Justification:

At our current funding levels we are reconstructing our high volume streets at a rate of approximately 1.5 lane miles per year. Based on an estimated 350 lane miles of high volume corridors within the city that experience more than 5000 ADT, it would take more than 200 years to go through the entire system. This program will allow us to replace the driving surface much sooner than they would without this program. The traveling public will have a much safer route to travel on much sooner than they would without this program.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	6,671	1,455	500	500	500	500	500	10,626
Municipal State Aid	1,500	500	500	500	500	500	500	4,500
Special Assessments	3,820	965	500	500	500	500	500	7,285
Stormwater Revenue	200							200
Transfer from General Fund	2,000							2,000
Transfer from Special Revenue Funds	1,000							1,000
Totals by Year	15,191	2,920	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	25,611

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

No grants or non-city funding sources are used in this program.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 10
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (22,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged

driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	165	80	80	80	80	485
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	2,616	1,349	1,349	1,349	1,349	8,010
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	139	71	71	71	71	425
Total Expenses with Admin	2,920	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	8,920

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

City of Minneapolis Goals
Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this program took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This is an ongoing pavement resurfacing program, funding allocations per year can be flexible and could result in more or less miles of pavement resurfacing as a result. The potential limiting factors, aside from funding levels, are workforce capacity and the limit of acceptance for disruption to the traveling public.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This program is currently carrying a balance. This unspent balance results from a compilation of several factors, including:
• Past estimating methodology that has proven to be inaccurate with respect to rate of return for special assessments. This methodology has since been revised.
• Past estimating assumptions for unit pricing that have proven to be high, especially given increased efficiencies with this type of work. These assumptions have since been revised.
• Delays in project delivery resulting from the desire for more community engagement, more time needed to coordinate overlapping initiatives or other unexpected factors.
Public Works is considering whether to reduce funding levels in the resurfacing programs until the unspent balances can be spent down, funds would be redirected to other paving needs. This action, should Public Works follow through, should not be misunderstood – current funding levels overall are not adequate to address the needs as described in the recent Infrastructure Report.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated.
This program consists of various street segments and residential areas some of which may be identified in the Bicycle Master Plan. Public Works, with input from the Bicycle Advisory Committee, tries to implement bicycle facilities along these segments when the design can be accomplished in conjunction with the resurfacing project (i.e. no moving the curb lines) and funding is available for the added scope of work.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience. NA

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
NA

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
The available right-of-way varies, however, this program does not generally move curb lines; when bicycle facilities are considered in conjunction with a resurfacing project they are generally accomplished through pavement striping.

City of Minneapolis

2014 - 2018 High Volume Reconditioning Program

Map Date: February 2014

MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Subject to Change

NORTH



LEGEND

2014 HIGH VOLUME CORRIDOR RECONDITIONING

- 26th St E: W of Hiawatha to I-35W Bridge
- 13th St N: Hennepin to Hawthorne
- 15th St N: Laurel to Hawthorne
- 16th St N: Hennepin to Linden
- Chestnut Ave: 15th St N to 12th St N
- Currie Ave: Dead End to 12th St N
- Laurel Ave: 16th St N to Hennepin
- Linden Ave: 15th St N to 16th St N
- Maple St: Harmon Pl to Hennepin Ave
- Harmon Pl: Maple St to Harmon Pl Service Road
- 4th Ave S: 10th St S to 12th St E, Grant to 15th St E
- 3rd Ave S, Clinton Ave, 4th Ave S
- 58th St E: 42nd to 46th Aves S
- Mn-62 Frontage Rd S: 34th to 46th Aves S
- Johnson St NE (SB): 8th St SE to E Hennepin
- 10th Ave SE: 8th St SE to Como Ave
- 11th Ave SE: Como to E Hennepin
- 51st Ave N: Xerxes to Oliver
- Hennepin Ave: 16th/Maple to 12th St

2015 HIGH VOLUME CORRIDOR RECONDITIONING

- 11th St N: Hawthorne Ave to 11th St N
- 11th St N: LaSalle Ave to Hennepin Ave
- 12th St N (SB): Glenwood Ave to Hawthorne Ave
- 12th St N (11th St N-NB): 11th St N to Currie Ave
- 12th St S: Hennepin to 3rd Ave S
- 31st St E: Bloomington to Cul-de-sac
- 34th Ave S: 44th St E to 42nd St E
- 43rd St E: West of 34th Ave S to 34th Ave S
- 42nd Ave S: 56th St E to 50th St E
- 42nd St E: 13th Ave S to Cedar Ave
- 24th St E/W: Hennepin Ave to 3rd Ave S
- Elm St SE: 17th Ave SE to 24th Ave SE
- Rollins Ave SE: 15th Ave SE to 17th Ave SE
- 17th Ave SE: Elm St SE to Rollins Ave SE
- 2nd St N: Plymouth Ave to Washington Ave N
- 21st Ave N: Washington Ave N to 2nd St N
- 30th Ave N: Washington Ave N to 2nd ST N
- 33rd Ave N: Washington Ave N to 2nd St N
- Pleasant St SE: Arlington St to Washington Ave

2016 HIGH VOLUME CORRIDOR RECONDITIONING

- 4th St S (19th Ave S to 21st Ave S)
- 19th Ave S (Riverside Ave to Washington Ave S)
- 20th Ave S (Riverside Ave to 4th St S)
- 9th St S: Chicago Ave to Hennepin Ave
- 36th St E: Cedar Ave S to 28th Ave S
- 28th Ave S: 38th St E to 36th St E
- 60th St W (Xerxes Ave S to Sunrise Dr)
- Sunrise Dr (60th St W to 58th St W)
- 58th St W (Sunrise Dr to TH 121 - E of Aldrich)

2017 HIGH VOLUME CORRIDOR RECONDITIONING

- 1st Ave S: Lake St E to Grant St E
- 5th St NE: E Hennepin Ave to 1st Ave NE
- 6th St NE: Central Ave NE to 1st Ave NE
- 8th St SE: Hennepin Ave to 15th Ave SE
- 13th Ave S: 8th St S to 5th St S

2018 HIGH VOLUME CORRIDOR RECONDITIONING

- Plymouth Ave N (Xerxes Ave N to Lyndale Ave N)
- Lyndale Ave N (Webber Pkwy to 49th Ave N)
- I-94 Frontage Rd E (49th Ave N to 53rd Ave N)
- I-94 Frontage Rd W (49th Ave N to 53rd Ave N)

MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

High Volume Corridor Reconditioning

Proposed: 2014-2019

PV061

Contact: Steve Hay 612-673-3884

Subject to Change

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Unpaved Alley Construction **Project ID:** PV063

Project Location: Citywide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2012
Project Start Date: 5/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Hay
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/1/19
Department Priority: 22 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3884
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $150,000

Project Description:

This program will complete the paving of the City's residential alley system. This system is composed of over 3,500 concrete and asphalt alleys and 79 dirt or oiled dirt surfaced alleys. These dirt or oiled dirt surfaced alleys will be paved using the standard residential concrete alley design which uses an inverted 6" V-section concrete pavement. In addition, all alley retaining wall and storm drain requirements necessitated by the alley construction will be addressed. Attached to this Capital Budget Request is a map of the 79 alleys that are eligible for this program.

Purpose and Justification:

The City of Minneapolis' residential alleys are a critical component of the transportation and storm water management systems. For any city, providing and maintaining the city's basic infrastructure at a level that attracts and maintains a strong business community as well as vibrant and livable neighborhoods is an essential element in making that city a place where people want to live, work, and visit. Completing the permanent paving of the City's residential alleys is also an effort to provide an equitable level of service to all residents of the City.

As noted, the system of alleys in Minneapolis is an essential component of its transportation network. Alleys provide access to the off-street side of properties that are utilized for parking and deliveries in commercial and industrial areas. The residential alleys provide access to the garages and/or off street parking and are used as primary locations for solid waste and recycling collection services. In addition these alleys provide for both controlled surface drainage as well as temporary storage of storm water runoff. In their current condition, many of the alleys in the program are not adequately served by the City's existing storm sewer. The Unpaved Alley program will correct these drainage issues. Consequently, it is important that these alleys are built and maintained in a manner that provides for these needs and that is consistent, maintainable and cost effective.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	450	150	150	150	150	150	150	1,350
Special Assessments	350	50	50	50	50	50	150	750
Totals by Year	800	200	200	200	200	200	300	2,100

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 70
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (250)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The current street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $1000 per mile for alleys in the City. This

program averages 2 alleys completed per year with an average length of 660 l.f. or approximately 0.25 miles, the annual savings would be $250 per year.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	190	190	190	190	190	952
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	10	10	10	10	10	48
Total Expenses with Admin	200	200	200	200	200	1,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

City of Minneapolis Goal – references
Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan by the City Planning Commission on April 23, 2009; no additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There are 79 alleys that are unpaved in the City of Minneapolis. The selected alleys, based on the size and scope of work, can be adjusted to utilize all available funds.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The construction of each unpaved alley will be completed within one construction season.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

A quality alley affects the respective values of the adjoining residential properties and allows for maintaining a safe, healthy, and aesthetically appealing residential neighborhoods. The Unpaved Alley Construction Program will help maintain this system at a high quality level.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.
No

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transit way, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

No.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

No.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

No.

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
UNPAVED ALLEY

81 Dirt Alleys

DIRT ALLEYS PER WARD

WARDS	TOTALS
1	21
2	11
3	8
4	11
5	4
6	2
7	8
8	1
9	3
10	1
11	4
12	1
13	6



MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Unpaved Alley Construction

Contact: Steve Hay 612-673-3884

Proposed: 2015-2019

Subject to Change

PV063

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: LaSalle Ave (Grant to 8th) **Project ID:** PV068

Project Location: 8th St S to Grant St	**Affected Wards:** 7
City Sector: Downtown	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** Various
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 11/15/15
Project Start Date: 4/15/14	**Department Priority:** 5 of 44
Submitting Department: Public Works	**Contact Phone Number:** (612) 673-3762
Contact Person: Beverly Warmka	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $0

Project Description:

This project proposes to reconstruct or resurface segments of LaSalle Avenue from 8th Street to Grant Street. The project is approximately 0.5 miles in length. The street is a high volume north/south downtown street. This segment of roadway does not have a consistent age of roadway or Pavement Condition Index (PCI) resulting in variability in the overall condition of the roadway and appropriate means of repair. Below is a summary of last known pavement condition ratings, it is likely that these have dropped in the 6 years since:

• From 8th St to 9th St was last constructed in 1938 with a seal coat in 1986, its last measured PCI was in 2008 and at 42 this stretch would have been deemed “poor”.
• From 9th St to 11th St was last constructed in 1938 but had a major renovation in 2002, its last measured PCI was in 2008 and at 77 this stretch would have been deemed “good”.
• From 11th to 12th St was last constructed in 1938 with a seal coat in 1986, its last measured PCI was in 2008 and at 36 this stretch would have been deemed “poor”.
• From 12th St to Grant St was last constructed in 1977 with a seal coat in 1986, its last measured PCI was in 2008 and at 70 this stretch would have been deemed “fair”.

Purpose and Justification:

The additional funding request is due to a policy change approved by city council which funds street lighting on Pedestrian Priority Corridors, Neighborhood Commercial Nodes, Activity Centers and the Central Business District with local sources other than street lighting assessments.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,515	805	2,320
Municipal State Aid	1,430		1,430
Special Assessments	1,070		1,070
Stormwater Revenue	505		505
Totals by Year	4,520	805	5,325

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (3,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged

driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	767	0	0	0	0	767
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	38	0	0	0	0	38
Total Expenses with Admin	805	0	0	0	0	805

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure, and contributes to a robust pedestrian network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth – references

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth – references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.

2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.

Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.

2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.

2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.

2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.

5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.

5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.

Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.

10.15.1 Consider street vacations as a last resort to preserve the network of city streets and arterials.

10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.

10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bumpouts.

10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.

10.15.5 Explore options to redesign larger blocks through the reintroduction and extension of the urban street grid.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2010. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Including coordinated utility work, this project will take 2 years to construct. Given the necessary utility work will take close to a full construction season, it's anticipated that the utility work will be performed the first year and the road reconstruction will be performed the following year. Spreading the construction over 3 or more years would decrease the cost-effectiveness of the project. Due to the limited NDB and MSA funding that is available we do not recommend scaling this project beyond what we already have.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The neighborhood and stakeholder engagement and design process began in March of 2014. The segment between 12th St S and Grant St W will be renovated in 2014. Water, communication, Gas and Electrical Utility upgrades in the segment between 8th St S and 12th St S will begin in 2014, with the reconstruction to follow in that segment in 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Capital improvement projects such as this one, completes a corridor, enhances the commercial character of the area which helps preserve existing property values and enhances the City's tax base.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated. Yes, the portion of LaSalle Ave south of 12th St S is in the Bicycle Master Plan for bike lanes.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience. No. However the location in downtown, would increase the number of pedestrian users.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details. The sidewalk intersections would be rebuilt to conform to the current ADA standards as they relate to landing areas and maximum slopes.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide

details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details. There is 80 feet of right-of-way for LaSalle Ave between 8th St S and 12th St S, there is only 60 feet of right-of-way between 12th St S and Grant St E. The existing configuration supports on-street parking and a high volume of automobile traffic. Options to reconfigure the roadway are partially constrained not only by the right-of-way, but also by the project's limited scope of work.







MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

LaSalle Avenue
Grant Ave to 8th St S

Contact: Bev Warmka 612-673-3762

Proposed: 2015

Subject to Change

PV068

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Riverside Extension - 4th St/15th Ave **Project ID:** PV070

Project Location: On 4th St S (Cedar Ave to 15th Ave S) on 15th Ave S (4th St S to 6th St S) on 16th Ave S (6th St S to Dead End)

City Sector: East

Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009

Project Start Date: 4/15/13

Submitting Department: Public Works

Contact Person: Christoper Engelmann

Affected Wards: 2

Affected Neighborhood(s): Cedar-Riverside

Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/17/15

Department Priority: 4 of 44

Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3274

Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The project consists of full reconstruction of approximately 0.37 miles of roadway around the Riverside Plaza development. The project will consist of full reconstruction of the right-of-way facilities. This consists of, at a minimum, full removal of the existing pavement, subgrade correction, aggregate base, asphalt paving, street lighting, curb and gutter, signage, sidewalks and pedestrian ramps, and drive entrance reconstruction.

Purpose and Justification:

15th Ave S was constructed in 1936 and is rated as in poor condition by the City's pavement management system with a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) rating of 44 in 2010 (est 32 in 2014). 4th St S is of undetermined age and was rated as in poor condition by the City's pavement management system with a PCI rating of 41 in 2010 (est 26 in 2014). The current pavement is over 50 years old and beyond its expected useful life. 16th Av S is an oiled dirt street. Because of the poor condition of the roadway it requires a significant amount of limited maintenance resources.

The area is also undergoing significant investment with upgrading/renewing of the existing Riverside Plaza buildings, construction of the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit facilities, improvement of the trail for the Hiawatha light rail transit corridor, resurfacing of Cedar Avenue and reconstruction of Riverside Avenue.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,730	500	2,230
Special Assessments	450		450
Stormwater Revenue	210		210
Totals by Year	2,390	500	2,890

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (925)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the

department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	476	0	0	0	0	476
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	24	0	0	0	0	24
Total Expenses with Admin	500	0	0	0	0	500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure, and contributes to a robust bicycle and pedestrian network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and

Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Maintenance of the street infrastructure is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to supporting reliable levels of service across the range of the City's interconnected multi-modal transportation system. Building a robust bicycle network is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to creating sustainable, livable, and healthy communities, as well as creating an asset that attracts residents, workers, and economic investment to the City.

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on June 11, 2012. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is anticipated to be a one construction year project. Spreading the construction over two or more years decreases the cost effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This project is scheduled for construction and expected to be substantially completed in 2014. The project plans and bid documents were finalized in early 2014.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

4th St S is designated as Bike Lanes; 15th Av S is designated as shared use pavement markings/sharrows (consider bike lanes when street reconstructed); 6th St S is designated as signed bike route; 16th Av S is not designated.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes, this area has a high volume of pedestrian traffic due to the proximity of the Cedar/Riverside LRT Station, Currie Park and high density residential housing. 16th Ave S is being constructed as a ped/bike only facility.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes. The proposed project scope includes bike lanes along 15th Av S and 4th St S. The proposed project scope includes widening sidewalks along 15th Av S and 4th St S to 8 feet wide. Intersections will have updated ADA compliant pedestrian ramps. The proposed project includes bump outs at intersections for additional pedestrian space and narrower street crossing distances. The proposed project scope includes repurposing 16th Av S from 6th ST S to the dead-end (at the Hiawatha Light Rail line and Hiawatha Trail) from a street to a mixed use trail.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes, however there is sufficient right of way space for the modal needs of the corridor. The right of way is 80 feet wide. This will support wider sidewalks, bike lanes, green boulevards that can support tree plantings, two parking lanes, and two driving lanes.

Riverside Extension (15th Ave S/ 4th St S Reconstruction)

City Preferred Layout 3





LEGEND

- Bike Lane
- Drive Lane
- Parking Lane
- Pedestrian Zone, Sidewalk
- Pedestrian Zone, Turf
- Driveway
- Pedestrian/Bike Trail/ Emergency Vehicle Access

December 26, 2012

MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Riverside Extension

4th St S/15th Ave S/6th St S/16th Ave S

Contact: Chris Engelmann 612-673-3274

Proposed: 2015

Subject to Change

PV070

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Pedestrian Improvement Project **Project ID:** PV072

Project Location: Downtown Pedestrian Improvements
City Sector: Downtown
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/16
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Beverly Warmka

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/17
Department Priority: 28 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3762
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project will implement pedestrian improvements on key east-west streets in downtown: 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th Streets S. The project will improve pedestrian connectivity within the downtown core and between the downtown core and Elliot Park. The project will include greening/landscaping, street lighting, pedestrian countdown timers, durable crosswalk markings, and accessible pedestrian ramps in addition to other potential aesthetic improvements to be determined through a public engagement process. The project may be coordinated with transit improvements to be recommended through the Downtown East-West Transit and Pedestrian Improvement Initiative.

Purpose and Justification:

The major north-south streets connecting to the core of downtown have enhanced pedestrian facilities. Hennepin Avenue has trees, street furniture, enhanced bus shelters, enhanced sidewalks, pedestrian level lighting, and countdown timers. Marquette and 2nd Avenues S have trees, enhanced bus shelters, enhanced sidewalks, pedestrian-level lighting, countdown timers, and new ADA-accessible pedestrian ramps. Nicollet Mall has trees, street furniture, granite pavers, enhanced bus shelters, and pedestrian-level lighting. In contrast, the east-west streets connecting to the core of downtown have little of this pedestrian infrastructure. This project will improve the pedestrian environment on 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th Streets S between 1st Avenue N and Chicago Avenue S, connecting the existing enhanced pedestrian environment on Hennepin, Nicollet, Marquette and 2nd, and connecting the downtown core to Elliot Park.

These segments of 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th Streets serve some of the busiest pedestrian areas in Minneapolis. Recent pedestrian counts showed over 8,000 daily pedestrians on 6th Street (between 2nd and Marquette), over 17,000 pedestrians on Nicollet Mall (between 6th and 7th Streets) and 6,000-7,000 pedestrians on each of 2nd, Marquette and Hennepin Avenues (between 6th and 7th Streets). Within the downtown area, at least 70,000 employees work within three blocks of 7th and 8th Streets, and over 15,000 transit passengers board buses every weekday on 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th Streets, with many more people boarding transit on north-south streets within a few blocks.

This project is supported by the Access Minneapolis Downtown Transportation Action Plan and the Pedestrian Master Plan, which recommend greening/landscaping, countdown timers, ADA-accessible pedestrian ramps, pedestrian-level street lighting, and improved crosswalk markings in downtown. These improvements will serve everyone who works, lives, visits, shops, and owns property in downtown.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	175	170	345
Municipal State Aid	170	170	340
Federal Government Grants	1,120		1,120
Totals by Year	1,465	340	1,805

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

This project has been awarded federal funding through the Metropolitan Council's Regional Solicitation process. The

application received $1,120,000 in funding in the Transportation Enhancements (TE) category

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Not applicable, this project will be maintained through the Downtown Improvement District.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	55	55	0	0	110
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	1,283	211	0	0	1,494
Project Management	0	38	38	0	0	75
Contingency	0	20	20	0	0	40
City Administration	0	70	16	0	0	86
Total Expenses with Admin	0	1,465	340	0	0	1,805

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to a safe and robust pedestrian network in high activity locations—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Enhancement of pedestrian facilities is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to creating sustainable, livable, and healthy communities, as well as creating vibrant places that attract residents, workers, and economic investment to the City.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

Policy 2.3: Encourage walking throughout the city by ensuring that routes are safe, comfortable, pleasant, and accessible.
2.3.1 Ensure that there are safe and accessible pedestrian routes to major destinations, including transit corridors, from nearby residential areas.
2.3.2 Identify and encourage the development of pedestrian routes within Activity Centers, Growth Centers, and other commercial areas that have superior pedestrian facilities.

Policy 1.13: Support high density development near transit stations in ways that encourage transit use and contribute to interesting and vibrant places.
1.13.6 Encourage investment and place making around transit stations through infrastructure changes and the planning and installation of streetscape, public art, and other public amenities.

Policy 10.9: Support urban design standards that emphasize traditional urban form with pedestrian scale design features at the street level in mixed-use and transit-oriented development.
10.9.3 Provide safe, accessible, convenient, and lighted access and way finding to transit stops and transit stations along the Primary Transit Network bus and rail corridors.
10.9.4 Coordinate site designs and public right-of-way improvements to provide adequate sidewalk space for pedestrian movement, street trees, landscaping, street furniture, sidewalk cafes and other elements of active pedestrian areas.

Policy 10.16: Design streets and sidewalks to ensure safety, pedestrian comfort and aesthetic appeal.
10.16.1 Encourage wider sidewalks in commercial nodes, activity centers, along community and commercial corridors and in growth centers such as Downtown and the University of Minnesota.
10.16.2 Provide streetscape amenities, including street furniture, trees, and landscaping, that buffer pedestrians from auto traffic, parking areas, and winter elements.
10.16.3 Integrate placement of street furniture and fixtures, including landscaping and lighting, to serve a function and not obstruct pedestrian pathways and pedestrian flows.
10.16.4 Employ pedestrian-friendly features along streets, including street trees and landscaped boulevards that add interest and beauty while also managing storm water, appropriate lane widths, raised intersections, and high-visibility crosswalks.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 23, 2011. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The City of Minneapolis is working with Metro Transit, the Downtown Improvement District, and others to further develop the concept of pedestrian improvements on 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th Streets.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Because improvements are proposed for several street corridors in downtown, this project may be scalable by prioritizing the street segments however funding needs to coincide with the program year of the federal funding.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Capital improvement projects such as this one, completes a corridor, enhances the commercial character of the area which helps preserve existing property values and enhances the City's tax base.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated.

Yes. Both 6th and 9th Streets are designated bicycle routes and currently have bike lanes. 7th and 8th Streets are not designated bicycle routes.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes. All of these corridors are high volume transit and pedestrian corridors. This project will improve the experience for both pedestrians and transit users by providing a more pleasant and comfortable sidewalk environment.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes. The pedestrian realm will be significantly enhanced with greening/landscaping, street lighting, pedestrian countdown timers, durable crosswalk markings, and accessible pedestrian ramps. Enhanced transit facilities and amenities may also be implemented on these streets as part of a separate initiative.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes. The right-of-way is extremely constrained in this downtown environment. Innovative design options are currently being explored on how to most effectively make use of the limited right of way through a separate initiative.



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Pedestrian Improvement Project
Downtown Area

Contact: Bev Warmka 612-673-3762

Proposed:
2016-2017
Subject to Change

PV072

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 26th Ave N (W Broadway to Lyndale Ave N) **Project ID:** PV073

Project Location: W Broadway to Lyndale Ave N	**Affected Wards:** Various
City Sector: North	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** Various
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2010	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 11/21/16
Project Start Date: 4/1/15	**Department Priority:** 19 of 44
Submitting Department: Public Works	**Contact Phone Number:** (612) 673-2172
Contact Person: Nickolas Van Gunst	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $0

Project Description:

The proposed project will reconstruct 1.2 miles of 26th Avenue North between Lyndale Avenue North and West Broadway Avenue. This will be a total reconstruction project involving the entire right-of-way and will include a new roadway, new curb and gutter, utility improvements, new sidewalks on the south side of the corridor, and a new off street protected bicycle facility on the north side of the corridor. The project will also include signal improvements, new signage, and new pavement markings.

Purpose and Justification:

The concrete pavement surface is currently heaving. The roadway was constructed in 1970 and was rated in poor condition, with a PCI=56 in 2011, (est 50 in 2014). Preventative maintenance can no longer address this problem, it is time to reconstruct the roadway. The proposed off street protected bicycle facility that will be constructed as part of this project will be the only east/west off-street facility in this part of the city and will provide regional connections to the Minneapolis Grand Rounds and to the Mississippi river.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	5,245		5,245
Municipal State Aid	2,555	305	2,860
Special Assessments	695	695	1,390
Stormwater Revenue	35	35	70
Water Revenue	200	200	400
Totals by Year	8,730	1,235	9,965

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (7,200)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	870	90	0	0	0	960
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	6,509	941	0	0	0	7,450
Project Management	220	35	0	0	0	255
Contingency	715	110	0	0	0	825
City Administration	416	59	0	0	0	475
Total Expenses with Admin	8,730	1,235	0	0	0	9,965

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both maintains existing infrastructure and contributes to a robust bicycle network, furthering the following city goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth – references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3: Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.5: Ensure that bicycling throughout the city is safe, comfortable and pleasant.
2.5.1 Complete a network of on- and off-street primary bicycle corridors.
2.5.2 Strive to accommodate bicycles on all streets. When other modes take priority in a corridor, provide accessible alternate routes.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.
10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bumpouts.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks and other pedestrian connections.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 23, 2011. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Both the Hawthorne and Jordan Neighborhoods for years have been requesting to add this project to the capital program to facilitate an off street protected bicycle facility along the corridor. Both neighborhoods combined have already invested $50,000 in NRP funding to come up with several options for a new off street protected bicycle facility; all options require the reconstruction of the roadway.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is funded over two years and the construction should be coordinated with the adjacent project along 26th Ave N (Wirth Pkwy to Broadway and Lyndale Ave to the River – PV086). Construction of both projects is expected to take two construction seasons, funding for both projects is spread over three years due to the total amount required and overall program balancing.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

This area has been one of the hardest hit in the city with regard to foreclosures. Many of the homes along this corridor have changed hands over the last five years. Reconstructing this corridor will improve the appearance and character of the neighborhood and should result in more private investment. There is very strong community support for this project.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated.
Yes – the proposed off street protected bicycle facility that will be constructed as part of this project will be the only off street protected bicycle facility in this part of the city and will provide regional connections to the Minneapolis Grand Rounds and to the Mississippi River.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.
Yes – The pedestrian realm will be improved with new sidewalks and the new off street protected bicycle facility including upgraded ADA pedestrian curb ramps.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
Yes - The proposed off street protected bicycle facility that will be constructed as part of this project will be the only off street protected bicycle facility in the part of the city and will provide regional connections to the Minneapolis Grand Rounds and to the Mississippi river. The project will accommodate pedestrians on both sides of the street, with upgraded ADA pedestrian ramps.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
The right-of-way is constrained; between 58 and 63 feet. It is envisioned that providing for improved sidewalks, boulevards and other green spaces, traffic lanes and other below and above ground infrastructure will require innovation given the constraints for the right-of-way.



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

26th Ave N
West Broadway to Lyndale Ave

Contact: Nick VanGunst 612-673-2172

Proposed: 2015-2016

PV073

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: CSAH & MnDOT Cooperative Projects **Project ID:** PV074

Project Location: Various locations throughout the City
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Chris Engelmann

Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/16/19
Department Priority: 7 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3274
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $2,385,000

Project Description:

This is a program to fund the City's cost participation on cooperative projects with Hennepin County and MnDOT that fall within the city limits. These projects could include reconstruction or rehabilitation of street segments, bridges, pathways or streetscapes. These projects typically include a variety of funding sources.

A large portion of the County State-Aid Highways were last constructed in the mid to late 1950s and are at or past the end of their serviceable lives. They have a high volume of traffic, and are exhibiting signs of severe deterioration. These streets are past the point where maintenance will ensure a safe and pothole free surface. Public Works/Street Maintenance has received a tremendous amount of complaints regarding these streets which already require extraordinary maintenance. Therefore, the City is requesting that the total reconstruction of these streets be done as early as possible.

Purpose and Justification:

A tremendous amount of money is spent on maintenance on several County State-Aid Highways which are beyond ordinary repair. Extraordinary maintenance drains resources and is not an efficient use of limited maintenance funds. This program will reconstruct those CSAH roadways that were built over 40 years ago. If these roadways are not reconstructed, the surface will deteriorate even more which will discourage traffic from using these streets. If the traffic does not use these streets, it will use other residential streets not intended nor built for high traffic volumes.

More generally, this program can be used to fund the City's cost participation on cooperative projects with either Hennepin County or MnDOT to facilitate improvements within the City Limits that provide benefit to the travelling public, adjacent property owners and the City in general.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	2,885	350	3,040	2,490	3,570	750	1,000	14,085
Municipal State Aid	255							255
Special Assessments	4,350	3,170	750			750	750	9,770
Stormwater Revenue	415	750						1,165
Other Local Governments	1,270							1,270
Totals by Year	9,175	4,270	3,790	2,490	3,570	1,500	1,750	26,545

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Hennepin County has funded projects within their 5 year capital program. In order for these projects to be completed, Minneapolis must have partnering funds. Funding which matches the timing of MnDOT's program will allow these projects to include additional enhancements.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

There will be no relative increase or decrease. Hennepin County provides Minneapolis funds to complete maintenance on their roads. Rebuilding a road releases maintenance money to other county roadways where additional maintenance is needed.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	580	290	175	315	130	1,490
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	2,322	2,490	1,696	2,195	824	9,526
Project Management	320	250	150	260	110	1,090
Contingency	845	580	350	630	365	2,770
City Administration	203	180	119	170	71	744
Total Expenses with Admin	4,270	3,790	2,490	3,570	1,500	15,620

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure, and contributes to a robust bicycle and pedestrian network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
• Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
• Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
• Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.

Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.

10.15.1 Consider street vacations as a last resort to preserve the network of city streets and arterials.

10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.

10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bumpouts.

10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.

10.15.5 Explore options to redesign larger blocks through the reintroduction and extension of the urban street grid.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This is a collaborative program with Hennepin County and/or MnDOT (Minnesota Department of Transportation). Typically, Hennepin County or MnDOT are the lead agency on the proposed projects and the City is a project partner and stakeholder.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

None – cost sharing is typically a set policy.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This is an ongoing program that covers various cooperative roadway projects that the City of Minneapolis contributes to MnDOT/Hennepin County financially. Any unspent balances are moved to the next project and the city budget is adjusted.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated. This is a collaborative program with Hennepin County and/or MnDOT (Minnesota Department of Transportation).

Typically, Hennepin County or MnDOT are the lead agency on the proposed projects and the City is a project partner and stakeholder. Project scope is identified by the lead agency, coordinated with the City, and may include a variety of projects that are included on the Bicycle Master Plan.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience. This is a collaborative program with Hennepin County and/or MnDOT (Minnesota Department of Transportation).

Typically, Hennepin County or MnDOT are the lead agency on the proposed projects and the City is a project partner and stakeholder. Project scope is identified by the lead agency and coordinated with the City. Specific details on the improvements are dependent on the scope identified by the lead agency.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

This is a collaborative program with Hennepin County and/or MnDOT (Minnesota Department of Transportation). Typically, Hennepin County or MnDOT are the lead agency on the proposed projects and the City is a project partner and stakeholder. Project scope is identified by the lead agency and coordinated with the City. Specific details on the improvements are dependent on the scope identified by the lead agency.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

This is a collaborative program with Hennepin County and/or MnDOT (Minnesota Department of Transportation). Typically, Hennepin County or MnDOT are the lead agency on the proposed projects and the City is a project partner and stakeholder. Project scope is identified by the lead agency and coordinated with the City. Specific details on the improvements are dependent on the scope identified by the lead agency.

CSAH: MnDot Cooperative Projects

2014-2015	1. Washington Ave
2014-2015	2. Minnehaha Ave
2015	3. 28th Ave S
2016-2018	4. I-35W/Lake St Interchange
2017-2018	5. Lake St





MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

CSAH & MnDot Cooperative Projects

Proposed:
2015-2018

PV074

Contact: Chris Engelmann 612-673-3274

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 38th St E (Hiawatha to Minnehaha) **Project ID:** PV076

Project Location: Hiawatha Ave to Minnehaha Ave
City Sector: South
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2010
Project Start Date: 4/15/16
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Chris Engelmann
Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/17
Department Priority: 30 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3274
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project would reconstruct 0.2 miles of 38th Street between Hiawatha Avenue and Minnehaha Avenue. It carries 6,700 vehicles per day, and pedestrian and bicycle counts conducted in 2008 reported approximately 630 pedestrians and 250 bicyclists per day. The purpose of the project is to improve the pavement condition and improve the right-of-way conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists, while maintaining or improving general traffic operations. This segment of roadway provides access to and across Hiawatha Avenue, a state trunk highway, and to the Hiawatha (Blue Line) light rail line station at 38th Street.

The project will include complete removal and replacement of the pavement, curb and gutter, driveways, sidewalks, and storm drain inlets. The project will include pedestrian and bicycle improvements, which may include bike lanes, tree boulevards, and pedestrian level lighting.

Purpose and Justification:

This segment of 38th Street was built in 1964 and is rated in poor condition by the City's pavement management system with a Pavement Condition Index rating of 54 in 2010. Streets with PCI's in this range often degrade at a rate of 2 – 5 points per year; therefore, an estimate of the 2016 PCI is 44 – 50.

The function of this segment of roadway has changed from primarily serving vehicular traffic and industrial land uses to serving growing numbers of pedestrians and bicyclists accessing the LRT station and future high-density, mixed-use developments. The current design of the street (two traffic lanes, narrow sidewalks, no tree boulevards, no bicycle lanes, and limited on-street parking) is not compatible with the current use and future plans for the corridor.

The Purina grain mills on the south side of the street between Hiawatha and Dight Avenues have been constructed as a high density, mixed-use development. Over the long term, the entire corridor is planned for high-density mixed-use development. City staff projections, based on planning to date, newly-implemented zoning, and current knowledge of future development opportunities, estimate that 1,800 new housing units will be built within one-half mile of the 38th Street LRT station.

Bicycle and pedestrian improvements along this segment of 38th Street are supported by multiple city and county plans, including the 2010 Minnehaha-Hiawatha Strategic Development Framework, the 2011 Bicycle Master Plan, the 2009 Pedestrian Master Plan, and the 2005 38th Street Station Area Plan.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	590	590
Municipal State Aid	1,150	1,150
Special Assessments	110	110
Stormwater Revenue	100	100
Water Revenue	100	100

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	Totals by Source
Totals by Year	2,050	2,050

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (1,200)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	255	0	0	0	255
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	1,287	0	0	0	1,287
Project Management	0	165	0	0	0	165
Contingency	0	245	0	0	0	245
City Administration	0	98	0	0	0	98
Total Expenses with Admin	0	2,050	0	0	0	2,050

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure, and contributes to a robust bicycle and pedestrian network, which supports of the nearby transit station and facilitates investment in nearby development opportunities—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
- High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
- All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here

• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Maintenance of the street infrastructure is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to supporting reliable levels of service across the range of the City's interconnected multi-modal transportation system. Building a robust bicycle network is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to creating sustainable, livable, and healthy communities, as well as creating an asset that attracts residents, workers, and economic investment to the City.

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that

analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2012. The project was found to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project is recommended in Hennepin County's 2010 Minnehaha-Hiawatha Community Development Framework, from which Hennepin County is implementing other Framework recommendations.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is anticipated to be a one construction year project. Spreading the construction over two or more years decreases the cost effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth states: "Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and business through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the city's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network."

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

Yes. 38th St E is a designated bicycle route and a candidate for on street bike lanes in the City's Bikeways Master Plan.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes. This corridor is a transit route used by Metro Transit Route 23. The transit stops will be updated to meet current ADA standards. This corridor also provides pedestrian access to the 38th St LRT Station. The sidewalks will be reconstructed as part of this project improving the pedestrian environment.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes. New sidewalks and the possible addition of bicycle lanes will provide substantial improvements in this corridor.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes. The right of way is constrained and innovated designs will be explored to determine possible inclusion of bike lanes and other improvements.





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**38th St E** Hiawatha Ave to Minnehaha Ave	**Proposed:** 2016	**PV076**
	Contact: Bev Warmka 612-673-3762		

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 18th Ave NE (Monroe to Johnson St NE) **Project ID:** PV080

Project Location: Monroe St. NE to Johnson St. NE
City Sector: East
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2010
Project Start Date: 4/17/17
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Beverly Warmka
Affected Wards: 1
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/1/17
Department Priority: 31 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3762
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The project includes reconstruction of approximately 0.73 miles of 18th Ave NE from Monroe St NE to Johnson St NE. Reconstruction of this roadway includes the complete removal and replacement of the driving surface and curb and gutter and will facilitate the construction of an off street protected bikeway on the south side of the corridor.

