

CITY OF RICHFIELD

MINNESOTA



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET AND PLAN

2020 - 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD	3
Capital Plan Process	4
Legal Framework	5
Document Organization	6
Capital Plan Summary	6
 SECTION ONE: GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	
Land Use	9
Housing	10
Transportation	12
Sustainability and Resiliency	12
Parks	13
Utilities	14
 SECTION TWO:	
FINANCING THE 2021-2024 CAPITAL PLAN	17
Special Revenue Funds	17
Industrial/Commercial Revenue Bonds	18
Capital Improvement Bonds	18
Federal & State Grants/County & Local Governments	18
Municipal State Aid	18
Tax Increment Financing	18
General Obligation Redevelopment Bonds	19
General Obligation Improvement Bonds	20
User Fees	20
General Obligation Bonds	21
Debt Policies for the City of Richfield	22
 SECTION THREE:	
Capital Improvement Budget & Plan Overview	25
Plan Summary - Estimated Costs and Funding Sources	26
Project Descriptions	36
Recreation and Open Space	37
Right of Way Improvements	57
Public Facilities	71

FORWARD

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

The specific objectives of CIB/CIP are:

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

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

CAPITAL PLAN PROCESS

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

CIB/CIP projects are identified through discussions of the city commissions and the City departments. From these discussions City staff compiles estimated costs, scope and potential funding sources for the projects.

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

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

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

The CIB/CIP, as recommended by the Planning Commission, is then returned to the Finance Director, formalized and submitted in summary form to the City Council as part of the current year proposed budget process.

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

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

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

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

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

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET/CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUMMARY

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

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

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

THIS PAGE WAS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

SECTION ONE

GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE RICHFIELD COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Comprehensive Plan is guided by a set of goals and policies that have their origins in both the 1997 and 2008 Comprehensive Plans. The goals and policies are focused on reflecting historical development patterns in Richfield, while helping position the City for the future. They represent the community's vision for future development, redevelopment and change. The framework for the goals and policies include:

- Committing to equitable opportunities for all.
- Emphasizing sustainability as a measure to ensure the future economic, environmental and social health of the community.
- Strengthening and enhancing the low density residential areas of the community.
- Maintaining a diversity of housing types and price ranges.
- Committing to a balanced multimodal transportation system.
- Providing quality parks and recreation areas that are well connected by trails.

This chapter brings forward each of the plan element's goals and policies. The goals are general statements Richfield hopes to accomplish in the future. The policies are specific statements and measurable strategies used to help achieve a goal. Combined, these statements provide the City direction and guidance for making future decisions.

LAND USE GOALS AND POLICIES

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

Policies:

- Establish a land use pattern and supporting infrastructure that preserves and enhances the ability of residents to make personal connections in their neighborhoods.
- Provide a full range of housing choices that contribute to vital and desirable neighborhoods that welcome diversity of age, race, and physical ability; while maintaining a comfortable small town atmosphere.
- Require site design and architectural characteristics that provide appropriate transitions between lower and higher intensity uses.
- Preserve historical, natural and cultural resources.
- Develop residential standards (scale, density, etc.) for redevelopment areas that create neighborhood character.
- Support and encourage commercial land uses that are diverse and responsive to their context.
- Maintain and provide quality amenities and a safe living environment.
- Establish land use policies that create a healthy, vibrant community of opportunity where low income people, peoples of color, new immigrants, and people with disabilities participate in and benefit from decisions that impact them.

Goal: Develop identifiable nodes, corridors and gateways throughout Richfield.

Policies:

- Facilitate an intense mixed pattern of regional and community-oriented land uses along regional corridor routes, such as I-494 and Cedar Avenue.
- Focus commercial and higher density residential development along major thoroughfares.
- Encourage a mix of uses that serve a market in and around the City in community commercial nodes.

- Encourage a mix of uses that serve surrounding local neighborhoods in neighborhood commercial nodes.
- Create meeting places in multiunit complexes to allow for interaction between its residents, and between its residents and surrounding neighbors.
- Improve gateways to create a visual means of welcoming people to the City.
- Integrate public art into public spaces when feasible.

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

Policies:

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

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

Policies:

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

HOUSING GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal: Maintain and enhance Richfield's commitment to housing maintenance, rehabilitation and redevelopment, resulting in an attractive, desirable and prosperous community.

Policies:

- Support the rehabilitation and upgrading of the existing housing stock.
- Support ongoing maintenance and upkeep of residential properties.
- Develop policies for naturally occurring affordable multi-family housing that encourage the maintenance and upgrading of aging apartment buildings, while maintaining affordability and preventing displacement of residents.
- Limit redevelopment of single-family neighborhoods into other uses except where such neighborhoods are directly adjacent to commercial areas or areas adversely affected by major roadways, the airport, or other major developments.
- Ensure that redevelopment and infill projects maintain the integrity of existing neighborhoods.
- Encourage the use of quality, durable building and landscaping materials to maintain a high-quality standard in residential development.
- Implement housing codes and support programs which lead to a housing stock that reflects the City's commitment to sustainability and healthy living.
- Support initiatives which help connect residents with their neighborhood and foster a sense of community, such as block groups, neighborhood clean-up days, and cultural activities.

Goal: Provide a full range of housing choices that meet residents' needs at every stage of their lives, and ensure a healthy balance of housing types that meet the needs of a diverse population with diverse needs.

Policies:

- Acknowledge and support the City's allocation of the region's need for affordable housing.
- Promote the development of a balanced housing stock that is available to a range of income levels.
- Encourage improvements to the housing stock to better serve families with children and seniors.
- Encourage the creation of "move-up" housing through new construction and home remodeling.
- Maintain an appropriate mix of housing types in each neighborhood based on available amenities, transportation resources and adjacent land uses.
- Promote additional housing diversity to serve families at all stages of their life-cycle through assistance, incentive programs, and the exploration of possible partnerships.
- Give priority to projects that meet the following criteria when considering proposals for market-rate, multi-family housing:
 - Located in transitional areas between single-family neighborhoods and commercial areas.
 - Offers a complementary size and style to the community.
 - Includes a mix of unit sizes and amenities.
 - Includes amenities to build community and encourage active lifestyles.
 - Offers a mix of residential and complementary commercial uses that embody and preserve the feel of the "Urban Hometown" in their design.
 - Offers flexibility in their design to accommodate market changes.
- Give priority to projects that meeting the following criteria when considering proposals for housing that include an affordable component:
 - Located in proximity to public transportation, job centers, schools and other amenities.
 - Dispersed evenly throughout the City.
 - Provides two and three-bedroom units (or larger).
 - Contains a mix of market-rate and affordable units, with a higher proportion of market-rate units.
 - Maintains affordability through the rehabilitation of existing, aging multi-family housing.
 - Includes attributes such as single-level living, low-rise developments, townhome style housing, shared community spaces, accessibility, and energy-efficient building systems.
- Give priority to projects that meet the following criteria when considering proposals for senior housing:
 - Includes lower-density senior housing.
 - Offers a continuum of care.
 - Offers geographic balance throughout the City.
 - Easily converts to serve other populations.
 - Identified as feasible based on a market survey.
 - Incorporates feedback from residents located near the proposed development.
 - Results in updates and upgrades to existing senior developments.
- Regularly review land use and zoning ordinances to ensure maximum opportunities for strengthening housing choices.
- Promote the development, management, and maintenance of affordable housing in the City through assistance programs, alternative funding sources, and the creation of partnerships whose mission is to promote low to moderate income housing.

TRANSPORTATION GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal: Improve pedestrian and bicycle travel in the City.

Policies:

- Embrace the City's Complete Streets Policy.
- Implement projects to improve connections as identified in the pedestrian and bicycle master plans, along with the Safe Routes to School Plan.
- Construct roadways to reduce vehicle speeding.
- Construct new sidewalks set back farther from the street for increased safety and accommodate winter maintenance operations.
- Utilize the existing right-of-way to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Create safe road crossings in high traffic areas.
- Bury parallel utility lines to provide safer corridors and accommodate space for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Goal: Explore opportunities to enhance mass transit systems.

Policies:

- Construct additional bus shelters attractive to users and safely located around intersections.
- Continue to work with Metro Transit to construct enhanced bus services.
- Work with existing groups and organizations to adequately meet the specialized transportation needs of seniors, youth, handicapped, and underprivileged citizens in the City.
- Promote mass transit options, such as bus rapid transit, to reduce dependence on automobiles and provide a diverse, balanced set of public transportation alternatives.
- Promote telecommuting and flex scheduling to reduce traffic.
- Identify or develop additional park-and-ride lots throughout the City to encourage transit ridership.

Goal: Improve regional and local mobility and safe access to the City.

Policies:

- Continue to work with MnDOT and the State Legislature to improve the operations of I-35W, I-494 and TH 62.
- Construct the extension of International Boulevard under TH 77.
- Consider roundabouts at major intersections.
- Preserve pavement condition on local streets.

SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCY GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal: Encourage the use of alternative energy sources and sustainable building practices.

Policies:

- Establish long-range energy/greenhouse gas emission reduction goals and commit to conducting an energy Action Plan or Climate Action Plan.
- Continue participating in the GreenStep Cities Programs to develop sustainable best practices.
- Become an innovator in the use of alternative fuels, wind power, and other sustainable energy sources.
- Install solar panels or similar energy sources on public buildings and encourage owners of businesses and private property owners to do the same.
- Encourage sustainable building practices.

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

Policies:

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

Goal: Encourage the use of alternative power sources for public vehicles.

Policies:

- Make fuel efficiency and alternative fuels a high priority when purchasing vehicles for use by the City.

Goal: Explore opportunities for policy change related to pollinator habitat protection, local food production and entrepreneurship, the promotion of healthy food retail, and waste reduction.

PARK SYSTEM GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal: Maintain and enhance Richfield's park system for today and tomorrow's residents.

Policies:

- Make facility improvements and lifecycle replacement based on demonstrated need. The City will evaluate recreation facility use prior to improvements or and at the end of a facility's lifecycle, and will determine at that time whether participation or use warrants replacement, conversion to an alternate uses, or removal.
- Preserve crucial public places like parks, recreation areas, open spaces, wetlands, and Wood Lake Nature Center.
- Provide all residents with access to parkland and trails within a walkable distance.
- Include criterion for all new park and facility improvements that improves sustainability of materials, energy use, operating cost and lifecycle replacement, and natural environmental impact.
- Incorporate best practices for stormwater retention in new park development and in the renovation of existing parks.
- Acquire park land on a willing seller basis. Where possible, the City will work to obtain a first right of refusal to purchase lands identified in this document.
- Prohibit tobacco use at all recreational facilities.
- Encourage parks to be naturalized with prairie grasses and pollinator-friendly plants, where suitable, to minimize maintenance costs and to beautify parks.

Goal: Provide recreational opportunities for all members of the community.

Policies:

- Provide all residents with access and the opportunity to be involved in recreation programs, regardless of age, culture and mobility level throughout the City.
- Provide adequate seating, shade, trail lighting and a trail loops of varying lengths in parks to encourage active living for an aging population.
- Provide public safety improvements as needed to ensure park and trail user's well-being. The City will utilize Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) strategies.
- Provide parks and recreation facilities that are handicap accessible consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines for Building and Facilities and universal design principles.

WASTE WATER GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal: Provide residents and businesses with affordable potable water that is safe and of high quality.

Policies:

- Provide adequate water services throughout the community and areas designated for redevelopment.
- Provide a low-maintenance, efficient water system that supplies the long-term needs of residents and businesses.
- Provide a minimal hydrostatic pressure of 50 psi.
- Selectively increase the size of pipes in the distribution system for areas within the City where low water pressures exist.

Goal: Work with surrounding communities to provide an assured source of water in case of emergencies.

Policies:

- Support an appropriate level of state funding for interconnections and other physical water system improvements to ensure water supply reliability, natural resource protection, and/or safety and security, including economic security, of the region and state.
- Investigate interconnection options with neighboring cities.
- Design and construct improvements to the water system that meet demands of redevelopment and for sufficient fire protection for the entire community.

Goal: Protect the groundwater supply from contamination.

Policies:

- Promote water conservation and sustainability by reducing water demand, reducing the waste of water, improving the efficiency of the existing system, and educating the public on water conservation.
- Conduct a water rate study to adopt a conservation rate structure that promotes water conservation.

SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal: Protect surface water quality by reducing the use of pesticides and chemical turf treatments that contribute to water pollution.

Policies:

- Demonstrate chemical treatment of surface waters as an innovative way to improve their quality and minimize their harm to the environment.

Goal: Provide a public education program to alert the public on the importance of protecting storm ponds from harmful pollutants and ensure the proper disposal of solid and liquid wastes.

Policies:

- Educate residents in responsible water quality management and ensure proper disposal of solid and liquid wastes.

Goal: Perform a regular maintenance program of existing storm drainage facilities, including sump, catch basin and retention basin cleaning, to protect private property from flood damage and maintain high water quality.

Policies:

- Design conveyance structures to accommodate a ten-year storm event and storage facilities to accommodate a one-hundred-year event.

- Eliminate illegal connections to the storm water system.

Goal: Explore innovative ways to improve the quality of surface water and evaluate the effectiveness of existing treatment methods at reasonable cost.

Policies:

- Research a variety of treatment methods to assess their effectiveness to improve water quality at a reasonable cost.
- Continue regular maintenance of storm ponds and drainage facilities to reduce damage to property and protect water quality.

SANITARY SEWER GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal: Provide high quality sanitary sewer service to the residents and businesses of Richfield in the most economical manner possible.

- Take all measures necessary to protect the capacity of the interceptor sewers that service the residents and businesses of Richfield.
- Place funding priorities on maintaining the existing municipal sanitary sewer system.
- Consider replacing old sanitary sewer pipe at the time of road reconstruction or redevelopment.
- Prepare a financial analysis prior to the reconstruction of any portion of the sanitary sewer system.
- Fund future sewer facility improvements identified in the Capital Improvements Plan.
- Determine who is responsible for the payment of reconstruction of sewer facilities will be made if insufficient capacity is available to serve the intensity of new development or redevelopment.

Goal: Provide sanitary sewer service that meets the requirements of the 2040 population and employment forecasts of the City.

- Make provisions to ensure sufficient sewer system capacity will serve the intensity of new development and redevelopment before final development approvals are granted by the City.
- Design trunk sewer expansions in relation to the proposed land use intensities outlined in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Goal: Take all necessary measures to maintain the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services Design Peak Hour to Average Daily Flow (P/A) Ratio of 2.5 to avoid paying an MCES surcharge.

Policies:

- Work with MCES staff to monitor the metered flows from the Richfield system.
- Continually monitor the sanitary sewer system to identify points of Inflow/Infiltration.
- Continue to eliminate points of Inflow/Infiltration to the sanitary sewer system on public property, and require the elimination of Inflow/Infiltration on private property.
- Periodically review and evaluate the sewer collection system, MCES treatment plant capacity, and the accuracy of metered flow data provided by MCES in relation to the confirmed community growth and development.
- Maintain operating efficiency, minimize sewage blockage, and reduce the potential for illness.
- Continue to improve the City's maintenance and inspection program.

SECTION TWO

SECTION TWO

FINANCING THE 2021 - 2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Richfield's planning for public improvements in the Capital Improvement Plan gives recognition both to community needs and to the City's ability to pay. A summary of each of the major revenue sources for the 2021-2024 Capital Improvement Plan is included below.

Source	Amount
Federal Funding	\$ 7,000,000
Municipal State Aid	2,360,000
State Bonding	12,000,000
State Grant	3,164,000
County	16,000,000
Local Grants	600,000
General Tax Levy	3,380,000
Issuance of Debt	32,300,000
Internal Funding	425,000
Special Revenues	2,575,000
Other Funding	16,670,000
User Fees	7,212,000
	<hr/>
TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS	<u>\$103,686,000</u>

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

The Special Revenue Fund consists of profits from the Richfield Liquor stores. These funds are used for Capital Improvement Plan projects in lieu of issuing general obligation bonds and paying interest on the bonds. This source of funding is the backbone of the City's "pay-as-you-go" policy. For three years beginning in 2017 and planned to conclude in 2019, the Municipal Liquor Fund will not be making transfers to the Special Revenue Fund. This is due to liquor funds being required to fund the remodeling of the three stores of the liquor operation and upgrade the HVAC system and signage at the south Lyndale Avenue store location. It is planned that the Municipal Liquor Fund will again transfer funds by ordinance to the Special Revenue in 2020. A history of the transfers from the Municipal Liquor Fund and the interest earned on those funds is included below.