Purpose and Justification:

The current condition of the street pavement is poor and in need of reconstruction. The Pavement Condition Index ratings are in the mid 50's. Reconstruction of this corridor is part of a larger initiative to connect the Mississippi River to the NE Diagonal Trail. This project will result in larger spaces for boulevards that can accommodate future boulevard trees, which currently do not exist in many places.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2017	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	670	215	885
Municipal State Aid	1,915	2,300	4,215
Special Assessments	705	710	1,415
Stormwater Revenue	25	25	50
Water Revenue	85	85	170
Other Local Governments	2,000		2,000
Totals by Year	5,400	3,335	8,735

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (4,400)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	600	0	0	600
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	3,283	2,516	0	5,799
Project Management	0	0	300	180	0	480
Contingency	0	0	960	480	0	1,440
City Administration	0	0	257	159	0	416
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	5,400	3,335	0	8,735

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both improves existing infrastructure and contributes to a robust bicycle network, furthering the following city goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with

land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2012. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project is a high priority for Northeast Minneapolis and has been requested by the Ward 1 Council Office. The project is supported by the community and the trail element has regional support.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is currently anticipated to be constructed over 2 years. Alternatively, construction in one year is likely feasible if funding can be allocated accordingly.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The neighborhood engagement for the design process will begin in 2015. Detailed design is anticipated to be completed in 2016. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2017 and be completed in 2018.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Capital improvement projects such as this one, completes a corridor, enhances the commercial character of the area which helps preserve existing property values and enhances the City's tax base.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated. Yes, This corridor is shown in the Plan as having an off-street trail.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience. No

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details. Yes. This project will improve facilities for both pedestrians and bicyclists through anticipated pedestrian ramp improvements and the addition of a multi-use trail.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details. Yes. The right-of-way is constrained. Parking will likely need to be eliminated on one side.





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**18th Ave NE** Monroe St NE to Johnson St NE	**Proposed:** 2017-2018	**PV080**
	Contact: Bev Warmka 612-673-3762		

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Minnehaha Ave (24th to 26th St E) **Project ID:** PV083

Project Location: 24th St. E. to 26th St. E.
City Sector: South
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2012
Project Start Date: 4/13/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Beverly Warmka
Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Seward
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/16/15
Department Priority: 26 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3762
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The project is a full reconstruction approximately 0.25 miles in length and is along Minnehaha Avenue from 24th Street East to 26th Street East. The street was originally constructed in 1970. The proposed roadway will consist of two traffic lanes (one each way), bike lanes, and parking on both sides, with new curb, gutter, boulevard, trees, and sidewalks. Minnehaha Avenue has existing on-street bicycle lanes.

Purpose and Justification:

The primary goals of the requested improvement are to provide a better street for all modes of traffic, to improve pedestrian crossings at intersections, to reduce city maintenance costs, to improve storm water drainage and to provide better access to adjacent properties.

The project area aesthetics will be greatly improved by reconstructing the roadway with new roadway surface, sidewalks, curb and gutter. The pavement condition is at a point where its severe deterioration requires increasing maintenance thus increasing costs. The segment of Minnehaha Avenue between 24th St E and 26th St E carries heavy truck traffic. The pavement condition for this segment is significantly lower than the adjacent areas. This project will reduce maintenance costs.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	335	335
Municipal State Aid	1,415	1,415
Special Assessments	955	955
Stormwater Revenue	120	120
Water Revenue	95	95
Totals by Year	2,920	2,920

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (1,500)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	10	0	0	0	0	10
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	275	0	0	0	0	275
Construction Costs	1,996	0	0	0	0	1,996
Project Management	140	0	0	0	0	140
Contingency	360	0	0	0	0	360
City Administration	139	0	0	0	0	139
Total Expenses with Admin	2,920	0	0	0	0	2,920

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure, and contributes to a robust bicycle and pedestrian network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.

2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2012. The project was found to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Public Works will work with the Seward neighborhood along with the Seward Business Association, and others as appropriate, during the planning and the design of this project.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The size of this project makes it suitable for substantial construction during one year. Spreading the construction over two or more years would decrease the cost-effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The neighborhood engagement and design process will begin in 2014 with construction in 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Capital improvement projects such as this one, completes a corridor vision, enhances the commercial and residential character of the area, and helps to preserve existing property values and tax base.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated. Yes, Minnehaha Ave is designated for bike lanes. This segment of Minnehaha already has bike lanes.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience. Yes. Minnehaha Ave (24th St E to 25th St E) is served by Metro Transit Route 9. Busses will ride more smoothly on the new pavement. Boarding/alighting areas and pedestrian ramps will be brought up to current standards for size and slope.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details. The sidewalk intersections would be rebuilt to conform to the current ADA standards as they relate to landing areas and maximum slopes, and bike lanes would be maintained through the project.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details. This section of roadway has an 80ft right-of-way. The proposed roadway is anticipated to have a configuration similar to that of the existing roadway.





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**Minnehaha Ave** **24th St E to 26th Ave S**	**Proposed:** **2015**	**PV083**
	Contact: Bev Warmka 612-673-3762		

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 54th St W (Penn to Lyndale Ave S) **Project ID:** PV084

Project Location: Penn Ave. S. to Lyndale Ave. S.
City Sector: Southwest
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2012
Project Start Date: 4/17/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Chris Engelmann
Affected Wards: 13
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/1/16
Department Priority: 29 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3274
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project is a complete reconstruction of 54th St. W. from Penn Ave. S. to Lyndale Ave. S. 54th St. is a Municipal State Aid Route with an Average Daily Traffic of 5,200 at Penn Ave. to 7,950 vehicles per day at Lyndale Ave. (2011 traffic count). A 2011 count reported an estimated 120 pedestrians and 70 bicyclists per day on 54th St W near Penn Ave. This segment is approximately 1 mile long with 2 traffic lanes and 2 parking lanes, the proposed reconstruction will continue the cross section constructed west of Penn Ave. in 2008.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing concrete pavement was constructed in 1969 and is rated in poor condition by the City's pavement management system with a Pavement Condition Index rating of 55 in 2009. Streets with PCI's in this range often degrade at a rate of 2 – 5 points per year; therefore, an estimate of the 2014 PCI would be 30 - 45. This segment of road is concrete and has severely deteriorated joints which have failed requiring extraordinary patching to maintain a safe driving surface.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	395	475	870
Municipal State Aid	1,975	3,325	5,300
Special Assessments		1,520	1,520
Stormwater Revenue	200	200	400
Water Revenue	15		15
Totals by Year	2,585	5,520	8,105

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (6,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	820	0	0	0	820
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	1,642	3,487	0	0	5,129
Project Management	0	0	550	0	0	550
Contingency	0	0	1,220	0	0	1,220
City Administration	0	123	263	0	0	386
Total Expenses with Admin	0	2,585	5,520	0	0	8,105

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both maintains existing infrastructure and contributes to the City's bicycle and pedestrian network--furthering the following city goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Maintenance of the street infrastructure is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to supporting reliable levels of service across the range of the City's interconnected multi-modal transportation system. Building a robust bicycle network is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to creating sustainable, livable, and healthy communities, as well as creating an asset that attracts residents, workers, and economic investment to the City.

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 24, 2012. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

N/A

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is anticipated to be a one construction year project. Spreading the construction over two or more years decreases the cost effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

N/A

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.
Yes. The Bicycle Master Plan calls for bike lanes to be considered when the street is reconstructed.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.
No.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
Yes. Pedestrian ramps will be reconstructed to current standards. The proposed reconstruction will continue the cross section constructed west of Penn Ave. in 2008. This cross section removes parking from the north side and replaces six-foot-wide sidewalks with five-foot-wide sidewalks to make width for the addition of bike lanes. The addition of bike lanes can reduce the number of bicyclists on the sidewalk and will provide a specific space for bicyclist use. This segment of 54th St is not a bus route.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes. The proposed reconstruction will continue the cross section constructed from Upton Avenue to Penn Avenue in 2008. The legal right-of-way from Upton Avenue to Lyndale Avenue is 66 feet wide. The distance from back-of-sidewalk to back-of-sidewalk, also known as the perceived right-of-way, is 57 feet wide from Upton Avenue to Knox Avenue. The perceived right-of-way from Knox Avenue to Lyndale Avenue varies and is typically 55 to 57 feet wide. Stated more simply, the sidewalks are farther from the houses than they are on the segment reconstructed in 2008. Grades and encroachments typically limit utilization of the entire legal right-of-way. Unless sidewalks can be moved closer to the houses, a modified cross section will have to be designed for portions where the perceived right-of-way is constrained. Pending preliminary survey, options to be considered might include boulevards narrower than the recommended boulevard width for tree planting.



Project

N



MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	54th St W Penn Ave S to Lyndale Ave S	Proposed: 2016-2017	PV084
	Contact: Chris Engelmann 612-673-3274		

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 26th Ave N (Wirth Pkwy to Brdwy/Lyndale to River) Project ID: PV086

Project Location: Wirth Parkway to W. Broadwy and Lyndale Ave. to Mississippi River
City Sector: North
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2012
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Nickolas Van Gunst

Affected Wards: 5
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/16
Department Priority: 18 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-2172
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project involves the major renovation of 0.80 miles on 26th Avenue North between Wirth Parkway and West Broadway Avenue and between Lyndale Avenue North and the Mississippi River. Renovation of this roadway will facilitate the construction of a new protected bicycle facility on the north side of the corridor in addition to improving the driving surface of the roadway.

Purpose and Justification:

The pavement condition for this roadway is poor and in need of renovation. Pavement Condition Index ratings were 62 in 2011 on the westerly segment (est at 53 for 2014) and 28 to 42 on the easterly segment (est at 18 to 27 in 2014). Renovation of this corridor will also allow for a protected bicycle facility to be placed on the north side of this corridor. This project combined with the 26th Avenue North (West Broadway to Lyndale Avenue North) project (PV073), will result in a multi-use trail from Wirth Parkway to the Mississippi River. This vision is consistent with the 26th Avenue North greenway corridor plans approved by both the Hawthorne and Jordan Neighborhoods.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,160	815	1,975
Municipal State Aid	275	530	805
Special Assessments	680		680
Stormwater Revenue	40		40
Totals by Year	2,155	1,345	3,500

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (4,800)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment

that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	315	0	0	0	0	315
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	706	0	0	0	0	706
Project Management	170	0	0	0	0	170
Contingency	90	0	0	0	0	90
City Administration	64	0	0	0	0	64
Total Expenses with Admin	1,345	0	0	0	0	1,345

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both maintains existing infrastructure and contributes to a robust bicycle network, furthering the following city goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.
10.15.1 Consider street vacations as a last resort to preserve the network of city streets and arterials.
10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.
10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bump-outs.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.
10.15.5 Explore options to redesign larger blocks through the reintroduction and extension of the urban street grid.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 9, 2013. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project is a collaborative effort with the Hawthorne Neighborhood and with the Jordan Neighborhood. Both neighborhoods have been actively involved in planning improvements for this corridor for almost 10 years. Both neighborhoods combined have already invested $50,000 in NRP funding to come up with several options for a new protected bicycle facility; all options require renovation or reconstruction of the roadway. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is also interested in completing this project as it will make a direct connection to the Mississippi River and is consistent with the RiverFirst concepts.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project should be coordinated with PV073 – 26th Avenue North from West Broadway Avenue to Lyndale Avenue North

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Renovating this corridor will improve the appearance and character of the neighborhood and may result in more private investment. The protected bicycle facility is also a very high priority for the Hawthorne and Jordan Neighborhoods and can't be built unless the roadway is renovated or reconstructed.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated.

Yes, the proposed multi use trail that will be constructed as part of this project will be the only east/west trail facility in this part of the city and will provide regional connections to the Minneapolis Grand Rounds and to the Mississippi river.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes, the pedestrian realm will be improved with new sidewalks and the multi use facility including upgraded ADA pedestrian curb ramps.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes, the proposed multi-use trail that will be constructed as part of this project will be the only east/west trail facility in the part of the city and will provide regional connections to the Minneapolis Grand Rounds and to the Mississippi river. The project will accommodate pedestrians on both sides of the street, with upgraded ADA pedestrian ramps.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

The right-of-way is constrained; between 58 and 63 feet. It is envisioned that providing for improved sidewalks, boulevards and other green spaces, traffic lanes and other below and above ground infrastructure will require innovation given the constraints for the right-of-way.





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**26th Ave N** Wirth Parkway to Broadway, Lyndale Ave to River	Proposed: 2014-2015	PV086
	Contact: Nick VanGunst 612-673-2172		

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 34th Ave S (54th St E to Minnehaha Pkwy) **Project ID:** PV087

Project Location: Minnehaha Parkway to 54th St. E.
City Sector: South
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2012
Project Start Date: 4/15/18
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Chris Engelmann

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/29/18
Department Priority: 37 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3274
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This segment of 34th Ave S is MSA route 247. The average daily traffic (ADT) was counted in 2012 ranging from 6400 to 7500. The project proposes to rehabilitate approximately 0.73 miles of roadway. This stretch of 34th Ave S is concrete and is experiencing failures along the joints. Public Works is currently assessing rehabilitation techniques for concrete pavement; the project is expected to include repairs without removing the existing curb and gutter and sidewalks. In most cases, only the failed joints will be removed and replaced.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing concrete pavement was constructed in 1971 and is rated in poor condition by the City's pavement management system with a Pavement Condition Index rating of 53 in 2010 estimated at 43 for 2014. The poor condition of the roadway is primarily the result of the joint failures. Because of the poor condition of the roadway, it requires a significant amount of limited maintenance resources. Rehabilitating the failed concrete joints will extend the useful life of this stretch of roadway and put off a more costly full reconstruction project.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,285	1,285
Special Assessments	320	320
Totals by Year	1,605	1,605

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

None

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (4,380)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	125	0	125
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	1,034	0	1,034
Project Management	0	0	0	100	0	100
Contingency	0	0	0	270	0	270
City Administration	0	0	0	76	0	76
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	1,605	0	1,605

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both maintains existing infrastructure and contributes to the City's bicycle and pedestrian network--furthering the following city goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway

system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2012. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is anticipated to be a one construction year project. Spreading the construction over two or more years decreases the cost effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.
No.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.
Yes. This corridor is a transit route used by MetroTransit Route 7. The roadway surface will be improved. Pedestrian curb ramps may be addressed with this project.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Yes
Provide details. Pedestrian ramps may be upgraded in accordance with the City's ADA Transition Plan.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space?
Provide details. Is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details

No. The current right-of-way is 66 feet however this is a rehabilitation project rather than a reconstruction project

therefore curb lines are not expected to be altered as part of the project scope. Bicycle facilities are not called for in our master plan and sidewalks are not part of the project scope. Innovative concrete rehabilitation techniques are planned for this project.





MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

34th Ave S
54th St E to Minnehaha Parkway

Proposed: 2018

PV087

Contact: Chris Engelmann 612-673-3274

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 4th St. SE **Project ID:** PV094

Project Location: 25th Ave. SE to 29th Ave. SE
City Sector: East
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2019
Project Start Date: 4/15/19
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Hay

Affected Wards: 2
Affected Neighborhood(s):
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/20
Department Priority: 44 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3884
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The project consists of full reconstruction of approximately 0.28 miles of roadway between TCF Bank Stadium and 29th Ave SE where the Central Corridor Light Rail Line is located. The project will consist of full reconstruction of the roadway infrastructure. This consists of, at a minimum, full removal of existing pavement, subgrade correction, aggregate base, asphalt paving, street lighting, curb and gutter, signage, sidewalks and pedestrian ramps, and drive entrance reconstruction.

Purpose and Justification:

4th St SE between 25th Ave SE and 29th Ave SE was constructed in 1951 and was rated as in very poor (PCI 14) condition in 2009 (PCI of 4 est in 2014). The current pavement is 63 years old and beyond its expected useful life. Because of the poor condition of the roadway it requires a significant amount of limited maintenance resources.

The area is undergoing significant investment with construction of Central Corridor Light Rail Transit along with development projects by either the University of Minnesota or private developers. This project coordinates with another reconstruction project proposed as part of our Development Infrastructure Program along 4th St SE between 29th Ave SE and Malcolm Ave SE which is adjacent to a known upcoming development project.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,395	1,395
Special Assessments	535	535
Stormwater Revenue	80	80
Totals by Year	2,010	2,010

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (2,520)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	175	175
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	1,279	1,279
Project Management	0	0	0	0	120	120
Contingency	0	0	0	0	340	340
City Administration	0	0	0	0	96	96
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	0	2,010	2,010

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure, and contributes to a robust bicycle and pedestrian network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
• Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.

2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.

Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.

10.15.1 Consider street vacations as a last resort to preserve the network of city streets and arterials.
10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.
10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bumpouts.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.
10.15.5 Explore options to redesign larger blocks through the reintroduction and extension of the urban street grid.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 9, 2013. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project coordinates with another reconstruction project proposed as part of our Development Infrastructure Program along 4th St SE between 29th Ave SE and Malcolm Ave SE which is adjacent to a known upcoming development project.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is anticipated to be a one construction year project. Spreading the construction over two or more years decreases the cost effectiveness of the project

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a

new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Preliminary design and public input will occur early in 2018 with final design completed in the fall. Major construction will be completed during the 2019 construction season.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

Yes – On-street bike lanes are proposed

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes, due to high pedestrian usage and the projects proximity to the U of M facilities sidewalks will be added to both sides of the street.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes – The project proposes consideration of on-street bike lanes and reconstruction of the sidewalks to meet width guidelines per the Street and Sidewalk Design Guidelines and possibly some amenities.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes – This is an MSA route and the design is proposed to meet MSA design criteria. Bike lanes do not exist today, parking currently exists on both sides of the street with what appears to be a high demand. Sidewalks are narrow and do not always have a consistent straight path.





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**4th St SE** 23rd Ave SE to 29th Ave SE	Proposed: 2019	PV094
	Contact: Steve Hay 612-673-3884		

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 4th St N & S **Project ID:** PV095

Project Location: 2nd Ave N to 4th Ave S
City Sector: Downtown
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2019
Project Start Date: 4/15/19
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Hay
Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/20
Department Priority: 36 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3884
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project will reconstruct 0.45 miles of 4th Street in downtown from 4th Avenue South to 2nd Avenue North. This section of 4th Street is Municipal State Aid (MSA) Route 341.

The project will consist of complete removal and replacement of the pavement, subgrade, curb and gutter, and driveways. Some sidewalks may also be replaced. The reconstructed roadway will include the eastbound bicycle lane and westbound contra-flow transit lane in addition to through traffic lanes.

Purpose and Justification:

This section of 4th Street was constructed between 1961-1963 as an asphalt over concrete roadway. It was overlaid in 2000 and seal coated in 2001. The Pavement Condition Index was last measured in 2010 and has a PCI rating of 42-55. This roadway has considerable medium and high severity cracking and patching, and is developing potholes. Some sections of curb and gutter are also showing medium to high levels of deterioration.

This is a very high volume corridor with traffic counts from 9,500-20,000 ADT. This is also a very high volume transit corridor with buses operating in both directions, eastbound with general traffic and westbound in the contra-flow transit lane. Metro Transit currently operates routes 3, 7, 16, 50, and 94 on 4th Street. This is also a heavily used bicycle route which currently has a separate bike lane.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	2,195	2,195
Municipal State Aid	775	775
Special Assessments	260	260
Totals by Year	3,230	3,230

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (3,360)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	320	0	320
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	2,011	0	2,011
Project Management	0	0	0	210	0	210
Contingency	0	0	0	535	0	535
City Administration	0	0	0	154	0	154
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	3,230	0	3,230

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure and contributes to a robust bicycle and transit network in furtherance of the following City goals:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.

2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.

Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 9, 2013. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This is a relatively short section of roadway, but with very high usage so it would be more efficient to complete the project in one year.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

Yes. This section of 4th street is a designated bicycle route on the City's Bikeways Master Plan.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes. The 4th Street corridor is a heavily used transit route that is currently being used by Metro Transit routes 3, 7, 16, 50, and 94. Buses travel in both directions, eastbound with general traffic and westbound in the bus contra-flow

lane. This project also has very high pedestrian activity because of its location in the core of downtown.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

The existing bicycle lane, contra-flow transit lane, and other transit infrastructure will be maintained. It is expected that enhanced transit amenities will be implemented on 4th Street prior to its reconstruction and those amenities would be maintained as well.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

The right of way is extremely constrained and no substantial changes in the existing cross section are anticipated.





MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

4th Street North & South

2nd Ave N to 4th Ave S

Proposed: 2018

PV095

Contact: Steve Hay 612-673-3884

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 42nd Ave N (Xerxes to Lyndale Ave N) **Project ID:** PV096

Project Location: Xerxes Ave N to Lynadale Ave N
City Sector: North
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2018
Project Start Date: 4/15/18
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Chris Engelmann
Affected Wards: 4
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/18
Department Priority: 35 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3274
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project will reconstruct 42nd Avenue North between Lyndale Avenue North and Xerxes Avenue North. 42nd Ave is a Municipal State Aid Route with an Average Daily Traffic ranging from 2,400 vehicles per day at Xerxes Ave and increasing to 8,800 vehicles per day at Lyndale Ave (2012 traffic count). The project is approximately 1.5 miles long with two (2) traffic lanes and two (2) bike lanes, with shared use pavement markings along both sides of 42nd Ave N extending from Lyndale Ave to Xerxes Ave N. The area along the project corridor is residential and abutting properties are predominantly single family homes. This will be a total reconstruction project involving the entire right-of-way and will include a new roadway, new curb/gutter, utility improvements, new sidewalks with ADA compliant pedestrian ramps, and bike lanes. The project will also include signal improvements, new signage, and new pavement markings.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing asphalt over concrete base pavement from Aldrich Ave N to Xerxes Ave N was constructed in 1965, with the remaining section from Lyndale Ave N to Aldrich Ave N constructed in 1923. The roadway is rated in poor condition by the City's pavement management system with a Pavement Condition Index rating ranging from 40 to 53 in 2009. Streets with PCI's in this range often degrade at a rate of 2 – 5 points per year; therefore, an estimate of the 2018 PCI is 8 – 35. This segment of road has severely deteriorated joints which have failed requiring extraordinary patching to maintain a safe driving surface. In addition, there are no ADA compliant pedestrian walkways for the majority of the project area.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	640	810	3,590	5,040
Municipal State Aid	2,785	4,895		7,680
Special Assessments	1,435	1,440	410	3,285
Stormwater Revenue	125	125		250
Water Revenue	185	185		370
Totals by Year	5,170	7,455	4,000	16,625

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (9,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged

driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	1,155	0	1,155
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	2,799	5,190	7,989
Project Management	0	0	0	220	550	770
Contingency	0	0	0	750	1,360	2,110
City Administration	0	0	0	246	355	601
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	5,170	7,455	12,625

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both maintains existing infrastructure and contributes to the City's bicycle and pedestrian network--furthering the following city goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Maintenance of the street infrastructure is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to supporting reliable levels of service across the range of the City's interconnected multi-modal transportation system. Building a

robust bicycle network is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to creating sustainable, livable, and healthy communities, as well as creating an asset that attracts residents, workers, and economic investment to the City.

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 9, 2013. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is anticipated to be a two year construction project. Spreading the construction over more than two years decreases the cost effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City

Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? Yes
If yes, how is the route designated.

The Bicycle Master Plan describes the corridor as a candidate for bike lanes. Established bike lanes/ shared use paths, exist along both sides of 42nd Ave. N. extending from Lyndale Ave. to Xerxes Ave. N.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Yes. Portions of this corridor are a transit route used by Metro Transit Route 19. Enhancing the existing sidewalks, crosswalks, and providing ADA compliant curb ramps are a part of this project. The transit stops will be updated to meet current ADA standards.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes. Enhancing the existing bike lanes and improving sidewalks, crosswalks, and providing ADA compliant curb ramps are an integral part of this project. The transit stops will be updated to meet current ADA standards.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes. The legal right-of-way of 42nd Ave N from Xerxes Ave to Lyndale Ave is 60 feet wide. The distance from back-of-sidewalk to back-of-sidewalk, also known as the perceived right-of-way, is 55 feet wide for most of the length of the project (Xerxes Ave to Aldrich Ave) with the sidewalk adjoining the back of curb and no established boulevards. The area along the project corridor is residential and abutting properties are predominantly single family homes. Grades and encroachments typically limit utilization of the entire legal right-of-way. A modified cross section will have to be designed for portions where the perceived right-of-way is constrained.





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**42nd Ave N** Xerxes Ave N to Lyndale Ave N	Proposed: 2018-2019
	Contact: Chris Engelmann 612-673-3274	

PV096

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 18th Ave NE Bikeway **Project ID:** PV097

Project Location: 6th St. NE to Washington St. NE
City Sector: East
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2018
Project Start Date: 4/15/18
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Donald Pflaum
Affected Wards: 1
Affected Neighborhood(s): Logan Park
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/18
Department Priority: 38 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-2129
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project entails the addition of a new protected bicycle facility between 6th Street NE and Washington Avenue NE along 18th Ave NE. This segment was postponed when the 18th Ave NE multi-use trail was built between Marshall Street and Monroe Avenue. The reason this segment was postponed was to allow for more time to work with adjacent property owners on securing the right-of-way for this project.

Purpose and Justification:

This project fills in a gap that exists in the bicycle system. Per the Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan, the 18th Avenue Trail connects the Mississippi River to the NE Diagonal Trail. The 18th Ave NE trail is the primary east/west trail connection through Northeast Minneapolis.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	300	300
Totals by Year	300	300

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

No grants have been secured at this time.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 600

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

$2 per linear foot for trail maintenance. Increased costs will need to be absorbed into the existing operating budget.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Once the facility is complete very little maintenance will be required for the first few years. Regular seal coats and crack sealing may be needed in 10-15 years.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	286	0	286
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	0	0	0	14	0	14
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	300	0	300

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both maintains existing infrastructure and contributes to a robust bicycle network, furthering the following city goals:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Building a robust bicycle network is supported by policies in the City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan related to creating sustainable, livable, and healthy communities, as well as creating an asset that attracts residents, workers, and economic investment to the City.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Land Use: Minneapolis will develop and maintain a land use pattern that strengthens the vitality, quality and urban character of its downtown core, commercial corridors, industrial areas, and neighborhoods while protecting natural systems and developing a sustainable pattern for future growth.

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain, and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivitol role as he center of the regional transportation network.

1.3: Ensure that development plans incorporate appropriate transportation access and facilities, particularly for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit.

1.3.2: Ensure the provision of high quality transit, bicycle, and pedestrian, access to and within designated land use features.
Policy 2.5: Ensure that bicycling throughout the city is safe, comfortable and pleasant.
2.5.1 Complete a network of on and off street primary bicycle corridors.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
Policy 5.4.1: Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 9, 2013. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project is a high priority for Northeast Minneapolis and has been requested by the Ward 1 Council Office. The project is supported by the community and the trail element has regional support.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project will be constructed in one construction season and it is recommended that the project funding be programmed for one year (2018).

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

This project will help make a seamless multi-use trail connection across NE Minneapolis from Stinson Blvd to Marshall Street NE.

Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

Yes, this corridor is shown in the plan as an off-street trail.

Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or multi-use trail experience.

No.

Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

This project will provide accommodations for both walkers and bicyclists.

Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes, right-of-way is constrained and property will need to be acquired.





MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

18th Ave NE Trail Gap
6th ST NE to Washington St NE

Proposed: 2018

PV097

Contact: Donald Pflaum 612-673-2129

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Hiawatha Trail Gap **Project ID:** PV098

Project Location: 28th St. E. to 32nd St E.
City Sector: South
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2018
Project Start Date: 4/15/18
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Hay
Affected Wards: 9
Affected Neighborhood(s): Longfellow
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/18
Department Priority: 39 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3884
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project involves the construction of a new protected bicycle facility along the east side of Hiawatha Avenue between East 28th Street and East 32nd Street, which is approximately a half mile in length. The facility will be 10 feet wide and will be located on MnDOT right-of-way.

Purpose and Justification:

In 1999 Hiawatha Avenue was constructed with a 12 foot wide concrete trail on the west side of the corridor. In 2004 the light rail project reduced the width of this trail significantly to a standard sidewalk width between 28th Street and 32nd Street, creating a trail gap. There is no facility on the east side of Hiawatha Avenue between 28th Street and Lake Street. There is an irregular width sidewalk on the east side of Hiawatha Avenue between Lake Street and East 32nd Street. This project would restore the bicycling connection that once existed and would provide a safe place for pedestrians to walk.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	500	500
Totals by Year	500	500

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

No grants have been secured at this time.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 5,280

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Trail maintenance has been determined to cost $2 per linear foot. This project is a half mile in length so the estimated cost is $5,280 per year. If funded, the new infrastructure costs will need to be funded with existing operations funding.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

A sealcoat and/or a crack seal may be needed in 10-15 years.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	25	0	25
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	391	0	391
Project Management	0	0	0	25	0	25
Contingency	0	0	0	35	0	35
City Administration	0	0	0	24	0	24
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	500	0	500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both maintains existing infrastructure and contributes to a robust bicycle network, furthering the following city goals:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Building a robust bicycle network is supported by policies in the City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan related to creating sustainable, livable, and healthy communities, as well as creating an asset that attracts residents, workers, and economic investment to the City.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the city's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3: Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.

2.2.6: Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.
2.3: Encourage walking throughout the city by ensuring that routes are safe, comfortable, pleasant, and accessible.
2.3.1: Ensure that there are safe and accessible pedestrian routes to major destinations, including transit corridors, from nearby residential areas.
2.3.6: Provide creative solutions to increasing and improving pedestrian connectivity across barriers such as freeways, creeks, and the river, and commercial areas, such as shopping centers.
2.5: Ensure that bicycling throughout the city is safe, comfortable and pleasant.
2.5.1 Complete a network of on and off street primary bicycle corridors.
5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1: Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.3: Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of the Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 9, 2013. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project has been coordinated with Hennepin County, Metro Transit, and MnDOT. A linear corridor has been preserved for this trail.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project will be constructed in one construction season.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Completing this gap would make it lot easier to get around by biking or walking in this area. The project directly connects to the Midtown Greenway, to Lake Street and to the Hiawatha Trail.

Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? Yes
If yes, how is the route designated.

This corridor is shown in the plan as having an off-street facility.

Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

No.

Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

This project will provide accommodations for both walkers and bicyclists.

Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Yes Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

No, adequate right-of-way has been preserved by MnDOT for the trail.





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**Hiawatha Trail Gap** 28th St E to 32nd St E	Proposed: 2018	PV098
	Contact: Don Pflaum 612-673-3884		

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 26th & 28th St Bikeway **Project ID:** PV099

Project Location: Hiawatha Ave. to 35W
City Sector: South
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2014
Project Start Date: 4/15/14
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Jon Wertjes
Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/15
Department Priority: 24 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-2614
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project involves the addition of a protected bicycle facility along 26th and 28th streets between Park/Portland Avenue and Hiawatha Avenue in conjunction with the programmed resurfacing of 26th Street and seal coating of 28th Street. Community feedback will help inform the design team regarding the preferred design treatments.

Purpose and Justification:

The purpose of this project is to improve safety and to increase bicycle mode share. This project will help create a more multi-modal transportation system and will make it easier for cyclists to get to destinations. Both 26th Street and 28th Street are identified in the Bicycle Master Plan for future on-street bicycle facilities.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	200	200	400
Totals by Year	200	200	400

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

No grants have been secured at this time.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Maintenance costs for protected bikeways will depend on the type of facility installed. Design options are currently being researched as part of the 2014 Bike Plan Amendment.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

To be determined; based on design type.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Construction Costs	190	0	0	0	0	190
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	10	0	0	0	0	10
Total Expenses with Admin	200	0	0	0	0	200

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project both maintains existing infrastructure and contributes to a robust bicycle network, furthering the following city goals:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Building a robust bicycle network is supported by policies in the City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan related to creating sustainable, livable, and healthy communities, as well as creating an asset that attracts residents, workers, and economic investment to the City.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.
Policy 2.5: Ensure that bicycling throughout the city is safe, comfortable and pleasant.
2.5.1 Complete a network of on and off street primary bicycle corridors.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
Policy 5.4.1: Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 9, 2013. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and

what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project should be coordinated with the resurfacing of 26th Street and the sealcoating of 28th Street.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This project should be coordinated with the resurfacing of 26th Street and the sealcoating of 28th Street.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Completing this project will improve bicycle mobility in one of the densest areas in the City. There is a high employment and housing density in this area with good connections to existing north/south bike routes.

Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated.
Yes – This corridor is shown in the plan as having an on-street bike lanes.

Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.
Yes – 26th St and 28th St are bus routes. Dedicated bicycle facilities decrease the volume of sidewalk riding, thereby improving the experience of transit users and pedestrians.

Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
Yes – This project will provide a new protected facility for bicyclists.

Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
Yes – There will likely be discussions about parking and impacts to vehicular through lane capacity.



Example of buffered bike lane - Park Ave



MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**26th & 28th Streets** **Buffered Bike Lanes - Hiawatha to 35W**	**Proposed:** **2014-2015**	**PV099**
	Contact: Jon Wertjes 612-673-2614		

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 29th St W Pedestrian Connection **Project ID:** PV101

Project Location: 29th St. W., Dupont Ave. S. to Lyndale Ave. S.
City Sector: Southwest
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2014
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Hay
Affected Wards: 10
Affected Neighborhood(s): Lowry Hill East
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/16
Department Priority: 25 of 44
Contact Phone Number: 612 673-3884
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project will improve the infrastructure within the right-of-way between Fremont Ave S and Lyndale Ave S (the segment from Emerson Ave to Dupont Ave has been vacated). Currently, this street segment has many areas of broken, or non-existent curb and the driving surface is in poor condition. Sidewalks are only located on the south side of the street. A community led process in 2014 will determine how the corridor will be improved. An emphasis will be placed on how to improve the pedestrian environment.

Purpose and Justification:

The current condition of the street pavement is poor (the PCI from 2011 was 55). The curb is either non-existent or in very bad shape. There are several new developments in this area and the population density has increased greatly over the last 5 years. There are numerous competing interests for this corridor (parking, truck and vehicle access, pedestrian space, etc.). The 2014 community meetings will help sort out the future layout for the corridor. It is likely that additional funds will be needed to complete this project if it is concluded that reconstruction will be pursued.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	350	350	700
Totals by Year	350	350	700

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (650)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $2,500 per mile for a local roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	271	0	0	0	0	271
Project Management	38	0	0	0	0	38
Contingency	25	0	0	0	0	25
City Administration	17	0	0	0	0	17
Total Expenses with Admin	350	0	0	0	0	350

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.
Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.
10.15.1 Consider street vacations as a last resort to preserve the network of city streets and arterials.
10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.
10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bump-outs.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.
10.15.5 Explore options to redesign larger blocks through the reintroduction and extension of the urban street grid.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project will be submitted for location and design review in 2014.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The size of this project makes it suitable for substantial construction during one year. Spreading the construction over two or more years would decrease the cost-effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The neighborhood engagement and design process will begin in 2014 and be completed by early 2015. Construction is anticipated to be substantially complete in November of 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

This project was added into the program by the Mayor in 2013. Capital improvement projects such as this one, completes a corridor, enhances the commercial character of the area which helps preserve existing property values and enhances the City's tax base.

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated.

No

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

No

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes. While the cross-section for this corridor has not been established, it is likely that the 2014 community process will likely result in several recommendations that will enhance the pedestrian experience. New curb ramps, new sidewalks, pedestrian level lighting, street furniture, and new boulevards with street trees will be considered if the street is reconstructed.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes. The right-of-way is constrained by the Midtown Greenway trench, which has a historic fence at the edge of the northern street right-of-way. There is approximately 40 feet remaining to potentially fit drive lanes, parking, new sidewalks, and boulevards.



Project

N



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

29th St W Pedestrian Connection

Fremont Ave S to Lyndale Ave S (except Emerson to Dupont)

Contact: Bev Warmka 612-673-3762

Proposed: 2014-2015

PV101

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 61st St W **Project ID:** PV103

Project Location: Lyndale Ave S to Nicollet Ave S
City Sector: Southwest
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2019
Project Start Date: 4/15/19
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Hay
Affected Wards: 13
Affected Neighborhood(s): Windom
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/20
Department Priority: 43 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3884
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project is a complete reconstruction of 61st St W from Nicollet Ave S to Lyndale Ave S. 61st St is a Municipal State Aid Route with an Average Daily Traffic of 4,125 vehicles per day (2011 traffic count). This segment is approximately 0.5 miles long with 2 traffic lanes and 2 parking lanes.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing asphalt over a concrete base pavement was constructed in 1962 and is rated in poor condition by the City's pavement management system with a Pavement Condition Index rating of 36 in 2013. Streets with PCI's in this range often degrade at a rate of 2 – 5 points per year. This segment of roadway is asphalt over a concrete base and has severely deteriorated joints in the concrete base which have failed requiring extraordinary patching to maintain a safe driving surface.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	2,270	2,270
Special Assessments	900	900
Stormwater Revenue	50	50
Totals by Year	3,220	3,220

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 60
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (3,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project decreases maintenance expenses by improving the quality of the existing pavement by replacing an aged driving surface with a new one. The current annual street maintenance expenditure is estimated at approximately $6,000 per mile for a commercial/MSA type of roadway.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	500	500
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	1,862	1,862
Project Management	0	0	0	0	330	330
Contingency	0	0	0	0	375	375
City Administration	0	0	0	0	153	153
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	0	3,220	3,220

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing street infrastructure and pedestrian network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
• Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and design review for this project will take place in 2014.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project is anticipated to be a one construction year project. Spreading the construction over two or more years decreases the cost effectiveness of the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.
No

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transit way, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

No.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Yes. Pedestrian ramps will be reconstructed to current standards.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Yes, this roadway has a 50 foot right of way to accomodate 2 driving lanes, parking, sidewalks and boulevards.





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	**61st St W** Lyndale Ave S - Nicollet Ave	**Proposed:** **2019**
	Contact: Steve Hay 612-673-3884	**PV103**

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: ADA Ramp Replacement Program **Project ID:** PV104

Project Location: Various locations throughout the City
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015
Project Start Date: 4/11/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Bill Fellows
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 10 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-5661
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The City of Minneapolis has nearly 16,000 sidewalk corners, many of which are deficient or non-compliant with current design standards. This program will fund the systematic replacement of up to 300 deficient or non-compliant pedestrian ramps per year as federally mandated. This program is separate from the work programmed in SWK001 which mainly works to address the nearly 2,000 miles of sidewalks in Minneapolis. SWK001 will address deficient or non-compliant sidewalk corners when adjacent to the sidewalk replacement work that program is focused on.