Year	<u>SPECIAL REVENUE</u>		Total
	Liquor Profits	Interest Earnings	
2009	450,000	943	450,943
2010	450,000	878	450,878
2011	450,000	439	450,439
2012	450,000	314	450,314
2013	450,000	135	450,135
2014	450,000	321	450,321
2015	450,000	207	450,207
2016	99,500	721	100,221
2017	-	874	874
2018	-	2,128	2,128

INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL REVENUE BONDS

In past years, the City has issued Industrial/Commercial Revenue Bonds to finance development within the City. The Industrial/Commercial Revenue Bond or tax exempt notes are placed in the name of the City to promote economic development and increase the tax base of the City. The proceeds of the bonds or notes are used to purchase plants and equipment. The bonds are repaid from the payments of the Industrial/Commercial Company.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS

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

FEDERAL AND STATE GRANTS/COUNTY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

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

MUNICIPAL STATE AID

The State of Minnesota provides funds for both construction and maintenance of certain streets in Richfield. The policy of the City is to finance traffic control improvements, and to partially finance street improvements, with municipal state aid construction funds. The state aid maintenance funds are used for designated maintenance purposes. With the completion of improvements on municipal state aid roadways, construction funds may be transferred to maintenance. The most recent annual allotment of these funds to the City of Richfield total approximately \$1,670,933 of which \$315,000 is for maintenance and \$1,355,933 for construction.

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING

The State Housing and Redevelopment Act has established a method of financing improvements in a renewal area. This statute enables a local Housing and Redevelopment Authority or City to finance redevelopment activities and public improvements through a tax increment program, without federal assistance and without additional burdens on the community's tax dollar. Since 1975, the City has created twenty-nine tax increment districts. The tax increment receipts are used to pay the debt service on the City's General Obligation Redevelopment Bonds and to fund redevelopment activities such as land acquisition, relocation and demolition. Remaining debt service on General Obligation Redevelopment Bonds as of December 31, 2019 is shown below.

GENERAL OBLIGATION REDEVELOPMENT BONDS
SCHEDULE DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

12/31/19
ANNUAL PAYMENTS

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PRINCIPAL</u>	<u>INTEREST</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>UNPAID PRINCIPAL</u>
				\$4,220,000
2020	745,000	128,321	873,321	3,475,000
2021	760,000	107,430	867,430	2,715,000
2022	790,000	84,528	874,528	1,925,000
2023	815,000	56,772	871,772	1,110,000
2024	850,000	24,256	874,256	260,000
2025	260,000	3,738	263,738	-
	<u>\$4,220,000</u>	<u>\$405,045</u>	<u>\$4,625,045</u>	

General Obligation Improvement Bonds

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

The City has \$48,460,000 of G. O. Improvement bonds outstanding as of December 31, 2019. Annual debt service requirements for the bonds are shown below.

GENERAL OBLIGATION IMPROVEMENT BONDS
SCHEDULED DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

12/31/19
ANNUAL PAYMENTS

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PRINCIPAL</u>	<u>INTEREST</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>UNPAID PRINCIPAL</u>
				\$48,460,000
2020	2,545,000	1,352,312	3,897,312	45,915,000
2021	2,800,000	1,256,979	4,056,979	43,115,000
2022	2,855,000	1,179,191	4,034,191	40,260,000
2023	2,935,000	1,098,299	4,033,299	37,325,000
2024	3,035,000	1,013,119	4,048,119	34,290,000
2025	3,130,000	925,148	4,055,148	31,160,000
2026	3,210,000	838,774	4,048,774	27,950,000
2027	3,300,000	753,398	4,053,398	24,650,000
2028	3,395,000	664,936	4,059,936	21,255,000
2029	2,955,000	579,323	3,534,323	18,300,000
2030	1,960,000	511,479	2,471,479	16,340,000
2031	2,035,000	455,378	2,490,378	14,305,000
2032	2,080,000	396,837	2,476,837	12,225,000
2033	2,130,000	335,863	2,465,863	10,095,000
2034	2,070,000	274,250	2,344,250	8,025,000
2035	1,980,000	214,025	2,194,025	6,045,000
2036	1,695,000	159,119	1,854,119	4,350,000
2037	1,490,000	112,294	1,602,294	2,860,000
2038	1,530,000	66,856	1,596,856	1,330,000
2039	980,000	26,813	1,006,813	350,000
2040	350,000	5,250	355,250	
	<u>\$48,460,000</u>	<u>\$12,219,643</u>	<u>\$60,679,643</u>	

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

USER FEES

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

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

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

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

The City's current bond rating is AA+ bond rating from Standard and Poor's for issues since 2010 and Aa2 rating on issues from Moody's Investor Services prior to 2010. The ratings from both services are excellent ratings for a suburban community like Richfield. The City's adjusted net tax capacity value on real and personal property for pay 2019 is \$33,767,365, including the value base obtained from the Metropolitan Area Fiscal Disparity Program. The City may issue general obligation bonds equal to a debt limit of 3% of market value of taxable property. Although the present total bonded debt is \$57,315,000, not all of this is applicable to the debt limit.

COMPUTATION OF LEGAL DEBT MARGIN

Market Value of Taxable Property			\$3,421,012,095
Debt Limit 3% of Market Value of Taxable Property			\$ 102,630,362
Amount of Debt Applicable to Debt Limit:			
Total Bonded Debt		\$65,640,000	
Less:			
Redevelopment Bonds	\$4,220,000		
Special Assessment Bonds	488,000		
Water Revenue Bonds	5,125,000		
Sewer Revenue Bonds	1,080,000		
Storm Sewer Revenue Bonds	6,755,000	\$17,668,000	
Total Debt Applicable to Debt Limit			\$ 47,972,000
Legal Debt Margin			\$ 54,658,362

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

COMPUTATION OF DIRECT AND OVERLAPPING DEBT

Jurisdiction	Net Debt Outstanding	Percentage Applicable to City of Richfield	Amount Applicable to City of Richfield
City of Richfield	\$ 52,806,152	100%	\$ 52,806,152
Hennepin County	\$ 1,056,890,798	2.00%	\$ 21,137,816
ISD #280, Richfield, MN	134,390,184	70.39%	94,597,251
Hennepin Suburb Park District	43,575,708	2.80%	1,220,120
Hennepin Regional RR Authority	24,600,380	2.80%	688,811
Metropolitan Council	75,902,689	.94%	721,076
	\$ 1,335,359,759		\$ 118,365,072
Total	\$ 1,388,165,911		\$ 171,171,224

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

DEBT POLICIES

I. Debt Limits

a. Legal Limits:

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

b. Policy Limits:

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

c. Financial Limits:

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

II. Use of Variable Rate Debt and Derivatives

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

III. Debt Structuring Practices

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

IV. Debt Issuance Practices

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

V. Debt Management Practices

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

VI. Updates of Policy

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

SECTION THREE

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET & PLAN

OVERVIEW

The final CIB/CIP document reflects a wide ranging group of projects which are designed to meet the most pressing capital needs of the community. The 2020 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB) along with the 2021-2024 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as generated by the City Manager is presented to a meeting of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission then reviews the CIB/CIP for conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Upon approval by the Planning Commission, the CIB/CIP is returned to the City Manager. The City Manager then incorporates the CIB/CIP into the 2019 Revised/2020 Proposed Budget, to be considered by the City Council.

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

2020 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB)

The 2020 Capital Improvement Budget (CIB) reflects funding for numerous projects throughout the city. In 2020 construction will be finalized on both the 66th Street reconstruction project and the Lyndale Avenue reconstruction project. In addition, 2020 will be the final year of the City's six year mill and overlay program.

The CIB also includes funding for several utility projects including the second year of the city wide water meter replacement program, the rehabilitation of water mains under I-35W and 65th Street, sanitary sewer main lining, dredging of storm water ponds, and the rehabilitation of storm water collection mains and manhole structures.

Finally, the 2020 CIB recommends projects totaling \$450,000 of Special Revenue funding. The funding will be used for park maintenance projects, building repair for community center and Wood Lake Nature Center buildings and the replacement of park play feature equipment in three separate parks. In addition, \$3,680,000 is budgeted for the Ice Arena Refrigeration project. Funding for this project will be provided by prior year's special revenue funds and internal funding from a park capital project fund. Finally, in formulating the City Manager's 2020 CIB within the available funding, it was necessary to defer or reduce funding for some projects.

2021-2024 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Over the next several years, most major arterial roads in the City will be reconstructed or improved. The 65th Street reconstruction project along with construction work on the 77th Street Underpass is planned to commence in 2021. The reconstruction of 69th Street is planned for 2023, followed by 70th Street in 2024, followed by 76th Street West, Humboldt Avenue & Lakeshore Drive, Penn Avenue and Nicollet Avenue sometime after 2024.

Finally, the recommended CIP includes the, funding to continue major park maintenance and upgrades of City parks, the replacement of the City's rolling stock and technology equipment, and the continuation of several projects that involve all three of the City's utility operations.

Other Considerations

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

PLAN SUMMARY

ESTIMATED COSTS
AND
FUNDING SOURCES

2020
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET
&
2021-2024
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

2020 Capital Improvement Budget

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE		
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE			
Park Maintenance/Wood Lake Fence Repair	\$	50,000	R
Community Center/Wood Lake Building Repair		50,000	R
Augsburg Park Play Equipment		180,000	R
Madison Park Play Equipment		85,000	R
Washington Park Play Equipment		85,000	R
Ice Arena Refrigeration Project		280,000	R
		3,400,000	I
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$	4,130,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT			
66th Street Reconstruction	\$	1,992,040	M
		756,870	I
Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction		3,000,000	B
		212,070	M
Pedestrian Improvements		40,000	M
Bicycle Improvements		40,000	M
Mill and Overlay Program		3,250,000	FF
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$	9,290,980	
PUBLIC FACILITIES			
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$	680,000	TL
Technology Replacement		135,000	TL
City Wide Water Meter Upgrade		1,340,000	U
Water Main Lining 65th Street		1,200,000	U
Water Main Lining Under 35W		580,000	U
Lime Filter Press Rehabilitation		70,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Mains		100,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Manhole Structures		100,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining		300,000	U
Sludge Tank Mixers Upgrade		90,000	U
Stormwater Pond Dredging		200,000	U
Taft Dumpsite Improvements		60,000	U
		10,000	C
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$	4,865,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$	18,285,980	

ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE

(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 3,000,000
(C) Hennepin County	10,000
(FF) Franchise Fees	3,250,000
(I) Internal Funding	4,156,870
(M) Municipal State Aids	2,284,110
(R) Special Revenue	730,000
(TL) Tax Levy	815,000
(U) User Fees	4,040,000
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 18,285,980

2021 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance/Wood Lake Fence Repair	\$ 50,000	R
Community Center/Wood Lake Building Repair	50,000	R
Donaldson Park Play Equipment	100,000	R
Donaldson Park Shelter Renovation	250,000	R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 450,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
65th Street Reconstruction	\$ 7,800,000	B
77th Street Underpass	7,000,000	F
	5,000,000	SB
	425,000	I
	3,164,000	S
	300,000	TR
Pedestrian Improvements	40,000	M
Bicycle Improvements	40,000	M
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 23,769,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 695,000	TL
Technology Replacement	135,000	TL
City Wide Water Meter Upgrade	1,340,000	U
Lime Filter Press Rehabilitation	70,000	U
Water High Service Pumps	17,000	U
	20,000	X
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Mains	100,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Manhole Structures	100,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	300,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 2,777,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 26,996,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 7,800,000	
(F) Federal Funding	7,000,000	
(I) Internal Funding	425,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	80,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(S) State Grant	3,164,000	
(SB) State Bonding	5,000,000	
(TL) Tax Levy	830,000	
(TR) Three Rivers Park District	300,000	
(U) User Fees	1,927,000	
(X) Xcel Energy	20,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 26,996,000	

2022 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance/Wood Lake Fence Repair	\$ 50,000	R
Community Center/Wood Lake Building Repair	120,000	R
Adams Hills Park Soccer Field	25,000	R
Christian Park Play Equipment	85,000	R
Roosevelt Parking Lot Expansion	50,000	R
Roosevelt Park Soccer Fields	120,000	R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 450,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
77th Street Underpass	\$ 7,000,000	SB
	700,000	M
	300,000	MC
Pedestrian Improvements	40,000	M
Bicycle Improvements	40,000	M
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 8,080,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 715,000	TL
Technology Replacement	135,000	TL
Emergency Water Interconnect with Neighboring Comm.	1,500,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Mains	100,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Manhole Structures	100,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	300,000	U
Stormwater Pond Dredging	200,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 3,050,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 11,580,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(M) Municipal State Aids	\$ 780,000	
(MC) Metropolitan Airports Commission	300,000	
(R) Special Revenue	450,000	
(SB) State Bonding	7,000,000	
(TL) General Tax Levy	850,000	
(U) User Fees	2,200,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 11,580,000	

2023 Capital Improvement Plan

		PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE			
Park Maintenance/Wood Lake Fence Repair	\$	50,000	R
Community Center/Wood Lake Building Repair		50,000	R
Monroe Park Play Equipment		90,000	R
Splash Pad at Outdoor Pool		260,000	R
Wood Lake Nature Center Facility		15,600,000	O
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$	16,050,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT			
69th Street Reconstrucrion	\$	4,500,000	B
		500,000	M
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$	5,000,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES			
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$	715,000	TL
Technology Replacement		135,000	TL
Clarifier Rake Assembly		250,000	U
Roof Replacement Wells 2 & 3		25,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Mains		100,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Manhole Structures		100,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining		300,000	U
Watermain Rehabilitation		200,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$	1,825,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS		\$ 22,875,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE			
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$	4,500,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids		500,000	
(O) Other Funding Source		15,600,000	
(R) Special Revenue		450,000	
(TL) General Tax Levy		850,000	
(U) User Fees		975,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$	22,875,000	

2024 Capital Improvement Plan

	PROJECT EXPENDITURE	
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance/Wood Lake Fence Repair	\$ 50,000	R
Community Center/Wood Lake Building Repair	50,000	R
Freemont Park Play Equipment	85,000	R
Sheridan Park Play Equipment	90,000	R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 275,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
70th Street Reconstruction	\$ 2,500,000	B
	100,000	X
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 2,600,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 715,000	TL
Technology Replacement	135,000	TL
Roof Replacement Wells 4, 5, & 6	60,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Mains	100,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Manhole Structures	100,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	300,000	U
Stormwater Pond Dredging	200,000	U
Watermain Rehabilitation	200,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 1,810,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 4,685,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 2,500,000	
(R) Special Revenue	275,000	
(TL) General Tax Levy	850,000	
(U) User Fees	960,000	
(X) Xcel Energy	100,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 4,685,000	

Capital Improvement Plan - Beyond 2024

PROJECT EXPENDITURE		
RECREATION & OPEN SPACE		
Park Maintenance/Wood Lake Fence Repair	\$ 50,000	R
Community Center/Wood Lake Building Repair	50,000	R
Outdoor Pool Liner Replacement	450,000	R
	150,000	OR
Taft Park Shelter Renovation	400,000	R
TOTAL REC. & OPEN SPACE	\$ 1,100,000	
RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENT		
76th Street West Reconstruction	\$ 3,500,000	B
	1,000,000	M
	800,000	X
Humboldt Ave/Lakeshore Drive Reconstruction	4,000,000	B
Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction	5,000,000	B
	8,000,000	C
Penn Avenue Reconstruction	5,000,000	B
	8,000,000	C
TOTAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 35,300,000	
PUBLIC FACILITIES		
Water Plant Roof Replacement	\$ 450,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Mains	100,000	U
Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Manhole Structures	100,000	U
Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	300,000	U
Watermain Rehabilitation	200,000	U
TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	\$ 1,150,000	
TOTAL USES OF FUNDS	\$ 37,550,000	
ESTIMATED REVENUE BY SOURCE		
(B) G.O. Street Reconstruction Bonds	\$ 17,500,000	
(C) Hennepin County	16,000,000	
(M) Municipal State Aids	1,000,000	
(OR) Other Recreation Funding	150,000	
(R) Special Revenue	950,000	
(U) User Fees	1,150,000	
(X) Xcel Energy	800,000	
TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 37,550,000	