Purpose and Justification:

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), enacted on July 26, 1990, is a civil rights law prohibiting discrimination against individuals on the basis of disability.

Title II of ADA pertains to the programs, activities and services that public entities provide. As a provider of public transportation services and programs, the City of Minneapolis must comply with this section of the Act as it specifically applies to local governments. Title II of ADA provides that, "...no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity." (42 USC. Sec. 12132; 28 CFR. Sec. 35.130)

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	5,000
Totals by Year	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	5,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

No increase in annual operating costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	75	75	75	75	75	375
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	842	842	842	842	842	4,212
Project Management	35	35	35	35	35	175
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	48	48	48	48	48	238
Total Expenses with Admin	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	5,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing pedestrian network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
• Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Land Use: Minneapolis will develop and maintain a land use pattern that strengthens the vitality, quality and urban character of its downtown core, commercial corridors, industrial areas, and neighborhoods while protecting natural systems and developing a sustainable pattern for future growth.
Policy 1.3: Ensure that development plans incorporate appropriate transportation access and facilities, particularly for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit.
1.3.1 Require safe, convenient, and direct pedestrian connections between principal building entrances and the public right-of-way in all new development and, where practical, in conjunction with renovation and expansion of existing buildings.

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with

land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.
Policy 2.3: Encourage walking throughout the city by ensuring that routes are safe, comfortable, pleasant, and accessible.
2.3.1 Ensure that there are safe and accessible pedestrian routes to major destinations, including transit corridors, from nearby residential areas.
2.3.6 Provide creative solutions to increasing and improving pedestrian connectivity across barriers such as freeways, creeks and the river, and commercial areas, such as shopping centers.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.9: Support urban design standards that emphasize traditional urban form with pedestrian scale design features at the street level in mixed-use and transit-oriented development.
10.9.3 Provide safe, accessible, convenient, and lighted access and way finding to transit stops and transit stations along the Primary Transit Network bus and rail corridors.
10.9.4 Coordinate site designs and public right-of-way improvements to provide adequate sidewalk space for pedestrian movement, street trees, landscaping, street furniture, sidewalk cafes and other elements of active pedestrian areas.
Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.
10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.
10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bump-outs.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.
Policy 10.16: Design streets and sidewalks to ensure safety, pedestrian comfort and aesthetic appeal.
10.16.1 Encourage wider sidewalks in commercial nodes, activity centers, along community and commercial corridors and in growth centers such as Downtown and the University of Minnesota.
10.16.2 Provide streetscape amenities, including street furniture, trees, and landscaping, that buffer pedestrians from auto traffic, parking areas, and winter elements.
10.16.3 Integrate placement of street furniture and fixtures, including landscaping and lighting, to serve a function and not obstruct pedestrian pathways and pedestrian flows.
10.16.4 Employ pedestrian-friendly features along streets, including street trees and landscaped boulevards that add interest and beauty while also managing storm water, appropriate lane widths, raised intersections, and high-visibility crosswalks.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and design review will take place in 2014.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

City of Minneapolis, the Minneapolis Park Board, Hennepin County, and MnDOT all have pedestrian ramp responsibilities within the City of Minneapolis. Public Works is cooperating and assisting with the coordination of these efforts.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is some flexibility in the funding level; the number of ramps that can be addressed each year is dependent upon the amount of funding per year. Minneapolis must upgrade all non-compliant and/or deficient curb ramps, less funding per year will mean that it will take longer to accomplish this mandate however there is a limit to the amount of work per year that can be reasonably accomplished.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Minneapolis completed a self-assessment of all (nearly) 16,000 sidewalk corners summer of 2012. We will identify project areas and any design needs each year for construction during the normal construction season of April thru October until the systematic replacement citywide is accomplished.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.
No

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience. The program includes project areas that are within or near transitways, transit routes, and high-volume pedestrian corridors. The program will improve accessibility for all.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
NA

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
Yes, Minneapolis has many constrained right of ways which will make designing the pedestrian ramps to standard very challenging. There is potential for innovative design options which will be site specific.

Intersection:300

58TH ST W(RES) at THOMAS CIR S(RES)

Corner 67 (NW):2012-08-26

Corner 81 (NE):2012-08-26

Location	6(Right)	67(Center)	7(Left)	8(Right)	81(Center)	1(Left)
Width		48			38	
Ramp Slope		9.88			5.50	
Flare Slope R		13.35			6.62	
Flare Slope L		10.64			9.25	
Texture		Smooth Conc			Smooth Conc	
Lip/STC						
Signal		N			N	
Ped. Light		N			N	
Push Button		N			N	

Corner 45 (SW):2012-08-26

Corner 23 (SE):2012-08-26

Location	4(Right)	45(Center)	5(Left)	2(Right)	23(Center)	3(Left)
Width		50			41	
Ramp Slope		7.07			8.19	
Flare Slope R		8.81			6.65	
Flare Slope L		12.36			14.74	
Texture		Smooth Conc			Smooth Conc	
Lip/STC						
Signal		N			N	
Ped. Light		N			N	
Push Button		N			N	



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

ADA Ramp Replacement Program
Various locations throughout City

Proposed:
2015-2019

PV104

Contact: Bill Fellows 612-673-5661

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Reimbursable Paving Projects **Project ID:** PV99R

Project Location: Various locations throughout the city
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Larry Mastumoto
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority:
Contact Phone Number: (612) 919-1148
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

These funds are requested to allow Public Works Paving Operations to do "work for others" (public and private) which will be reimbursed by the requesting agency, business or individual.

Purpose and Justification:

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Reimbursements	17,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	38,500
Totals by Year	17,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	38,500

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	3,333	3,333	3,333	3,333	3,333	16,667
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	167	167	167	167	167	833
Total Expenses with Admin	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	17,500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and

Objectives:

City of Minneapolis Goal - reference
Connected communities – great spaces & places, thriving neighborhoods

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.
10.15.1 Consider street vacations as a last resort to preserve the network of city streets and arterials.
10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.
10.15.3 Reduce street widths for safe and convenient pedestrian crossing by adding medians, boulevards, or bump-outs.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian connections.
10.15.5 Explore options to redesign larger blocks through the reintroduction and extension of the urban street grid.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan by the City Planning Commission on April 23, 2009; no additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Defective Hazardous Sidewalks **Project ID:** SWK01

Project Location: Various locations throughout the city.
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Dan Bauer, Supervisor, Sidewalk Inspections
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 2 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 919-7543
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

To provide a hazard free pedestrian passage over approximately 2,000 miles of public sidewalk by inspecting and replacing defective public sidewalks. The work is done in neighborhood size areas on an approximate ten year cycle. The work is coordinated with other construction projects performed by Public Works, Hennepin County, utility providers, and other entities. The work is competitively bid to private sidewalk contractors to obtain the lowest possible price. The work performed must adhere to City of Minneapolis specifications. To provide access for persons with disabilities by installing ADA compliant pedestrian curb ramps at street corners and other locations as per Federal requirements and the City of Minneapolis ADA Transition Plan.

Purpose and Justification:

This project assures that the public sidewalks are maintained and are in good repair. Not doing this project would result in the deterioration of the public sidewalks, thus increasing the likelihood of accidents and lawsuits.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,275	305	315	325	335	345	325	3,225
Special Assessments	13,985	3,215	3,360	3,505	3,650	3,795	3,535	35,045
Totals by Year	15,260	3,520	3,675	3,830	3,985	4,140	3,860	38,270

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This proposal has no effect on annual operating/maintenance costs. Funds for the operation of the Sidewalk Inspection office are provided by: 1) the Sidewalk Construction Permit fees paid by contractors, 2) Administrative fees paid by property owners when they are notified by the Sidewalk Inspections office and are required by ordinance to repair public sidewalk defects, or, when they request to use the City hired sidewalk contractor to make needed repairs to defective public sidewalk, and 3) Administrative fees paid by other City of Minneapolis departments when the sidewalk portion of their project work is constructed by the City hired sidewalk contractor. The cost of maintenance of the public sidewalks is required by ordinance (City Charter, Chapter 8, Section 12 and 13) to be paid for by the adjacent property owner.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	3,352	3,500	3,648	3,795	3,943	18,238
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	168	175	182	190	197	912
Total Expenses with Admin	3,520	3,675	3,830	3,985	4,140	19,150

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing transportation infrastructure, including a robust street and sidewalk network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Land Use: Minneapolis will develop and maintain a land use pattern that strengthens the vitality, quality and urban character of its downtown core, commercial corridors, industrial areas, and neighborhoods while protecting natural systems and developing a sustainable pattern for future growth.

Policy 1.3: Ensure that development plans incorporate appropriate transportation access and facilities, particularly for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit.

1.3.1 Require safe, convenient, and direct pedestrian connections between principal building entrances and the public right-of-way in all new development and, where practical, in conjunction with renovation and expansion of existing buildings.

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's

pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.

Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.

Policy 2.3: Encourage walking throughout the city by ensuring that routes are safe, comfortable, pleasant, and accessible.
2.3.1 Ensure that there are safe and accessible pedestrian routes to major destinations, including transit corridors, from nearby residential areas.
2.3.6 Provide creative solutions to increasing and improving pedestrian connectivity across barriers such as freeways, creeks and the river, and commercial areas, such as shopping centers.

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.

Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.

Policy 10.9: Support urban design standards that emphasize traditional urban form with pedestrian scale design features at the street level in mixed-use and transit-oriented development.
10.9.3 Provide safe, accessible, convenient, and lighted access and way finding to transit stops and transit stations along the Primary Transit Network bus and rail corridors.
10.9.4 Coordinate site designs and public right-of-way improvements to provide adequate sidewalk space for pedestrian movement, street trees, landscaping, street furniture, sidewalk cafes and other elements of active pedestrian areas.

Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.
10.15.2 Integrate and/or reuse historic pavement materials for streets and sidewalk reconstruction, where appropriate.
10.15.4 Improve access management and way-finding to and from all streets, sidewalks, and other pedestrian

Policy 10.16: Design streets and sidewalks to ensure safety, pedestrian comfort and aesthetic appeal.
10.16.1 Encourage wider sidewalks in commercial nodes, activity centers, along community and commercial corridors and in growth centers such as Downtown and the University of Minnesota.
10.16.2 Provide streetscape amenities, including street furniture, trees, and landscaping, that buffer pedestrians from auto traffic, parking areas, and winter elements.

10.16.3 Integrate placement of street furniture and fixtures, including landscaping and lighting, to serve a function and not obstruct pedestrian pathways and pedestrian flows.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project is coordinated with all other CIP projects on the five year plan, and also with the Park Board, CPED, MPHA, the Library Board, Hennepin County right of way projects, and with many private projects as approved through the Minneapolis Development Review process.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Not Applicable

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

There are no unspent balances in this ongoing program.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.
Not Applicable

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

Not Applicable

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

Not Applicable

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

Not Applicable

Deteriorated Sidewalk

Broken Sidewalk

Projecting Sidewalk

Uneven Sidewalk



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Defective Hazardous Sidewalk

Contact: Dan Bauer 612-673-2420

Proposed:
2015-2019
Subject to Change

SWK01

Defective Hazardous Sidewalk





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	Defective Hazardous Sidewalk	Proposed: 2015-2019	SWK01
	Contact: Dan Bauer 612-673-2420	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Major Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation **Project ID:** BR101

Project Location: Various locations throughout the city.
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Larry Matsumoto
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 1 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 919-1148
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $320,731

Project Description:

This Program provides for the major repair and rehabilitation of existing City Bridges in order to extend the operational life of the structures for a period of time equal to or greater than the life of the capital bonds.

Major repairs include work on the bridge approaches, abutments, the bridge superstructure and substructure components, decks and associated railings and sidewalks. Specific items of work include the removal and replacement of unsound concrete, soil stabilization, soil anchoring, “shot-crete” repair, fiber reinforcement mat installation, and steel reinforcement bar replacement.

Purpose and Justification:

The costs for major repair and rehabilitation of bridges is relatively small in comparison to the replacement cost of the much larger bridge asset. Consequently, the benefits of extending the operational life of the City's bridge inventory through major repair and rehabilitation is realized through this Program.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,700	400	400	400	400	400	400	4,100
Totals by Year	1,700	400	400	400	400	400	400	4,100

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

No grants or non-city funding sources are used in this program.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (20,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Cost impacts represent an analysis of “Routine Bridge Maintenance” expenses.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Design Engineering/Architects	40	40	40	40	40	200
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	341	341	341	341	341	1,705
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	19	19	19	19	19	95
Total Expenses with Admin	400	400	400	400	400	2,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing transportation infrastructure, including a robust street and sidewalk network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities. Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.

5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and design review for this project took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan by the City Planning Commission on April 23, 2009. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The size and scope of the work can be adjusted to utilize available funds.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This unspent balance will be used in 2014 to complete larger, more expensive rehabilitation work that would normally exceed the program's annual budget.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The proposed funding level will allow for major repair and rehabilitation work that is beyond the scope of annual routine maintenance funding. Consequently, this program allows for the routine bridge maintenance effort to focus on minor repairs, maintenance, and cleaning.

This program allows for system-wide major bridge repair and rehabiltaion efforts including bridge deck repair, repair and rehabilitation of bridge piers, columns, sidewalks, and railings. The resulting extension of the operational life of the structures is realized through improvements or stabilization of the "Bridge Sufficiency Ratings".

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

BRIDGE REPAIR PROJECTS

2014 - 2019

BRIDGE PROJECT





MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Major Bridge Repair & Rehabilitation

Contact: Tracy Lindgren 612-290-5898

Proposed:
2014-2019
Subject to Change

BR101

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 1st Ave S over HCRRA **Project ID:** BR106

Project Location: 1st Ave. S. over Midtown Greenway Corridor
City Sector: Southwest
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/17/17
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Meseret Wolana
Affected Wards: 10
Affected Neighborhood(s): Whittier
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/17
Department Priority: 34 of 44
Contact Phone Number: 612 673-3527
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project proposes the replacement of the 1st Ave. S. Bridge (Municipal State Aid Route #190) over the Midtown Greenway Corridor. The existing bridge is a three span; cast-in-place concrete tee-beam structure built in 1914. The Bridge carries 3,500 vehicles per day, including passenger vehicles, trucks and buses.

Purpose and Justification:

The 1st Ave. S. Bridge is nearing the end of its useful life and needs to be replaced. The existing bridge has a current Sufficiency Rating of 36.9. Bridges are rated during regular inspections from 0 to 100. Any bridge with a Sufficiency Rating below 50 is considered deficient and should be replaced. Deficiencies and deterioration are evident in all major bridge components including the bridge deck, superstructure, and substructure.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	3,220	3,220
Municipal State Aid	1,315	1,315
Totals by Year	4,535	4,535

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Non-city funding has not been secured, we will be seeking funding from other outside sources. MnDOT, Federal and Hennepin County funds.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 75
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (5,250)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The amount is an average based on actual costs tracked in the finance system for maintenance work on the bridge which were provided by Bridge Maintenance Foreman.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	550	0	550
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	2,779	0	2,779
Project Management	0	0	0	275	0	275
Contingency	0	0	0	715	0	715
City Administration	0	0	0	216	0	216
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	4,535	0	4,535

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing transportation infrastructure, including a robust street and sidewalk network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of

this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
Heritage Preservation: Minneapolis will promote the sustainable practice of protecting and reusing our culturally significant built and natural environment, including buildings, districts, landscapes, and historic resources, while advancing growth through preservation policies.
Policy 8.1: Preserve, maintain, and designate districts, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture.
8.1.1 Protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance.
8.1.2 Require new construction in historic districts to be compatible with the historic fabric.
8.1.3 Encourage new developments to retain historic resources, including landscapes, incorporating them into new development rather than removal.
8.1.4 Designate resources recommended for designation from historic surveys and listed on the National Register of Historic Places which have no local protection.
Policy 8.5: Recognize and preserve the important influence of landscape on the cultural identity of Minneapolis.
8.5.1 Identify and protect important historic and cultural landscapes.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2012. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The design of this Project was completed in collaboration with Mn/DOT State Aid, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA).

HCRRA is the owner the Midtown Railroad corridor (also known as the Midtown Greenway), including the majority of bridges crossing the corridor.

SHPO is involved because the entire Midtown Railroad Corridor is condsidered a historic resource.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Not Applicable

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The design of this Project has been completed and has been approved by the Mn/DOT Bridge Office, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the Mn/DOT Cultural Resources Unit.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The design features of the reconstruction work will maintain the historical character of the Midtown Greenway Corridor Historic District which is a collaborative effort of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Federal Government, CPED, HCRRA and the State Historic Preservation Office

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated.
Yes. The 1st Avenue South Bridge is on a route that is part of the Bicycle Master Plan and currently carries a single striped shared use bike lane.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.
Yes. 1st Avenue South is a fixed Metro Transit Bus route providing a continuous transit connection from Nicollet Ave. north of Lake St. to Nicollet Ave. south of Lake St. Replacement of the bridge will ensure continued transit connectivity along this route.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
No.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
No.

1st Avenue South over HCRRA



MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	1st Avenue South over HCRRA	Proposed: 2018	BR106
	Contact: Meseret Wolana 612-673-3527	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 1st St N Bridge over Bassett's Creek **Project ID:** BR117

Project Location: 1st St N near 8th Ave N
City Sector: Downtown
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 4/15/19
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Meseret Wolana
Affected Wards: 3
Affected Neighborhood(s): North Loop
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 40 of 44
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3527
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project proposes the reconstruction of the 1st Street North Bridge over Basset Creek. The bridge is actually located under the 1st Street North roadway between 7th Avenue North and 8th Avenue North in the North Loop neighborhood. The bridge is a masonry/arch structure, originally built in 1915.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing 1st Street North bridge has a sufficiency rating of 55.3 and is considered in fair condition. Bridges are rated during regular inspections from 0 to 100. Any bridge with sufficiency rating below 50 is considered deficient. Although this bridge is rated in fair condition, in the long run, a significant amount of maintenance costs will be eliminated by replacement.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	Totals by Source
Stormwater Revenue	1,915	1,915
Totals by Year	1,915	1,915

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 75
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (2,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Similar projects in the past show a decrease of approxiamtely $2,000 annually.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Repair or rehabilitation of this project is not economical and will not have significant impact to increase the sufficiency rating of the bridge. A new bridge structure is an investment that will decrease future maintenance expenses.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	180	0	180
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	1,479	0	1,479
Project Management	0	0	0	165	0	165
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	0	0	0	91	0	91
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	1,915	0	1,915

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing transportation infrastructure, including a robust street and sidewalk network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Maintenance of the street and bridge infrastructure is supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to supporting reliable levels of service across the range of the City's interconnected multi-modal transportation system. Since the downtown location of the project puts it in the Downtown Growth Center, this project would also support development in the Growth Center.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

Policy 1.15: Support development of Growth Centers as locations for concentration of jobs and housing, and supporting services.
1.15.1 Support development of Growth Centers through planning efforts to guide decisions and prioritize investments

in these areas.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project will be submitted for location and design review in 2014.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not Applicable

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Not Applicable

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth states: "Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and business through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the city's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network."

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

No.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

No.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

No.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

No.

1st St N Bridge over Bassett's Creek



Project

N



Tunnel runs under street here



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

1st Street North Bridge over Bassett's Creek

Contact: Meseret Wolana 612-673-3527

Proposed: 2018

Subject to Change

BR117

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 28th Ave S **Project ID:** BR123

Project Location: 46th St. E. to 47th St. E.
City Sector: South
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2012
Project Start Date: 4/15/18
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Meseret Wolana
Affected Wards: 12
Affected Neighborhood(s): Ericcson
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 32 of 44
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3527
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This Project proposes the major rehabilitation of the 28th Avenue Bridge over Minnehaha Creek. The bridge was constructed in 1904, and is currently eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The bridge is made up of a reinforced concrete arch with concrete headwalls. The bridge foundation is supported by a concrete pile cap on timber piles. The bridge spans 25 feet with a rise of 7 feet over Minnehaha Creek. The bridge is 53 feet wide and carries a 44 foot wide roadway with two lanes of traffic. The bridge has 4.5 foot sidewalks on both sides of the roadway which overhang the arch approximately 3.5 feet on each side.

Stormwater drainage from the roadway flows through a series of pipes in the bridge deck to the creek below. Pipes on the west side of the bridge direct stormwater to the creek through concrete spillways along the outside of the headwalls, while pipes on the east side are more elaborate and send the water further downstream before entering the creek.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing bridge has a current Sufficiency Rating of 81.2. Although the bridge does not need to be replaced, numerous bridge components are significantly deteriorated, in poor condition and should be repaired or replaced in order to extend the useful life of the structure.

The concrete headwalls of the bridge are in poor condition; compressive strength tests on concrete core samples taken from the structure indicate that the headwalls should be replaced. The ornamental metal railing is in poor condition, is substandard dimensionally and should also be replaced. Drainage pipes on the east side of the bridge are cracked and should be replaced. The existing bituminous roadway surface and the concrete bridge curbs and sidewalks are in poor condition and should be replaced with a new concrete bridge deck and integral curbs and sidewalks.

Testing of the concrete in the main arch does not indicate that partial or complete removal is necessary; however numerous cracks in the barrel should be sealed and the backside of the barrel should be waterproofed to prevent further water penetration into the concrete structure. Because the barrel will be exposed while headwalls are being replaced, waterproofing the barrel (at this time) is a cost effective long term maintenance measure.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2017	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,885	1,885
Municipal State Aid	765	765
Totals by Year	2,650	2,650

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Non-city funding is currently not available

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 35
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (2,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The amount is an average cost estimate based on the tracked financial system for maintenance

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	310	0	0	310
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	1,654	631	0	2,285
Project Management	0	0	165	80	0	245
Contingency	0	0	395	384	0	779
City Administration	0	0	126	55	0	181
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	2,650	1,150	0	3,800

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing transportation infrastructure, including a robust street and sidewalk network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This project is consistent with the City's comprehensive plan through: (1) maintaining and improving infrastructure quality, (2) building a connected bicycle system, and (3) maintaining historic resources (the bridge is designated historic landmark). 10th Avenue is an important link in a developing bicycle route system linking to the University of Minnesota and Southeast Minneapolis area.
Policies in the City's comprehensive plan that support this project are listed below.
Policy 2.3: Encourage walking throughout the city by ensuring that routes are safe, comfortable, pleasant, and accessible.
2.3.1 Ensure that there are safe and accessible pedestrian routes to major destinations, including transit corridors, from nearby residential areas.

Policy 2.5: Ensure that bicycling throughout the city is safe, comfortable and pleasant.
2.5.1 Complete a network of 0n- and off-street primary bicycle corridors.

Policy 8.1: Preserve, maintain, and designate districts, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture.
8.1.1 Protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance.

Policy 8.5: Recognize and preserve the important influence of landscape on the cultural identity of Minneapolis.
8.5.1 Identify and protect important historic and cultural landscapes.
8.5.3 Preserve historic materials typically found in public spaces, such as street materials like pavers, lighting and other resources.

This project is consistent with the City's "Connected Communities" goal, specifically: Integrated, Multimodal Transportation Choices Border-to-Border.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design review was completed on May 9, 2013. The project was found to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The design features of the rehabilitation work are a collaborative effort of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB).

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Scalability may be limited to outside funding sources

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This project requires Mn/DOT State Aid review and approval and design needs to begin 3 years prior to construction.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
Yes

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.
Yes, 28th Avenue South is a fixed Metro Transit Bus route. Rehabilitation of the bridge will insure continued transit connectivity along this route.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
Yes, design alternatives will consider a separated grade crossing of the adjacent pedestrian and bike trail that follows Minnehaha Creek immediately north of the existing structure.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
No

28th Ave S over Minnehaha Creek







MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	28th Ave S over Minnehaha Creek	Proposed: 2017	BR123
	Contact: Meseret Wolana 612-673-3527	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 40th St Pedestrian & Bicycle Bridge over 35W **Project ID:** BR126

Project Location: 40th St. E. over I-35W	**Affected Wards:** 8
City Sector: Multiple	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** Various
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2012	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 11/15/16
Project Start Date: 4/18/16	**Department Priority:** 33 of 44
Submitting Department: Public Works	**Contact Phone Number:** 612 673-3527
Contact Person: Meseret Wolana	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $0

Project Description:

The 40th St bridge is a pedestrian overpass crossing I-35W in south Minneapolis at 40th Street. The proposed project would widen the deck of the bridge to accommodate bicycle users, raise the bridge, and improve its aesthetics. Constructed in 1965, the bridge is the sole connection over 35W between 38th Street and 42nd Street. It is the principal pedestrian link for neighborhoods on the east side of the freeway to the neighborhood recreational facilities (Martin Luther King Park and the Dr. Martin Luther King Recreation Center) located at the west end of the bridge. It also is a primary link connecting two phases of the recently completed River Lake Greenway.

Purpose and Justification:

The bridge is functionally obsolete and marginally serves its current purpose. As a primary bicycle artery for Minneapolis, the bridge should meet current geometric standards for a shared-use facility to safely convey pedestrians and bicyclists over I-35W. According to the bridge's inventory report, the current bridge provides only 15 feet of vertical clearance over southbound 35W traffic. To minimize the chance of an over height vehicle impacting a pedestrian bridge, current design standards provide a vertical clearance of at least 17'-4".

The bridge is heavily used by both pedestrians and bicyclists. Mn/DOT's Bikeway Facility Design Manual (MBFDM) recommends connections between neighborhoods over high-volume, high-speed arterial roadways when the spacing between signalized crossings is more than 450 feet. The distance between 38th Street and 42nd Street is approximately 2500 feet. Consequently, this bridge is the only convenient crossing over 35W for a large area of south Minneapolis.

The current bridge has a width between handrails of less than 8 feet. The MBFDM has a minimum recommended width of 12 feet for a shared-use overpass. The connection on the east does not align directly with Bicycle Boulevard requiring bicyclists to navigate an offset to enter the bridge. The proposed work will not eliminate the offset, but providing a wider deck will significantly improve the safety of the movement for bicyclists.

In addition, the narrow width of the bridge combined with the presence of noise walls at each end of the bridge limits the sight distance that bicyclists have for cross-trail bicycle traffic on the west and vehicular traffic on 2nd Avenue on the east. The proposed work will improve the sight distances for bicyclists as they exit the bridge at both ends.

This project would raise the bridge and modify the superstructure to provide between 12 and 14 feet of clear distance between railings on the rehabilitated bridge. The aesthetics of the bridge would be improved by removing the chain link fencing and utilizing a more attractive railing on the renovated bridge.

Concrete surfaces are deteriorating due to weathering and scaling. Water leakage through the longitudinal joints is causing corrosion on the steel girders. Loose or bent anchors exist at the bearing assemblies. If the infrastructure is allowed to continue to deteriorate, rehabilitation will no longer be cost effective.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,515	1,515

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	Totals by Source
Other Local Governments	1,000	1,000
Totals by Year	2,515	2,515

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Non-city funding is currently not available.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 75
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (2,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Similar projects in the past show a decrease of approxiamtely $2,000 annually.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	350	0	0	0	350
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	1,490	0	0	0	1,490
Project Management	0	240	0	0	0	240
Contingency	0	315	0	0	0	315
City Administration	0	120	0	0	0	120
Total Expenses with Admin	0	2,515	0	0	0	2,515

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing transportation infrastructure, including robust bicycle and pedestrian networks—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This proposal is consistent with the following policies of The Minneapolis Plan, as they relate to reconnecting (and maintaining) link of the bikeway system, maintenance of infrastructure, and historic preservation.
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes and strengthen neighborhood character.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2012. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project will be coordinated with Mn/DOT, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) bridge crossing Interstate Highway 35W.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Scalability may be limited by outside funding sources.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth states: "Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and business through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the city's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network."

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated.

Yes. The route is designated as bicycle and pedestrian route only.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.

No.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.

The bridge is designated as bicycle and pedestrian bridge. The project enhances the multi-modal enhancement. The current bridge has a width between handrails of less than 8 feet. The (MBFDM) Mn/DOT's Bikeway Facility Design Manual has a minimum recommended width of 12 feet for a shared-use overpass. The connection on the east does not align directly with Bicycle Boulevard requiring bicyclists to navigate an offset to enter the bridge. The proposed work will not eliminate the offset, but providing a wider deck will significantly improve the safety of the movement for bicyclists.

In addition, the narrow width of the bridge combined with the presence of noise walls at each end of the bridge limits the sight distance that bicyclists have for cross-trail bicycle traffic on the west and vehicular traffic on 2nd Avenue on the east. The proposed work will improve the sight distances for bicyclists as they exit the bridge at both ends.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.

No. The proposed project does not anticipate any right-of-way constriction to users.

40th Street Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge



Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Nicollet Ave over Minnehaha Creek **Project ID:** BR127

Project Location: Minnehaha Parkway to 50th St. E.
City Sector: Southwest
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2012
Project Start Date: 4/15/18
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Meseret Wolana

Affected Wards: 11
Affected Neighborhood(s): Fuller Tangletown
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 41 of 44
Contact Phone Number: 612 673-3527
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This Project proposes the major repair and renovation of the Nicollet Avenue Bridge over Minnehaha Parkway and Minnehaha Creek. The existing bridge is a 16-span open-spandrel concrete arch bridge, 818 feet long and 63 feet wide. The original bridge was built in 1923 and renovated in 1974. Nicollet Avenue South (Municipal State Aid Route #430) carries an average daily traffic count of 13,862 vehicles across the bridge.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing bridge has a current Sufficiency Rating of 65.0. Although the bridge does not need to be replaced, numerous bridge components are significantly deteriorated, in poor condition and should be repaired or replaced in order to extend the useful life of the structure.

The expansion joints at each of the arch spans are the primary cause of structural distress. Moisture and salts are penetrating these joints and causing significant chloride contamination of the concrete superstructure. These joints should be replaced with new waterproof expansion joints.

Concrete delamination is evident throughout the superstructure. Areas of loose and broken concrete are a constant threat of falling onto the underlying roadway, bike path, and creek below; potentially causing injury to pedestrians or damage to vehicles. All areas of concrete delamination should be removed, the underlying surfaces repaired, and the concrete replaced. In addition, all damaged concrete pier caps at joint locations should be removed and replaced. Concrete deck replacement or concrete overlay may also be needed.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	4,745	4,745	9,490
Municipal State Aid	1,750	1,530	3,280
Totals by Year	6,495	6,275	12,770

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Non-city funding is not secured, but may be applied for.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 35
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (45,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The amount is an average based on actual costs tracked in the finance system for maintenance work on the bridge which were provided by Bridge Maintenance Foreman.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	700	700
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	4,336	4,336
Project Management	0	0	0	0	350	350
Contingency	0	0	0	0	800	800
City Administration	0	0	0	0	309	309
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	0	6,495	6,495

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing transportation infrastructure, including a robust street and sidewalk network—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all
• All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This proposal is consistent with the following policies of The Minneapolis Plan, as they relate to reconnecting (and maintaining) link of the bikeway system, maintenance of infrastructure, and historic preservation.
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy.
2.2.6 Encourage reconnection of the traditional street grid where possible, to increase connectivity for all travel modes

and strengthen neighborhood character.
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
Heritage Preservation: Minneapolis will promote the sustainable practice of protecting and reusing our culturally significant built and natural environment, including buildings, districts, landscapes, and historic resources, while advancing growth through preservation policies.
Policy 8.1: Preserve, maintain, and designate districts, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture.
8.1.1 Protect historic resources from modifications that are not sensitive to their historic significance.
8.1.2 Require new construction in historic districts to be compatible with the historic fabric.
8.1.3 Encourage new developments to retain historic resources, including landscapes, incorporating them into new development rather than removal.
8.1.4 Designate resources recommended for designation from historic surveys and listed on the National Register of Historic Places which have no local protection.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2012. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project will be coordinated with Mn/DOT State Aid and the Minneapolis Park Board.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The scalability may be limited by the requirements of potential outside funding.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This project requires Mn/DOT State Aid review and approval and design needs to begin 3 years prior to construction.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth states: "Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and business through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the city's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network."

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan? If yes, how is the route designated.
Yes, Nicollet Avenue South is in the Bicycle Master Plan as a shared use bikeway.

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience.
Yes, Nicollet Avenue South is a fixed Metro Transit Bus route. Rehabilitation of the bridge will insure continued transit connectivity along this route.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details.
Yes, the project proposes to improve the sidewalks and bridge railings.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details.
No.

Nicollet Ave Bridge over Minnehaha Creek



MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	Nicollet Ave Bridge over Minnehaha Creek	Proposed: 2019-2020	BR127
	Contact: Meseret Wolana 612-673-3527	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 7th St Ramp Bridge over 35W **Project ID:** BR130

Project Location: Current 5th St ramp from I94 to 7th St S at 13th Ave S
City Sector: Downtown
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2013
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Jenifer Hager

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/16
Department Priority: 12 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3625
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The proposed project will construct a new westbound Interstate 94 (I-94) off ramp that will re-orient traffic entering downtown Minneapolis from 5th Street to 7th Street. This project is a recommendation from the City's Downtown Action Plan, part of our Access Minneapolis Transportation Plan. Reorienting the ramp will improve the efficiency of downtown Minneapolis' one-way street network. The one-way street network provides important connections in and around downtown.

Completing this project will allow the existing I-94 5th Street off ramp to be repurposed to provide a multi-modal connection between the Cedar Riverside neighborhood and the downtown core. The repurposing will be completed as a separate project.

Purpose and Justification:

Reorienting the I-94 exit ramp will improve the efficiency of the downtown one-way street network. The one-way street network provides important connections in and around downtown, in addition to the regional freeway system. Redirecting traffic to 7th Street will also give numerous express and local bus routes improved access into downtown on 7th Street. Furthermore, the repurposed 5th street ramp will enhance connectivity and provide more opportunities for residents to access jobs by various transportation modes. This project is an integral part of a larger plan to improve downtown's transportation network as envisioned in the City of Minneapolis' Access Minneapolis Downtown Action Plan (2007).

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	3,000	3,000
State Government Grants	6,790	6,790
Totals by Year	9,790	9,790

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

This project was awarded funding through the MnDOT Transportation Economic Development (TED) program. The TED award is for $6,790,000 and requires that the project be let for construction on or before June 5, 2015.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 75
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This bridge will ultimately be owned and maintained by MnDOT.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

When the new exit ramp bridge is completed, it will be owned, operated, and maintained by MnDOT. No additional City funds will be required to realize its expected useful life.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	6,824	0	0	0	0	6,824
Project Management	1,250	0	0	0	0	1,250
Contingency	1,250	0	0	0	0	1,250
City Administration	466	0	0	0	0	466
Total Expenses with Admin	9,790	0	0	0	0	9,790

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

City of Minneapolis Goal - references
Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Transportation: Minneapolis will build, maintain and enhance access to multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses through a balanced system of transportation modes that supports the City's land use vision, reduces adverse transportation impacts, decreases the overall dependency on automobiles, and reflects the city's pivotal role as the center of the regional transportation network.
Policy 2.2: Support successful streets and communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with

land use policy.
2.2.3 Promote street and sidewalk design that balances handling traffic flow with pedestrian orientation and principles of traditional urban form
Policy 2.6: Manage the role and impact of automobiles in a multi-modal transportation system.
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review will occur spring 2014

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

This project is being done in collaboration with MnDOT. MnDOT is participating in project development activities. As noted above, MnDOT will own, operate, and maintain the bridge and exit ramp.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This project must proceed in the 2015 construction year as a requirement of the grant funding.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not Applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Q1. Is the proposed project on a route that is included in the Bicycle Master Plan?
If yes, how is the route designated. No

Q2. Is the proposed project on an existing or planned transitway, transit route, or high-volume pedestrian corridor? If yes, provide details on how the project will improve the transit and/or pedestrian experience. Yes, the I-94 exit ramp into downtown is a heavily used bus route, especially for express buses. The new ramp configuration will improve bus access into downtown as buses will no longer be required to divert from 5th Street to other streets, primarily 7th Street.

Q3. Does the proposed project anticipate multi-modal enhancements (sidewalks, bicycle or transit facilities)? Provide details. No. Bicycles and pedestrians are not allowed on the exit ramp.

Q4. Is the right-of-way constrained and do you anticipate that modes of travel will be competing for space? Provide details, is there potential for innovative design options? Provide details. No. Bicycles and pedestrians are not allowed

on the exit ramp.



OPTION A –
7th St – 3 Lane One–Way Roadway, 2 Lane Bridge Approaching 7th St from I–94W, Existing Hiawatha Ramp to Remain Unchanged and a Signal is added at the 7th St and 13th Ave Intersection

MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	7th St Ramp Bridge over 35W	Proposed: 2015	BR130
	Contact: Jeni Hager 612-673-3625	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Parkway Street Light Replacement **Project ID:** TR008

Project Location: City Wide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Bill Prince

Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 15 of 44
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3901
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This proposal consists of the replacement of deteriorated services, poles, fixtures, and electrical wiring associated with the lighting systems in place along parkways throughout the City. Much of the system is old and needs to be replaced or is in a state of disrepair. The net debt bond funding requested is a key component of a joint City of Minneapolis/Park Board plan to remove and replace all remaining poles and fixtures on the Parkways that are not in conformance with the current light standard. A majority of the lighting units utilize mercury vapor luminaires, which are approaching the end of their serviceable life. These units will either need to be retrofitted or replaced since State Statutes (Section 216C.19 subd. 1) prohibits doing anything other than minor repair or removal of lighting units utilizing mercury vapor luminaires. It is anticipated that, based on the latest budget estimates from the Park Board, it will take 5 to 6 years of capital expenditure to replace, paint, renovate and repair the entire system of 1,000+ remaining obsolete Park Board lighting units and associated underground cabling throughout the City under the proposed joint City/Parkboard plan. Any deviations from that funding level would require extension of the program. This has already taken place in 2013 and is likely to take place in 2014. The cost of the new lighting system is estimated to be approximately $8,500 per fixture for the fixture, pole, foundation, and wiring. The funding for pole and fixture replacements will need to be continued through at least 2019 to complete the replacement of obsolete poles and fixtures. It is expected that LED lighting will be included in the project as the fixtures become available.