2021 - 2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN - CITY OF RICHFIELD, MINNESOTA

Recommended and Scheduled for Four Year Period

TOTAL*											
PROJECTS	CIP COST	2021	2022	2023	2024	Beyond 2024					
RECREATION											
OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT											
1 Park Maintenance/Wood Lake Fence Repair	\$ 250,000	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R	\$ 50,000 R
2 Community Center/Wood Lake Building Repair	\$ 320,000	50,000 R	120,000 R	50,000 R	50,000 R	50,000 R	50,000 R	50,000 R	50,000 R	50,000 R	50,000 R
3 Donaldson Park Play Equipment	\$ 100,000	100,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4 Donaldson Park Shelter Renovation	\$ 250,000	250,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Adams Hill Park Soccer Field	\$ 25,000	-	25,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 Christian Park Play Equipment	\$ 85,000	-	85,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7 Roosevelt Park Parking Lot Expansion	\$ 50,000	-	50,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8 Roosevelt Park Soccer Fields	\$ 120,000	-	120,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9 Monroe Park Play Equipment	\$ 90,000	-	-	90,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10 Splash Pad Outdoor Pool	\$ 260,000	-	-	260,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 Wood Lake Nature Center Facility	\$ 15,600,000	-	-	15,600,000 O	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12 Freemont Park Play Equipment	\$ 85,000	-	-	-	85,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-
13 Sheridan Park Play Equipment	\$ 90,000	-	-	-	90,000 R	-	-	-	-	-	-
14 Outdoor Pool Liner Replacement	\$ 450,000	-	-	-	-	450,000 R	-	-	-	-	-
15	\$ 150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000 OR	-	-	-	-	-
16 Taft Park Shelter Renovation	\$ 400,000	-	-	-	-	400,000 R	-	-	-	-	-
17 TOTAL RECREATION & OPEN SPACE	\$ 18,325,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 16,050,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 1,100,000					
18											
19 (R) Special Revenue	\$ 2,575,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 950,000					
20 (O) Other Funding Source	\$ 15,600,000	-	-	15,600,000	-	-					
21 (OR) Other Recreation Funding	\$ 150,000	-	\$ -	-	-	150,000					
22 TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 18,325,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 16,050,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 1,100,000					
23											
24											
25	PROJECTS	TOTAL *									
26	CIP COSTS	2021	2022	2023	2024	Beyond 2024					
27 RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS											
28 65th Street Reconstruction	\$ 7,800,000	\$ 7,800,000 B	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					
29 77th Street Underpass	\$ 14,000,000	7,000,000 F	7,000,000 SB	-	-	-					
30	\$ 5,700,000	5,000,000 SB	700,000 M	-	-	-					
31	\$ 725,000	425,000 I	300,000 MC	-	-	-					
32	\$ 3,164,000	3,164,000 S	-	-	-	-					
33	\$ 300,000	300,000 TR	-	-	-	-					
34 69th Street Reconstruction	\$ 4,500,000	-	-	4,500,000 B	-	-					
35	\$ 500,000	-	-	500,000 M	-	-					
36 70th Street Reconstruction	\$ 2,500,000	-	-	-	2,500,000 B	-					
37	\$ 100,000	-	-	-	100,000 X	-					
38 76th Street West Reconstruction	\$ 3,500,000	-	-	-	-	3,500,000 B					
39	\$ 1,000,000	-	-	-	-	1,000,000 M					
40	\$ 800,000	-	-	-	-	800,000 X					
41 Humboldt Ave/Lakeshore Drive Recon.	\$ 4,000,000	-	-	-	-	4,000,000 B					
42 Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction	\$ 5,000,000	-	-	-	-	5,000,000 B					
43	\$ 8,000,000	-	-	-	-	8,000,000 C					
44 Penn Avenue Reconstruction	\$ 5,000,000	-	-	-	-	5,000,000 B					
45 Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 8,080,000	40,000 M	40,000 M	-	-	8,000,000 C					
46 Bicycle Improvements	\$ 80,000	40,000 M	40,000 M	-	-	-					
47											
48	\$ 74,749,000	\$ 23,769,000	\$ 8,080,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 35,300,000					
49											
50 (B) G.O. Improvement Bonds	\$ 32,300,000	\$ 7,800,000	\$ -	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 17,500,000					
51 (C) Hennepin County	\$ 16,000,000	-	-	-	-	16,000,000					
52 (F) Federal	\$ 7,000,000	7,000,000	-	-	-	-					
53 (I) Internal Funding	\$ 425,000	425,000	-	-	-	-					
54 (M) Municipal State Aid	\$ 2,360,000	80,000	780,000	500,000	-	1,000,000					
55 (MC) Metropolitan Airports Commission	\$ 300,000	-	300,000	-	-	-					
56 (S) State Grant	\$ 3,164,000	3,164,000	-	-	-	-					
57 (SB) State Bonding	\$ 12,000,000	5,000,000	7,000,000	-	-	-					
58 (TR) Three Rivers Park District	\$ 300,000	300,000	-	-	-	-					
59 (X) Xcel Energy	\$ 900,000	-	-	-	100,000	800,000					
60 TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	\$ 74,749,000	\$ 23,769,000	\$ 8,080,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 35,300,000					
61											

2021 - 2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN - CITY OF RICHFIELD, MINNESOTA

		Recommended and Scheduled for Four Year Period					
62	<u>PROJECTS</u>	TOTAL*					
63		CIP COSTS	2021	2022	2023	2024	Beyond 2024
64	<u>PUBLIC FACILITIES</u>						
65	Replacement Central Garage Equipment	\$ 2,840,000	\$ 695,000 TL	\$ 715,000 TL	\$ 715,000 TL	\$ 715,000 TL	\$ -
66	Technology Replacement	\$ 540,000	135,000 TL	135,000 TL	135,000 TL	135,000 TL	-
67	City Wide Water Meter Upgrade	\$ 1,340,000	1,340,000 U	-	-	-	-
68	Lime Filter Press Rehabilitation	\$ 70,000	70,000 U	-	-	-	-
69	Water High Service Pumps	\$ 17,000	17,000 U	-	-	-	-
70		\$ 20,000	20,000 X	-	-	-	-
71	Emergency Water Interconnect with Neighb. Comm.	\$ 1,500,000	-	1,500,000 U	-	-	-
72	Clarifier Rake Assembly	\$ 250,000	-	-	250,000 U	-	-
73	Roof Replacement Wells 2 & 3	\$ 25,000	-	-	25,000 U	-	-
74	Roof Replacement Wells 4, 5, & 6	\$ 60,000	-	-	-	60,000 U	-
75	Water Plan Roof Replacement	\$ 450,000	-	-	-	-	450,000 U
76	Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection Mains	\$ 500,000	100,000 U	100,000 U	100,000 U	100,000 U	100,000 U
77	Rehab. of Stormwater Collection Manhole Structures	\$ 500,000	100,000 U	100,000 U	100,000 U	100,000 U	100,000 U
78	Sanitary Sewer Main Lining	\$ 1,500,000	300,000 U	300,000 U	300,000 U	300,000 U	300,000 U
79	Stormwater Pond Dredging	\$ 400,000	-	200,000 U	-	200,000 U	-
80	Watermain Rehabilitation	\$ 600,000	-	-	200,000 U	200,000 U	200,000 U
81	TOTAL PUBLIC FACILITIES	<u>\$ 10,612,000</u>	<u>\$ 2,777,000</u>	<u>\$ 3,050,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,825,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,810,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,150,000</u>
82							
83	(TL) Tax Levy	\$ 3,380,000	\$ 830,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 850,000	\$ -
84	(U) User Fees	\$ 7,212,000	1,927,000	2,200,000	975,000	960,000	1,150,000
85	(X) Xcel Energy	\$ 20,000	20,000	-	-	-	-
86	TOTAL FUNDING BY SOURCE	<u>\$ 10,612,000</u>	<u>\$ 2,777,000</u>	<u>\$ 3,050,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,825,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,810,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,150,000</u>
87							
88	<u>SUMMARY PROJECTS</u>						
89							
90	Recreation/Open Space Development	\$ 18,325,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 16,050,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 1,100,000
91	Right of Way Improvements	\$ 74,749,000	23,769,000	8,080,000	5,000,000	2,600,000	35,300,000
92	Public Facilities	<u>\$ 10,612,000</u>	<u>2,777,000</u>	<u>3,050,000</u>	<u>1,825,000</u>	<u>1,810,000</u>	<u>1,150,000</u>
93	TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECTS	<u>\$ 103,686,000</u>	<u>\$ 26,996,000</u>	<u>\$ 11,580,000</u>	<u>\$ 22,875,000</u>	<u>\$ 4,685,000</u>	<u>\$ 37,550,000</u>
94							
95	(B) G.O. Improvement Bonds	\$ 32,300,000	\$ 7,800,000	\$ -	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 17,500,000
96	(C) Hennepin County	\$ 16,000,000	-	-	-	-	16,000,000
97	(F) Federal	\$ 7,000,000	7,000,000	-	-	-	-
98	(I) Internal Funding	\$ 425,000	425,000	-	-	-	-
99	(M) Municipal State Aid	\$ 2,360,000	80,000	780,000	500,000	-	1,000,000
100	(MC) Metropolitan Airports Commission	\$ 300,000	-	300,000	-	-	-
101	(O) Other Funding Source	\$ 15,600,000	-	-	15,600,000	-	-
102	(OR) Other Recreation Funding	\$ 150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000
103	(R) Special Revenue	\$ 2,575,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	275,000	950,000
104	(S) State Grant	\$ 3,164,000	3,164,000	-	-	-	-
105	(SB) State Bonding	\$ 12,000,000	5,000,000	7,000,000	-	-	-
106	(TL) Tax Levy	\$ 3,380,000	830,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	-
107	(TR) Three Rivers Park District	\$ 300,000	300,000	-	-	-	-
108	(U) User Fees	\$ 7,212,000	1,927,000	2,200,000	975,000	960,000	1,150,000
109	(X) Xcel Energy	<u>\$ 920,000</u>	<u>20,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>100,000</u>	<u>800,000</u>
110	TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES	<u>\$ 103,686,000</u>	<u>\$ 26,996,000</u>	<u>\$ 11,580,000</u>	<u>\$ 22,875,000</u>	<u>\$ 4,685,000</u>	<u>\$ 37,550,000</u>
111	* Total CIP costs do not include any project costs reflected in the 2020 CIB.						