Purpose and Justification:

These lighting facilities cannot be properly maintained at the present level of maintenance funding. Aged, deteriorated, and obsolete units and associated underground wiring are not able to be replaced at a fast enough rate to catch up on deferred maintenance. The requested net debt bond portion is a key component of the proposed joint City/Park Board plan to replace the remaining obsolete poles, fixtures and underground electrical cabling in the next 5-6 years and bring all parkway lighting to the current standard.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	950	350	350	310	270	350	350	2,930
Park Capital Levy	1,000	780	1,030	1,030	1,030			4,870
Transfer from Special Revenue Funds	450							450
Totals by Year	2,400	1,130	1,380	1,340	1,300	350	350	8,250

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The City has repeatedly applied for Minnesota Bonding Money. To date, the City has received funding for Victory Memorial Drive lights, which were installed in 2010. The City and the Park Board are working on a funding plan that will combine the net debt bond funds with other sources to expedite the replacement of the remaining obsolete poles. The Park Board committed almost $1.5 million in capital and other funds for 2012 Parkway lighting replacement and has committed $290,000 for 2013 construction, an estimated $500,000 for 2014 construction, with levels closer to 2012 funding being anticipated for years 2015-2019. The Park Board funds are in addition to the City net debt bond contribution. Any funding cuts act to delay the completion of the overall system replacement.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (6,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

It's estimated that personnel cost would be reduced by $4,500 and equipment rental by $1,500. As LED lights are installed savings of $100 in maintenance and $25 in electricity per fixture can be anticipated.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

This project will replace existing lights resulting in a decrease in maintenance costs. Implementing replacement and painting programs will extend the life of the lighting system.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	85	115	110	105	27	442
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	991	1,199	1,166	1,133	306	4,796
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	54	66	64	62	17	262
Total Expenses with Admin	1,130	1,380	1,340	1,300	350	5,500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Lighting is also part of the urban design component of the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, specifically policy 10.17:
Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.17: Provide sufficient lighting to reflect community character, provide a comfortable environment in a

northern city and promote environmentally friendly lighting systems.
10.17.1 Provide high-quality lighting fixture designs that are appropriate to street types and land use, and that provide pedestrian friendly illumination, but minimize glare and dark sky conditions, and other unnecessary light pollution.
10.17.3 Encourage pedestrian scale lighting throughout neighborhoods as well as in areas such as waterfronts, pathways, parks and plazas, and designated historic districts.
10.17.4 Ensure that all site lighting requirements and directional signs have appropriate illumination levels to comply with zoning and industry illumination standards.
10.17.6 Provide sufficient lighting for better way-finding and safe circulation within and around a development.
10.17.7 Encourage additional pedestrian-scale, exterior lighting in growth centers, activity centers, commercial nodes, pedestrian overlay districts and transit station areas.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Public Works coordinates with the Park Board on National Scenic Byway and trail projects that may provide a source of additional revenue/matching dollars and coordinate project timelines to maximize efficiency.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Money spent now on the replacement of lighting will reduce the cost for maintenance for a system that is beyond its service life. Portions of the Parkway lighting system have been condemned and turned off until funds are available to provide temporary connections.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Approximately 45-50% of the system has been replaced. This is a multi-year project. Timing of completion is based on available funding.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

This project will allow for the existing parkway lighting to be upgraded. The electrical cost of much of the existing system is based on a flat-rate per light. This project installs electrical meters and will more accurately reflect true usage. The quality of lighting will improve and the lighting will be focused down, and along the parkway, instead of upward. LED lighting will be included on years 2015 and beyond. Lights replaced previous will need to have fixtures upgraded over time.



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Parkway Street Light Replacement
Citywide

Contact: Steve Mosing 612-673-5746

Proposed:
2014-2018
Subject to Change

TR008

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Traffic Management Systems **Project ID:** TR010

Project Location: Citywide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Alan Klugman
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 8 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 672-2743
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $380,486

Project Description:

The Traffic & Parking Services Division of the Public Works Department has taken a proactive position in seeking to improve and enhance mobility and safety throughout the City of Minneapolis for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and motorists. The City of Minneapolis has applied for Federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding for 2015. The City has been informed that the application submitted in August of 2011 has been approved for funding. The City, with the cooperation of our project partners, Hennepin County and the Federal Highway Administration, will complete the following projects: 1) The City will replace approximately 280 outdated traffic signal controllers and conflict monitors in south Minneapolis. 2) The City will install fiber optic communications along Broadway Avenue, Lowry Avenue, and Lyndale Avenue for bringing video detection and PTZ camera images and other traffic signal data back to the Traffic Management Center (TMC). 3) The City will install traffic signal interconnect cable to signals that are currently not connected to the TMC. These signals are along 27th Avenue SE from University Avenue to East River Road, Broadway Avenue from Stinson Boulevard to Industrial Boulevard, Industrial Boulevard from Broadway Avenue to 35W Ramps, and 28th Avenue South from 38th Street to Minnehaha Parkway.

Purpose and Justification:

The goal of these projects is to improve and enhance mobility and safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and motorists throughout the City. The City will be replacing approximately 280 outdated traffic signal controllers and conflict monitors in south Minneapolis. The existing controllers are about 20+ years in age and the typical lifecycle is 15 years. They are no longer sold by manufactures and they are becoming more expensive to repair. They also have limited features and expandability. The new controllers the City has been using on projects such as the Central Corridor Light Rail and the TMC upgrade have more features and capabilities that enhance mobility, especially with transit. The new controllers have software routines that can accommodate transit signal priority (TSP). TSP allows the traffic signal to better serve a bus or LRT vehicle approaching the signal while keeping the signal in coordination with the nearby signals. Metro Transit is currently doing a study to determine where in the City they would like to do TSP. The City is taking a proactive approach by installing equipment that will help achieve TSP operation if it is used on a corridor within the City in the future. The City is already in the process of installing new traffic signal controllers with TSP capabilities at about 500 other signals over the next two years.

The recently completed TMC upgrade project included leveraging the existing 30+ year old communication network that is used to communicate to the signal controller cabinets and improving the functionality of the network. This improvement is needed to help increase the reliability for the new central system to communicate with the various field devices and it will allow for future expansion of the central system. There was not enough funding in the TMC upgrade project to support a major overhaul of the existing communications network. Additional improvements will be needed in the future to ensure that the City has good and ongoing reliability within the communication network between the TMC and field devices but it also could benefit and help other City departments meet the City's overall goals. Installing fiber optic and traffic signal interconnect cable along the various corridors as described in the project description will help meet our goal of ensuring ongoing reliability within the communications network.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	520	400	400	30	35	165	1,550

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Municipal State Aid	740	400	400	305	110	500	2,455
Federal Government Grants	3,120	2,360					5,480
Hennepin County Grants	570	250	250	100	205	635	2,010
Totals by Year	4,950	3,410	1,050	435	350	1,300	11,495

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The City has been informed that they will receive federal funding in 2015; however the funding is dependent on the federal government's new transportation bill which is slated to start in 2015. The Metropolitan Council will notify the City if the new transportation bill causes a change in status or availability of the funding. The City will have to contribute at least 20% of the project construction costs to receive the federal funding.

The City has had initial conversations with the County regarding these projects. Although an agreement has not formally been created between the County and City of their contribution to these projects, the County has told the City they will participate in the costs for these projects.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Not Applicable

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	32	16	5	5	18	76
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	3,183	964	405	324	1,202	6,078
Project Management	32	20	5	5	18	79
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	162	50	21	17	62	312
Total Expenses with Admin	3,410	1,050	435	350	1,300	6,545

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here

• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The above mentioned projects are consistent with policies 2.6.4, 5.4.2 and 5.4.3 of section 4F, Traffic Control & Street Lighting. These policies are as follows:
2.6.4 Increase the operational efficiency of the roadway network through the use of advanced technologies for traffic operations.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

This project will also provide public facilities that will help with growth needs and use fiscal resources efficiently by installing fiber optic and other traffic signal interconnect cable along several corridors. The new cable will provide more capacity to bring back traffic signal data, camera images, and improve the reliability within the communications network. This project will also establish connections from existing
traffic signals to the TMC that are not currently connected. This new connection will allow these signals to be centrally monitored and provide additional signal information that is currently not available.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The project partners are the FHWA and Hennepin County. FHWA will be providing 80% of the funding required for construction and approving the required documents and plans needed for bidding. Hennepin County will be contributing money towards the design and construction of the project.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The most that can be spent in a given year is $3,500,000. There is flexibility to increase the amount of funding for each year, which would help cover unexpected costs. Funding could be decreased in 2017 and 2018; however, reduction in funding could reduce or even delay improvements to several areas of the City.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The unspent balance is funding for the TMC upgrade and the City wide retiming projects. All these projects are currently underway. The TMC upgrade project will be completed by July 2014. Work on the signal retiming for the downtown, south, and north/northeast/southeast Minneapolis areas should be completed by September 2014.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be

approved:

Not Applicable



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Traffic Management Systems

Contact: Allan Klugman 612-673-2743

Proposed:
2015-2019

Subject to Change

TR010

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: City Street Light Renovation **Project ID:** TR011

Project Location: Various locations throughout the city
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/3/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Steve Mosing
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 13 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-5746
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $150,000

Project Description:

This Capital Program proposes to continue a multi-year City-wide renovation program of the existing decorative street lighting system. There are approximately 7,000 decorative street lighting poles (30-40 ft. heights) distributed throughout the City, generally located in commercial areas and along some arterial roadways. The majority of these streetlights were installed between 1954 and 1963 (more than 40 to 50 years ago). A significant number of these light poles and their anchorages are at or are reaching the end of their serviceable life due to the corrosive effects of salt on the lower six feet of the pole. The majority of existing poles utilizes high pressure sodium light fixtures, resulting in high energy and maintenance costs.

Purpose and Justification:

The funding proposed for 2018 is a continuation of a program first begun in 2005, as the start of a long-term light pole renovation project which required a substantial investment during the first 10 years to get the program underway. It was originally estimated to take $300,000 annually during the early program years to renovate the poles most in need of immediate attention and keep them from falling over into the street, sidewalk, or onto adjacent buildings. Originally, $1,000,000 was appropriated for the project and all of the money was spent in the first year.

As the Program continues and pole conditions are improved, it is anticipated to continue this program in order to allow for the purchase of newer technology light fixtures (such as LED) which result in great energy savings and longer fixture life. Starting in 2014 and moving forward, it is planned to use at least half of the available budget to procure and install LED fixtures and begin the transition from high pressure sodium lights.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,000	550	550	445	625	1,000	350	4,520
Transfer from Special Revenue Funds	3,100							3,100
Totals by Year	4,100	550	550	445	625	1,000	350	7,620

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (7,500)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? ($7,500) plus ($100) per year savings per fixture converted to LED.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

The street light renovation program will replace poles and bases where necessary and implement a painting program that will extend the service life of a street light pole or base 5 to 10 years. Fixture changes will comprise half the budget moving forward at an estimated cost of $550-600 per fixture to convert to LED.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	499	499	404	565	904	2,871
Project Management	25	25	20	30	48	148
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	26	26	21	30	48	151
Total Expenses with Admin	550	550	445	625	1,000	3,170

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Lighting is also part of the urban design component of the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, specifically policy 10.17:
Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.17: Provide sufficient lighting to reflect community character, provide a comfortable environment in a northern city and promote environmentally friendly lighting systems.
10.17.1 Provide high-quality lighting fixture designs that are appropriate to street types and land use, and that provide pedestrian friendly illumination, but minimize glare and dark sky conditions, and other unnecessary light pollution.

10.17.3 Encourage pedestrian scale lighting throughout neighborhoods as well as in areas such as waterfronts, pathways, parks and plazas, and designated historic districts.
10.17.4 Ensure that all site lighting requirements and directional signs have appropriate illumination levels to comply with zoning and industry illumination standards.
10.17.6 Provide sufficient lighting for better way-finding and safe circulation within and around a development.
10.17.7 Encourage additional pedestrian-scale, exterior lighting in growth centers, activity centers, commercial nodes, pedestrian overlay districts and transit station areas.
LED conversion will also greatly reduce energy consumption and reduce maintenance cost while maintaining similar lighting standards and help the City be greener and more carbon neutral.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Public Works coordinates as much as possible with other projects that may provide a source of additional revenue/match dollars and coordinate project timeline to maximize efficiency.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Money spent now on the replacement and/or painting of light poles and bases will reduce the cost for maintenance of a system that is beyond its service life. The ability to increase or decrease work has been accomplished by adding temporary additional help from the union hall to meet goals.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The program began in 2005. This is a multi-year project. Timing of completion is based on available funding.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Pedestrian, bicyclists, and motorists will benefit from this project. The cost premium for LED lights compared to high pressure sodium has virtually been eliminated and the technology and warranties appear much more reliable and the conversion would have great long term benefits for the City.



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

City Street Light Renovation
Citywide

Contact: Steve Mosing 612-673-5746

Proposed:
2015-2019
Subject to Change

TR011

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Traffic Signals **Project ID:** TR021

Project Location: Various locations throughout the City
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Alan Klugman
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 11 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-2743
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $3,139,512

Project Description:

This project consists of the following objectives: the replacement of Traffic Signal red and green LED illuminated indications that have reached the end of their service life; installation of equipment and associated wiring to detect emergency vehicles at signalized intersections; replacement of traditional pedestrian signal indications with countdown timer pedestrian signal indications; and the replacement of 30+ year old obsolete traffic signal system equipment including signal poles, mast arms, foundations, traffic signal control cabinets, wiring, and underground conduit.

Purpose and Justification:

This program is intended to improve the overall safety of the transportation system. Sufficient funds have not been available in the operations and maintenance general fund budget to permit an extensive replacement program. Over the past several years, the City has cut funding that is available for traffic signal maintenance which has further reduced the efforts in replacing traffic signal equipment. The City of Minneapolis operates and maintains 800 traffic signal systems. Some of the traffic signal poles, mastarms, controller cabinets and controllers, and other equipment have been in use for more than 30 years. There are a number of locations where poles and mastarms have started to deteriorate. In some cases, the signal poles and mastarms were replaced for safety reasons. The Mayor and Public Works have identified additional capital dollars for replacing failed or failing traffic signal equipment and infrastructure.

This program also identifies locations where emergency vehicle priority equipment can be installed. Priority vehicle control gives emergency vehicles priority treatment at signalized intersections. This will improve emergency services by reducing trip travel times by decreasing delay at signalized intersections.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	5,570	1,625	1,725	1,335	1,340	1,500	425	13,520
Municipal State Aid	1,470	175	125	110	110	125	125	2,240
Federal Government Grants	4,800							4,800
Hennepin County Grants	925	125	125	125	125	125	125	1,675
Other Local Governments	600							600
Totals by Year	13,365	1,925	1,975	1,570	1,575	1,750	675	22,835

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The City has had initial conversations with the County regarding this project. Although an agreement has not formally been created between the County and City of their contribution to these projects, the County has told the City they will participate in the costs for this project. Also, the City is discussing with the State a partnership to address traffic signals along State Trunk Highways.

The City has applied for and is receiving federal funding through the Hazard Elimination Safety (HSIP) Application. The funding will be available in 2016. The Federal government will provide 90% of the construction cost and the city

will provide the remaining 10%.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (20,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Replacement of old and obsolete traffic signal system equipment with capital funding will help reduce the amount of maintenance money that is used towards replacement of failing equipment. It also helps reduce the number of hours personnel spends maintaining the old and obsolete traffic signal system equipment and more hours can be used on work activities that were previously understaffed.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	45	27	27	27	30	156
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	1,761	1,836	1,450	1,455	1,617	8,118
Project Management	27	18	18	18	20	101
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	92	94	75	75	83	419
Total Expenses with Admin	1,925	1,975	1,570	1,575	1,750	8,795

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains and improves the efficiency of existing infrastructure, improves motorist and pedestrian safety, and reduces impacts on the environment—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project

implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The above mentioned project is consistent with policies 2.6.6 and 5.4.1 of section 4F, Traffic Control & Street Lighting. These policies are as follows:
2.6.6 Maintain street infrastructure in good condition to maximize the life of existing facilities.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

This project maintains street infrastructure and improves the quality and condition of public infrastructure by replacing old and obsolete traffic signal system equipment. The old equipment that is or has failed will be replaced with new equipment, which will improve the condition of the overall public infrastructure.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2010. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

An agreement between the City and Hennepin County requires that the City will operate and maintain each traffic signal on a County roadway and the County will pay for a portion of the operation and maintenance costs. The City is requesting the County to contribute capital money beyond the amount that was agreed to for operation and maintenance to help pay for the controller replacement on County roadways. The County has agreed to provide additional funding. A formal agreement between the City and County for the additional funding is not in place yet. Also, the City is discussing with the State a partnership to address traffic signals along State Trunk Highways.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The most that can be spent in a given year is $5,000,000. There is flexibility to increase funding in each year. More funding will allow Public Works personnel to replace old and obsolete traffic signal equipment faster and also install more pedestrian countdown timers each year. There is some flexibility to decrease in 2015 - 2019; however decreasing funding for these years will slow down the replacement of traffic signal equipment resulting in more maintenance efforts, both in operating dollars and personnel hours, will be spent on maintaining old and obsolete equipment.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The City has a project that involves replacing 19 obsolete traffic signal systems in coordination with mill and overlay projects. This project started construction last year and will be completed by the end of 2014. Another project is reconstructing four signals in a joint effort with MnDOT along Central Avenue. Construction began in 2013 and will finish in 2014.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Below is the list of locations where overhead signals will be installed in 2016 with HSIP funding.

2016 24th St W & Hennepin Av S (2 OH's)
2016 24th St W & Dupont Av S (3 OH's)
2016 24th St W & Lyndale Av S (2 OH's)
2016 24th St W & Blaisdell Av S (3 OH's)
2016 24th St W & Nicollet Av S (2 OH's)

2016 24th St E & 1st Av S (4 OH's)
2016 24th St E & 3rd Av S (4 OH's)
2016 24th St E & Portland Av S (2 OH's)
2016 24th St E & Park Av S (2 OH's)
2016 24th St E & Chicago Av S (2 OH's)
2016 24th St E & 11th Av S (3 OH's)
2016 24th St E & Bloomington Av S (4 OH's)
2016 24th St E & 18th Av S (2 OH's)
2016 24th St E & Minnehaha Av S (4 OH's)
2016 Dowling Av N & Emerson Av N (2 OH's)
2016 34th Av N & Penn Av N (2 OH's)
2016 Como Av SE & 18th Av SE (2 OH's)
2016 4th St SE & 4th Av SE (2 OH's)
2016 26th St E & 10th Av S (2 OH's)
2016 34th St W & Grand Av S (4 OH's)
2016 42nd St E & 42nd Av S (4 OH's)
2016 50th St W & Vincent Av S (4 OH's)
2016 50th St W & James Av S (4 OH's)
2016 50th St W & Minnehaha Pkwy W (4 OH's)
2016 54th St W & Garfield Av S (3 OH's)



Regular Ped Signal



New Signal Controller and Cabinet

Pedestrian Signal with Count-down Timer

Accessible Pedestrian Signal

Old Traffic Signal Pole

New Traffic Signal Pole



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Traffic Signals

Contact: Allan Klugman 612-673-2743

Proposed:
2015-2019
Subject to Change

TR021

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Traffic Safety Improvements **Project ID:** TR022

Project Location: Various locations throughout the City
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Allan Klugman
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 3 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-2743
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $2,877,118

Project Description:

The first objective is to increase safety as it relates to traffic, bicycles and pedestrians. This will be achieved by the following: adding overhead signal indications on mastarms at existing signalized intersections; improving traffic signals for bicycles and pedestrians, purchasing and installing durable pavement markings, updating or replacing existing street lights and bridge navigation lighting under various bridges/viaducts in the City; pursing opportunities to improve safety for pedestrians through review of current practices and development of new strategies in the application of pavement markings, public awareness and input initiatives, and public right-of-way management.

The second objective is to increase traffic flow. This will be achieved by the following: improving traffic signal overall operations by modifying electrical service points, modernizing the operation of the traffic signal itself, improving the signal timing and coordination, and modifying the traffic signal heads and street signs to comply with State and Federal standards; and installing metro-sized street name signs for motorist on major commercial street as they approach arterial streets.

The third objective is to improve the conditions and quality of bicycling and walking to school. This will be achieved through the Safe Routes to School program and other bike/walk efforts.

The fourth objective is to prioritize Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) installations.

Purpose and Justification:

The purpose of the first objective is to improve the safety of the drivers, bicycles and pedestrians using the City's transportation network. Installing overhead signal indications on mastarms will improve the signal visibility for users and thereby reduce certain types of crashes and improve traffic flow on major arterial streets. Making improvements to traffic signals for bicycles and pedestrians will increase safety and compliance. Installing permanent pavement markings will enhance safety by providing year round visibility for roadway markings. Installation of these markings will also reduce annual maintenance costs. Existing underpass and navigation lighting units at some locations need to be replaced in their entirety due to corrosion and aging and the damages resulting from ice, high water levels and debris within the river.

The purpose of the second objective is to improve traffic flow throughout the City. Substandard signal designs exist that are in need of modernization and updating to current State and Federal standards. By bringing existing traffic signal designs and operations up to date, vehicle traffic flow will benefit from these improvements.

The purpose of the third objective is to get more students walking or biking to school. Many of us remember a time when walking and bicycling to school was a part of everyday life. In 1969, about half of all students walked or bicycled to school. Today, however, the story is very different. Fewer than 15 percent of all school trips are made by walking or bicycling, one-quarter are made on a school bus, and over half of all children arrive at school in private automobiles. This decline in walking and bicycling has had an adverse effect on traffic congestion and air quality around schools, as well as pedestrian and bicycle safety. In addition, a growing body of evidence has shown that children who lead sedentary lifestyles are at risk for a variety of health problems such as obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease. Safety issues are a big concern for parents who consistently cite traffic danger as a reason

why their children are unable to bicycle or walk to school. The purpose of the Federal Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program is to address these issues head on. At its heart, the SRTS Program empowers communities to make walking and bicycling to school a safe and routine activity once again. The Program makes funding available for a wide variety of programs and projects, from building safer street crossings to establishing programs that encourage children and their parents to walk and bicycle safely to school.

The purpose of the forth objective is to install APS where needed. APS are used by blind and deaf individuals when crossing the street at signalized intersections. Public Works takes requests for APS from individuals who live in the City and applies the adopted City Council guidelines to evaluate the need of APS at the requested location. If the evaluation shows APS is needed, then Public Works installs the APS.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	3,225	310	345	265	450	545	5,140
Municipal State Aid	1,560	150	55		30	125	1,920
Federal Government Grants	720	885	650				2,255
Hennepin County Grants	945	95			65		1,105
State Government Grants	46						46
Other Local Governments	122						122
Totals by Year	6,618	1,440	1,050	265	545	670	10,588

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The City has applied for and is receiving federal funding through the Hazard Elimination Safety (HSIP) Application. The funding will be available in 2015 and 2016. The Federal government will provide 90% of the construction cost and the city will provide the remaining 10%.

The City has requested that Hennepin County contribute funding in 2015 and 2018. Although an agreement has not formally been created between the County and City for the contribution, negotiations have taken place and it is anticipated that an agreement will be reached.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 6,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Overhead signal additions would increase operating costs by $15.00 per unit per year. There are 55 overhead signal structures proposed for construction from 2015 to 2019. The SRTS Program will replace some of the existing infrastructure. However, it's expected that potential increases may be realized with future infrastructure additions. The increased maintenance costs will be paid through the existing maintenance budget.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	75	60	9	20	25	189

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	1,251	905	239	487	598	3,481
Project Management	45	35	4	12	15	111
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	69	50	13	26	32	189
Total Expenses with Admin	1,440	1,050	265	545	670	3,970

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains and improves the efficiency of existing infrastructure, improves motorist and pedestrian safety, and reduces impacts on the environment—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The above mentioned project is consistent with policies 2.6.5 and 5.4.1 of section 4F, Traffic Control & Street Lighting. These policies are as follows:
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

This project will make improvements to the street network and promotes efficient safe movement of traffic by installing overhead signal indications, APS, and other infrastructure. The overhead signal indications will help increase the signal visibility for drivers and reduce the number of right angle crashes. The APS will help individuals who are blind and/or deaf cross the street at a signalized intersection safely. The installation of new roadway signing and markings will improve the quality and condition of the public streets and help drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians navigate the roadway network with more ease.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 24, 2010. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The two project partners for the traffic signal overhead addition projects are the FHWA and Hennepin County. FHWA will give approval of the plans, specifications, and estimates that will be needed for construction and they will provide 90% of the funding for each project. The City is requesting Hennepin County contribute funding to each project. For the SRTS project, Public Works has worked with Public Schools, Police Department, School Patrol, Health Department, Neighborhood Organizations, Private and the Minneapolis Park Board. Discussions with these groups assist in the prioritization of tasks to be funded.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The most that can be spent in a given year is $2,500,000. There is some flexibility to increase the amount of funding for each year, which could help speed up some projects. There is very little flexibility to decrease the amount of funding in 2015 and 2016 since the federal funding for HSIP requires a 10% match for construction costs. Reducing funding in these years may delay these projects.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The sign reflectivity project accounts for about $1,348,000 of the unspent balance. Approximately $450,000 was planned for but not received from Park Board, Trunk Highway, and County State Aid. This project started in 2012 as part of TR022 and is continuing into this year. In 2015, the sign replacement project will become its own project under TR025. In the previous two years City staff has completed an inventory and condition rating of the over 80,000 signs within the City. This was a necessary first step before embarking on the full installation program that will use the remaining project funding. The majority of the 80,000+ signs will be replaced from 2014-2019. Most of the remaining unspent funds in TR022 are overhead signal addition projects which will be completed in 2014.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Below is the list of locations where overhead signals will be installed.

YEAR	INTERSECTION
2015	35th Street & Blaisdell Avenue S (3 OH's)
2015	35th Street & Nicollet Avenue S (1 OH's)
2015	35th Street & 1st Avenue S (2 OH's)
2015	35th Street & Stevens Avenue S (2 OH's)
2015	35th Street & 2nd Avenue S (2 OH's)
2015	35th Street & 3rd Avenue S (1 OH's)
2015	35th Street & 4th Avenue S (3 OH's)
2015	35th Street & Portland Avenue S (2 OH's)
2015	36th Street & Blaisdell Avenue S (3 OH's)
2015	36th Street & Nicollet Avenue S (1 OH's)
2015	36th Street & 1st Avenue S (2 OH's)
2015	36th Street & Stevens Avenue S (2 OH's)
2015	36th Street & 2nd Avenue S (2 OH's)
2015	36th Street & 3rd Avenue S (1 OH's)
2015	36th Street & 4th Avenue S (1 OH's)
2015	36th Street & Portland Avenue S (2 OH's)
2015	Penn Avenue N & 42nd Avenue N (2 OH's)
2015	Osseo Road & Victory Memorial Parkway (2 OH's)
2015	Penn Avenue N & Oak Park Avenue (2 OH's)
2016	4th Avenue S & 3rd Street S (2 OH's)

2016 4th Avenue S & 4th Street S (2 OH's)
2016 4th Avenue S & 5th Street S (2 OH's)
2016 4th Avenue S & 6th Street S (2 OH's)
2016 4th Avenue S & 7th Street S (2 OH's)
2016 4th Avenue S & 8th Street S (2 OH's)
2016 4th Avenue S & 9th Street S (2 OH's)
2016 4th Avenue S & 10th Street S (2 OH's)
2016 4th Avenue S & 11th Street S (1 OH's)

2019 Fremont Avenue & 17th Avenue N (1OH, 1 street light)
2019 Fremont Avenue & 24th Avenue N (1OH, 1 street light)
2019 Fremont Avenue & 26th Avenue N (1OH, 1 street light)

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
TRAFFIC PROJECTS
2014 - 2019



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Traffic & Safety Improvements

Contact: Steve Mosing 612-673-5746

Proposed:
2015-2019
Subject to Change

TR022

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Pedestrian Level Lighting Program **Project ID:** TR024

Project Location: Various construction projects in the City
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2014
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Bill Prince

Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 14 of 44
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3901
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The City of Minneapolis has identified numerous streets and business and activity nodes as Pedestrian Priority Corridors (PPC) for the purposes of installing upgraded streetlighting systems. These streets and node centers are identified in the Minneapolis Streetlight Policy based on their access to transit, their overall traffic and pedestrian volume and commercial use. The City Council has directed Public Works to amend our streetlight policy to promote the installation of lighting along PPC's and remove the property assessment and owner petition requirements to provide for City funding of these PPC improvements.

Purpose and Justification:

As part of the City Pedestrian Master Plan and as documented in the City Streetlight Policy, high volume streets along transit routes and corridors as well as certain commercial nodes are designated as Pedestrian Priority Corridors (PPC). The City has made it a priority to install enhanced streetlighting along these corridors for the benefit of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. In the past, streetlighting on these PPC was assessed to abutting property owners requiring a supermajority of owners to opt out of the assessment during road construction projects. This process was re-examined in 2013 and the City agreed to change the funding mechanism to not assess property owners along PPC. Due to the extended time between full street reconstruction projects, the opportunities to install lighting on PPC are limited. This project will allow for some accelerated installation of enhanced streetlighting in PPC which are not part of the current street reconstruction program. At current 2014 costs per installed streetlight, the requested $500,000 per year would allow for between 50 and 60 poles per year to be installed in PPC.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	500	500	500	445	450	500	500	3,395
Totals by Year	500	500	500	445	450	500	500	3,395

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 35
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The electricity usage should be close to even as higher wattage Xcel pole lights are replaced with lower wattage and longer lasting LED lights. It is estimated one wrecked pole per year would need to be replaced at a cost of $3000 based on a 2% probability of a given pole being hit in a year.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

The new streetlights installed under the pedestrian corridor light improvement will include LED lights to ensure an expected 20 year fixture life. New pole specifications should ensure an expected 30-40 year pole life.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	451	451	399	404	451	2,156
Project Management	25	25	25	25	25	125
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	24	24	21	21	24	114
Total Expenses with Admin	500	500	445	450	500	2,395

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains and improves the efficiency of existing infrastructure, improves motorist and pedestrian safety, and reduces impacts on the environment—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Lighting is also part of the urban design component of the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, specifically policy 10.17:
Urban Design: Minneapolis will be an attractive and inviting city that promotes harmony between the natural and built environments, gives prominence to pedestrian facilities and amenities, and respects the city's traditional urban features while welcoming new construction and improvements.
Policy 10.17: Provide sufficient lighting to reflect community character, provide a comfortable environment in a northern city and promote environmentally friendly lighting systems.

10.17.1 Provide high-quality lighting fixture designs that are appropriate to street types and land use, and that provide pedestrian friendly illumination, but minimize glare and dark sky conditions, and other unnecessary light pollution.
10.17.3 Encourage pedestrian scale lighting throughout neighborhoods as well as in areas such as waterfronts, pathways, parks and plazas, and designated historic districts.
10.17.4 Ensure that all site lighting requirements and directional signs have appropriate illumination levels to comply with zoning and industry illumination standards.
10.17.6 Provide sufficient lighting for better way-finding and safe circulation within and around a development.
10.17.7 Encourage additional pedestrian-scale, exterior lighting in growth centers, activity centers, commercial nodes, pedestrian overlay districts and transit station areas.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project will be submitted for Location and Design Review in 2014.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Public Works coordinates as much as possible with other projects that may provide a source of additional revenue/match dollars and coordinate project timeline to maximize efficiency.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Realistically, our crews could install around 100 poles per year for a total of $850,000 per year expected max spending, contingent on other projects.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

N/A

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Pedestrian, bicyclists, and motorists will benefit from this project. Residents and businesses along corridors with streetlighting in the past have used their streetlighting to enhance their neighborhood identity using banners and holiday lighting.



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Pedestrian Level Lighting Program

Contact: Bill Prince 612-673-3901

Proposed:
2015-2019
Subject to Change

TR024

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Sign Replacement Program **Project ID:** TR025

Project Location: Citywide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2014
Project Start Date: 4/15/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Timothy Drew
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 11/15/19
Department Priority: 9 of 44
Contact Phone Number: 612 673-2152
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

In 2005, the State of Minnesota published requirements for minimum levels of retro-reflectivity for roadway signs and mandated dates for compliance with the new standard. This language was based on the Federal requirements contained in the Manual on Uniform traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). In 2010, the Federal Highway administration decided to reconsider the original language and began the process of amending the language contained in the 2005 MUTCD.

The proposed language that was offered for public comment essentially eliminated specific compliance dates but still retained the retro-reflectivity requirements.

The comment period portion of the rulemaking process has passed and the adapted revised language includes:

Regulatory and Warning Signs
Federal Register/Vol. 77, no. 93 / Monday May 14, 2012 / Rules and Regulation
• Implementation and continued use of an assessment or management method that is designed to maintain regulatory and warning sign reflectivity at or above established minimum levels.

• An assessment or management method must be established within 2 years of date of the above revision.

The City of Minneapolis has chosen the Blanket Replacement Method where all signs in an area/corridor, or of a given type, should be replaced at specified intervals (10 to 15 years). The interval level will be based on expected sign life.

The City recognizes the value of maintaining the visibility of roadway signs and in 2010 began planning the implementation of a program that will insure adequate retro-reflectivity system wide. The program was originally funded under TR022. Beginning in 2015, the sign replacement program will be given its own project under TR025.

Purpose and Justification:

These funds are requested to allow Public Works Traffic Operations to proceed with the plan for assuring compliance with federal and state standards for minimum levels of retro-reflectivity for roadway signs

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	590	590	525	530	590	2,825
Municipal State Aid	305	305	270	275	305	1,460
Totals by Year	895	895	795	805	895	4,285

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The maintenance costs will be paid through the existing maintenance budget for signage.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	777	777	692	702	777	3,726
Project Management	30	30	25	25	30	140
Contingency	45	45	40	40	45	215
City Administration	43	43	38	38	43	204
Total Expenses with Admin	895	895	795	805	895	4,285

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• High-quality and convenient transportation options connect every corner of the city

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The above mentioned project is consistent with policies 2.6.5 and 5.4.1 of section 4F, Traffic Control & Street Lighting. These policies are as follows:
2.6.5 Encourage the design and completion of needed improvements to the street network, including the freeway system, which promote the efficient, safe movement of traffic.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
The installation of new roadway signing and markings will improve the quality and condition of the public streets and

help drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians navigate the roadway network with more ease.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project will be submitted for location and design review in 2014.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The City will be partnering with the State to help replace signs on State Trunk Highways and City streets. This effort is in response to the new federal standards for sign reflectivity.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Could increase/decrease forces used, increase/decrease MSA dollars.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Reimbursable Transportation Projects **Project ID:** TR99R

Project Location: Various locations throughout the city
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Alan Klugman
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority:
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-2743
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

These funds are requested to allow Public Works Traffic Operations to do "work for others" (public and private) which will be reimbursed by the requesting agency, business or individual.

Purpose and Justification:

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Reimbursements	3,000	600	600	600	600	600	600	6,600
Totals by Year	3,000	600	600	600	600	600	600	6,600

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	571	571	571	571	571	2,857
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	29	29	29	29	29	143
Total Expenses with Admin	600	600	600	600	600	3,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and

Project Title: Reimbursable Transportation Projects Project ID: TR99R

Objectives:

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan by the City Planning Commission on April 23, 2009; no additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Sanitary Sewers & Tunnel Rehabilitation Program **Project ID:** SA001

Project Location: City Wide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Kevin Danen
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 1 of 2
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-5627
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $3,000,000

Project Description:

This program establishes the annual funding needed to perform repair and rehabilitation activities as needed to the sanitary sewer system as prioritized by the Minneapolis Public Works Surface Water and Sewers Division. The primary targeted components of the project are repairs and rehabilitation to the system piping, lift stations, tunnels and access structures. For piping systems, the scope is to supplement the funding of cured in place lining rehabilitation. This work extends the operable life of pipe segments with minimal disruption to the traveling public and other underground and surface infrastructure.

Purpose and Justification:

The City owns and operates approximately 832 miles of sanitary sewer piping, 10 sanitary lift stations and 5.5 miles of deep collection tunnels. The City's sanitary collection system conveys sanitary sewage flow to main interceptors and treatment plant, both owned and operated by the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services.

At present, efforts to repair and rehabilitate the sanitary sewer system has concentrated on rehabilitating structural failures to the piping system, providing better access to the deep collection tunnels to allow proper maintenance and major repair maintenance to lift stations. Currently condition assessments have been made to the deep collection tunnels and lift stations with an ongoing effort being made to comprehensively assess the sanitary piping system in order to improve the reliability of the system. The installation of a SCADA system has been identified as a key component in providing efficient management of the lift and pump stations. Based on these assessments the work involved includes replacing worn out components of lift stations, rehabilitation and or replacing cracked/ failed pipe segments, removing system structural flow restrictions and repairing manholes.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Sanitary Bonds	14,000	4,000	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750	36,750
Totals by Year	14,000	4,000	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750	36,750

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The City of Minneapolis will continue to look for grant opportunities with Met Council Environmental Services (MCES) as well as the State Clean Water Revolving Fund.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 50
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (100,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The decreased amount of operating costs represents savings in labor, equipment and material expenses associated with the ongoing maintenance and small repair of the areas in most need of rehabilitation within the sanitary sewer

system. Clear water can also be removed with these projects, potentially reducing MCES treatment costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	780	730	730	730	730	3,700
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	2,880	2,691	2,691	2,691	2,691	13,645
Project Management	150	150	150	150	150	750
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	190	179	179	179	179	905
Total Expenses with Admin	4,000	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750	19,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing sewer infrastructure and services—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.

5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan. Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations. Policy 6.10: Coordinate and operate waste management programs that focus on reducing, reusing and recycling solid waste prior to disposal.

6.10.1 Operate waste management practices consistent with the state approved waste management hierarchy.
6.10.2 Follow source reduction criteria in all City operations for new construction, demolition and renovation activities.
6.10.3 Educate citizens about the risks associated with using products that generate hazardous waste.
6.10.4 Minimize use of products in City operations that generate hazardous waste.
6.10.5 Strongly emphasize and promote reduction, reuse and recycling, including the purchase of recycled materials in residential, business and industrial and government operations and building practices.
6.10.6 Encourage deconstruction and construction waste management plans in development proposals and projects to minimize the amount of waste going to landfills and promote sustainable building practices.
6.10.7 Encourage reuse of existing materials or use of products with recycled content materials for city purposes, including new construction or renovation projects.
6.10.8 Encourage standards for product purchase decisions based on selecting products that have high post-consumer and pre-consumer recycled material content, long product life expectancy, and product life cycles with minimal environmental impacts, and high potential for reuse or recycling.
6.10.9 Educate residents and property owners about the benefits of recycling, and of properly composting and reusing yard wastes and organic plant-based food waste.
6.10.10 Provide seasonal yard waste collection services from spring through fall.
6.10.11 Assign waste that cannot be reused, recycled or composted to facilities that recover some of the energy value in garbage.
6.10.12 Use landfilling as a last alternative for waste disposal.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The City of Minneapolis often has to collaborate with the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) regarding projects. The City's system collects and conveys sanitary sewage flow to main interceptors owned by MCES.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This program could be flexible within the five-year plan but the requested funding is necessary to continue addressing identified structural/condition needs and meet Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) regulations.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

SA001 is set up as a long term asset management program with an ongoing rehabilitation plan. Projects are generally completed within the year programmed.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis Public Works Tunnel Management Program

Benefits of Preventative Maintenance

Major Sewer Tunnels in Minneapolis



Note:
Cured in place concrete locations are not shown.



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Sanitary Sewer & Tunnel Rehabilitation

Contact: Kevin Danen 612-673-5627

Proposed: 2015-2019

Subject to Change

SA001

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Infiltration & Inflow Removal Program **Project ID:** SA036

Project Location: City Wide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Kelly Moriarity
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 2 of 2
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3617
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $3,384,734

Project Description:

This program focuses on developing and implementing an inflow and infiltration (I&I) reduction program based on Metropolitan Council Environmental Service's (MCES) Ongoing I&I Surcharge Program and the City's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) permit. Inflow is typically flow from a single point where stormwater is entering the sewer system directly through stormwater inlets or discharge from sump pumps, downspouts and foundation drains. Infiltration usually means the seepage of groundwater into sanitary sewer pipes through cracks and joints. Specific activities include but are not limited to studies, metering, smoke testing, separation projects, lining of sewer pipes and manhole lining/repairs.

Purpose and Justification:

The purpose of the program is to implement projects that will reduce the amount of clear water in the sanitary system and reduce the risks for overflows of untreated sewage mixed with stormwater to the Mississippi River during severe rainstorms. The reduction of clear water in the sanitary sewer system is also required by MCES which provides regional wastewater collection and treatment. The MCES I&I surcharge program is based on peak flow from the city sanitary system which occurs during large rain events. As of 2010, the City has completed the work required by the first phase of the MCES surcharge program, but starting in 2013, MCES is implementing an ongoing surcharge program to require communities to continue to make progress in removing I&I from the system.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Sanitary Bonds	14,000	2,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	23,500
Sanitary Revenue	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	8,000
Totals by Year	16,000	3,000	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	31,500

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 45
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating Costs were determined with past practices, and this work does not result in a change in operating costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

No future capital investment is required to realize the expected useful life of this improvement.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	450	375	375	375	375	1,950
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	1,507	1,256	1,256	1,256	1,256	6,531
Project Management	400	330	330	330	330	1,720
Contingency	500	420	420	420	420	2,180
City Administration	143	119	119	119	119	619
Total Expenses with Admin	3,000	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	13,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the efficiency of existing sewer infrastructure and services, and reduces the chances for adverse ecological impacts—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.

6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.
6.9.8 Eliminate combined sewer overflows and reduce the volume of stormwater that inflows into sanitary sewers to reduce the total volume for treatment.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is require

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Several projects require collaboration with the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) due to the joint agreement for the freeway tunnels which these projects eventually drain to. Other projects require collaboration with various watershed districts or organizations.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This program has some flexibility for decreased funding in the five-year plan, but regulatory requirements may also change in that time eliminating any flexibility.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The City will continue to make progress removing I&I from the sanitary sewer system with projects in each year of the program

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements



2014 CSO

1. Manhole Cover Replacement (Citywide) Not on Map
2. Cured in Place Pipe Lining (Citywide) Not on Map
3. CSO 007 Sheridan Ave N & 29th Ave N
4. CSO148 31st & Columbus
5. CSO151 38th St W & Dupont Ave S
6. CSO161 Chestnut Ave & Upton Ave
7. CSO166 E Hennepin & Buchanan Ave NE
8. CSO167 26th St E & 25th Ave S
9. CSO168 26th St W & Nicollet Ave S
10. CSO169 4th Ave S & 19th St E
11. CSO170 3rd Ave S & 19th St E

2015 CSO

12. Manhole Cover Replacement (Citywide) Not on Map
13. Cured in Place Pipe Lining (Citywide) Not on Map
14. CSO007 Sheridan Ave N & 29th Ave N
15. RLD006 Van Cleve Park, Como to Rollins Ave SE, 13th to 15th Aves SE
16. CSO55 18th to Cedar Ave S, E 47th to Minnehaha Pkwy
17. CSO56 24th Ave SE, Elm St To RR tracks
18. CSO117 2nd St N & 23rd Ave N
19. CSO1 22nd Ave N, E of 2nd St N
20. CSO158 24th Ave S & 54 1/2 St E

Future CSO

21. Manhole Cover Replacement (Citywide) Not on Map
22. Cured in Place Pipe Lining (Citywide) Not on Map
23. CSO 095 33rd Ave NE Tyler to Polk Sts NE
24. CSO 108 36th Ave NE & Polk St NE
25. CSO 138 W Broadway Frontage Rd at Xerxes Ave N
26. CSO 139 Washburn Ave N at Osseo Road
27. CSO 140 Xerxes Ave N, at 47th Ave N
28. RLD 005.2 2nd St N & 3rd Ave N Downtown N & E Loop
29. RLD 005.3 4th St N & 1st Ave N Downtown N & E Loop
30. CSO42 Stevens Ave & Lake St
31. CSO133 Stevens Ave & 35th St
32. CSO150 Stevens Ave & 32nd St
33. CSO144 Glenwood Ave & Colfax Ave
34. CSO148 31st ST E & Columbus Ave
35. CSO142 Xerxes Ave N, south of 42nd Ave N
36. CSO149 Bryant Ave S & 40th St W
37. CSO153 Colfax Ave S & 20th St W
38. CSO154 New Brighton Blvd, Coolidge to 19th Ave NE
39. CSO159 Queen Ave N & Plymouth Ave N
40. CSO162 1123 Glenwood Ave
41. CSO164 Madison St & Spring St SE
42. CSO165 N of 18th St E between Nicollet & 1st Ave S
43. CSO171 Hennepin Ave & 26th St N

MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Infiltration & Inflow Removal Program

Contact: Kelly Moriarity 612-673-3617

Proposed:
2015-2019
Subject to Change

SA036

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Reimbursable Sanitary Sewer Projects **Project ID:** SA99R

Project Location: City-Wide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Kelly Moriarty
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority:
Contact Phone Number: (612)-673-3617
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

These funds are requested to allow Public Works Sewer Operations to do "work for others" (public and private) which will be reimbursed by the requesting agency, business or individual.

Purpose and Justification:

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Reimbursements	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	8,000
Totals by Year	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	8,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure?
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 0
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	952	952	952	952	952	4,762
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	48	48	48	48	48	238
Total Expenses with Admin	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	5,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and

Objectives:

City of Minneapolis Goal - reference
Connected communities – great spaces & places, thriving neighborhoods

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Uncertain, need more details.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan by the City Planning Commission on April 23, 2009; no additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Implementation of US EPA Storm Water Regulations Project ID: SW004

Project Location: Various locations throughout the City.
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Kelly Moriarity
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 3 of 8
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3617
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This program will allow the implementation of individual projects and supporting activities termed Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to mitigate the pollution effects of urbanization on stormwater runoff. Structural BMPs are the capital improvement projects, and non-structural BMPs are the maintenance activities, ordinances, stormwater monitoring and public education which, in total, improve the runoff being discharged to the lakes, streams and Mississippi River in the City of Minneapolis.

Purpose and Justification:

The primary purpose for this project is to assist the city in complying with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination system (NPDES) Stormwater Management requirements. The objective of these requirements is to improve the overall water quality of our receiving surface waters.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Stormwater Revenue	1,250	250	250	250	250	250	250	2,750
Totals by Year	1,250	250	250	250	250	250	250	2,750

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 100
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Construction of new stormwater best management practices (BMPs) may require additional maintenance costs which will be paid for from the stormwater utility maintenance funding depending on the BMP constructed. Maintenance costs will be highly dependent on the BMP selected. Many of these BMPs do not have enough data to determine annual maintenance costs. The department is working towards tracking and identifying these costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

None

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Design Engineering/Architects	34	34	34	34	34	170
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	192	192	192	192	192	960
Project Management	12	12	12	12	12	60
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	12	12	12	12	12	60
Total Expenses with Admin	250	250	250	250	250	1,250

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project reduces adverse ecological impacts of urban stormwater on our rivers and lakes—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and

policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.3 Accomplish the guiding principles of the city's Local Surface Water Management Plan, which are to protect people, property and the environment; maintain and enhance infrastructure; provide cost-effective services in a sustainable manner; meet or surpass regulatory requirements; educate and engage the public and stakeholders, and enhance livability and safety.
6.9.5 Support pollution prevention programs as an important first step in maintaining a healthy physical environment.
6.9.6 Manage pollutants at the source in order to prevent degradation of water bodies.
6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.
6.9.8 Eliminate combined sewer overflows and reduce the volume of stormwater

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (MPRB) is a co-permittee with the City of Minneapolis on the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The watershed organizations have multiple roles with the carrying out of NPDES requirements within the city. These partners are variously involved with the planning, implementation and additional funding of projects utilizing this fund.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is some flexibility among years, although it is most effective to have the consistent program amount available each year without gaps.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Not applicable

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

None

Rain Gardens

Helping improve water quality

Rain gardens are depressed native plant gardens located where they can collect, infiltrate and filter rain that falls on hard surfaces minimizing negative impacts surface water can have on lakes and streams.

NE Rain Garden - Park Board

Ewing - Porous Pavement



Minneapolis Central Library Extensive Green Roof

Sustainable Parking Lot Design

No curbing allows stormwater to flow to vegetated areas.

Infiltration Swale



Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements **Project ID:** SW005

Project Location: Various locations throughout the City.
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Kelly Moriarity

Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 2 of 8
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3617
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $4,000,000

Project Description:

The purpose of this program is to remove the direct inflow of stormwater to the sanitary sewer system and redirect it to the storm drain system where appropriate. This program was developed both to remove inflow from public sources and to provide facilities for private disconnections where no storm drain currently exists in the area. It is also used to complement an inflow and infiltration (I&I) reduction program based on Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) Ongoing I&I Surcharge Program and the City's Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) permit. Inflow is typically flow from a single point where stormwater is entering the sewer system directly through stormwater inlets or discharge from sump pumps, downspouts and foundation drains. Infiltration usually means the seepage of groundwater into sanitary sewer pipes through cracks and joints. Specific activities include but are not limited to studies and sewer separation projects.

Purpose and Justification:

The purpose of the program is to implement projects that will reduce the amount of clear water in the sanitary system and reduce the risks of overflows of untreated sewage mixed with stormwater to the Mississippi River during severe rainstorms. The reduction of clear water in the sanitary sewer system is also required by the MCES which provides regional wastewater collection and treatment. The MCES I&I surcharge program is based on peak flow from the city sanitary system which occurs during large rain events. As of 2010, the City has completed the work required by the first phase of the MCES surcharge program, but starting in 2013, MCES is implementing an ongoing surcharge program to require communities to continue to make progress in removing I&I from the system.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Stormwater Revenue	9,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	18,500
Totals by Year	9,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	18,500

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 100
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating Costs were determined with past practices, and this work does not result in increased operating costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

No future capital investment is required to realize the expected useful life of this improvement.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	225	225	225	225	225	1,125
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	754	754	754	754	754	3,768
Project Management	200	200	200	200	200	1,000
Contingency	250	250	250	250	250	1,250
City Administration	71	71	71	71	71	357
Total Expenses with Admin	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	7,500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the efficiency of existing sewer infrastructure and services, and reduces the chances for adverse ecological impacts—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.

Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.6 Manage pollutants at the source in order to prevent degradation of water bodies.
6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.
6.9.8 Eliminate combined sewer overflows and reduce the volume of stormwater that inflows into sanitary sewers to reduce the total volume for treatment.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Several projects require collaboration with the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) due to the joint agreement for the freeway tunnels which these projects eventually drain to. Other projects require collaboration with various watershed districts or organizations.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This program has some flexibility for decreased funding in the five-year plan, but regulatory requirements may also change in that time eliminating any flexibility. There is also some flexibility among years, although it is most effective to have the consistent program amount available each year without gaps.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The City will continue to make progress separating the storm and sanitary sewer systems. Individual projects within the program will vary in cost and may take multiple years to complete.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements



2014 CSO

1. Manhole Cover Replacement (Citywide) Not on Map
2. Cured in Place Pipe Lining (Citywide) Not on Map
3. CSO 007 Sheridan Ave N & 29th Ave N
4. CSO148 31st & Columbus
5. CSO151 38th St W & Dupont Ave S
6. CSO161 Chestnut Ave & Upton Ave
7. CSO166 E Hennepin & Buchanan Ave NE
8. CSO167 26th St E & 25th Ave S
9. CSO168 26th St W & Nicollet Ave S
10. CSO169 4th Ave S & 19th St E
11. CSO170 3rd Ave S & 19th St E

2015 CSO

12. Manhole Cover Replacement (Citywide) Not on Map
13. Cured in Place Pipe Lining (Citywide) Not on Map
14. CSO007 Sheridan Ave N & 29th Ave N
15. RLD006 Van Cleve Park, Como to Rollins Ave SE, 13th to 15th Aves SE
16. CSO55 18th to Cedar Ave S, E 47th to Minnehaha Pkwy
17. CSO56 24th Ave SE, Elm St To RR tracks
18. CSO117 2nd St N & 23rd Ave N
19. CSO1 22nd Ave N, E of 2nd St N
20. CSO158 24th Ave S & 54 1/2 St E

Future CSO

21. Manhole Cover Replacement (Citywide) Not on Map
22. Cured in Place Pipe Lining (Citywide) Not on Map
23. CSO 095 33rd Ave NE Tyler to Polk Sts NE
24. CSO 108 36th Ave NE & Polk St NE
25. CSO 138 W Broadway Frontage Rd at Xerxes Ave N
26. CSO 139 Washburn Ave N at Osseo Road
27. CSO 140 Xerxes Ave N, at 47th Ave N
28. RLD 005.2 2nd St N & 3rd Ave N Downtown N & E Loop
29. RLD 005.3 4th St N & 1st Ave N Downtown N & E Loop
30. CSO42 Stevens Ave & Lake St
31. CSO133 Stevens Ave & 35th St
32. CSO150 Stevens Ave & 32nd St
33. CSO144 Glenwood Ave & Colfax Ave
34. CSO148 31st ST E & Columbus Ave
35. CSO142 Xerxes Ave N, south of 42nd Ave N
36. CSO149 Bryant Ave S & 40th St W
37. CSO153 Colfax Ave S & 20th St W
38. CSO154 New Brighton Blvd, Coolidge to 19th Ave NE
39. CSO159 Queen Ave N & Plymouth Ave N
40. CSO162 1123 Glenwood Ave
41. CSO164 Madison St & Spring St SE
42. CSO165 N of 18th St E between Nicollet & 1st Ave S
43. CSO171 Hennepin Ave & 26th St N

MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements - Phase 2

Contact: Kelly Moriarity 612-673-3617

Proposed: 2015-2019

Subject to Change

SW005

Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Storm Drains and Tunnels Rehabilitation Program **Project ID:** SW011

Project Location: Citywide	**Affected Wards:** All
City Sector: Citywide	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** City-Wide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 12/31/19
Project Start Date: 1/1/15	**Department Priority:** 1 of 8
Submitting Department: Public Works	**Contact Phone Number:** 612-673-5627
Contact Person: Kevin Danen	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $14,827,168

Project Description:

This project establishes the annual funding to allow repair and rehabilitation activities to be completed as needed to the storm drain system as prioritized by the Minneapolis Public Works Surface Water and Sewers Division.

Purpose and Justification:

The City owns, operates, and maintains approximately 566 miles of storm drain piping, 400+ storm outfalls, 26 storm drain pump stations, 12 holding ponds, and 16 miles of deep drainage tunnels. The storm drain system conveys storm water runoff to area water bodies such as lakes, streams and the Mississippi River.

At present, efforts are concentrated on the rehabilitation of the deep drainage tunnels, repair improvements to the piping system, repair improvements to the storm drain pump stations and repair improvements to storm drain outfalls. A comprehensive condition assessment was made to the storm drain tunnel system. Typical problems discovered through the assessment includes voids either above or below the tunnel structure, cracking of the tunnel's liner due to pressurization, erosion of the surrounding sandstone and infiltration of ground water and sand. The Public Works Department has been conducting ongoing emergency spot repairs of damaged or failed tunnel liner sections over the past several years. The cost to repair damaged tunnels varies greatly and is often limited to being conducted during the winter months where storm water runoff is limited. The Department wishes to move from emergency reaction response to a planned rehabilitation program in order to minimize repair costs and liabilities as well as maximize work force efficiencies.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Stormwater Bonds	33,700	1,000	2,000	8,600	10,000	5,500	6,900	67,700
Stormwater Revenue	7,800	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,500		1,500	16,300
Totals by Year	41,500	3,500	3,500	10,100	11,500	5,500	8,400	84,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The City of Minneapolis is working with the Minnesota Department of Transportation to identify any other potential funding sources including state bonding options.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 50
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (300,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The decreased amount of operating costs represents savings in labor, equipment and material expenses associated with the ongoing maintenance and small repair of the areas in most need of rehabilitation within the storm drain tunnel system.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	543	525	1,515	1,725	825	5,133
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	2,713	2,734	7,904	8,954	4,282	26,587
Project Management	77	74	200	274	131	756
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	167	167	481	548	262	1,624
Total Expenses with Admin	3,500	3,500	10,100	11,500	5,500	34,100

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing sewer infrastructure and services—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The City of Minneapolis has joint agreements with the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) regarding the tunnels within the freeway right of way system. Those agreements commit the City to maintenance of those tunnel systems. Public Works meets collaboratively with MnDOT to determine priorities and responsibilities.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

This program could be flexible within the five-year plan, but the requested funding is necessary to continue addressing identified needs.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This winter Public Works plans to complete a project on the downtown tunnel systems, it is in the process of developing plan sets for the 10th Ave SE tunnel and possibly start maintenance on the 35W south tunnel to ensure the use of the unspent balance.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Defects:
1. Hydraulic restrictions & pressurization (often localized).
2. Longitudinal cracks with displaced tunnel liner.
3. Holes in tunnel liner.
4. Longitudinal cracks in tunnel liner.
5. Large void between tunnel liner and sandstone (often localized).
6. Sandstone infiltration.
7. Groundwater infiltration.
8. Circumferential and/or angular cracks in tunnel liner.
9. Cold joint separation in tunnel liner.
10. Storm water exfiltration.
11. Liner deterioration (liner cracking/breaking, concrete spalling, brick work missing).

Capital Budget Request
Project Title: Storm Drains and Tunnels Rehabilitation Program Project ID: SW011

Benefits:
1. Reduced risk of tunnel failures
. Fix minor problem areas before they become major problem areas.
. Traveling public and property owners will experience less surface disturbance from construction crews.

2. Extended tunnel service life
3. Increase in the time intervals between inspections (operating budget decrease)
4. Increase in tunnel capacity
. Reduce pressurization
. Pressurization that causes manhole covers to blow off.
. Reduce surface flooding
. Allows the addition of storm water from roof leaders without adding new tunnels to the system.
. Allows the tunnel to carry a larger flow during storms of a large and long duration.
. Eliminate hydraulic restrictions.

SW011 I-94 Tunnel

SW011 10th Av Tunnel

SW011 Central City Tunnel

SW011 35W S Tunnel

SW011 Phillips Tunnel

SW011 35W S Tunnel



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Storm Drains & Tunnels Rehab Program

Contact: Kevin Danen 612-673-5627

Proposed:
2015-2019
Subject to Change

SW011

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Flood Area 29 & 30 - Fulton Neighborhood **Project ID:** SW018

Project Location: South of W 48th St, east of France Ave, North of W 54th St and West of a line from Beard Ave S and W 54th St to Sheridan Ave S and Lake Harriet

City Sector: Southwest

Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009

Project Start Date: 1/1/15

Submitting Department: Public Works

Contact Person: Kelly Moriarity

Affected Wards: 13

Affected Neighborhood(s): Various

Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/16

Department Priority: 7 of 8

Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3617

Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The goal of the project is to protect Fulton Neighborhood homes from flooding by using runoff volume and rate control. This combination produces runoff load reduction and that result will help the city meet Minnesota Pollution Control Agency standards for surface water runoff. The preliminary design has several alternatives using a combination of new pipe for storage where there is runoff volume reduction using a combination of underground and surface ponding. There are also alternatives for simply increasing pipe size in strategic locations if abstraction and rate control will not work. The runoff would be directed to Minnehaha Creek or Lake Harriet after treatment.

Purpose and Justification:

The flooding occurs at 50th Street and Chowen Avenue, along 51st Street from Chowen Avenue to York Avenue and at 52nd Street and Chowen Avenue. There are 365 acres draining to this storm sewer shed. The flooding in this area reaches 31 homes, 3 businesses and a number of garages. This area has property with a 2007 estimated market value of $ 10,200,000. This project will reduce the risk to those homes and businesses from flooding, although some ponding will still occur during major storms. This system will be designed to protect the principal structure during a 100 year return storm (a storm with a 1% chance of occurring) based on model results.

The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) is a project partner technically as well as financially. The MCWD has a new goal of volume reduction and that goal is consistent with city goals. This project will use volume, load and rate controls in order to mitigate flooding problems. The Design for this project must conduct a study to develop practical systems for stormwater volume control in a fully urbanized area like Minneapolis. This study is needed to determine acceptable design options in the MCWD.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Stormwater Bonds	900	1,055	1,955
Other Local Governments	2,388	5,525	7,913
Totals by Year	3,288	6,580	9,868

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The MCWD has not acted on the appropriation of the MCWD share of this project.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 100
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating Costs have not been determined yet. This work may result in increased operating costs given the potential alternatives including green solutions that require regular maintenance. Until specific alternatives are selected, accurate estimates of the annual operating cost can not be determined.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

No future capital investment is required to realize the expected useful life of this improvement.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	500	1,000	0	0	1,500
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	1,658	3,317	0	0	4,975
Project Management	0	328	660	0	0	988
Contingency	0	645	1,290	0	0	1,935
City Administration	0	157	313	0	0	470
Total Expenses with Admin	0	3,288	6,580	0	0	9,868

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project reduces adverse ecological impacts of urban stormwater on our rivers and lakes—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.6 Manage pollutants at the source in order to prevent degradation of water bodies.
6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.
6.9.8 Eliminate combined sewer overflows and reduce the volume of stormwater that inflows into sanitary sewers to reduce the total volume for treatment.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The MCWD is a partner in funding as well as granting the City of Minneapolis appropriate permits for the project.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is no flexibility to decrease funding unless the selected alternative is less expensive.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Design and coordination with the MCWD would occur in 2012 and 2013 with construction taking place in 2014 and 2015 dependent on the selected alternative. Coordination with the affected neighborhood and property owners would occur during all phases of the project.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Flood Area 29 & 30





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	Flood Areas 29 & 30	Proposed: 2016-2017	SW018
	Contact: Kelly Moriarity 612-673-3617	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconstruction **Project ID:** SW032

Project Location: I-35W corridor, I-35W/I-94 commons then to the Mississippi River along the St. Mary's Tunnel Corridor

City Sector: Multiple

Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009

Project Start Date: 1/1/18

Submitting Department: Public Works

Contact Person: Mitchell Sawh

Affected Wards: Various

Affected Neighborhood(s): Various

Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19

Department Priority: 8 of 8

Contact Phone Number: 612-673-2360

Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The I35W corridor from 39th St.E. to the Mississippi River contains a deep stormwater tunnel which conveys stormwater runoff from both the freeway corridor and the City of Minneapolis. The tunnel is undersized, undergoes significant hydrostatic pressurize during moderate rainfall events, and results in flooding problems in the I35W corridor and in the City of Minneapolis. The proposed project entails construction of a parallel stormwater tunnel or increasing the existing tunnel size. The project anticipates including the St. Mary's stormwater tunnel as part of the solution.

Purpose and Justification:

The tunnel is undersized and does not meet the conveyance needs for existing stormwater runoff from the I-35W/I-94 corridor and the City of Minneapolis areas. In addition, the City must discharge additional flows from future CSO and rainleader violation areas in the City to the tunnel. Based on an agreement with MnDOT, the City is responsible to maintain and repair the exiting tunnel. The existing hydraulic conditions that include surging water and the pressure of surcharged segments exacerbate normal wear of the tunnel and this will increase repair frequency because the existing tunnel does not have the structure required to withstand the loading. MnDOT is interested additional capacity in the tunnel to address the existing conditions and provide flexibility with future design improvements. The recommended option in the 2006 study considered this project the most prudent choice for future capacity. This proposed option includes modifications of a St. Mary's Tunnel segment.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Stormwater Bonds	1,000	36,000	37,000
Totals by Year	1,000	36,000	37,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The project has not been programmed by Mn/DOT.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 100

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This work will result in increased operating costs, but until specific alternatives are selected, accurate estimates of the

annual operating cost cannot be determined. This work could also decrease the amount of maintenance currently required for the existing 35W South Tunnel.

This department expects to recover increased operating cost by including the cost in sewer rates.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

No future capital investment is required to realize the expected useful life of this improvement.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	952	952
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	0	0	0	0	48	48
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project maintains existing sewer infrastructure and services—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
• Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth –
references Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.

5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.

5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.

Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.

6.9.6 Manage pollutants at the source in order to prevent degradation of water bodies.

6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.

6.9.8 Eliminate combined sewer overflows and reduce the volume of stormwater that inflows into sanitary sewers to reduce the total volume for treatment.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

There is no specific cost sharing relationship between the City of Minneapolis and MnDOT, future negotiations will establish this cost sharing relationship.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan. All of the funds for design would have to be spent in one year.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

N/A

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Project is in the neighborhoods of King Field, Bryant, Central, Lyndale, Phillips West, Whittier, Steven's Square Loring Heights, Elliot Park, Ventura Village, Seward, and Cedar Riverside.

Project also affects wards 2, 6, 7, 8.

Possible future MN/Dot and Federal funding.



Existing Tunnel



MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	I-35W Storm Tunnel Reconstruction New Tunnel Segment	Proposed: 2019	SW032
	Contact: Mitchell Sawh 612-673-2360	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Flood Area 22 - Sibley Field **Project ID:** SW033

Project Location: Sibley Field Pond, north of E 39th St, west of 23rd Ave S, south of E 29th St, east of Bloomington Ave S to E 36th St to Columbus Ave S to E 39th St.

City Sector: South

Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009

Project Start Date: 1/1/15

Submitting Department: Public Works

Contact Person: Kelly Moriarity

Affected Wards: 9

Affected Neighborhood(s): Various

Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/15

Department Priority: 5 of 8

Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3617

Prior Year Unspent Balances: $484,000

Project Description:

The goal of the project is to protect the homes near Sibley Pond from flooding. The preliminary design proposes replacing existing storm drains with new bigger sized storm drain pipes on E 38th St and Longfellow Av, as well as some smaller laterals that drain into these two major pipes, and a new inlet structure at Sibley Pond. Additional capacity is required to alleviate the flooding in areas around Sibley Pond. Possible solutions include expanding the size of the pond, lowering the adjacent ball fields or adding underground storage.

Purpose and Justification:

During the 1997 flood, Sibley Flood Control Pond was operating above its capacity. Water overfilled the pond and flooded 29 homes and a number of garages. Additionally, there were 40 homes that reported sewer back-ups in their homes. There are a total number of 43 affected properties with a total property value of $ 7.5 million using 2006 estimated market values. These homes provide a 2006 tax base of $ 88,000. This project will help to minimize flooding in the future.

The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) is a project partner technically as well as financially. The MCWD has a new goal of volume reduction and that goal is consistent with city goals. This project will use volume, load and rate controls in order to mitigate flooding problems. The Design for this project must conduct a study to develop practical systems for stormwater volume control in a fully urbanized area like Minneapolis. This study is needed to determine acceptable design options in the MCWD. This study started with a feasibility analysis in 2013.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	Totals by Source
Stormwater Revenue	280	280
Other Local Governments	2,735	2,735
Totals by Year	3,015	3,015

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The MCWD has not acted on the appropriation of the MCWD share of this project.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 100

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating Costs have not been determined yet. This work may result in increased operating costs given the potential alternatives including green solutions that require regular maintenance. Until specific alternatives are selected, accurate estimates of the annual operating cost can not be determined.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

No future capital investment is required to realize the expected useful life of this improvement.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	450	0	0	0	0	450
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	1,521	0	0	0	0	1,521
Project Management	300	0	0	0	0	300
Contingency	600	0	0	0	0	600
City Administration	144	0	0	0	0	144
Total Expenses with Admin	3,015	0	0	0	0	3,015

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the capacity of the existing sewer infrastructure, and reduces the adverse ecological impacts of urban stormwater and an overburdened sanitary sewer system on our rivers and lakes—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet

realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.6 Manage pollutants at the source in order to prevent degradation of water bodies.
6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.
6.9.8 Eliminate combined sewer overflows and reduce the volume of stormwater that inflows into sanitary sewers to reduce the total volume for treatment.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The MCWD is a partner in funding as well as granting the City of Minneapolis appropriate permits for the project.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is no flexibility to decrease funding unless the selected alternative is less expensive.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Ongoing coordination with MCWD is occurring on acceptable design alternatives to be used in the district in order to have MCWD act on appropriation of the MCWD share of the project. Design and coordination with the MCWD and the started and will occur in 2013-2014. Construction will occur in 2015. Coordination with the affected neighborhood and property owners would occur during all phases of the project.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Flood Area 22
Sibley Field - Zone 3



Project

NORTH



MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	Flood Area 22 Sibley Field	Proposed: 2015	SW033
	Contact: Kelly Moriarity 612-673-3617	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Flood Area 21 - Bloomington Pond **Project ID:** SW034

Project Location: Bloomington Pond, north of E 42nd St, Bloomington Ave S, south of E 40th St, east of 12th Ave S

City Sector: South

Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009

Project Start Date: 1/1/15

Submitting Department: Public Works

Contact Person: Kelly Moriarity

Affected Wards: Various

Affected Neighborhood(s): Ventura Village

Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/15

Department Priority: 6 of 8

Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3617

Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The preliminary design options for this project include replacing existing storm drains with larger sized storm drain pipes at E 41st St, E 42nd St & Bloomington Av S, two new grit chambers, install new outlet structures to the Bloomington pond, removing an existing lift station, which will abandon a Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) connection, as well as abandoning some obsolete storm drains. This project will use volume, load and rate controls in order to mitigate flooding problems.

Purpose and Justification:

This complex storm drainage network contains Bancroft Meadows and Sibley flood control ponds. This area had reported flooding in 1978, 1987, 1992 and 1997. The affected properties have a total property value of $9 million, using 2006 estimated market values. This project will improve the pipe capacity to drain the area; minimize flooding, as well as improve water quality. Additionally, this project will remove one CSO connection to the sanitary sewer system, removing 2.4 acres of drainage from the sanitary sewer system. Eliminating this CSO area will help reduce the potential discharge of raw sewage into the Mississippi River; will protect and sustain the City's water resources; and will support a clean and healthy environment.

The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) is a project partner technically as well as financially. The MCWD has a new goal of volume reduction and that goal is consistent with city goals. This project will use volume, load and rate controls in order to mitigate flooding problems. The Design for this project must conduct a study to develop practical systems for stormwater volume control in a fully urbanized area like Minneapolis. This study is needed to determine acceptable design options in the MCWD.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	Totals by Source
Stormwater Revenue	445	445
Other Local Governments	4,395	4,395
Totals by Year	4,840	4,840

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

The MCWD has not acted on the appropriation of the MCWD share of this project.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 100

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating Costs have not been determined yet. This work may result in increased operating costs given the potential alternatives including green solutions that require regular maintenance. Until specific alternatives are selected, accurate estimates of the annual operating cost can not be determined.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

No future capital investment is required to realize the expected useful life of this improvement.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	725	0	0	0	725
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	2,910	0	0	0	2,910
Project Management	0	480	0	0	0	480
Contingency	0	495	0	0	0	495
City Administration	0	230	0	0	0	230
Total Expenses with Admin	0	4,840	0	0	0	4,840

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the capacity of the existing sewer infrastructure, and reduces the adverse ecological impacts of urban stormwater and an overburdened sanitary sewer system on our rivers and lakes—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - references
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet

realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.6 Manage pollutants at the source in order to prevent degradation of water bodies.
6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.
6.9.8 Eliminate combined sewer overflows and reduce the volume of stormwater that inflows into sanitary sewers to reduce the total volume for treatment.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The MCWD is a partner in funding as well as granting the City of Minneapolis appropriate permits for the project.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is no flexibility to decrease funding unless the selected alternative is less expensive.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Design and coordination with the MCWD has started and will occur in 2013-2014. Construction will occur in 2015. Coordination with the affected neighborhood and property owners would occur during all phases of the project.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Bloomington Pond
FA-21 Zone 2





MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	Flood Area 21 Bloomington Pond	Proposed: 2016	SW034
	Contact: Kelly Moriarity 612-673-3617	Subject to Change	

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Flood Mitigation with Alternative Stormwater Mgmt **Project ID:** SW039

Project Location: City Wide	**Affected Wards:** All
City Sector: Citywide	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** City-Wide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 12/31/19
Project Start Date: 1/1/15	**Department Priority:** 4 of 8
Submitting Department: Public Works	**Contact Phone Number:** (612) 673-3617
Contact Person: Kelly Moriarity	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $3,905,142

Project Description:

The purpose of this program is to address localized flooding and drainage problems city-wide. Where practical, environmentally friendly "green infrastructure" stormwater practices such as rain gardens, bioswales, constructed wetlands, and hard surface reduction will be utilized. Solutions for larger-scale drainage problems will look to incorporate underground storage, pipes and ponds with the above practices. This program will also evaluate and develop a plan to address the over 40 known areas within the City with flooding problems during heavy rains.

Purpose and Justification:

This program supports and promotes environmentally friendly stormwater practices consistent with the Mayor's and City Council's sustainability goals while at the same time developing a plan to address the over 40 known areas throughout the City with flooding problems during heavy rains. A number of these problem areas experienced significant flooding with some property damage during the heavy rains in the summer of 2010. Incorporating green infrastructure solutions to these stormwater projects will improve water quality in Minneapolis lakes, streams and the Mississippi River and enhance neighborhood livability.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Stormwater Revenue	5,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	23,000
Totals by Year	5,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	23,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 100
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

This project may increase annual operating and maintenance costs of the Surface Water & Sewers Division of Public Works for maintenance of the BMPs. However, any increase may be offset by a decrease in annual operating and maintenance costs of the same division for addressing localized flooding issues. Any net increase would be paid from the Stormwater Utility enterprise fund.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

No future capital investment is required to realize the expected useful life of these improvements.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	300	300	300	300	300	1,500
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	2,007	2,007	2,007	2,007	2,007	10,036
Project Management	200	200	200	200	200	1,000
Contingency	350	350	350	350	350	1,750
City Administration	143	143	143	143	143	714
Total Expenses with Admin	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	15,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the capacity of the existing sewer infrastructure, and reduces the adverse ecological impacts of urban stormwater and an overburdened sanitary sewer system on our rivers and lakes—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper
• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
• All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
• The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Maintenance of sewer infrastructure, reduction of flooding, and minimizing adverse ecological impacts of urban stormwater on the City's lakes and rivers, are supported by policies in the City's comprehensive plan related to providing efficient services, maintaining property values, and reducing the City's environmental footprint.

The following are key policies from the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth that are supportive of this capital budget request.

Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.
6.9.8 Eliminate combined sewer overflows and reduce the volume of stormwater that inflows into sanitary sewers to reduce the total volume for treatment.

Policy 7.4: Work to restore and preserve ecosystem functions in green open space areas.
7.4.3 Identify ecological impacts on open spaces and parks caused by urban uses, for example stormwater runoff, and work to mitigate these impacts in order to advance environmental and human health.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

For this project, the Department of Public Works will collaborate with neighborhood organizations, the watershed organizations, CPED, and the Park and School Boards

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is some flexibility among years, although it is most effective to have the consistent program amount available each year without gaps.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

2014 funding will be spent on smaller projects and planning for a program to address larger drainage problems city-wide, including modeling modeling of existing storm sewers.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:



Pervious Paving

SCENARIO 3:

R/W Conversion - Convert Streets to Rain Gardens

Street Flooding



MINNEAPOLIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Flood Mitigation w/Alternative Stormwater Management

Contact: Kelly Moriarity 612-673-3617

Proposed: 2015-2019

Subject to Change

SW039

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Reimbursable Sewer & Storm Drain Projects **Project ID:** SW99R

Project Location: City-Wide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Kelly Moriarity
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority:
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-3617
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

These funds are requested to allow Public Works Sewer Operations to do "work for others" (public and private) which will be reimbursed by the requesting agency, business or individual.