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Parks Major Maintenance and Wood Lake Fence Repair
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Parks Major Maintenance/Wood Lake Fence Repair
2. Total project cost:	\$50,000/year
3. Years to complete:	Annual ongoing major maintenance items
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2000
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB	\$50,000	2024 CIP	\$50,000
2021 CIP	\$50,000	Beyond 2024	\$50,000/year
2022 CIP	\$50,000		
2023 CIP	\$50,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$50,000/year	% of total	100
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$50,000/year		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Various projects relating to the upkeep of existing park infrastructure are identified and prioritized each year by Recreation Services and Public Works Maintenance staff. In addition to annual repair of the Wood Lake perimeter fence, other project examples include tennis/basketball court resurfacing, trail resurfacing, roof replacement, parking lot reconstruction, field renovation and other replacement of existing park capital items.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Community Center and Wood Lake Building Repair
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Community Center and Wood Lake Building Repair
2. Total project cost:	\$50,000/year (except 2022)
3. Years to complete:	Annual ongoing major maintenance items
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2019
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB	\$50,000	2024 CIP	\$50,000
2021 CIP	\$50,000	Beyond 2024	\$50,000 per year
2022 CIP	\$120,000		
2023 CIP	\$50,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$50,000/year (except 2022)	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$50,000/year (except 2022)		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Various projects relating to the upkeep of the Community Center and Wood Lake Nature Center buildings will be identified and prioritized each year by Recreation Services staff. Items may include HVAC repairs, roof repairs, window and flooring repairs, and other repair and replacement of existing capital items.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Augsburg Play Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Augsburg Park Play Equipment Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$180,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB	\$180,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$180,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other		% of total	
TOTAL	\$180,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the play equipment structure at Augsburg Park as a fully-inclusive, accessible playlot. The replacement of equipment is in accordance with the Play Equipment Replacement Schedule that was established in 2018.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Madison Play Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Madison Play Equipment Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$85,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB	\$85,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$85,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$85,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the existing play equipment structure in Madison Park in accordance with the Play Equipment Replacement Schedule that was established in 2018.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Washington Play Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Washington Play Equipment Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$85,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB	\$85,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$85,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$85,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the play equipment structure at Washington Park in accordance with the Play Equipment Replacement Schedule that was established in 2018.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Ice Arena Refrigeration Project
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Richfield Ice Arena Refrigeration Project
2. Total project cost:	\$3,680,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB	\$3,680,000		
2021 CIP			
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$280,000	% of total	7.6%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$3,400,000	% of total	92.4%
TOTAL	\$3,680,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The project would include replacing the Richfield Ice Arena refrigeration system, so both rinks run on one plant and do not rely on freon for the coolant. Freon will cease to be manufactured after 2019, so the quantity will be limited and the cost eventually prohibited. The project is timely in that current infrastructure is in need of major repairs and the coolant will become obsolete. The costs will include a subfloor heating and cooling system, and function as a usable space with or without ice.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Donaldson Play Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	\$100,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the existing play equipment structure in Donaldson Park in accordance with the Play Equipment Replacement Schedule that was established in 2018.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Donaldson Park Shelter Renovation
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Donaldson Park Shelter Renovation
2. Total project cost:	\$250,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	\$250,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$250,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$250,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Renovate the existing shelter at Donaldson Park to accommodate indoor warming house for outdoor skating and program/rental use, and to comply with ADA requirements. Replace lighting and mechanical with energy saving equipment.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Adams Hill Soccer Field
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Adams Hill Soccer Field
2. Total project cost:	\$25,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP	\$25,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: Grade a crowned surface in the large open space and seed for new turf to create a usable playing space for soccer.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Christian Play Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Christian Play Equipment Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$85,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP	\$85,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$85,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$85,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the play equipment structure at Christian Park in accordance with the Play Equipment Replacement Schedule that was established in 2018.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Roosevelt Parking Lot Expansion
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Roosevelt Parking Lot Expansion
2. Total project cost:	\$50,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP	\$50,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$50,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$50,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Expand the parking lot at Roosevelt Park to accommodate additional parking spaces for use of the athletic complex and the park.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Roosevelt Soccer Fields
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Roosevelt Soccer Fields
2. Total project cost:	\$120,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP	\$120,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$120,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$120,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Remove the existing hockey boards and replace with several soccer fields at Roosevelt Park to accommodate the demand for soccer and similar activities.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Monroe Play Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Monroe Play Equipment Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$90,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP	\$90,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$90,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other		% of total	
TOTAL	\$90,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the play equipment structure at Monroe Park in accordance with the Play Equipment Replacement Schedule that was established in 2018.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Splash Pad at Outdoor Pool
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Splash Pad at Outdoor Pool
2. Total project cost:	\$260,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP	\$260,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$260,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$260,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Install a splash pad on the south side of the outdoor pool to enhance the overall pool facility. A future plan for a splash pad was incorporated in the design for the renovated pool and building in 2003. Space for filtration equipment is available in the existing bathhouse and water lines are already installed to the proposed location.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

Preserve	Manage	Replace/Improve	Expand XX
-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-------------------------

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Wood Lake Nature Center Building Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Wood Lake Nature Center Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$15,600,000M
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP	\$15,600,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$15,600,000	% of total	100%
TOTAL	\$15,600,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the Wood Lake Nature Center with a new building that has an environmentally friendly design. The building would include gathering areas for special events and meetings, science classrooms, office areas, and an exploration area with nature related exhibits. The \$15.6 million quote does include \$10 million for construction and an additional 30% for soft costs/inflation for 2023.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Fremont Play Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Fremont Play Equipment Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$85,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	\$85,000
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$85,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$85,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the existing play equipment structure at Fremont Park in accordance with the Play Equipment Replacement Schedule that was established in 2018.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Sheridan Play Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Sheridan Play Equipment Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$90,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	\$90,000
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$90,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$90,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Replace the play equipment structure at Sheridan Park in accordance with the Play Equipment Replacement Schedule that was established in 2018.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Outdoor Pool Liner Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Outdoor Pool Liner Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$600,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	\$600,000
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$450,000	% of total	75%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$150,000	% of total	25%
TOTAL	\$600,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Investigate options to replace or repair the concrete container of the olympic-sized outdoor pool.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Recreation & Open Space
Project Summary Form – Taft Park Shelter Renovation
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Taft Park Shelter Renovation
2. Total project cost:	\$400,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Recreation Services

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	\$400,000
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$400,000	% of total	100%
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$400,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Renovate the existing shelter at the south end of Taft Park to accommodate concessions and maintenance storage and comply with ADA requirements. Replace lighting and mechanical with energy saving equipment.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

RIGHT OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 66th Street Reconstruction
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	66 th Street Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$27,165,000
3. Years to complete:	4
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2017
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

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

2020 CIB	\$2,748,910	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$13,000,000	% of total	47%
Mun. State Aid	\$10,300,640	% of total	38%
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$1,782,500	% of total	7%
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Internal Funding	\$756,860	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$1,325,000	% of total	5%
TOTAL	\$27,165,000		100%

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Lyndale Avenue Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$12,912,290
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2019
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

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

2020 CIB	\$3,212,070	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

UF – Utility Bond	\$3,168,340	% of total	25%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds (Street Recon)	\$8,531,880	% of total	66%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Internal Funding	\$1,212,070	% of total	9%
PIR	\$	% of total	
Xcel Rate Payers	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$12,912,290		100%

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Multi-Year Pedestrian Improvements
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Pedestrian Improvements
2. Total project cost:	\$160,000
3. Years to complete:	4
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2018
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

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

2020 CIB	\$40,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	\$40,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP	\$40,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: Following the Mill and Overlay Program , pedestrian facilities would be installed in the year following the overlay. Spot pedestrian improvements, such as refuge islands, RRFBs, pavement markings would be constructed as well where potential benefit as identified with the Pedestrian Master Plan and Safe Routes to School Plan for the largest safety improvements are identified.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Multi-Year Bike Improvements
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Bicycle Improvements
2. Total project cost:	\$160,000
3. Years to complete:	4
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2018
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

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

2020 CIB	\$40,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	\$40,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP	\$40,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: As part of the implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan and Safe Routes to School Plan improvements to bike facilities would be installed. Each route would go through a public input process prior to implementation. Spot pedestrian improvements would be constructed as well, where potential for the largest safety improvements are identified. Improvements may be identified as signage, pavement markings, or other items identified in each plan.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 6 Year Mill and Overlay Project
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB	\$3,250,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 65th Street Reconstruction
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	65 th Street Central Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$9,000,000
3. Years to complete:	2
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

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

2020 CIB	\$1,200,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	\$7,800,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$1,200,000	% of total	13%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds (Street Recon and Utility)	\$7,800,000	% of total	87%
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$9,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of 65th Street in two phases from Nicollet Avenue and 66th Street to Lyndale Avenue from 64th Street to the 66th Street reconstruction limits. The project will replace the outdated road design and include the lining of a large water main and sanitary sewer. The project also includes replacement of storm sewer utilities, new utilities on the east end of the corridor, and intersection control at both Nicollet and Lyndale Avenues. The project will include a public input process to identify the future design and streetscape.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 77th Street Underpass
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	77 th Street Underpass
2. Total project cost:	\$32,489,000
3. Years to complete:	7
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2016
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

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

2020 CIB	\$	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	\$15,889,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP	\$8,000,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$700,000 (2022)	% of total	2%
Grants			
Federal	\$7,000,000 (2021)	% of total	22%
State	\$3,164,000 (2021)	% of total	10%
County	\$1,500,000 (2019)	% of total	5%
Other (TRPD)	\$300,000 (2021)	% of total	1%
Other (MAC.)	\$300,000 (2022)	% of total	1%
State Bonding	\$19,100,000 (2018-2022)	% of total	58%
Internal Funding	\$425,000 (2021)	% of total	1%
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$32,489,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The project will extend 77th Street under Highway 77 to connect to the 24th Avenue Interchange at I-494. Right-of-way acquisition is required to complete the project. The underpass will include bike and pedestrian accommodations. The project also includes the construction of Richfield Parkway from 77th Street to 76th Street along an 18th Ave alignment. This section of Richfield Parkway will replace the frontage road connection at 77th Street to Old Cedar Avenue.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form –69th Street Reconstruction Project
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	69 th Street Reconstruction
2. Total project cost:	\$5,000,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP	\$5,000,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds (Street Reconstruction)	\$4,500,000	% of total	90%
Mun. State Aid	\$500,000	% of total	10%
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
PIR	\$	% of total	
Special Assessment	\$	% of total	
Franchise Fees	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$5,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The project includes reconstruction of 69th Street between Penn Avenue and Xerxes Avenue, including narrowing of the roadway to add sidewalk to one side, reconstruction of retaining wall, lining or replacement of sanitary sewer, replacement of storm sewer, and a possible water main interconnect with Edina.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 70th Street Reconstruction
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	\$2,600,000
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: Reconstruction of 70th Street between 2nd Avenue to 5th Avenue, also including sidewalk, curb, and gutter as well as undergrounding of parallel utilities. Additionally, the reconstruction will comprise replacement of City utilities, including an 84" storm sewer pipe that will connect to the storm system installed with the Portland Avenue project. The existing pipe is being monitored for condition, and rate of deterioration may impact the year of reconstruction. Per current conditions, this has been identified as high risk through the Stormwater Risk Assessment. Design of the roadway will include a public participation process.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – 76th Street West Reconstruction
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	\$5,300,000
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Humboldt Avenue/Lake Shore Reconstruction
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	\$4,000,000
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Nicollet Avenue Reconstruction
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	\$13,000,000
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Right of Way Improvements
Project Summary Form – Penn Avenue Reconstruction
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	\$13,000,000
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form –Central Garage Equipment Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Replacement of Central Garage Equipment
2. Total project cost:	\$3,520,000
3. Years to complete:	Ongoing
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	N/A
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	N/A
5. Responsible department:	Public Works

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

2020 CIB	\$680,000	2024 CIP	\$715,000
2021 CIP	\$695,000	Beyond 2024	Ongoing
2022 CIP	\$715,000		
2023 CIP	\$715,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other – Tax Levy	\$3,520,000	% of total	100%
TOTAL	\$3,520,000		100%

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Technology Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Technology Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$675,000
3. Years to complete:	Ongoing
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	N/A
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	N/A
5. Responsible department:	Administrative Services

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

2020 CIB	\$135,000	2024 CIP	\$135,000
2021 CIP	\$135,000	Beyond 2024	Ongoing
2022 CIP	\$135,000		
2023 CIP	\$135,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$	% of total	
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other – Tax Levy	\$675,000	% of total	100%
TOTAL	\$675,000		100%

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – City-wide Water Meter Upgrade
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	City wide water meter upgrade
2. Total project cost:	\$4,000,000
3. Years to complete:	3
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2019
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

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

2020 CIB	1,340,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	1,340,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: The current city-wide system of 11,000 water meters was installed in 2007 and requires employees to drive by each property to obtain meter readings. The system is failing and it is becoming time consuming to maintain. The installation of a new system will have a signal read radio device which will eliminate the need to drive by each property.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Water Main Rehabilitation under 65th Street
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Line Water Main under 65 th Street
2. Total project cost:	\$1,200,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

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

2020 CIB	\$1,200,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: A large diameter watermain runs down 65th Street between Nicollet and Rae Drive. This watermain is one of the main feed lines to Penn water tower and the west side of Richfield. A condition assessment was performed on this pipeline and it was found to be in need of replacement or rehabilitation. Lining the watermain was the chosen course of action. Lining of this main will restore the pipe back to a “like new” condition and will result in a new life for the pipe. This technology is very cost effective and is the preferred choice for this application. This project is intended to be completed prior to the reconstruction of 65th Street and will result in lower construction costs for the roadway.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Water Main Rehabilitation under Highway 35W
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Line Water Mains under Interstate Highway 35W
2. Total project cost:	\$580,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

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

2020 CIB	\$580,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$580,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$580,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The water distribution system has three water mains that supply water west of Highway 35W. One of the water mains was updated in the 1990's, and the two other water mains date back to the 1960's. Lining of these mains will restore the pipe back to a "like new" condition and will result in a new life for the pipe. Lining is a trenchless technology where a liner is placed in the pipe and heated. The heating process hardens the liner essentially forming a new pipe within the old pipe. This technology is very cost effective and is the preferred choice for this application.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Lime Filter Press Rehabilitation
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Lime Filter Press Rehab
2. Total project cost:	\$140,000
3. Years to complete:	2
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