Purpose and Justification:

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Reimbursements	13,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	25,000
Totals by Year	13,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	25,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 0
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	1,705	1,705	1,705	1,705	1,705	8,524
Project Management	100	100	100	100	100	500
Contingency	100	100	100	100	100	500
City Administration	95	95	95	95	95	476
Total Expenses with Admin	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	10,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and

Objectives:

City of Minneapolis Goal - reference
Connected communities – great spaces & places, thriving neighborhoods

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Uncertain, need more details.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan by the City Planning Commission on April 23, 2009; no additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Water Distribution Improvements **Project ID:** WTR12

Project Location: Various locations throughout the city
City Sector: Multiple
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2010
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Marie Asgian
Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 2
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-5682
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

Water Distribution Improvement funds are used to rehabilitate water mains by cleaning and lining or replacement, replacement of system valves and the manholes that house them replacement of worn meters and the data communication devices connected to them, and replacement of hydrants.

The City's water distribution system includes 1,000 miles of water main, over 8,000 fire hydrants, over 16,000 valves, over 16,000 manholes, and over 100,000 water meters with remote data collection devices. This system delivers safe drinking water to all those living, working, or visiting the City or any of the suburbs that buy City water on a wholesale basis as well as providing fire protection for properties in the City. Most of the water distribution system is 50 to 100 years old. In order to continue providing service, a certain amount of system rehabilitation or replacement has to be performed. Additionally, a certain number of meters and remote communication devices need to be replaced to make sure that the City's customers receive accurate bills. The Water Enterprise Fund receives most of the revenue needed to continue water treatment and distribution system operations from metered water sales.

Purpose and Justification:

The Water Distribution Improvement program is a reinvestment in the City's infrastructure to maintain system reliability and viability. The work and reasons for performing it include:
• Water main rehabilitation by cleaning the mineral deposits from the inside of pipes and then lining to prevent future build up
• Water main replacement or structural lining for locations with repeated leaks
• Replacement of system valves and the manholes that house them in order to minimize the number of properties disrupted during a water main shut down
• Replacement of worn meters and the communication devices that send data from the meters for billing,
• Life-cycle change out of fire hydrants that are broken, damaged, or not a "traffic style" hydrant designed to break away if hit by a vehicle. Hydrants are not only vital to fire safety but also provide a means to flush the system.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Water Bonds	500							500
Water Revenue	22,400	6,200	6,300	6,400	6,500	6,600	6,700	61,100
Totals by Year	22,900	6,200	6,300	6,400	6,500	6,600	6,700	61,600

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Work will be funded as part of annual water enterprise revenue.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 50
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (10,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the

department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Reduced maintenance needed for rehabilitated pipes.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

N/A

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	620	630	640	650	660	3,200
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	4,712	4,788	4,864	4,940	5,016	24,320
Project Management	248	252	256	260	264	1,280
Contingency	325	330	335	340	346	1,676
City Administration	295	300	305	310	314	1,524
Total Expenses with Admin	6,200	6,300	6,400	6,500	6,600	32,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to the maintenance of the water distribution infrastructure, and the health of the City's residents and workers, in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
- Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
- Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
- Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
- All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
- Engaged and talented employees reflect our community, have the resources they need to succeed and are empowered to improve our efficiency and effectiveness
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
- Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
- Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with

the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Water Distribution Improvements complies with The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth (the City's comprehensive plan) through the following specific references:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.1 Continue to invest in maintaining excellent water quality for consumption, and ensure delivery of safe drinking water to customers.
6.9.3 Accomplish the guiding principles of the city's Local Surface Water Management Plan, which are to protect people, property and the environment; maintain and enhance infrastructure; provide cost-effective services in a sustainable manner; meet or surpass regulatory requirements; educate and engage the public and stakeholders, and enhance livability and safety.
6.9.4 Encourage consumer use of the municipal water supply to reduce reliance on bottled water and the waste stream water bottles generate.
6.9.5 Support pollution prevention programs as an important first step in maintaining a healthy physical environment.
6.9.6 Manage pollutants at the source in order to prevent degradation of water bodies.
6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.

Given the policy framework indicated above, the proposed project outlined in this Capital Budget Request is consistent with the City's comprehensive plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

No collaboration agreements. Coordination with other utilities during design and construction as needed.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Some flexibility, but limited by available city staff within 10 to 20 percent of budget.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a

new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

No carry-over from previous years.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The Water Distribution system is vital to the delivery of safe water to all city residents and water customers. Maintaining the existing infrastructure will reduce the need for major capital expenditures in the future. This project helps the City maintain infrastructure reliability, preserve the water quality from treatment plant to tap, and improve the overall quality of life in Minneapolis.

Water pipe before cleaning

Pipe cleaned & lined



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Water Distribution Improvements

Contact: Marie Asgian 612-673-5682
Contact: Dan Folen 612-661-4908

Proposed:
2015-2019
Subject to Change

WTR12

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Water Distribution Facility **Project ID:** WTR18

Project Location: Future location to be identified as part of project
City Sector: South
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2013
Project Start Date: 1/1/14
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Marie Asgian

Affected Wards: 6
Affected Neighborhood(s): Phillips
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/16
Department Priority: 4
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-5682
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $7,000,000

Project Description:

The existing Water Distribution Maintenance Facility (referred to as the Water East Yard) is located at the intersection of 5th Avenue SE and Hennepin Avenue. This facility serves as the base of operations for the water distribution system maintenance and construction group of the Water Treatment and Distribution Division. It is the intent of this Project to vacate the existing facilities and replace them with new facilities. The project scope has been expanded to include relocation of the Water Meter Shop presently located at the Fridley Water Plant (4300 Marshall Street NE). The initial capital budget request for relocation to the Hiawatha Maintenance Facility (1901 E. 26th St.) is no longer viable due to space constraints. The expanded Water Distribution group, incorporating the Meter Shop, will not fit into the available space at the Hiawatha Facility. Other Public Works work groups will move into the space intended for Water Distribution and an alternative site will be found to replace East Yard.

Currently, City staff is working on a Feasibility Assessment of a possible facility location inside of Minneapolis and evaluating it against the feasibility of a location at the Fridley Water Works campus. Once a site is selected, an updated budget and rate impact will be developed. It is expected that site selection will be completed by the end of 2014.

Purpose and Justification:

The purpose of this project is to design and build a suitable multipurpose distribution system maintenance facility for the Water Treatment and Distribution Division of the Minneapolis Public Works Department.

The current site is comprised of multiple structures of various sizes and types, circulation space, construction yard space, and site storage spaces that are intermingled with employee parking areas. These facilities, due to age, location, and changes in function over time, no longer provide adequate or efficient use of space for the required Water Division group. Several of the buildings have exceeded their useful life and need to be replaced, while others are in need of major repairs and rehabilitation in order to continue service. The existing facilities are deficient in a variety of functional areas including: heating, air conditioning, power, lighting, security and communications. In addition, the industrial nature of the site coupled with the inefficient physical layout has a strong negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Water Meter group has been organizationally merged into the East Yard Water Distribution group. When the two work units are co-located in the same facility, field staff can be shared and work together to increase operational efficiencies. The existing Meter Shop is in similar condition to the East Yard facility. An alternative location will need to be found that is efficiently located in the City with sufficient space to house the Water Distribution group (including the water meter operations).

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	Totals by Source
Water Bonds	4,000	4,000
Water Revenue	3,000	3,000

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	Totals by Source
Totals by Year	7,000	7,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not Applicable

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 50
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (50,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The proposed project will result in decreased operating costs that are directly related to modern design standards, including being equal to a Silver Rating, based on the criteria of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED).

However, due to the pending replacement of the existing facilities, the City has deferred maintenance at the current facility for the past several years. If this Project is not approved, a considerable amount of deferred maintenance work will need to be performed on the existing buildings, thereby increasing the current annual operating costs.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Current Industry standards suggest that the City provide for an annual capital investment in facilities based on an increasing percentage of the total replacement cost and the age of the facility. For example: a capital investment of 1% of the replacement cost is recommended annually for a facility up to ten years in age, 2% for facilities between 10 and 20 years old, 4% for facilities between 20 and 40 years old, and a 6% investment for facilities in excess of 40 years in age.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to the maintenance of the water distribution infrastructure, and the health of the City's residents and workers—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting

- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
- Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
- Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
- Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
- All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
- Engaged and talented employees reflect our community, have the resources they need to succeed and are empowered to improve our efficiency and effectiveness
- Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
- Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
- Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This proposal is consistent with and contributes to implementation of the following policies and implementation steps related to public facilities in The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.
5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.
5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.
5.1.3 Work with all partner agencies, including City departments, to ensure that facility planning is consistent with the land use policies of The Minneapolis Plan.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Future Task.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is flexibility in the project schedule.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Complete feasibility study and site selection in 2014.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The proposed relocation of the Water Distribution and Maintenance Operations will resolve the deficiencies of the existing facilities thereby improving the City's ability to provide drinking water to all of its customers in the most efficient and cost effective manner. Watermain maintenance and construction activities can be more closely coordinated and key services delivered more effectively and professionally in a modern facility.

Photos of existing East Yard Facility

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Treatment Infrastructure Improvements **Project ID:** WTR23

Project Location: Water Campuses
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2010
Project Start Date: 1/1/13
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Dale Folen
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 1
Contact Phone Number: (612) 661-4908
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

Many small to medium-sized improvement projects have been identified as necessary to maintain operation of the water treatment plants on the water works sites. Projects are identified each year based on condition assessments, and prioritized based on an organized system of ranking criteria. The next anticipated projects include improvements to the river water intake system, pumping systems and the control system. Projects will also include added systems to manage spent filter backwash water, electrical power system replacements, and coagulant feed system replacements.

Purpose and Justification:

The goal will be to conduct on-going small renovations to delay or avoid larger Capital Projects. The existing water filtration plant in Columbia Heights was constructed from 1913 to 1918. The existing water softening plant in Fridley was completed around 1940. The process equipment and structures periodically need repairs. Each plant has chemical feed systems, which have a shorter life than the building structures, and will continue to be replaced under this program. Process control and monitoring equipment need regular updating. While the sand filters at Columbia Heights have been replaced by Ultrafiltration, the pretreatment processes remain in service to condition the feed water for the ultrafiltration plant. All of these facilities, including pumping and transmission piping within and between the treatment campuses need replacement of significant parts or systems to maintain operability.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Water Bonds	1,000							1,000
Water Revenue	16,500	3,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	5,000	5,000	39,500
Totals by Year	17,500	3,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	5,000	5,000	40,500

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

All funding for this project is planned to come from water enterprise revenue funds.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The general plan is for a neutral change or decrease in operating costs. Attempts to improve efficiency are pursued wherever possible.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

N/A.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	300	300	300	400	500	1,800
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	2,280	2,280	2,280	3,040	3,800	13,680
Project Management	120	120	120	160	200	720
Contingency	157	157	157	210	262	943
City Administration	143	143	143	190	238	857
Total Expenses with Admin	3,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	5,000	18,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to the maintenance of the water infrastructure, and the health of the City's residents and workers—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
- Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
- Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
- Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
- All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
- Engaged and talented employees reflect our community, have the resources they need to succeed and are empowered to improve our efficiency and effectiveness
- Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
- Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
- Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Treatment Infrastructure Improvements complies with The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth (the City's comprehensive plan) through the following specific references:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.1 Continue to invest in maintaining excellent water quality for consumption, and ensure delivery of safe drinking water to customers.
6.9.3 Accomplish the guiding principles of the city's Local Surface Water Management Plan, which are to protect people, property and the environment; maintain and enhance infrastructure; provide cost-effective services in a sustainable manner; meet or surpass regulatory requirements; educate and engage the public and stakeholders, and enhance livability and safety.
6.9.4 Encourage consumer use of the municipal water supply to reduce reliance on bottled water and the waste stream water bottles generate.
6.9.5 Support pollution prevention programs as an important first step in maintaining a healthy physical environment.
6.9.6 Manage pollutants at the source in order to prevent degradation of water bodies.
6.9.7 Preserve and enhance the strategic placement of pervious surfaces within the city to decrease the rate and volume of stormwater runoff.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None finalized. Plan for Custom Efficiency rebates (electric power savings) from Xcel Energy where possible.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Significant flexibility is available, as long as systems remain operational.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Establish annual goals and schedules for each sub-project.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

We have developed a long, prioritized list of projects, so that progress in improvements can continue in the case of certain projects being delayed or if other projects must be accelerated due to an imminent need arising.

Recent Construction - Ammonia System

Recent Chemical Feed System Replacement

Pump Station Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation



Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Fridley Filter Plant Rehabilitation **Project ID:** WTR24

Project Location: Treatment Campus in Fridley
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2013
Project Start Date: 1/1/13
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Dale Folen

Affected Wards:
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/17
Department Priority: 3
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-4908
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project will renovate twenty granular media filters, constructed around 1925, at the Fridley Filter Plant. The filters were partially renovated in the 1970's. The proposed project will include more systems than the previous renovation, such as upgrading the backwash supply system, piping, and valves, as well as replacing filter underdrains and filtration media. The new filtration media will include granular activated carbon to control potential tastes and odors. The project will modernize the backwashing system to meet industry best practices, and improve flow path redundancy in plant.

Purpose and Justification:

The main purpose of the project is to extend the life of the existing structure, improve filtered water quality and improve system reliability. Detailed evaluations of filters in 2010 and 2011 confirmed concerns regarding conformity of filter media with current standards, adequacy of the backwash supply and residual handling systems, and efficacy of filter controls and monitoring.

Recent evaluations of taste and odor technologies found that replacing filter media with granular activated carbon (GAC) will address taste and odor challenges while continuing to meet particle removal goals. Use of GAC requires modification to disinfection practices and additional storage volume for disinfection contact time at all plant rates. Plant redundancy will be improved by modifying filter influent and effluent conduits. The redundancy improvements will allow filter rehabilitation to be constructed in two phases with half the plant operational during construction.

The cost-saving cancellation of the ultrafiltration project at the Fridley campus makes it even more critical to properly maintain and optimize performance of the Fridley Filtration Plant.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	Totals by Source
Water Bonds	6,000	8,000	9,000	8,000	8,000	39,000
Water Revenue	800					800
Totals by Year	6,800	8,000	9,000	8,000	8,000	39,800

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

All funding planned from Water enterprise fund.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Generally plan for neutral change in operating cost. Attempt to improve efficiency wherever possible.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Not Applicable

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	1,900	600	600	600	0	3,700
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	5,040	7,290	6,320	6,400	0	25,050
Project Management	320	360	320	320	0	1,320
Contingency	359	321	379	299	0	1,359
City Administration	381	429	381	381	0	1,571
Total Expenses with Admin	8,000	9,000	8,000	8,000	0	33,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to the health of the City's residents and workers — in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
- Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
- Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
- Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
- All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
- Engaged and talented employees reflect our community, have the resources they need to succeed and are empowered to improve our efficiency and effectiveness
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
- Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
- Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and

develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 - Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 - Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 - Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.

Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.1 - Continue to invest in maintaining excellent water quality for consumption, and ensure delivery of safe drinking water to customers.
6.9.3 - Accomplish the guiding principles of the city's Local Surface Water Management Plan, which are to protect people, property and the environment; maintain and enhance infrastructure; provide cost-effective services in a sustainable manner; meet or surpass regulatory requirements; educate and engage the public and stakeholders, and enhance livability and safety.
6.9.4 - Encourage consumer use of the municipal water supply to reduce reliance on bottled water and the waste stream water bottles generate.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 23, 2011. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. No additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Perform collaborative research with the University of Minnesota by pilot testing of granular activated carbon filters to evaluate and optimize filter media performance on a fundamental basis and identify key design parameters.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

SiSignificant flexibility is available as long as systems remain operational – dependent upon redundancy improvements early in the project.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

2014:
• Complete construction of redundancy improvements.
• Detailed investigations to finalize the scope of the design and construction project.
• Begin design of improvements and rehabilitation for filters, backwash, and disinfection systems.

2015:
• Complete final design phase and bidding.
• Begin construction of system improvements.

2016 through 2018:

• Complete construction in phases

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The Ultrafiltration Project, cancelled in early 2009, would have replaced the filters being rehabilitated by this project.

Fridley Filtration Plant, completed around 1927

Technology Research with University of Minnesota

Pipe Gallery Rehabilitation



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Fridley Filter Plant Rehabilitation

Contact: Dale Folen 612-661-4908

Proposed:
2014-2018

Subject to Change

WTR24

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Ground Water Supply **Project ID:** WTR25

Project Location: Treatment Campuses and Ward 4
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2014
Project Start Date: 1/1/14
Submitting Department: Other Departments
Contact Person: Dale Folen

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/29
Department Priority: 5
Contact Phone Number: (612) 661-4908
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The project includes a series of Ground Water supply wells and the piping to deliver the water to various points in the water treatment system. A system of about 30 wells will be constructed near the existing treatment campuses and in the northern part of the city. The system will be developed over several years. Pipe systems will be designed to allow bypassing of parts of the treatment system to increase the resiliency of system.

Purpose and Justification:

The City of Minneapolis and its wholesale water customers rely upon water from the Mississippi River. There is currently no alternative source of water if the River becomes unusable. While most poor conditions in the River are short term, there are conceivable events that put the river at risk for longer times. There is also possibility of damage to a treatment plant due to a series natural or man-made disasters.

State regulatory agencies strongly recommend an alternative supply.

The ground water generally has a very consistent water quality and temperature. Mixing ground water with the surface water from has the potential to yield specific process benefits. Ground Water will be a temporary source.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Water Revenue	500	500	1,000	1,500	1,500	2,000	39,000	46,000
Totals by Year	500	500	1,000	1,500	1,500	2,000	39,000	46,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

All funding for this project is planned to come from water enterprise revenue funds.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 40
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 50,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

There will be increased cost to pump from the ground water and through the piping to the treatment compared with pumping from the river. The pumping equipment, as does all equipment, will require some maintenance labor time. Operational plans have not yet been identified, so costs are not estimated.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Each well will provide water to the system. The wells and pipelines will be built in annual steps that fit the budgeted amounts.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	200	100	150	150	200	800
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	225	760	1,140	1,140	1,520	4,785
Project Management	20	40	60	60	80	260
Contingency	31	52	79	79	105	345
City Administration	24	48	71	71	95	310
Total Expenses with Admin	500	1,000	1,500	1,500	2,000	6,500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to the improvement of the water infrastructure, and the health of the City's residents and workers, in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
- Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
- Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
- Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
- All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
- Engaged and talented employees reflect our community, have the resources they need to succeed and are empowered to improve our efficiency and effectiveness
- Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
- Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
- Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Ground Water Supply project complies with The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth (the City's comprehensive plan) through the following specific references:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and

develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.1 Continue to invest in maintaining excellent water quality for consumption, and ensure delivery of safe drinking water to customers.
6.9.3 Accomplish the guiding principles of the city's Local Surface Water Management Plan, which are to protect people, property and the environment; maintain and enhance infrastructure; provide cost-effective services in a sustainable manner; meet or surpass regulatory requirements; educate and engage the public and stakeholders, and enhance livability and safety.
6.9.4 Encourage consumer use of the municipal water supply to reduce reliance on bottled water and the waste stream water bottles generate.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

The precise locations of the wells and pipelines are still under development. Reviews with the Planning Commission will be a future task.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Significant flexibility is possible. The entire program will be a series of sub-projects.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Each year the amount of well and pipeline construction will be determined by the established budget.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Ground water has been considered for several decades as an alternative supply, but the idea was hampered by significant contamination in the shallowest two aquifers near both of the treatment campuses. The recent investigation showed other nearby sources of ground water. These include deeper aquifers near the treatment plants and a combination of multiple aquifers in northern part of the city, across the river from the Fridley campus. The shallower aquifers are available across the river.



Hydro-Geologic Cross-Section
in Twin Cities Metropolitan Area

Source: Minnesota Geological Survey (MGS) Open File Report 06-04



Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Recarbonation System Replacement **Project ID:** WTR26

Project Location: Treatment campus in Fridley
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Dale Folen
Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): Various
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/17
Department Priority: 6
Contact Phone Number: (612) 661-4908
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

Replacement of the carbon dioxide feed system and storage tanks at the Fridley Softening Plant. The softening plant removes minerals from the water by raising the pH of the water. The recarbonation system uses carbon dioxide to decrease the pH of the water, bringing it nearer to neutral for the next stages in the treatment process.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing steel storage tanks were installed between 1947 and 1951. The feed system is from the same era or earlier. Some parts of the system were replaced about 20 years ago. The tanks have volume to serve for about 7 days between deliveries. The proposed system will have a capacity to meet average needs for about 21 days. This will improve system resiliency.

This project is as a sub-project of the Treatment Infrastructure Improvements program and was identified as needed by the project prioritization evaluation system. It is listed as a separate project due to its large size.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Water Bonds	1,000		1,000	2,000
Water Revenue	1,500	1,500	1,000	4,000
Totals by Year	2,500	1,500	2,000	6,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

None.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating cost will be equal or less than the costs of operating the existing system. Investigations have begun to evaluate the potential for higher efficiency feed systems.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

N/A.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	450	150	200	0	0	800
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	1,750	1,140	1,520	0	0	4,410
Project Management	100	60	80	0	0	240
Contingency	81	79	105	0	0	264
City Administration	119	71	95	0	0	286
Total Expenses with Admin	2,500	1,500	2,000	0	0	6,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to the improvement of the water infrastructure, and the health of the City's residents and workers, in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
- Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
- Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
- Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
- All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
- Engaged and talented employees reflect our community, have the resources they need to succeed and are empowered to improve our efficiency and effectiveness
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
- Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
- Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Recarbonation System Replacement project complies with The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth (the City's comprehensive plan) through the following specific references:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and

develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.
6.9.1 Continue to invest in maintaining excellent water quality for consumption, and ensure delivery of safe drinking water to customers.
6.9.3 Accomplish the guiding principles of the city's Local Surface Water Management Plan, which are to protect people, property and the environment; maintain and enhance infrastructure; provide cost-effective services in a sustainable manner; meet or surpass regulatory requirements; educate and engage the public and stakeholders, and enhance livability and safety.
6.9.4 Encourage consumer use of the municipal water supply to reduce reliance on bottled water and the waste stream water bottles generate.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Reviews with the Planning Commission will be a future task.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Very little flexibility.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The cost estimates were based on replacement of the feed system in the first year. The storage tank system would be replaced over the second and third years, to manage the budget and allow for other treatment infrastructure projects in those years.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The Recarbonation system is a vital part of the Softening Plant.



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Recarbonation System Replacement

Proposed:
2015-2017

WTR26

Contact: Dale Folen 612-661-4908

Subject to Change

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Meter Replacement Program **Project ID:** WTR27

Project Location: City-Wide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2018
Project Start Date: 1/1/18
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Marie Asgian / Bob Ervin
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/25
Department Priority: 8
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-5682 / (612) 673-5509
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The scope of work for this project includes: the research and purchase for new water meters, automated meter reading devices and necessary electronic infrastructure (radio receiving antennae, software and hardware) as well as removal and installation of the existing water meters as part of a life cycle change out for all water meters in the City.

Purpose and Justification:

The purpose for this project is for the lifecycle change out of water meters and to implement new technology. The benefits of advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) are due to its operational efficiency as well as its ability to help improve customer service and water conservation.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Water Bonds		5,000	20,000	25,000
Water Revenue	100			100
Totals by Year	100	5,000	20,000	25,100

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

No grants or other non-City funding sources.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Reduced maintenance needed for new meters will result in a reduction of operating costs. Implementing the new technology will result in the eliminating the current technology of using a van to drive the City streets to collect the readings from the meters and the reduction of 1 FTE.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

N/A

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	85	500	585

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	3,800	3,800
Project Management	0	0	0	4	20	24
Contingency	0	0	0	6	442	448
City Administration	0	0	0	5	238	243
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	100	5,000	5,100

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to the improvement of the water infrastructure, and the health of the City's residents and workers, in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
- Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
- Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
- Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
- All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
- Engaged and talented employees reflect our community, have the resources they need to succeed and are empowered to improve our efficiency and effectiveness
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
- Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
- Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The project complies with The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth (the City's comprehensive plan) through the following specific references:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.

5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.

5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Reviews with the Planning Commission will be a future task.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

N/A

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

There is a certain amount of flexibility to increase or decrease funding per year by scaling the specific project areas. The implementation of this project will be by neighborhood. We can increase or decrease the number of neighborhoods to be included in each year's change-over plan.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This is a new project and will have phases that include research and design, purchasing and implementation. The first year of the project will be solely researching the best product for implementation and purchasing. The following years will be implementation.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The Water Division recovers its cost for producing and distributing potable water through metered water sales. The water meters can be considered the “cash registers” of the Water Division. Citywide meter change out was performed in the late 1990’s. The meters and the automated communication devices are due to be changed out. Maintaining the existing meters and making sure they are reading and transmitting reliably for monthly billing is a primary goal of the daily activity of the Meter Shop personnel.

The benefits of advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) are due to its operational efficiency as well as its ability to help improve customer service and water conservation. Such capabilities are primarily attributed to AMI enabling utilities to quickly collect meter readings from the office, whereas previously, workers were challenged with the time-consuming task of manually collecting all meter readings during each billing cycle. Currently one FTE is used primarily to drive routes with a minivan mounted data collector to each meter location and collect a meter read.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Ultrafiltration Module Replacement **Project ID:** WTR28

Project Location: Treatment campus in Columbia Heights
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2018
Project Start Date: 1/1/18
Submitting Department: Public Works
Contact Person: Dale Folen
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/18
Department Priority: 7
Contact Phone Number: (612) 661-4908
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

Replace the internal filter membrane modules (cartridges) in the Ultrafiltration plant that has been operational since 2006. Also repair or replace other short-life components such as instruments or frequently operated valves.

Purpose and Justification:

This is normal procedure for membrane filtration plants like the Minneapolis Ultrafiltration plant at Columbia Heights. The equipment that holds the filter modules will last 20 to 30 years, but the modules themselves have a 7 year warranty. When the system began operation, the City began setting aside a cash reserve each year to prepare for this replacement.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2018	Totals by Source
Water Revenue	10,300	10,300
Totals by Year	10,300	10,300

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

None.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 7
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

No expected change in operating cost.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

N/A

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	515	0	515
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	8,446	0	8,446

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Project Management	0	0	0	412	0	412
Contingency	0	0	0	437	0	437
City Administration	0	0	0	490	0	490
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	0	10,300	0	10,300

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project contributes to the improvement of the water infrastructure, and the health of the City's residents and workers, in furtherance of the following City Goals.

Living well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting
- Our neighborhoods have amenities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life

A hub of economic activity and innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here
- Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce
- Areas of greatest need are focused on; promising opportunities are seized
- Strategies with our city and regional partners are aligned, leading to economic success

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected
- All Minneapolis residents, visitors and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy
- The city restores and protects land, water, air and other natural resources
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place
- We welcome our growing and diversifying population through thoughtful planning and design

A City that works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves
- Engaged and talented employees reflect our community, have the resources they need to succeed and are empowered to improve our efficiency and effectiveness
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused
- Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust
- Responsible tax policy and sound financial management provide short-term stability and long-term fiscal health

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Ultrafiltration plant complies with The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth (the City's comprehensive plan) through the following specific references:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet

realistic timelines.

5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.

Environment: Minneapolis will promote sustainable design practices in the preservation, development, and maintenance of its natural and built environments, provide equal access to all of the city's resources and natural amenities, and support the local and regional economy without compromising the needs of future generations.
Policy 6.9: Be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems.

6.9.1 Continue to invest in maintaining excellent water quality for consumption, and ensure delivery of safe drinking water to customers.

6.9.3 Accomplish the guiding principles of the city's Local Surface Water Management Plan, which are to protect people, property and the environment; maintain and enhance infrastructure; provide cost-effective services in a sustainable manner; meet or surpass regulatory requirements; educate and engage the public and stakeholders, and enhance livability and safety.

6.9.4 Encourage consumer use of the municipal water supply to reduce reliance on bottled water and the waste stream water bottles generate.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project is planned maintenance for a project that was approved by the Planning Commission in 1999.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

None.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Very little flexibility, since the module replacement must be done for the whole plant. However, we are investigating options for a step-wise replacement.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

N/A

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The membrane modules were replaced in 2010 as a part of a warranty claim. The system has been operating very well since that time.



MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

Ultrafiltration Module Replacement

Contact: Dale Folen 612-661-4908

Proposed:
2018

Subject to Change

WTR28

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Reimbursible Watermain Projects **Project ID:** WTR9R

Project Location: Various
City Sector:
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan:
Project Start Date: 1/1/13
Submitting Department:
Contact Person: Marie Asgian

Affected Wards:
Affected Neighborhood(s):
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority:
Contact Phone Number: (612) 673-5682
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

These funds are requested to allow Public Works Water Operations to do "work for others" (public and private) which will be reimbursed by the requesting agency, business or individual.

Purpose and Justification:

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Future Years	Totals by Source
Reimbursements	10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	22,000
Totals by Year	10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	22,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure?
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 0
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	200	200	200	200	200	1,000
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	1,520	1,520	1,520	1,520	1,520	7,600
Project Management	80	80	80	80	80	400
Contingency	105	105	105	105	105	524
City Administration	95	95	95	95	95	476
Total Expenses with Admin	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	10,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and

Objectives:

Contributions will vary for each sub-project.

The Reimbursable Water Main Projects are generally consistent with the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth. The following policies directly support water main work, especially when done to improve both water service and other to accommodate facilities that serve the public (as in conjunction with projects such as LRT or street redesign).

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.

From Chapter 5 – Public Services and Facilities: "The City provides basic infrastructure and public services to all neighborhoods, including bridges, streets, traffic signals, street lighting, drinking water, sanitary sewer, stormwater management, and solid waste removal and recycling services. It is necessary to maintain these functions to keep the city viable, and to plan for the future as the city evolves."

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place April 17, 2009. The project was found consistent with the comprehensive plan by the City Planning Commission on April 23, 2009; no additional review is required.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Enterprise Content Management **Project ID:** IT003

Project Location: Citywide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2010
Project Start Date: 1/1/07
Submitting Department: IT Department
Contact Person: Debra Parker
Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 4 of 4
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-2496
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $423,763

Project Description:

This is the City's Enterprise Content Management (ECM) services program. CLIC has been providing capital funding since 2007. These investments have built the platform and infrastructure so IT can provide information management tools and services such as: information classification and indexing, retention and disposition management, unstructured data management (e.g. MS Office docs, digital photographs, audio and video files); document scanning services, web content management, and retention management.

No CLIC funds are requested for 2015. IT will use previously allocated funds to continue planned work to implement the City's digital records management program. This will include completing the replacement of the aging physical records tracking system. It also will include work to roll out the indexing and classification service that will underpin the records management program.

Funds requested for 2016-2019 reflect the anticipated upgrade and/or replacement of the Web content management platform. New functionality is available on the existing Oracle product that can significantly improve web content delivery with features such as shared collaboration portals and blog sites. However, Microsoft Office 365 (implemented last year) comes with a built-in suite of similar capabilities the City plans to adopt, and will replace Oracle for internal online collaboration and web content management. This will prompt reexamination of the Oracle product and whether its future capabilities align the City's goals for public-facing online services.

Funding requests for 2016-2019 also reflect the City's plans for a large-scale document digitization project, which is on the records management roadmap. This project will require enhanced infrastructure capacity for content storage and retrieval processing power. It also anticipates implementation of scanning infrastructure and tools for automated classification and capture of scanned documents into the content management system.

Purpose and Justification:

Digital management of the City's unstructured data is critical to upcoming Open Data services initiatives. Classifying and indexing these data underpins such services, and serves to preserve availability of public records while protecting private information captured and stored in the content management system.

Digital management of an indexed repository of content items also improves operational efficiencies with easy search and retrieval, version control, reliable authenticity, and reduced storage (digital and physical) costs as paper records are digitized and the redundant renditions that proliferate in unmanaged repositories can be safely disposed.

A modernized public web and online interaction platform is needed to catch up with and anticipate future expectations of our citizens and stakeholders for expanded online civic engagement and services, especially for mobile users.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,250	300	300	300	300	2,450
Totals by Year	1,250	300	300	300	300	2,450

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not applicable.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 10
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 275,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Implementation of a formal digital records management program on the platform built with capital funds will increase operating costs in the IT department. Need for at least one new support staff position is anticipated, and there will be increased maintenance costs over and above existing costs when the program is in operation. Classification and indexing services also will drive increased IT costs for infrastructure maintenance application support, and ongoing management of the indexing schema. However, it is expected that some or all of these increased costs will eventually be offset by operational efficiencies gained from reducing time spent on search and retrieval, reduced physical storage and streamlining of physical records management tasks.

Additionally, as the ECM upgrade is completed and the City implements its new outsourcing strategy beginning in 2016, there is the potential to reduce maintenance costs over the long-term as the City takes advantage of more flexible cloud service opportunities.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

New IT infrastructure – hardware and software acquisition – always requires initial one-time funding. The useful life for hardware products is 5 to 7 years, driven both by demand for capacity that outgrows an existing platform and by routine deprecation of IT devices that reach end-of-life and go out of support. Lifecycle planning for enterprise class software usually anticipates major upgrades/enhancements resulting in significant implementation costs every 3 to 5 years. The out-year capital funding requests for 2016-2019 reflect these predicted capital funding needs.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	286	286	286	286	1,143
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	0	14	14	14	14	57
Total Expenses with Admin	0	300	300	300	300	1,200

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This program contributes primarily to A City That Works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves. Data that is indexed and managed to be shared across departments and workgroups provide the foundation needed for departments to work with each other and with the community. Information that is well managed, and that can be relied on for accuracy and integrity support effective decision making, and help staff improve efficiency and effectiveness. That said, making sure that data is available, organized and understandable contributes to virtually all the City's goals and objectives.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.

5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.

5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.

5.1.3 Work with all partner agencies, including City departments, to ensure that facility planning is consistent with the land use policies of The Minneapolis Plan.

5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.

Policy 5.8: Make city government more responsive to the needs of people who use its services.

5.8.1 Ensure equal access to city services and contracts across the protected classes.

5.8.2 Continue to improve accessibility of core government functions through service enhancements such as Minneapolis Development Review and Minneapolis 311.

This project is consistent in the following ways:

1: The City websites are updated by the Enterprise Content Management System. Implementation of a Universal Records Management (URM) program will enable City content publishers to efficiently locate relevant records or content thus improving publishing of relevant information and enhancing the City's web presence to meet the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.

2: The URM program will ensure data compliance, improve accessibility and search ability via the e-Discovery process and improve ability to place records on legal hold.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Not applicable.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not applicable.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Because computing technology evolves at such a rapid pace, and because the expectations for future business needs also can change, adjustments in the funding requests among the years in the five-year plan may well be necessary. The plan has placeholders for anticipated needs in each year of the plan, but actual needs in any given year could be

increased or reduced as initiatives get underway.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Unspent funds awarded in prior years will be used to complete and/or initiate the following projects on the ECM roadmap:

2014 — Complete the major infrastructure upgrade that is reducing overall operating costs for the platform and laying the groundwork for implementation of the digital records management program. Go live date is scheduled for May 2014.

2014 — Initiate a project to stabilize the system that tracks retention and location of physical records. This system is out-of-support and a hardware or software failure could result in the loss of this important data. The project will export and provide a backup repository for the data while analysis is performed to determine how to replace the current system. Goal is to have a replacement system in operation by mid-year 2015.

2015 — Initiate a project to upgrade or replace the public-facing web content management system. Existing funds should be sufficient to cover the requirements gathering and conceptual design for a new set of tools and services for modernizing the City's web presence and interactive services. The goal will be to have a five-year-plan defined for these services by year-end 2015. However, the transition activities resulting from adoption of the new outsourcing strategy may delay this milestone until early 2016. Funds requested for 2016 and beyond will be needed to acquire and implement new solutions and services.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The way people work and collaborate online is rapidly changing as the technology tools and services have matured both in terms of commercial availability and ease-of-use. Additionally, the major business systems being adopted to improve operational efficiencies overall come with the expectation that enterprise data, both structured and unstructured, will be available, indexed and managed in repositories that allow full integration with automated workflows and reporting capabilities. Enterprise Content Management services are the lynch pin that allow the City to realize its full investment in these new and improved ways of doing business.

New emphasis on protecting the privacy of the data that government holds on individuals is accelerating business drivers for making sure such data is properly classified and controlled. New emphasis on open government data sharing also is driving public demand that government data is available in universally usable formats. Again, Enterprise Content Management services are and will be critical to meeting these demands.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Enterprise Infrastructure Modernization **Project ID:** IT004

Project Location: Citywide	**Affected Wards:** All
City Sector: Citywide	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** City-Wide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 1/1/19
Project Start Date: 12/31/14	**Department Priority:** 1 of 4
Submitting Department: IT Department	**Contact Phone Number:** 612 673-2580
Contact Person: Sybil Luft	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $50,458

Project Description:

Infrastructure maintenance is critical to ensure stable IT operations. IT must “refresh” end-of-life technology, invest in new technology and ensure that capacity is available to meet the needs of business departments. This is a continual process. Annual sub-projects reduce the risk of failures, improve information security, build capacity, and provide the foundation to support end-user productivity in an increasingly mobile environment.

Network Infrastructure Refresh: Refresh, upgrade and consolidate critical network equipment throughout the City which is at end-of life. This is critical to the stability of the enterprise network. In 2015 we will refresh approximately sixty-five (65) devices including two (2) Intrusion Detection devices to ensure stability, reliability and security of the City’s enterprise network.

2015 CLIC funds requested: $270,000

IT Security Improvements: Implement two new security capabilities: 1) Network access authentication to restrict access to only those computers that the City explicitly allows; and 2) audit and accountability log management and monitoring to protect data privacy and reduce compliance risk. Replace and improve perimeter security infrastructure (firewalls, intrusion detection, etc.)

2015 CLIC funds requested. $320,000

Enterprise systems: Telecom upgrades are needed to maintain stable voice communications systems, enhance functionality and streamline configuration and support of virtual workers. In 2015 we need to upgrade the 911 AmCom server (supports City phones dialing the 911 system) and upgrade the HiPath 4000 system (the core of the City’s telephone system that allows for inbound and outbound telephone communications for City departments and the general population). Continued expansion of IP telephony to additional City facilities is necessary to ensure the availability of enterprise-class unified communications systems, where appropriate for financial benefits realization.

2014 CLIC funds requested: $260,000

Purpose and Justification:

Network Infrastructure Refresh: The City’s IT network infrastructure is the foundation for all other IT capabilities. This program and its rolling annual maintenance and improvement projects keep this critical IT infrastructure operating at optimal performance levels to meet City needs. It is the equivalent of the roads and bridges that interconnect and provide access to homes, businesses and community and government service locations across the City. Similar to these assets, network infrastructure needs to be maintained for continued safety and the ability to meet traffic demands. Likewise, it needs to be improved when demand outstrips current capacity, or when the need for new services is identified.

The 2015 network infrastructure refresh project will replace aging assets to maintain and enhance network capacity and performance.

Security: The 2015 network security improvements will close security gaps and add important layers of protection needed to counter an ever-changing arsenal of cybersecurity threats. Managing devices on the network (network access control), will close a significant gap in the City's security posture. Log management and monitoring will add important protections against insider threats and allow the City to meet regulatory compliance demands.

Enterprise systems: The 2015 telephony systems upgrades will maintain core telephony capabilities such as inbound and outbound telephone communications between City of Minneapolis departments and the general population. This core system provides the foundation on which all other telephony systems rely, such as City call centers (311, Utility Billing, etc.). Projects requesting funding for 2015 will also provide core functionality critical to the life-safety of City employees who experience emergency events at work (e.g. the ability to call 911 from their place of work and have the responders know where they are located).

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	2,650	850	750	750	850	750	6,600
Totals by Year	2,650	850	750	750	850	750	6,600

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

None.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 7
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 200,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Operating costs for software licensing and managed security services will be added for the new network security assets that will be implemented with 2015 funds. Network equipment refresh and telephony upgrades are not expected to increase operating costs. Increased operating costs generated by improved solutions will be added to the enterprise allocation model that supports IT services.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Funds for the network access control project will be spent in 2015 and no additional capital investment is expected within the current 5-year plan to realize full expected lifespan for the assets.

The perimeter security enhancement project will require additional capital investment in 2016, estimated at $150,000 to acquire and deploy the new systems. The 2015 dollars will be spent on architectural design and product selection.

Additional capital investment for the audit and accountability log management and monitoring project will be needed across the next two years (2016-2017). The 2015 funds will be used to acquire the log management platform. Future investment will fund implementation of the core system and sub-projects that will add logs from various contexts for management and monitoring, such as Windows active directory, and critical system server and application logs.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Information Technology	810	714	714	810	714	3,762
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	40	36	36	40	36	188
Total Expenses with Admin	850	750	750	850	750	3,950

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Infrastructure management can be aligned with meeting all City goals due to the very foundational nature of this project and the fact that all City departments and lines of business rely on this foundation.

Living Well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life.
IT infrastructure supports public safety systems and functions such as Police, Fire and 911. IT infrastructure supports access to all City business systems such as those that support the management of regulatory compliance, city planning and economic development, community health and emergency management.

One Minneapolis: Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper.
Improved public access to departments, services, and information via stable network connectivity within the City of Minneapolis and connectivity options, such as 311 and the City's website, will allow faster and more consistent resolution to problems and requests for service.

A Hub of Economic Activity and Innovation: Businesses, big and small, start, move, stay and grow here.
IT promotes public, community, and private partnerships to support strong, healthy communities by upgrading the current infrastructure to meet the demands of citizen-facing functions.

Great Places: Natural and built spaces work together and our environment is protected.
These initiatives promote a sustainable Minneapolis by increasing the efficiency of environmental regulation enforcement and reducing costs of that enforcement through emerging technologies. As we refresh technology, we are also simplifying and consolidating servers and network equipment when possible. This results in lower energy consumption and cost, and an overall reduced carbon footprint.

A City That Works: City government runs well and connects to the community it serves.
The IT technology network infrastructure is the foundation of all City and public serving technology systems. A sound, stable and well-maintained technology infrastructure is essential and critical in assuring the availability of City business systems such as 311, public safety and public works systems, etc. If any element of the network infrastructure fails, then customer-serving City systems will not be accessible.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Not applicable.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Not applicable.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

For all enterprise infrastructure modernization projects, significant collaboration will be required with our suppliers - mainly Unisys, Black Box, Century Link and USIW. Unisys and Century Link are our network service providers and will be responsible for design and replacement of data network components. Black Box and Century Link are responsible for the voice network components that may also be impacted.

Additionally, it is possible we will engage additional vendors as we embark upon transition activities stemming from the outsourcing RFP.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

For this project, Minneapolis IT has built prioritization flexibility for subprojects into the overall funding request for each given year. This approach allows us to accommodate new inputs that might drive changes in the timing for any given subproject within any given budget year without impacting the overall capital spending plan.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

2013 accomplishments:

1. Network refresh activities
   a. Twenty-one connectivity devices refreshed including strategic devices such as those in the 311 Center, City Hall and all Police Precincts.
   b. Procured 6 UPS battery packs and completed battery replacement on 20 UPS devices
   c. Four Firewall devices replaced (Merge CAD Firewalls into City Firewalls)
   d. Two Site-to-Site VPN devices replaced (merging into Cisco SSL devices)
2. Database updates -
   a. MS SQL 2008 migrations activities completed for shared environments, no additional funds expended
3. Operating System updates
   a. Completion of Infrastructure server migration to Windows 2008
   b. Windows 7 deployment began
4. Mobility Wireless
   a. Completion of additional sites including 311, the Hiawatha and Currie maintenance facilities, the Impound Lot and the Police Precincts
5. Telecom system updates
   a. Upgrade ProCenter call recording system
   b. Upgrade eWorkforce Management call routing system
   c. Update all Police precincts with IP phones
6. Security
   a. Build infrastructure to host Microsoft Forefront Identity Management (FIM) system

2014 plans for remaining funds:

1. Network refresh activities
   a. Twenty-nine devices have been identified and are planned for refresh to maintain stability of our connections to sites including the Water Plant, Public Service Center, the Police Property facility and Fire Station 20
   a. Small budget requested each year for UPS battery replacements as needed
   b. Scheduled refresh of two F5 Load Balancers ensuring stable access to the City's intranet site and internal-facing web-based business applications.
2. Operating System updates
   a. Windows 7 deployment completes in 2014
   b. Office 2013 Upgrades
3. Mobility Wireless
   a. Complete the build out of wireless capabilities to remaining sites where technically possible.
4. Telecom system updates
   a. Upgrade the Xpressions Voice Mail System

5. Security
   a. Implement Forefront Identity Management System (FIM). Synchronize with Active Directory; deploy password reset self-service
   b. Implement self-service for security group management (FIM)
   c. Begin design of the FIM/HRIS integration
   d. Implement Symantec Secure Web Gateway

2015 goals:
1. Network refresh activities
   a. Sixty-five devices have been identified and are planned for refresh to ensure a stable enterprise network that supports all City business systems.
   b. Small budget requested each year for UPS battery replacements, as needed, to ensure network equipment has stable power to maintain connectivity
   c. Refresh 2 Intrusion Detection System devices
2. Telecom system updates
   a. Refresh the 911 AmCom Server in 2015 (supports internal City phones dialing the 911 system; required for employee safety.)
   b. Upgrade the HiPath 4000 system in 2015 (this is the core of the City's telephone system that allows for inbound and outbound telephone communications for City departments and the general population)
3. Security
   a. Complete integration of FIM with HRIS
   b. Design and specify solution for audit and accountability log management and monitoring system
   c. Redesign network to isolate high-value data environments for added security protection and compliance remediation; refresh and/or add firewalls and other security devices such as intrusion detection as appropriate in response to changes in network topology
   d. Implement network access control to help detect and prevent access by unauthorized devices

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

All City of Minneapolis Department information technology solutions depend on a stable, reliable infrastructure that has the capacity to meet the demands of municipal government. Without the continual refurbishing and upgrading of this infrastructure, City business and the goals it supports will be jeopardized. All City departments, their business and customers would suffer, but if service were to be jeopardized in our Police, Fire, and Health departments, unintended but tragic consequences could occur for a citizen in need of assistance.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Geographical Information System (GIS) **Project ID:** IT031

Project Location: Citywide	**Affected Wards:** All
City Sector: Citywide	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** City-Wide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2010	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 12/31/19
Project Start Date: 1/1/07	**Department Priority:** 3 of 4
Submitting Department: IT Department	**Contact Phone Number:** 612-673-2496
Contact Person: Debra Parker	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $132,893

Project Description:

This is the City's Geographical Information Services program. CLIC has been providing capital funding since 2007. These investments have built the platform and infrastructure so IT can provide vital mapping, spatial data management and analysis capabilities to City departments.

The strategic direction for GIS during this five-year plan has been to deliver increased GIS self-service capacity. Modernized applications are web-enabled and give City staff and the public access to powerful GIS capabilities to improve data analysis and decision making. IT also has made use of lower cost Cloud infrastructure services to host public-facing GIS services; one important benefit being the ability to increase capacity on-demand during high utilization periods such as severe weather events. Another is that it will be easier, and less expensive, to make City information available in 'open data' mode for secondary use.
No CLIC funds are requested for 2015. IT will use previously allocated funds to continue planned work to implement self-service tools for City staff, especially for mobile GIS users.
Funds requested for 2016-2019 reflect the anticipated upgrades and enhancements to the GIS technology platform. It also reflects planned initiatives to use the GIS platform to provide 'open data' services to the public, and to continue to geocode City infrastructure assets to achieve IT goals for a digitized city.

Purpose and Justification:

Spatial data management and geographical analysis are core capabilities for municipal government. An enterprise-class GIS platform provides the ability to visualize and analyze data to reveal relationships, patterns and trends in a format that is quickly understood and easily shared. This project will ensure that the City has the effective and innovative GIS tools and services at its disposal now and into the future.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	200	300	300	200	150	1,150
Totals by Year	200	300	300	200	150	1,150

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Not applicable.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 10
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 350,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Plans to geocode more City data and to use the GIS platform to provide 'open data' services will result in increased support needs. While there may be efficiencies gained City wide to offset increased IT operating costs, these

initiatives do represent some new services that will add cost. Need for at least two GIS analyst support positions is anticipated over the next few years. Anticipated need for increased processing power and data storage capacity will result in increased operating costs. This estimate also reflects inevitable annual increases built in to data-center hosting and software licensing agreements.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

New IT infrastructure – hardware and software acquisition – always requires initial one-time funding. The useful life for hardware products is 5 to 7 years, driven both by demand for capacity that outgrows an existing platform and by routine deprecation of IT devices that reach end-of-life and go out of support. Lifecycle planning for enterprise class software usually anticipates major upgrades/enhancements resulting in significant implementation costs every 3 to 5 years. The out-year capital funding requests for 2016-2019 reflect these predicted capital funding needs.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	286	286	190	143	905
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	0	14	14	10	7	45
Total Expenses with Admin	0	300	300	200	150	950

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Although City goals are evolving under the new administration, this project will contribute to both new and continuing objectives. This project will support new goals around open access to data and increased public and private data. It also supports continuing objectives for "A City That Works" through ongoing gains in effective decision-making and operational efficiency.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth:
Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.

5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.

5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.

5.1.3 Work with all partner agencies, including City departments, to ensure that facility planning is consistent with the land use policies of The Minneapolis Plan.

5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.

Policy 5.8: Make city government more responsive to the needs of people who use its services.

5.8.1 Ensure equal access to city services and contracts across the protected classes.

5.8.2 Continue to improve accessibility of core government functions through service enhancements such as Minneapolis Development Review and Minneapolis 311.

This GIS project is consistent in the following ways:

1: Public safety is improved by providing GIS technology that is used by public safety professionals for real-time life-safety information. Applications designed to deliver critical information in a short period of time will be possible with this funding to create a Common Operating Picture application for example.

2: An optimal GIS system directly supports business development and enterprise projects such as Enterprise Land Management and Asset Management. It is also critical to 311 in providing location information needed to request and complete service requests.

3: GIS contributes to the overall technology infrastructure that provides information and services to the City, residents, the business community, and the non-profit sector. This enhances the overall livability and development of evaluating this vision.

4: GIS tools enable web distributed analysis (trends and projections).

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Not applicable.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Not applicable.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Because computing technology evolves at such a rapid pace, and because the expectations for future business needs also can change, adjustments in the funding requests among the years in the five-year plan may well be necessary. The plan has placeholders for anticipated needs in each year of the plan, but actual needs in any given year could increase or decrease as new initiatives surface and planned initiatives get underway.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Unspent funds awarded in prior years will be used to complete the GIS upgrade work that began in 2013. City expects to have 0 unspent funds by end of Q2 2014:

GIS roadmap initiatives within the five-year plan include:

2016

- Purchase and migrate to a physical database server environment from the virtual environment GIS currently uses. This will help maintain performance as use increases due to land and asset management systems that will be in place and operational.
- Purchase and migrate to an expanded physical environment for application servers to enhance performance of internal web service and geo-processing calls due to increased need. This will also support increased use of Image Server functionality.
- Expand the external (Amazon/Azure) cloud environment in anticipation of increased public facing self-services offerings, expanded web application capacity, open data portal, and greatly improve business processes and tools to support this environment and the offerings/efficiencies gained by it.
- Maintain software viability by migrating to latest software versions. This is important as the GIS suite becomes more and more intertwined with the SaaS and cloud service offerings which seem to be the industry direction.

2017
- Implement additional expansion of the external (Amazon/Azure) cloud environment to support increased public facing self-services offerings, expanded web application capacity, open data portal, and greatly improve business processes and tools to support this environment and the offerings/efficiencies gained by it.

2018
- Implement real time data integration in both internal and external web facing environments.
- Maintain software viability by migrating to latest software versions. This is important as the GIS suite becomes more and more intertwined with the SaaS and cloud service offerings that appear to be the strategic direction of GIS suppliers.

2019
- Tool and software technology enhancements.
- Expand support and development of web application, self service and open data offerings to utilize built environment.
- Continued and conclude work on tails from previous years.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

GIS capabilities are critical to nearly every City operation. Public safety first responders rely on it for accurate dispatch and efficient routing. Housing and environmental health regulators rely on it to maintain effective inspection and remediation programs. Law enforcement relies on it for crime prevention analysis and dissemination of information like crime maps that help the public protect themselves. Livability and economic development planners rely on it to maintain zoning codes and identify opportunities for public investment to improve City neighborhoods. Civil engineers rely on it to maintain physical infrastructure and anticipate future needs for additions and improvements. In short, virtually all City departments are dependent in some way on GIS analytic and visualization capabilities. And, increasingly, residents, visitors, business owners, non-profit community organizations and economic development investors (to name a few) are coming to rely on the availability of the City's GIS data, tools and services. Continued investment is needed to sustain and evolve this vital information technology asset now and into the future.

Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Police Report Management System Upgrade **Project ID:** IT033

Project Location: Citywide	**Affected Wards:** All
City Sector: Citywide	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** City-Wide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2013	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 12/31/17
Project Start Date: 4/1/13	**Department Priority:** 2 of 4
Submitting Department: IT Department	**Contact Phone Number:** 612-673-3587
Contact Person: Greg Reinhardt	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $350,000

Project Description:

The Minneapolis Police Department uses a custom built police Record Management System (RMS) called CAPRS, (Computer Assisted Police Reporting System). CAPRS was created through the combined efforts of police officers and city IT staff more than 24 years ago and has served the city very well. It is still supported with a combined effort of MPD and IT staff and runs on the Unisys supported city network and hardware. CAPRS data is mined for a host of reasons; the obvious ones being crime prevention, criminal prosecution and resource allocation, but it is equally valuable to the citizenry for monitoring livability issues and holding government accountable. CAPRS is also available for regional public safety departments query capability.

While CAPRS has proven to be extremely stable with extensive daily use for data entry and retrieval; it is the very software platform that provided this strong backbone that is now the main blockade to its future. Functionality that was implemented as a security measure to reduce the likelihood of data loss during network disruptions is no longer necessary and limits the opportunity to move to a web format. Moving to a web application is necessary for a full mobile deployment that would include the use of handheld devices.

CAPRS is written in the software called Visual Basic version 6.0. This software platform has been out of support since 2005 and the greatest concern at this point is should it stop working for an unrecognizable reason, there may be no way to bring it back to life. This greatly reduces the ability to interact with other technology implementations within the city, such as Stellent which is the city's content management system or the GIS mapping software that would allow CAPRS to verify addresses. Moving to a .NET environment is absolutely essential in order to have interfaces with CAPRS that do not require external software to communicate back and forth between various databases.

This project will begin with exploration of options through extensive requirements gathering and detailed documentation of the city environment and all that it encompasses. The initial investigation has begun with MPD and IT staff meeting on a regular basis and a steering committee has been formed within MPD.

This will be a collaborative effort between MPD, IT, City and County Attorney, 911, and 311 as it touches each of these departments. Any solution must interface with all current technology initiatives within the city and maintain all web service connections with the state and county.

Purpose and Justification:

The purpose of this project is to utilize all technologies available to the City of Minneapolis in collaboration with the police report management system to reduce or prevent crime and reach the city goal of a “living well”.

Over the past 20 years the Police Department and the IT Department have worked hand in hand to create a police record system that is innovative and intuitive. It has been rock solid in performance and durability, but has fallen behind with regard to interactivity with other technologies available in today's environment. Much of the world has moved to web based solutions and the use of mobile devices that do not require full installations of software applications.

This limited ability to interact with other technologies has severely restricted the ability to add functionality and mobility. These are two areas that have exploded for most technology solutions in the past decade, but MPD's reporting system has been stagnant as a result of the current software platform and the need for a full application install on each device. Currently, interfaces with CAPRS involve the use of external software applications to extract data and then transform it to compatible formats to be usable with technology that operate on newer software. This is the process used today for performing analytics and what could be automated has become labor intensive, requiring extensive data extraction before comparative analysis can occur.

Moving to a .NET platform would allow interoperability and data sharing between the police reporting system and other software applications throughout the city. A single point of entry would become the norm and thereby reduce the likelihood of mistakes occurring through repeated entries of the same data in multiple systems. Address validation would occur on the front end as opposed post entry geographic verification.

This new software platform would allow for a public interface to be implemented where citizens would have access to view public information and be able to enter lower level police reports without the need for human intervention. This would reduce staff time currently required to perform these duties and increase public satisfaction with prompt and efficient service.

A significant enhancement that would come with moving to a modern software platform would be the ability to easily enter and store digital data. A few examples of this type of data are photographs, audio and video recordings; and scanned documents. This process would allow evidentiary data to pass through the RMS; and be stored in the city content management environment; and then be retrievable through the same process. This is not currently possible and it is extremely frustrating to all participants from citizens to officers and all the way through to the court system.The most significant improvement in service to the public will occur when officers have the ability to perform entirely from the field. This technology would place a great amount of information at their fingertips and create a truly mobile environment throughout the City of Minneapolis. It would be possible for an officer to arrive at a scene; use the data from the 911 call; add any additional information obtained through speaking with the individuals involved; collect and store digital evidence; and be able to email a copy of the report to the citizen while still at the scene.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,350	2,000	1,900	100	5,350
Totals by Year	1,350	2,000	1,900	100	5,350

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Grant funding has been greatly reduced and at this time we have been unsuccessful in locating a grant to assist with funding this project.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 10

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 300,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Because this is an upgrade as opposed to an entirely new project there are current operating costs for comparison and the new hardware and software expense is based on multiple vendor demonstrations with cost evaluations including licensing expenses and ongoing support based on a known number of users. Our expected first year of ongoing costs will start in 2016.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment

that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Future Capital costs to keep this new system current will occur every two years to maintain supportability, system improvements and bug fixes. This system is projected to go live in December 2016. The first major upgrade will occur in late 2019 with an estimated cost of $75,000. These upgrade costs will occur approx. every two years through 2031. These upgrades will require a future capital investment of $525,000 through the life of this system. These costs will be paid for by the MPD operating budget.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	1,665	1,570	20	0	0	3,255
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	140	140	50	0	0	330
Contingency	100	100	25	0	0	225
City Administration	95	90	5	0	0	190
Total Expenses with Admin	2,000	1,900	100	0	0	4,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

1. Living Well – The entire project focuses on improved Public Safety Service through innovation with crime analysis, crime prevention and crime reduction.

2. One Minneapolis – Communities will have greater access to digital data to develop strategies to strengthen and improve neighborhoods.

3. A Hub of Economic Activity and Innovation – the project will help build a safe and informed public; businesses will invest in the community and its citizens.

4. Great Places – Our parks, homes, business, and public spaces will become safer and we can focus on the continued well-being of our citizens and the environment which surrounds them.

5. A City That Works – This project will take full advantage of the city investments in technology and innovation. This will include the use of the city wide wireless network and will empower city employees to become high performing individuals from the field; which in turn will build on the already strong relationships between the city, parks, schools and private sector.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This project will be instrumental in reaching the strategic goals identified by many city departments throughout the City of Minneapolis.

All six of the Police Department goals will be impacted, enhanced and are attainable through the implementation of this project. Moving the police reporting system software platform to a modern technology environment will open the door to public access, which in turn will foster confidence and provide accuracy to crime reporting. This will build

relationships between the citizenry and government by holding us accountable to the people we serve.

The Police Department is dedicated to being a leader in crime prevention, reduction and prosecution using every possible means including innovation, evidence-based policing, and new approaches to dealing with difficult issues such as Domestic violence and gang crime.

(Police Dept. Goals from the 2010-2014 Business Plan)

1. Citizens have confidence in and trust their police force
2. People in our community feel safe
3. A department which is a national leader in police innovation
4. A department which is a national leader in evidence-based policing
5. A department which is a national leader in reduction of domestic violence
6. A department which is a national leader in addressing gang crime

In addition to the police department goals this project will have a major impact on other departments reaching their goals. The following is a partial list of department strategic goals identified in the Mayors 2012 Budget Plan and the 2010-2014 Department Business Plans.

Department: City Attorney
• Reduce repeat livability crime to create welcoming neighborhoods and a thriving downtown
• Violent crimes aggressively prosecuted
• Enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the criminal justice system

Department: 311
• 311 prepared to handle any question or service a customer may have
• 311 will be managed toward operational excellence – people, process and technology – to deliver the best customer service

Department: City Coordinator's Office
• Departmental or divisional silos disappear and cross-department collaboration in solving public problems is the City's cultural norm.
Department: Neighborhood and Community Relations
• Thriving, safe, sustainable and livable neighborhoods

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

The City IT Department conducts annual technology design reviews of Police Department Technology implementations and evaluates supportability. This projects design review will be occurring during the design phase of the project in July through November 2014.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Collaborative Partners for this project include the following departments and organizations:
• Minneapolis Police Department
  - Sponsor and Director of project
  - Steering Committee
• Minneapolis IT
  - Project Management and ongoing support
  - Planning and guidance
  - Infrastructure Maintenance
• Minneapolis 911 and 311

- Partnering Department / Super user guidance
• Minneapolis City Attorney's Office
- Partnering Department /Super user guidance
• Minneapolis Park Police Department
- Partnering Department / Customer guidance
• University of MN Police Department
- Partnering Department / Customer guidance
• Hennepin Justice Integration Program (HJIP)
- Integration and IT support for courts, prosecution, and defense as it relates to data transfer for Adult and Juvenile cases
• Hennepin County Attorney's Office
- Partnering Agency / Super user guidance
• Hennepin County Sheriff's Office
- Partnering Agency / Integration and support
• Metro Transit Police Department
- Partnering Agency / Integration and support
• Unisys Corporation
- City IT vendor support for hardware, network and software integrations

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

First year: flexible expense as it is the requirements gathering and planning period, most staffing hours are covered under operating costs.

Second year: increase in expense for RFP process, testing and project management.

Third and fourth years: the greatest expense years with little flexibility as the project will be in implementation process and will have staff dedicated to it full time.

Fifth year: reduced expense as project completion nears (project staff reductions will occur).

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

This is an upgrade project to an existing Law Enforcement Records System that is required by Federal and State regulations for records retention. Completion of this project will lead directly into the next phase of annual upgrading to stay current, as opposed to a project that would be finished upon complete implementation. The annual upgrading will be done through operating expenses.

Project Phases will include:
Project Definition (1st year)
• Requirements Gathering
Analysis and Solutioning (2nd year)
• RFP, testing, selection
Build out (3rd and 4th years)
• Implementations
• Integrations
• Testing
• Data migration
• Go Live and project closure (5th year)
• Financial review conducted
• Unspent funding returned to city general fund for redeployment

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City

Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

It is absolutely imperative that CLIC committee members understand the importance of this Police Reporting System and how it plays a major role in making the City of Minneapolis a safe place to live, work and visit.

It is not simply a data repository, but essentially the life blood of public safety as we know it in the metro area of Minnesota. Information from this system assists many areas of service to the public including crime prevention, criminal prosecution, social services, resource allocation and government accountability in general.

We have reached a breaking point with the current system; it operates on a platform that is 7 years out of support and potentially could become irreparable at some point in the near future. Significant time and expense has been placed in attempts to bring it up to current standards, but the underlying software is no longer sustainable.

The time to act is now, before we must react, which is always more expensive and has a negative effect on the community. The Police Department and the Information Technology Department have the expertise and staffing in place to move this project forward immediately.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: New Fire Station No. 11 **Project ID:** FIR11

Project Location: 935 5th Avenue SE
City Sector: East
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015
Project Start Date: 3/1/15
Submitting Department: Fire Department
Contact Person: Greg Goeke
Affected Wards: 3
Affected Neighborhood(s): Marcy-Holmes
Estimated Project Completion Date: 3/1/17
Department Priority: 02 of 02
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-2706
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This Project will plan, design, and construct a new Fire Station # 11. The project will meet the current and anticipated future needs of the Minneapolis Fire Department in this geographic portion of the City.

The new Fire Station No. 11 is planned to be located on the City-owned property located at 935 5th Avenue SE. This property is currently the site of the East Yards Water Distribution and Maintenance Facility which is to be relocated as part of the current Capital Improvement plan (WTR 18 Water Distribution Facility).

Purpose and Justification:

The location and configuration of the current Fire Station No. 11 are no longer adequate to serve today's fire department operations. The building no longer meets the current building code, energy code and ADA accessibility due to age. Increases (and changes) in staff size, the lack of privacy and gender issues as it relates to open sleeping areas, have combined to create a demand for private sleeping rooms.

Because of higher demand, due to shifts in property development and street access, response times for Fire Station #11 have decreased in some of the neighborhoods that it serves. The Minneapolis Fire Department measures response times based on a percentage of first unit arrival within five (5) minutes. Response times below 70% indicate unacceptable levels of service. Due to the increased service demands on Fire Station #11, a new facility and a better location will improve service and response times to these surrounding neighborhoods.

The current Fire Station #11 is located (on a residential street) at 229 6th St. S.E. The original station, built in 1925, is a two-story brick building including a finished basement, with two apparatus bays. The area of the station is approximately 16,500 square feet. The Fire Station serves the East Bank, Marcy Holmes, St. Anthony (East and West), Beltrami, Mid-City Industrial, and Como neighborhoods of Minneapolis. The original station provides living space (open dorm) to accommodate three rotating shifts of 24 firefighters, and 6 captains for a total of 30 occupants.

The new station will be planned to accommodate three rotating shifts of 21 firefighters, 6 captains and 6 Fire Motor-Operators, for a total of 33 occupants (eleven staff per shift). This will result in a functional and efficient living space that will provide for all 33 firefighters. The building will be designed aesthetically to fit into the surrounding setting of the neighborhood to become part of the urban fabric. The primary design goals and objectives of the Fire Department are private sleeping rooms (Male/Female separation,) natural light to all living areas, a residential "home" feel to the living areas and blending the station into neighborhood surroundings. The building will be designed, constructed and commissioned utilizing the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	465	1,910	3,350	5,725
Totals by Year	465	1,910	3,350	5,725

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Grants have or other sources of funding have not been applied for at this time. The proposed location does have two structures that may be eligible for historic preservation grant funding.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 75
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 20,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Newly constructed fire stations have more complex mechanical, electrical, and life-safety systems than the buildings they replace. The advantage is that the systems provide for a healthier and safer environment for the firefighters. Although the systems are more energy efficient (approximately 30%) the savings are offset by bringing more fresh air, exhausting harmful pollutants, and controlling temperature and humidity with more precision. Similarly, the maintenance savings of having new systems is offset by having more systems to maintain. The stations will be designed to be more efficient and effective to clean on a daily basis. The Firefighters self-perform the cleaning of the station therefore there will not be any financial offset.

The end result is there will not be any operational savings with the new building. It is anticipated that the costs may actually be $20,000 a year higher based on comparative stations. The average maintenance costs (3-year average)(2011- 2013) for the current Fire Station #11 was $52,468 and the average maintenance costs for the newly constructed FS #14 for the same period of time was $83,435. Energy costs in 2013 for FS#11 were $22,213 ($1.57 per square foot) and were $24,753 ($1.73 per square foot) for Fire Station #14.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

The intended life of a new facility should be at least 75 years with a small incremental capital investment starting at approximately the 10th year of operations and with major building systems replacement starting in the 25th year of operation.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	10	0	0	10
Design Engineering/Architects	390	60	50	0	0	500
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	200	0	0	200
Information Technology	0	15	50	0	0	65
Construction Costs	0	1,625	2,400	0	0	4,025
Project Management	53	44	45	0	0	142
Contingency	0	75	435	0	0	511
City Administration	22	91	160	0	0	273
Total Expenses with Admin	465	1,910	3,350	0	0	5,725

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

LIVING WELL: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy, and uniquely inviting

A CITY THAT WORKS: CITY GOVERNMENT RUNS WELL AND CONNECTS TO THE COMMUNITY IT SERVES
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer –focused

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

The Project has not yet been submitted into the Location and Review process. Staff from the Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) department have been assigned to this project and will assist in the identification of appropriate re-use opportunities for the historic building on the proposed site as well as the redevelopment of the current FS#11 for private use.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The project currently does not have any partners.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The project does not include any cost for acquiring property at this time as it is City-owned.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The project timing is dependant upon the relocation of the current Public Works operation. Staff plans on proceding with the design of the new station.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The current fire station has redvelopment potential and will be marketed for redevelopment by the Community

Planning and Economic Development (CPED) department.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Fire Station No. 1 Renovation and Expansion **Project ID:** FIR12

Project Location: 530 South 3rd Street
City Sector: Downtown
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2018
Project Start Date: 3/1/18
Submitting Department: Fire Department
Contact Person: Greg Goeke

Affected Wards: 3
Affected Neighborhood(s): Downtown West
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 1 of 2
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-2706
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

This project would provide for the comprehensive renovation and expansion of Fire Station #1 at its current location.

Purpose and Justification:

Fire Station #1 (built in 1908 and remodeled in 1963) is a traditional two-story brick building with a partial basement and two apparatus bays, and living space. The building has a significant amount of deferred capital maintenance as the long term plan called for its eventual replacement. This building currently houses Engine #1 and the “on shift” Duty Deputy. Strategic Planning called for this station to be replaced as part of serving (an every growing) downtown population and redevelopment potential.

In 2003, Fire Station #10 closed (19 Fourth Street North, now Police Precinct #1) and the Fire Department staff was transferred to Fire Station #6 (near the Convention Center) with the goal of replacing Station #1 with a larger station that would accommodate the staffing and equipment needs for higher density residential housing and large scale commercial structures. The thought at the time (as well as today) is the downtown and adjacent neighborhoods can be served with two larger stations at the outer edges of the central commercial district.

With two downtown locations (vs. three) the numbers of calls/responses by Fire Station 1 has risen dramatically over time (from 979 responses in 1993 to 3,339 responses in 2013) (241% increase). Response times from this location meet the Department's response time performance goals. The current location has good access points to the existing transportation routes and therefore the project would renovate and expand at the current location.

Station #1 would be expanded into a multifunctional station with the addition of specialized equipment, personnel, and administrative staff. The addition/expansion to the current station would include new apparatus bays for an Engine Company, Mobile Command, Ladder Company, and the Duty Deputy; this would be in conjunction with redesigning the original building to relocated Fire Headquarters (out of City Hall). Placing Fire Headquarters at Station #1 will remove the physical separation of fire suppression and administrative operations, providing more growth for leadership opportunities and better continuity for daily operations. In addition, with this consolidation of services, it will also contribute to providing a more expansive relationship with the downtown community.

In order to keep Fire Service operating (during the project) the expansion would be built first and then the original structure would be renovated for its new intended use.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	500	3,000	3,000	6,500
Totals by Year	500	3,000	3,000	6,500

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Grant and other non-City funding have not been applied for at this time. Even though the building is old it may not be seen as architecturally or historically significant.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 75

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 60,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

It is anticipated that the additional square footage would cost $6.00 per square foot to maintain and provide utilities for. Without a completed design it is anticipated that the new addition will be 10,000 square feet. Therefore an additional $60,000 of expense is anticipated for the future. The Fire Department would be vacating space in City Hall that can be used by other departments, thus reducing the operating impact by the City leasing less space.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Through a due diligence assessment, all capital, planning/zoning, ADA and functional needs will be identified that will improve the facility for the next 30 years of life while meeting the operational needs of the Fire Department.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	200	125	50	0	0	375
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	125	0	0	125
Information Technology	1	12	12	0	0	25
Construction Costs	100	2,500	2,500	0	0	5,100
Project Management	75	75	25	0	0	175
Contingency	100	145	145	0	0	390
City Administration	24	143	143	0	0	310
Total Expenses with Admin	500	3,000	3,000	0	0	6,500

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the ability of the Fire Department to provide services to the public—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

LIVING WELL: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life
- All neighborhoods are safe, healthy, and uniquely inviting

A CITY THAT WORKS: CITY GOVERNMENT RUNS WELL AND CONNECTS TO THE COMMUNITY IT SERVES
- Decisions bring City values to life and put City goals into action
- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer –focused

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED
- The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

The Project has not yet been submitted into the Location and Review process. Staff from the Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) department have been assigned to this project to assist in determining historic preservation status as well as guide the disucssion of development potential in this part of the downtown.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The project currently does not have any partners.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Cost estimates are not based on an actual design. The project does not include any cost for acquiring property at this time. The estimates will be updated at time of an acquisition and at the completion of schematic design.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The project is planned to be constructed as a single project over a two-year period.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The existing Station #1 is 106 years old, even though the block is ready for large scale development, including the current Fire Station into a development project may be a financial burden that would impede a normally viable project. The location works well for the Fire Department in delivery services so it seems logical to include the current station, make it multi-purpose by including a small expansion, and keep continuity of Fire service throughout the project. Community, Planning and Economic Development staff is engaged in the final staff recommendation as to renovate and expand at the current site or relocate to better accomodate development of the parcel.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Hamilton School Acquisition & Facility Improvement Project ID: MPD03

Project Location: 4119 Dupont Avenue North
City Sector: North
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2013
Project Start Date: 3/1/14
Submitting Department: Police Department
Contact Person: Greg Goeke

Affected Wards: 4
Affected Neighborhood(s): Webber-Camden
Estimated Project Completion Date: 3/31/16
Department Priority: 01 of 01
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-2706
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $900,000

Project Description:

The project is envisioned to acquire and improve Hamilton School, located at 4119 Dupont Avenue North, for the long term needs of the Police Department.

Purpose and Justification:

The Police activities which are currently operating out of Hamilton School need a permanent home. The City has leased the former Hamilton Elementary School, from the Minneapolis Public Schools, since December 1, 2006 for the needs of the Police Department. The Police utilize the facility for In-Service training, Cadet training, Weapons/Gangs Investigations, Reserves, Special Operations, SWAT, Community Engagement, and the Police Athletic League.

Hamilton School (approximately 51,000 square foot in size) was shuttered for several years by the School District until the City occupancy begin in late 2006.The MPLS School Board has been requested (by City staff) to officially declare the facility as excess inventory and with the intent to sell the building at the end of the lease. The City has negotiated first right of refusal on a purchase during the term of the lease. The facility has reasonably met the needs of the Police on an interim basis and the Police would like for the City to own the facility so long term capital investment could be considered. Many of the major building systems are original to the building and would need replacement for long term occupancy.

The cost to purchase and renovate this building will be significantly less than siting a new location and designing and constructing new. To design and construct a comparable building would cost approximately $240 a square foot (total of $12 million) on top of the cost to acquire a property (potentially through eminent domain), mitigate existing pollution, and reduce property tax revenue. Long term the cost of real estate ownership is less than renting. Also, there are few rental options that would meet the operational needs of the Police Department.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,000	2,000	1,000	4,000
Totals by Year	1,000	2,000	1,000	4,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

City Staff has not applied for any grant or other non-City funding for this project.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (162,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the

department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

Expenses will decrease annually through the reduction of rent in the amount of $156,000 and utilities in the amount of $12,000, for a total of $162,000 annual cost savings. The current electric and natural gas costs for the building were $79,423 for 2013. It is anticipated that with capital investment in new building systems that the costs will decrease by 15% per year.