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

2020 CIB	\$70,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	\$70,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$140,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$140,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The lime filter presses were newly installed in 2008. The two filter press units include numerous components that wear over time and require replacement at regular intervals. Replacement of these components will result in more efficient and reliable filter press operation and is part of the life cycle asset management of the units.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form –Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection System Mains

2020 Capital Budget (CIB)

2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB	\$100,000	2024 CIP	\$100,000
2021 CIP	\$100,000	Beyond 2024	\$500,000
2022 CIP	\$100,000		
2023 CIP	\$100,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: The stormwater collection system was installed in the mid 1950's and is comprised of mostly reinforced concrete pipe (RCP). A cleaning and inspection program is underway to determine the condition of the stormwater collection mains. Mains that are identified as poor condition and not in need of upsizing for capacity will be rehabilitated using a cast-in-place-pipe (CIPP) lining method. This method is widely used for pipeline rehabilitation and does not require excavation. The rehabilitation will extend the life of the mains by up to 75 years.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form –Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection System Manhole Structures

2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Rehabilitation of Stormwater Collection System Manhole Structures
2. Total project cost:	\$1,000,000
3. Years to complete:	10
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2019
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Stormwater

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

2020 CIB	\$100,000	2024 CIP	\$100,000
2021 CIP	\$100,000	Beyond 2024	\$500,000
2022 CIP	\$100,000		
2023 CIP	\$100,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

8. Brief summary of project: The stormwater collection system was installed in the mid 1950's and is built of brick structures. As staff does ongoing maintenance and inspections, they are encountering structures that are passing water between the bricks. Rehabilitating the structures consists of installing a liner inside the existing structure. The liner is installed by inflating and heating which causes the liner to adhere to the bricks. The cooled liner then creates a structurally safe manhole structure. This technique is widely used in the industry and is done at the fraction of the cost of digging and replacing the complete structures. Once the structure is lined, the approximate life expectancy will be extended by 30 years.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Sewer Main Lining
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Sewer Main Lining
2. Total project cost:	\$20,000,000
3. Years to complete:	Ongoing Until Complete
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	Yes
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	2018
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Wastewater

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

2020 CIB	\$300,000	2024 CIP	\$300,000
2021 CIP	\$300,000	Beyond 2024	\$300,000/year
2022 CIP	\$300,000		
2023 CIP	\$300,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$20,000,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$20,000,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The wastewater collection system was installed in the late 1950's and mainly consists of VCP (Vitrified Clay Pipe). As staff does ongoing maintenance and television inspections, they encounter areas with tree root intrusion and/or pipes that have cracks. In order to preserve the level of service to our users and protect the mill and overlay investment, these pipes should be lined. Lining consist of installation of a liner in the existing clay pipe; which expands and heats the liner, causing adherence to the pipe. Once it cools, the liner hardens to a consistency of schedule 40 PVC, the appropriate standard. This technique is widely used in the industry and is done at a fraction of the cost of open cutting a street to replace the line. It's anticipated this program will be accelerated in the future and be completed within 5 years

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Sludge Tank Mixers Upgrade
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Sludge Tank Mixers Upgrade
2. Total project cost:	\$90,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

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

2020 CIB	\$90,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$90,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$90,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The current sludge tank mixers are submersible style mixers in a high pH environment. The mixers require constant maintenance at a high cost due to the harsh environment. The replacement sludge tank mixer would be floor mounted and would keep the motor and gearbox out of the harsh environment. This would result in lower maintenance costs, as well as easier, safer maintenance.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Stormwater Pond Dredging
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Stormwater Pond Dredging
2. Total project cost:	\$1,400,000
3. Years to complete:	10
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Stormwater

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

2020 CIB	\$200,000	2024 CIP	\$200,000
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	Ongoing
2022 CIP	\$200,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$1,400,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$1,400,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Richfield's stormwater is treated in a regional system of stormwater ponds. Over time the removed sediments and pollutants build up in the bottom of the pond and require removal through dredging. Dredging will return the ponds to the original capacity and will result in improved pond water quality and therefore improved area lake water quality.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Taft Dumpsite Improvements
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB	\$70,000	2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$60,000	% of total	86%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County-Env Response Fund	\$10,000	% of total	14%
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$70,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: Public Works utilizes the Taft Dumpsite for temporary storage of construction/maintenance materials throughout the year. The site is unusable at times due to rain and snow melt. The intention of this project is to grade, pave, and install permanent erosion control measures for the entire site. This project will also improve water quality of Taft Lake.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – High Service Pumps VFDs
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	High Service Pumps VFDs
2. Total project cost:	\$37,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP	\$37,000	Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$17,000	% of total	46%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other - Xcel	\$20,000	% of total	54%
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$37,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The high service pumps pump water from the water treatment plant to the distribution system. The pumps serve a vital role in distributing treated water to residents and are amongst the largest energy users in the water system. An analysis was performed on the energy usage of the pumps and a determination was made that variable frequency drives (VFDs) would help reduce energy usage by allowing the pumps to be run at slower speeds. Staff has partnered with Xcel Energy to obtain a rebate to cover most of the cost of the VFDs. This project will result in lower energy usage at the water plant and a savings in electric utility costs.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities

Project Summary Form – Emergency Water Interconnect with Neighboring Community

2020 Capital Budget (CIB)

2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP	\$1,500,000		
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$1,500,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$1,500,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The Water Treatment Plant (WTP) was built in 1963 and to-date has been a standalone system. If the WTP were to have a catastrophic failure and be unable to produce water, the city is not equipped with a long-term emergency backup water source. Connecting to another City's water system would create a backup system, as well as provide a backup system for the partnering community. Partnering communities are still being considered. As part of the DNR's water supply plan, they encourage all cities to have an emergency backup water source.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Clarifier Rake Assembly Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Clarifier Rake Assembly Replacement
2. Total project cost:	\$250,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP	\$250,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$250,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$250,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The clarifier rakes aid in removal of the byproduct of the lime softening process. Each year, the clarifiers are drained, cleaned, and the rakes are painted to prevent corrosion. This process is time consuming and costs approximately \$20,000 per year. Transitioning to stainless steel rakes will eliminate the painting process and ultimately reduce the annual maintenance cost. The existing clarifier rakes were installed in 1994. The new stainless steel rakes would be expected to last 50+ years.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Roof Replacement of Wells 2 and 3
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Project:	Roof Replacement on Wells 2 and 3
2. Total project cost:	\$25,000
3. Years to complete:	1
4. Is this a continuation of a current project?	No
If "Yes", what is first year project appears in CIP?	
5. Responsible department:	Public Works/Water

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP	\$25,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Watermain Rehabilitation
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2023 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB	\$	2024 CIP	\$200,000
2021 CIP	\$	Beyond 2024	\$200,000/year
2022 CIP	\$		
2023 CIP	\$200,000		

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

User Fees	\$600,000	% of total	100%
Special Revenue	\$	% of total	
Bonds	\$	% of total	
Mun. State Aid	\$	% of total	
Grants			
Federal	\$	% of total	
State	\$	% of total	
County	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
Federal Demo.	\$	% of total	
Tax Increment Fin	\$	% of total	
Other	\$	% of total	
TOTAL	\$600,000		100%

8. Brief summary of project: The water distribution system was installed in the 1960's and is comprised of mostly cast iron pipe (CIP) and ductile iron pipe (DIP). The pipe assets have shown an increase in failures over the last five years likely due to the assets approaching the end of their useful life. In an effort to restore the useful life of the distribution assets, staff began a desktop analysis of the water system which took into account pipe age, pipe location, and main break history to produce a comparison of potential pipe failure risk for each asset. This comparison will be used to prioritize investment of capital funds to renew the water system using trenchless technologies. This will be an ongoing investment in renewal of the water system.

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Roof Replacement of Wells 4, 5, and 6
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	\$60,000
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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

Public Facilities
Project Summary Form – Water Plant Roof Replacement
2020 Capital Budget (CIB)
2021-2024 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

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

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

2020 CIB		2024 CIP	
2021 CIP		Beyond 2024	\$450,000
2022 CIP			
2023 CIP			

7. Please indicate the sources of funding:

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

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

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

10. Priority ranking system

A. Check one of the following:

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

B. Indicate points for the following:

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