For the most part, daily maintenance is addressed by City staff, as City expense. Break and fix maintenance is extremely high for the facility due to lack of capital investment, which is not in the best interest of City taxpayers (regardless of ownership) (City or Schools).
Current expenditures for maintenance have not kept pace with need. Therefore it is anticipated operating costs will increase significantly without capital investment in the near future.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Through a due diligence assessment, all capital, planning/zoning, ADA and functional needs will be identified that will improve the facility for the next 30 years of life while meeting the operational needs of the Police Department.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	150	50	0	0	0	200
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	150	40	0	0	0	190
Information Technology	15	0	0	0	0	15
Construction Costs	1,500	775	0	0	0	2,275
Project Management	40	40	0	0	0	80
Contingency	50	47	0	0	0	97
City Administration	95	48	0	0	0	143
Total Expenses with Admin	2,000	1,000	0	0	0	3,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project will provide for a permanent home for valuable Police resources and the services provided from the facility-in furtherance of the following City Goals.

A CITY THAT WORKS: CITY GOVERNMENT RUNS WELL AND CONNECTS TO THE COMMUNITY IT SERVES
• Decisions bring City values to life and put City goals into action
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer –focused

GREAT PLACES: NATURAL AND BUILT SPACES WORK TOGETHER AND OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs
• We sustain resources for future generations: reducing consumption, minimizing waste and using less energy

By improving the facility the Police Department will be able to efficiently deliver services to the public by leveraging staff for differing needs

Capital investment will also improve the long term cost of ownership.

The playfield on the north end of the site is utilized for the Police Athletic League as well as Park and neighborhood uses. The site also has a "tot lot" for pre-school age children.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This project is consistent with the following policy and implementation steps of The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth:

Public Services and Facilities: Through sound management and strategic investments, Minneapolis will maintain and develop public services and facilities that promote health, safety and an enhanced quality of life for all members of this growing community.

Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.
5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.
5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.
5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.
Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.4.4 Encourage the creation of special service districts downtown and in other business districts in order to enhance streetscapes, provide security services, and maintain the public realm.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.
6.3.1 Encourage developments to implement sustainable design practices during programming and design, deconstruction and construction, and operations and maintenance.
6.3.5 Support the development of sustainable site and building standards on a citywide basis.
6.3.9 Develop regulations to further reduce the heat island effect in the city by increasing green urban spaces for parks and open spaces, including shading of parking lots, sidewalks and other impervious surfaces, promoting installation and maintenance of green roofs and utilization of highly reflective roofing and paving materials.
6.3.10 Promote climate sensitive site and building design practices.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

The Project has not completed a Location and Design review at this time. Staff has been in contact with the Planning and Zoning staff as to long term plans for the facility and site.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The City currently houses the Police Athletic League and plan on improving spaces in the building to enhance and

expand the program. The Alocohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) agency of the federal government also staff officers at this location to assist the Police Department. The Minneapolis Public Schools has cooperated with the City in its current lease arrangement and is interested in making final determination for the future of the property. If deemed unneeded, the School District benefits by disposing of an excess property; the advantage to the City is the more cost effective solution of renovating an existing building as opposed to building new and potentially reducing property tax income.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The overall estimated costs to improve the property are for budgetary purposes at this time. The estimated costs will be updated at the completion of the desing and cost estimating phase of the project. The project does not include any costs for acquiring the property at this time. An appraisal was conducted in 2013 by the Minneapolis School Board and is being revised to reflect current market value. The project budget does not include relocation of the City Regulatory Services staff as this will be necessary to meet the space needs of the Police Department.

The City is completing its due diligence in order for the acquisition to be completed prior the end of the lease. Flexibility on capital improvement spending will be dependent on the scale and magnitude of the building systems that are in need of replacement and the extent in which spaces need to be modified to meet the Police departments needs.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The project would be completed in phases. Due dilligence efforts are underway. The first efforts are completing a 1) facility audit to determine deferred capital maintenance needs, 2) to identify any conditional use permitting or capital investment needed to meet Planning and Zoning requirements , 3) complete a schematic design for functional improvement requirements for long term Police use, and 4) update real estate appraisals to determine the fair market value of the property. The combined effort would be considered “due diligence” research prior to acquiring the property. Assuming the City and School Board wish to proceed, staff would negotiate and execute a purchase agreement and close on the property. Upon planned ownership by the City, design, bidding and phased constructioon will follow accordingly.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The current lease and utilization of Hamilton School has been a successful partnership for the community and have strategically located and efficiently utilized police resources.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Traffic Maintenance Facility Improvement **Project ID:** PSD15

Project Location: 300 Border Avenue North
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan:
Project Start Date: 1/1/14
Submitting Department: Other Departments
Contact Person: Chirs Backes

Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 6/30/18
Department Priority: 1 of 2
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3774
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $910,062

Project Description:

The scope of the project is to replace the heating, ventilation, air conditioning (HVAC), ceilings and lighting, electrical distribution, life-safety systems, and ADA deficiencies for the building. The project is envisoned to be done in two phases.

Purpose and Justification:

The Traffic Maintenance facility is home to the Public Works Traffic Management and Maintenance staff responsible for street and signal lighting, traffic markings and signage, and overall traffic management strategies. The facility is home to the new multi-million dollar traffic management system.

The Traffic Maintenance facility is approximately 63,700 square feet on two levels. Of the total square footage approximately 20,000 is for vehicular storage, 22,000 is shop/repair, 11,000 is parts storage/inventory and the remainder is office and meeting space. The Traffic Maintenance facility was built in two phases, the original in 1961 and the north addition in 1970.

The majority of the building systems are original to the construction of the building and have far exceeded their intended life. The systems are not energy efficient and are basically obsolete. HVAC components have begun to fail, primarily during the summer months.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2017	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	500	2,500	3,000
Totals by Year	500	2,500	3,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Grants or other non-City funding has not been secured for this project. This project will qualify for rebates from Xcel and Centerpoint Energy.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (45,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

In 2013, the City spent $221,827 to maintain and clean the facility. The City also spent $77,270 for utilities.

Renovated buildings have more complex mechanical, electrical, and life-safety systems than those that were original to the building. The advantage is that the systems provide for a healthier and safer environment for the City staff. Although the systems are more energy efficient (approximately 30%) the savings are offset by bringing more fresh

air, exhausting harmful pollutants, and controlling temperature and humidity with more precision. Similarly, having the maintenance savings (fewer break-down repairs) of having new systems is offset by having more systems to maintain. The larger savings is the cost avoidance of complete system failure that would require relocation of staff until the problem is resolved.

The end result is there will not be significant operational savings with the systems.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Due to imminent failure of the the HVAC system the first phase of the renovation is underway. Due to needed repairs, design started in late 2013 and construction should take place in summer and fall 2014. Upgraded building systems should have a 30 year life span.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	150	100	0	250
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	25	0	25
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	250	1,900	0	2,150
Project Management	0	0	50	50	0	100
Contingency	0	0	26	306	0	332
City Administration	0	0	24	119	0	143
Total Expenses with Admin	0	0	500	2,500	0	3,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

GREAT PLACES:
• The city's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A CITY THAT WORKS:
• City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer-focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Policy 5.4 Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's Infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.
5.4.3 Prioritize capital improvements according to an objective set of criteria consistent with adopted goals and policies, including those of The Minneapolis Plan.
Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design)

standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project has not yet gone through a Location and Design Review process.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

There are no apparent partners for this project.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Project is scalable but is planned to be completed in two phases. Current phase is underway.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

NA

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Investment in this facility has been deferred due to the potential for large scale sports facilities being studied as an option for this area of the City. With the Metrodome site being redeveloped and the large investment in the new Traffic Management System at the current site it would seem that this location and site will be the long term home for this operation.

Investment in the building is also an investment in the efficiency and effectiveness of the staff working at this location.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Farmer's Market Improvements **Project ID:** PSD16

Project Location: 300 Lakeside Avenue
City Sector: Multiple
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 10/1/13
Submitting Department: Other Departments
Contact Person: Greg Goeke

Affected Wards: Various
Affected Neighborhood(s): North Loop
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/20
Department Priority: 2 of 2
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-2706
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $50,000

Project Description:

The project is to make capital improvements to the market site to improve flow, function and safe operation of the site, address ADA deficiencies, to increase the number of vendors stalls available to promote Homegrown Minneapolis participation, and to weatherize a portion of the stalls for extended (if not year round) season service.

Purpose and Justification:

The Minneapolis Farmer's Market is an important local and regional asset. The Market is nationally recognized and is often rated amongst the top ten markets in the country. The market, with the exception of replacing the shed roofs and painting, has remained in its basic form for its 75 years of existence. The current structure was constructed for a wholesale activitity versus the retail format that exists today. Also, improved facilities and site may provide for an opportunity to host special events both during and after market hours.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	50	50	50	500	500	250	1,400
Totals by Year	50	50	50	500	500	250	1,400

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Grant or other non-City funding has not been secured for this project. Several grants and private sources of revenue have supproted the operation of the market but not capital improvements.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 25,000

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

It is anticipated that any increase in operating costs will be funded through higher rental fees paid by the growers.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Any growth is the capital infrastructure will have a projected minimum life of 25 years prior to renovation or replacement.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Design Engineering/Architects	40	40	20	10	0	110
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	5	25	30
Information Technology	0	0	0	5	25	30
Construction Costs	0	0	400	400	150	950
Project Management	7	7	35	35	20	104
Contingency	1	1	21	21	18	62
City Administration	2	2	24	24	12	64
Total Expenses with Admin	50	50	500	500	250	1,350

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Living Well:

- Our neighborhoods have amentities to meet daily needs and live a healthy life.
- The City is growing with density done well

One Minneapolis:

- All people have access to quality essentials, such as housing, education, food, child care and transportation

A hub of economic activity and innovation:

- Infrastructure, public services and community assests support businesses and commerce

A City that works:

- Departments work seemlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.
5.1.3 Work with all partner agencies, including City departments, to ensure that facility planning is consistent with the land use policies of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.
5.4.1 Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.

Policy 5.7: Protect and improve individual, community, and environmental

health.
5.7.1 Support the health of individuals through direct services, initiatives, research, and advocacy.
5.7.3 Promote nutrition using strategies to ensure access to healthy foods for all residents.

Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
6.1.2 Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project has not yet been submitted for a Location and Design Review process.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Central Minnesota Vegetable Growers Association (Business Process Improvement) (design review and input)
HomeGrown Minneapolis (locally grown and processed foods)
Hennepin County (Electronic Benefits Transfer program)

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Funding and project delivery is flexible at this time. Capital Improvements need to be completed during the off-season for the market. The overall scope and plan for the project yet to be finalized.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The City has hired a consultant to develop a vision of the market for the future. The report is to be completed in 2014.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

With resident population growing in the Downtown and North Loop neighborhoods, the customer base is growing. Also, with the Southwest light rail transit line (and transit station) to be located in the area, access to a larger population within the City and region is envisioned. A higher density mixed development growth is envisioned for the properties adjacent to the market that will make the economic potential for an extended (or year round) market more viable.

In order to keep the Market vibrant and competitive, the City needs to create a long term vision and capital improvement plan to support a larger, local grower base as well as value added processors that support local food and job growth.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: New Solid Waste & Recycling Facility **Project ID:** PSD17

Project Location: 2710 Pacific Avenue North (current)	**Affected Wards:** 5
City Sector: North	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** Hawthorne
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan:	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 12/31/17
Project Start Date: 3/1/14	**Department Priority:** 1 0f 1
Submitting Department: Public Works	**Contact Phone Number:** 612-673-2706
Contact Person: Greg Goeke	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $0

Project Description:

The project will design and construct a new facility (on a new site) to support the long term operating needs of the Solid Waste and Recycling division of Public Works.

Purpose and Justification:

The current 2710 Pacific Avenue North location is the primary site for the City's internal Solid Waste and Recycling program. The site is a combination of one primary industrial building, a transfer station, fuel island, and auxilary buildings and functions. The main building is comprised primarily of shop space with service bays for on-site mechanics, storage areas for parts and supplies, as well as a two story office function which houses operations staff. The facility has had minimal investment since its inception in 1948, with the exception of a small addition in 1959 and a sizable addition on each side of the original building in 1968 of both the office and shop areas. The various additions to the building and operational changes over time have created inefficiencies and poor utilization of space.

The building has extensive capital maintenance needs that have been deferred, lacks elevator service and much of the facility is not code compliant. The building's outdated systems and deferred maintenance has led to energy inefficiencies that no longer meet today's standards for energy compliance and the building is no longer compliant for storm water separation ordinances, ADA and does not meet the functional needs of the department.

A physical condition assessment of the facility was completed in 2013 to identify and address all code issues (including ADA), deferred maintenance, and systems and building deficiencies, in order to bring the facility to current City standards. The assessment provided the scope of work and associated cost estimates required to modernize the facility. As a result of the survey it has been determined that the current site and building will require substantial investment and still not meet the current (or future) operational needs of the division. Therefore it has been determined to design and construct a new facility on a new site. By doing so it will also free up the current site for the "Above the Falls" park development.

The new site and building will also provide for the needed space (and equipment) to accomodate all Solid Waste and Recycling staff at one location and to expand service to include organics collection in the future. The new site and building would accomodate the use of Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) as a fueling option to be considered as the fleet is updated in the future.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	Totals by Source
Solid Waste Bonds	5,000	20,000	10,000	35,000
Totals by Year	5,000	20,000	10,000	35,000

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Grant or other non-City funding has not been secured at this time. There is potential for non-City contributions (or incentives) with a CNG fleet.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 75
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The project will need to be further developed to determine if there are any operating cost impacts. Project does not include the costs for a CNG fleet, these purchases would be part of a regular fleet replacement schedule. A decision to implement a CNG fleet has yet to be made by the City.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

The intended life of a new facility should be at least 75 years with a small incremental capital investment starting at approximately the 10th year of operations and with major building systems replacement starting in the 25th year of operation.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	1,500	0	0	0	0	1,500
Relocation Assistance	500	0	0	0	0	500
Design Engineering/Architects	1,500	750	350	0	0	2,600
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	1,200	0	0	1,200
Information Technology	10	12	0	0	0	22
Construction Costs	1,000	16,500	7,500	0	0	25,000
Project Management	100	135	125	0	0	360
Contingency	152	1,650	349	0	0	2,151
City Administration	238	952	476	0	0	1,667
Total Expenses with Admin	5,000	20,000	10,000	0	0	35,000

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Great Places:

- All Minneapolis residents, visistors, and employees experience a safe and healthy environment
- We sustain resources for future generations: reducting consumption, mnimizing waste and using less energy
- The City's infrastructure is managed and improved for current and future needs

A City That Works:

- City operations are efficient, effective, results-driven, and customer focused

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

This project has not gone through the Location and Design review process.

The current project has impacts to the long term "Above the Falls" park development plan. The date in which this site will need to be converted has yet to be determined.

Policy 1.14 Maintain Industrial Employment Districts to provide appropriate locations for industrial land uses.
1.14.1 Develop regulations for the Industrial Employment Districts that promote compatible industrial development and the efficient use of land.
1.14.2 Allow industrial uses outside of Industrial Employment Districts to transition over time to other uses.
1.14.3 Restrict the development and expansion of nonindustrial uses within designated Industrial Employment Districts, limiting non-industrial uses to the types of uses and locations designated in the Industrial Land Use and Employment Plan.

Policy 5.1 Coordinate Faclity Planning around City Departments and Public Institutions.
5.1.1 Encourage communication and coordination among city departments, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Minneapolis Public Schools to share use of facilities.
5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.
5.1.3 Work with all partner agencies, including City departments, to ensure that facility planning is consistent with the land use policies of The Minneapolis Plan.
5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.

Policy 5.4 Enhannce the safety, apprearance, and effectiveness of the City's Infrastructure.
5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet realistic timelines.

5.7 Protect and Improve individual, community, and enironmental health.
5.7.1 Support the health of individuals through direct services, initiatives, research, Farmers markets contribute to good nutrition by providing a source for healthy, locally-grown produce.
Chapter 5: Public Services and Facilities 5-9 City Council Adopted 10/2/09 and advocacy.

Policy 6.1: Integrate environmental, social and economic goals into decision-making processes at all levels.
Promote efficient use of natural and limited resources when renovating, constructing or operating city facilities and in general city operations.
6.1.3 Apply the city-adopted US Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards and the State of Minnesota Sustainable Building B3 Guidelines as tools for design and decision-making when developing, renovating or operating city facilities.
6.1.4 Invest in energy efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, controls and sensors that minimize emission and noise, use of renewable fuel sources, and utilization of best available control technology to minimize particulate emissions.
6.1.5 Continue to modify and improve processes to replace chemicals, vehicles, equipment, and fuels with safer alternatives to reduce emissions, noise and other pollutants resulting from city operations.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

This project has not gone through the Location and Design review process. Staff has engaged the staff of the Community Planning and Economic Development department to assist in the site evaluation and selection process.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The potential for a CNG fueling option may be a private-public partnership.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

The projected funding for this project is flexible and will be within the Solid Waste and Recycling financial direction (for the fund).

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

The goal for 2014 is to complete the site assessment/acquisition process.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

This proejct will free up land that will become part of the "Above the Falls" park development.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: 911 Telephone System Replacement **Project ID:** 91101

Project Location: City Hall/311 Backup Center	**Affected Wards:** All
City Sector: Citywide	**Affected Neighborhood(s):** City-Wide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2013	**Estimated Project Completion Date:** 5/1/15
Project Start Date: 1/1/13	**Department Priority:** 1 of 1
Submitting Department: Other Departments	**Contact Phone Number:** 612-673-5921
Contact Person: Heather Hunt	**Prior Year Unspent Balances:** $85,832

Project Description:

Replace the legacy E911 telephone system

The computerized E911 telephone system resides in City Hall (primary) and 311 (backup). The function of the system is to receive emergency calls from the public, process those calls, and dispatch police, fire and ambulance.

The system consists of two fully redundant 911 telephone switching computers with 42 computerized 911 Telephone Workstations. The system receives 911 calls over the Minnesota Emergency Services Network, a statewide program under the Minnesota Department of Public Safety. All 911 calls that originate in the geographic boundaries of Minneapolis, whether land wired telephones or wireless phones, are routed through an intricate and robust schematic developed in concert with the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB). When a 911 call is received by Minneapolis 911, the computer system supplies the location data of the caller to the 911 operator who then asks a series of specialized questions to determine the nature of the emergency. If the caller is not an English speaker, the call is immediately routed to an interpreter service who works in conference with the 911 operator. The call is then interfaced with the Computer Aided Dispatch System so that Minneapolis Dispatchers, along with Hennepin County and North Ambulance Paramedics can dispatch police, fire or ambulance to the emergency.

The system is designed to be fully redundant (a necessity for life-critical applications) and has backup call answering capacity at 311.

Purpose and Justification:

The City of Minneapolis is tasked with providing 911 services to residents and visitors. The 911 system is the single point of entry for citizens to gain access to emergency services. Minneapolis 911 answers an average of 1,300 911 calls each day. Each and every call is processed in accordance with the specific operational requirements of the Minneapolis Police and Fire Departments and North Memorial and Hennepin County Ambulance. 911 uses a comprehensive set of highly detailed operating procedures, designed for the best outcomes in our urban environment.

The existing E911 telephone system was installed in 2005. The life expectancy for such systems is 5 – 10 years. Through careful maintenance and timely, economical upgrades, the City has extended the life of this system and has realized an excellent investment.

As of May 31, 2015 the vendor will no longer support the system. In addition, the current software is reliant on retired Windows OS versions that are no longer commercially available. To provide uninterrupted 911 call answering services for the City, a new system must be in place by May 31, 2015. Replacing the system will alleviate the risk associated with operating a mission critical public safety application on an outdated and unsupported platform.

Even if the current system support could be extended, its architecture cannot support the new features that will be available for 911 such as video, automatic crash data, and text messaging: a staple of the deaf and hard-of-hearing community. As a city that values all people and provides first class services to its residents, we must be ready to incorporate these lifesaving technologies and accessibility features. We must be ready to take 911 to the next level in Minneapolis.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,075	975	2,050
Totals by Year	1,075	975	2,050

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 10
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	929	0	0	0	0	929
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	46	0	0	0	0	46
Total Expenses with Admin	975	0	0	0	0	975

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

City Goal: Living Well: Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life.

Providing 911 emergency response services to the community is a key governmental responsibility. The 911 Telephone System forms the link between Minneapolis citizens and the emergency responders (police, fire and ambulance). When seconds count, the 911 center is ready around the clock to provide this vital service to all callers. The technology must be kept current and well maintained to continue the capability to answer 911 calls. Every single resident, employee, business owner, and visitor of Minneapolis benefits from the 911 program. The program provides livability benefits not only for those who unfortunately find themselves in need of 911, but for their families, friends and neighbors who enjoy the enhanced quality of life that a safe community supported by an excellent emergency response system provides.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Public Safety

Watching over safety and security is a traditional function of government, and is especially important for achieving sustainable growth. Reducing crime and improving the perception of safety will affect the degree to which Minneapolis retains and attracts residents, jobs, and visitors.

Rapid response to emergencies is a function that calls upon all sectors of government. 911 is the first point of contact in the emergency response system. The collapse of the Interstate 35W bridge in 2007 demonstrated that first responders, such as the Minneapolis Fire Department, are critical to recovery and safety functions. As the “first, first responders,” 911 initiates all Police and Fire response. The Bridge response also highlighted the importance of maintaining an emergency operations plan and coordinating closely with other public safety agencies. 911 plays a key role in the notification of citizens and the implementation of the emergency operations plan.

Policy 5.6: Improve the safety and security of residents, workers, and visitors.

5.6.4 Maintain and enhance a public safety infrastructure that improves response time to police and fire calls, implements new technologies, provides operation and training opportunities and facilities, and improves communication among public safety agencies.

5.6.6 Maintain an Emergency Operations Plan by planning, acquiring equipment, and training for response to emergencies and disasters.

Policy 5.8: Make city government more responsive to the needs of people who use its services.

5.8.1 Ensure equal access to city services and contracts across the protected classes.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Our strategy includes increased collaboration across the region. 911 and the City of Minneapolis has and continues to examine every possibility for collaboration. Our close and current work with the nine-county Metro Emergency Services Board (MESB) to explore technology sharing opportunities presents the most comprehensive and cohesive effort yet towards regionalization of services. In early 2013, 10 Metro-area agencies formed a committee to jointly offer an RFP for a shared/hosted 911 call handling system. As a participant, Minneapolis may realize increased efficiency and improved service by sharing system procurement and administration. Once firm pricing is received, this proposal may be revised.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

A number of unconfirmed factors may influence the amount of funding needed for this project. This proposal reports the failsafe scenario that will best reduce risk and cost to the City of Minneapolis come May of 2015 in a worst case scenario (no other funding becomes available).

The current system was grant funded. We have learned that the grant scenario has changed and that grant funding will most likely not not be available for this project. Should grant funding become available, we will aggressively pursue any available dollars.

The most that could be spent on this project in a given year is estimated to be $975K.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a

new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Phases: Project definition and requirements QIV 2013; RFP issue and Review QIV 2014; Training and Installation QI 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The 911 Public Safety Answering Point is THE point of entry for emergency services for our citizens and visitors. The technology supporting this key government service must be modern, efficient, and unfailingly reliable. The current 911 Telephone System has reached its end of life and must be replaced.

The existing 911 telephone system was purchased with UASI grant funding in 2005. We have been advised that, due to progressively declining grant dollars, there is little likelihood of securing grant funding again for a project of this scope. Should federal or state grant funding or other funding sources become available, 911 will aggressively pursue them.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Art in Public Places **Project ID:** ART01

Project Location: City-wide
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2009
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: CPED
Contact Person: Mary Altman, Public Art Administrator

Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/15
Department Priority: 1 of 1
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-3006
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $1,170,000

Project Description:

Art in Public Places, which has been part of the City's Capital Improvement Program for over 30 years, integrates public art into City capital projects. The City annually contributes 2% of the net debt bond for public art projects. Current 2014 projects include the John Biggers Seed Project, a collaborative design effort engaging renowned African American artists in mentoring emerging artists, providing career development and transferable skills, and creating a sense of place that speaks to the culture of North Minneapolis. Other projects include an assessment and initial conservation of over a dozen of the City's historical sculptures, and Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction, a ten-block placemaking effort. Any City Department, Board or NRP group can propose a public art site.

Purpose and Justification:

The mission of Art in Public Places is to enrich the lives of local citizens and visitors by integrating public art into City planning, services, design and infrastructure. The goals of the program are to:
• Stimulate Excellence in Community Design: Public art improves the City's appearance and stimulates innovation and high quality design.
• Enhance Community Identity: Public art inspires discussion about issues affecting quality of life and builds pride in community and cultural heritage.
• Contribute to Community Vitality: Public artworks contribute to livability and vibrancy of public places and attract visitors.
• Involve a Broad Range of People and Communities: The process of developing public artworks builds the capacity of community organizations and leaders by involving them in the design of public space, which also fosters their support of public assets.
• Uses Resources Wisely: Well-maintained and well-designed public artworks add to the value of City infrastructure and provide opportunities for private investment in the community.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	Prior Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	2,091	545	405	425	465	640	4,571
Totals by Year	2,091	545	405	425	465	640	4,571

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

Unknown at this point as 2015 to 2019 projects are not yet selected and all additional fundraising is project-specific, however on average, most Art in Public Places projects leverage more than an 80 percent match in funding from other sources.

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing
What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 25
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 500

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

During design development for each public art project, a design assessment is conducted by an art conservator which estimates the annual maintenance costs, as well as the costs of periodic treatments, such as repainting. After this assessment, staff works with the artist to determine design changes which could decrease maintenance costs and make the artwork more durable. This process has resulted in a 67% decrease in maintenance costs since 2003. The above figure is based on the average annual cost of maintaining an artwork. Annual maintenance is funded and provided by CPED and other project partners. For example, about half of the maintenance of the three sculptural installations entitled "Luminous" at Oaks Station Place, is covered by management firm for the adjacent housing development.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

None

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	150	85	85	95	200	615
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	313	243	260	286	346	1,447
Project Management	56	58	60	62	64	300
Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Administration	26	19	20	22	30	118
Total Expenses with Admin	545	405	425	465	640	2,480

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

• All neighborhoods are safe, healthy and uniquely inviting: Through community and youth involvement, public art projects support safety efforts in high risk areas by increasing pedestrian traffic and public awareness and ownership of the site. The public art process engages local citizens in designing public spaces and thereby increases the pride and stake they have in those spaces. For example, the light sculptures and artist-designed backstop at Jackson Square Park have helped to activate a park that residents felt was very unsafe. All Art in Public Places projects are designed in consultation with local police and residents with regard to crime prevention through environmental design principles and vandalism prevention. Due to community ownership, public art projects are tagged with graffiti less frequently than other public properties.

• Residents and visitors alike have ample arts, cultural, entertainment and recreational opportunities: With a goal of working in each ward at least once every five years, Art in Public Places works with a range of City entities and community organizations to develop projects across the City, reaching all residents.

• Equitable systems and policies lead to a high quality of life for all: Art in Public Places was one of the first programs within the City to develop comprehensive policies for community engagement. These policies, approved by the City Council in 2007, proscribe a broad range of community involvement strategies tailored specifically to each project and to neighborhood and community needs.

• Residents are informed, see themselves represented in City government and have the opportunity to influence decision-making: Public art decision-making is overseen by the Minneapolis Arts Commission and its Public Art Advisory Panel, and both of these bodies include strong and diverse community representation. This includes project selection, design review, acceptance of gifts, conservation initiatives and removal of works of art. This decision-making is governed by policies that were developed by a task force with a broad-based membership of civic, arts and community leaders, and with extensive community engagement.

• The workforce is diverse, well-educated and equipped with in-demand skills: Public art commissions support the livelihood of local artists and other fabricators. The majority of artworks are fabricated and installed by Minneapolis artists and subcontractors. The John Biggers Seed project has a special focus on “closing the gap” in the public art field and building the careers of the next generation of African American artists. These artists are participating in the design and fabrication of a major North Minneapolis Gateway. With funding from the McKnight Foundation, they will receive one year of follow-up training in the public art profession, learning everything from how to develop scale drawings and models, to writing contracts and maintenance plans.

• Infrastructure, public services and community assets support businesses and commerce: Public artworks along Nicollet Mall help to market a thriving downtown, while others, celebrate the unique identity of participating neighborhoods, making them interesting places to visit and shop. One example of this is “Blossoms of Hope,” the flowering bus stop at Penn and Broadway avenues, which organizers hope will attract retail to the newly renovated 5 Points Building and surrounding area and act as a visible North Minneapolis gateway.

• Iconic, inviting streets, spaces and buildings create a sense of place: Public art projects celebrate the City and individual neighborhoods. Both the planning process and completed works engage residents in dialogue about City and neighborhood identity, history, geography and issues. Public art projects involve partnerships and collaborations across departments and communities. Each public art project includes extensive collaboration with a number of partners (CPED, MPRB, Public Works, neighborhoods, local non-profits, developers etc.) Underway is a project involving Public Works, the Lyndale and Kingfield neighborhoods and local businesses to integrate public art gateways and seating into south Nicollet Avenue and to enhance the image of this community corridor.

• Departments work seamlessly with each other and with the community and form strategic partnerships: Art in Public Places has had long standing collaborations with a number of departments, as well as the Park Board. Much of the program’s implementation and maintenance is managed collectively with Public Works and the Minneapolis Park Board (the majority of Art in Public Places projects are in the Right of Way or Park Board Property). For over a dozen year’s Public Works has assigned a staff person to be a liaison to the Public Art Administrator, to support a range of needs, from making generators and water available on project sites, to engineering review and concrete testing. Two Public Works engineers and one Park Board staff member serve on the Public Art Advisory Panel.

• Transparency, accountability and ethics establish public trust: The City’s public art policies and process focus on transparency, fairness, and ethical decision-making. Commissioning of artists is done through an open call process. Information, materials and panel comments are made available to all applicants. A hallmark of the Art in Public Places program is the City’s respect for artist’s copyrights. Meetings of the Public Art Advisory Panel and Arts Commission are open to the public, and artists and community members are frequently invited to present and share their viewpoints.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Policy 9.4.3 states “Fund public art with a portion of the annual net debt bond as part of the City’s annual Capital Long Range Improvement Plan.”

Art in Public Places regularly supports other policies of the Comprehensive Plan by partnering with City Departments and Boards to implement the Plan goals related to their activities. This includes chapters 2-Transportation, 3-Housing, 4-Economic Development, 5-Public Services and Facilities, 6-Environment, 7-Open Space and Parks, 8-Heritage Preservation and 10-Urban Design. “Sixth Avenue Stroll,” supports policy 8.12.5 “Provide educational activities, such as walking tours, to foster appreciation of Minneapolis’ history...” through a two-block open air gallery of bronze sculptures celebrating the historic homes of the Marcy Holmes neighborhood. By replacing the existing chain link fencing on the bridge spanning I94 at Highway 55 with artistic railing, the Seed project will help implement policy 2.3.6 “Provide creative solutions to increasing and improving pedestrian connectivity across barriers such as

freeways....”

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

April 17, 2008 - L&DR NRR; April 23, 2009 - CPC,COW, NRR. Review will also occur as needed as specific public art locations are identified.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Each public art project requires extensive collaboration with a number of partners, especially other City entities involved in capital projects (CPED, MPRB,Public Works, neighborhoods, local developers, etc.). Those partners invest portions of their construction budgets to support the development of the artwork and provide direct funding to the project. They also help to implement the project, provide easements, assist with community engagement and help to support ongoing maintenance. Over the last three-years Art in Public places co-developed 12 public art projects with 4 different City Departments and partnered with 13 outside non-profit organizations, neighborhood and businesses. On average every dollar spent by Art in Public Places leverages 80 percent support from another source, including funds through the Federal Transit Authority, the National Endowment for the Arts, McKnight Foundation, private developers, foundations and the Downtown Improvement District.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Funding to Art in Public Places support is generally the equivalent of 2% of the Net Debt Bond.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Project	Appropriation	Remaining	Year Funded	Completion
Administration	105,000	70,000		
Nicollet Avenue	160,000	150,000	2010	2015
Seed	300,000	200,000	2009	2014
Conservation	110,000	80,000	2013/2014	2014
Powderhorn Cons	100,000	100,000	2012	2014
Leaders Wall	25,000	25,000	2013	2014
Historical Cons	110,000	110,000	2013	2016
Morrison Cons	50,000	42,000	2011	2014
Sayles Belton	1,000	1,000	2013	2014
2014 Projects	392,000	392,000	2014	TBD
	1,577,000	1,170,000		

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

Public art is the most accessible cultural opportunity in the City. It's free of charge and can be experienced by all residents on their way to work and school. Its visual nature makes it understandable by many people, regardless of language or cultural barriers.

Minneapolis City of Lakes Capital Budget Request

Project Title: Public Safety Radio System Upgrade **Project ID:** RAD01

Project Location: City Hall, MECC, various remote secure locations
City Sector: Citywide
Initial Year in 5 Year Plan: 2015
Project Start Date: 1/1/15
Submitting Department: Other Departments
Contact Person: Heather Hunt/Rod Olson

Affected Wards: All
Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide
Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/19
Department Priority: 1 of 1
Contact Phone Number: 612-673-5921 or 612-673-5672
Prior Year Unspent Balances: $0

Project Description:

The City of Minneapolis owns and operates a subsystem of the statewide Allied Radio Matrix for Emergency Response (ARMER) system. ARMER was instrumental in assuring all responders to the I35-W Bridge Collapse could communicate with each other, and the system remains the lifeline for police, fire, and emergency medical services in the Metro Region as well as statewide. All police, fire and EMS services in the Metro use ARMER for their radio communications.

The system consists of (16) computerized radio workstation located in 911, and a series of computerized central electronics banks (CEB's) installed in a secured area of City Hall, and connected to microwave equipment in several local locations. The system operates as a subsystem of the Statewide Radio Network and provides radio system coverage and backup for the entire Metro area.

Purpose and Justification:

The existing radio system was installed in (2001). The life expectancy for such systems is (20) years. The City has a remaining debt of $4.045 million, out of an initial investment of $15.4 million.

The ARMER subsystem has three major system components: Radio Workstations "Consoles" (in 911), Infrastructure "Radio Tower equipment" (electronic controlling equipment) in various secure city locations, and End User Equipment (mobile and portable radios) in use by Police, Fire, and other city departments.

The city has received an "end of life notice" from the vendor, Motorola, with a date of (2018) for the Workstations. Upgrading the workstations will alleviate the risk associated with operating a mission critical public safety application on an outdated and unsupported platform.

In addition, changes to the system versions are under discussion at the Statewide Radio Board, and may result in a mandate to system users to upgrade or risk losing their interoperable communications capabilities. These changes will require upgrades to the Consoles, Workstations, first (most likely in 2015), and the Radio Tower Site Equipment Infrastructure secondly, (estimated 2018 timeline).

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2015	2018	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	1,700	6,000	7,700
Totals by Year	1,700	6,000	7,700

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

N/A

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? Existing

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 20
What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? 0

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

The City purchased the existing system on a 20-year bond issue. The city currently has $4.045 million of debt remaining to retire on the current system. The system is stable and could operate past 2018 before infrastructure change would be necessary, but because of changes to the statewide requirements, a plan must be in place to comply with mandated changes or risk losing interoperability. The workstations must be replaced regardless of system changes since they will reach end of life and they are the first step in the upgrade process.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

N/A

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	1,169	0	0	4,039	0	5,208
Information Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs	350	0	0	1,550	0	1,900
Project Management	50	0	0	50	0	100
Contingency	50	0	0	75	0	125
City Administration	81	0	0	286	0	367
Total Expenses with Admin	1,700	0	0	6,000	0	7,700

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

Living well; Minneapolis is safe and livable and has an active and connected way of life.

Providing clear communications to public safety responders is critical to the safety of all people in all areas of the City. Clear emergency communications are paramount to the health and well-being of all people in the City of Minneapolis and a necessity to all world class cities. Updating and keeping current with the ARMER system backbone requirements allows the City to remain interoperable (connected) with other public safety agencies which also keeps us prepared for disaster response and the expected growth of the City which will bring an increase to emergency responses.

Watching over safety and security is a traditional function of government, and is especially important for achieving sustainable growth. Reducing crime and improving the perception of safety will affect the degree to which Minneapolis retains and attracts residents, jobs, and visitors.

Rapid response to emergencies is a function that calls upon all sectors of government. 911 is the first point of contact in the emergency response system. The collapse of the Interstate 35W Bridge in 2007 demonstrated that first responders, such as the Minneapolis Fire Department, are critical to recovery and safety functions. As the “first, first responders,” 911 initiates all Police and Fire response, using the communications tools provided by the ARMER system. The Bridge response also highlighted the importance of maintaining an emergency operations plan and coordinating closely with other public safety agencies.

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Policy 5.6: Improve the safety and security of residents, workers, and visitors.

5.6.4 Maintain and enhance a public safety infrastructure that improves response time to police and fire calls, implements new technologies, provides operation and training opportunities and facilities, and improves communication among public safety agencies.

5.6.6 Maintain an Emergency Operations Plan by planning, acquiring equipment, and training for response to emergencies and disasters.

Policy 5.8: Make city government more responsive to the needs of people who use its services.

5.8.1 Ensure equal access to city services and contracts across the protected classes.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

N/A

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

The ARMER system is operated in collaboration with the State of Minnesota Department of Public Safety, as well as local and regional partners. The Minneapolis subsystem serves as a back site for Hennepin County.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

A number of unconfirmed factors may influence the amount of funding needed for this project. This proposal reports the failsafe scenario that will best reduce risk and cost to the City of Minneapolis in the event that no other funding becomes available. The City has moved to include state reimbursement funding for this project as part of the legislative agenda. Federal grant funding will be explored; resources in this area are in steady decline.

This proposal covers upgrades in two tiers:

1. Radio Workstations in 911
2. Infrastructure (“back room” equipment – controlling electronics)

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

Phases: Project definition and requirements QIV 2014; Training and Installation QII 2015.

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

The City must have a plan in place to ensure continued public safety communications interoperability.