

City Council Agenda

Monday, May 15, 2017 5:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

(Times are Approximate – please note that items may be earlier or later than listed on the agenda)

5:30 p.m.	1.	Roll Call	
o o piin		Voting & Seating Order: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten McGehee, and Roe	
5:31 p.m.	2.	Pledge of Allegiance	
5:32 p.m.	3.	Approve Agenda	
5:35 p.m.	4.	Public Comment	
	5.	Recognitions, Donations and Communications	
5:40 p.m.	6.	Items Removed from Consent Agenda	

7. Business Items

Interview Commission Applicants

a. Commission Interviews

Planning Commission (1 Vacancy)

5:43 p.m.	1. Nic Baker
5:50 p.m.	2. Larry Ragland
5:57 p.m.	3. Joseph Ayers-Johnson
6:04 p.m.	4. Jumi Kassim
6:11 p.m.	5. Sharon Brown
6:18 p.m.	6. Kelli Johanson
6:25 p.m.	7. Joseph Hartmann
6:37 p.m.	b. Review Ramsey County's 2018 Assessed Market Value Report

Council Agenda - Page 2

6:42 p.m. c. Receive the 2018-2037 Capital Improvement Plan

7:27 p.m. d. Consider License Center Proposed Lease Terms and Expansion Option

7:47 p.m.

e. Review and provide comment on the last chapter of a comprehensive technical update to the requirements and procedures for processing subdivision proposals as regulated in City Code Title 11 (Subdivision) (PROJ-

0042)

8:47 p.m. f. Discuss Proposed Text Amendments to Roseville's City Code, Chapter 407 Nuisances

9:02 p.m. g. Discuss 407.02.G of City Code Regulating Pigs and Goats

8. Approve Minutes

9:12 p.m. **9. Approve Consent Agenda**

- a. Appoint Youth Commissioner to Human Rights, Inclusion and Engagement Commission
- b. Resolution Opposing Small Cell Legislation for the Use of Public Rights-of-Way
- 9:17 p.m. **10. Council and City Manager Communications, Reports and Announcements**
- 9:22 p.m. 11. Councilmember Initiated Future Agenda Items and Future Agenda Review
- 9:27 p.m. **12. Adjourn**

Some Upcoming Public Meetings......

Wednesday	May 17	6:00 p.m.	Human Rights, Inclusion, and Engagement Commission
Monday	May 22	6:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting
Tuesday	May 23	6:30 p.m.	Public Works, Environment & Transportation Commission
Wednesday	May 24	6:30 p.m.	Comp Plan 2040 Update
Monday	May 29	-	City Offices Closed - Observation of Memorial Day
June			
Tuesday	Jun 6	6:30 p.m.	Parks & Recreation Commission
Wednesday	Jun 7	5:30 p.m.	Variance Commission
Wednesday	Jun 7	6:30 p.m.	Planning Commission
Monday	Jun 12	6:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting
Tuesday	Jun 13	6:30 p.m.	Finance Commission
Monday	Jun 19	6:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting

Date: May 15, 2017 Item # 7.a

Commission Interviews

Full Name: Company:	Nic Bak Plannin		
Home Address:			
Roseville, MN 55113			
Home:			
E-mail: E-mail Display As:	Nic Bak	ker	
First Name		Nic	
Last Name		Baker	
Address 1			
Address 2			
City		Roseville	
State		MN	
Zip Code		55113	
Home or Cell Ph Number	one		
Email Address			
How many years you been a Rosev resident?		1	
Commissions		Planning	
Commission pref	ference	Planning	
Commission pref	ference	Field not completed.	
This application	is for	New Term	
If this is a studen application pleas grade in school		Field not completed.	

Why do you want to serve on this Commission?	I volunteer for this commission reluctantly, as I'm not sure I'm the right person for it. On the one hand, I do have community experience: I have volunteered for the city a number of times since we moved here last summer. I was previously on the board of directors of my Minneapolis Neighborhood Association for six years, two as president. Finally, I was on the board of our previous townhouse association and condo association. ON THE OTHER HAND I am new to Roseville and do not have a grasp of the issues facing the city. Further, I do not have any experience with city government (other than putting on a workshop for your staff last fall). I therefore don't know if I have anything to contribute to the commission at this time.
What is your view of the role of this Commission?	I understand that you are in the process of developing a long- term comprehensive plan. What that entails or other duties of the commission, I'm afraid I really don't know.
Civic and Volunteer Activities	Various activities for Roseville, including delivering a grant-writing workshop to your staff Volunteer grant-writing for a number of small nonprofit organizations Volunteer mediation Security escort and representative for Planned Parenthood Staff of an ACLU booth at the State Fair Member of my current townhouse association's board of directors Member, Citizen's Climate Lobby (In this capacity, I spoke to the council on April 24).
Work Experience	Now retired. Worked for 24 years as a proposal/grant writer in the Washington, DC area. Have been doing some work in that area since moving to MN in 2010, but mostly writing grants on a volunteer basis.
Education	Current student at the University of MN (non-degree, 15 hours to date) MSW, University of Utah, 1979 BS, Westminster College, 1972
Is there additional information you would like the City Council to consider regarding your application?	I am applying primarily because there seems to be a real need for residents to join the commission. Again, the key question is whether I have the potential to be a productive member of that body.
Additional Information if you	u become Board or Commission Member

Additional information may be emailed to <u>info@cityofroseville.com</u> or delivered to Administration Department, City of Roseville, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, MN 55113 or faxed to 651-792-7020.

Minnesota Government Data Practices Act	Yes
Minnesota Statute §13.601. subd. 3(b)	Email Address
Acknowledgement	Yes

Full Name: Larry Ragland Company: Planning

Home Address: Roseville, MN 55113

Mobile:

E-mail Display As: Larry Ragland

First Name	Larry
Last Name	Ragland
Address 1	
Address 2	Field not completed.
City	Roseville
State	MN
Zip Code	55113
Home or Cell Phone Number	
Email Address	
How many years have you been a Roseville resident?	14
Commissions	Planning
Commission preference	Planning
Commission preference	Field not completed.
This application is for	New Term
If this is a student application please list grade in school	Field not completed.
Note There is no character limit	for the fields below.

Why do you want to serve on this Commission?

Roseville has been a great place for me to live and work. I have great respect for the importance of city planning and feel that Roseville has been the beneficiary of good planning. I believe in community service and I have the time and energy available to devote to Planning Commission work.

What is your view of the role of this Commission?

The Planning Commission helps establish a vision defining what it takes to be a great community and reviews development proposals to assure conformance with that vision. The vision is defined in the city's comprehensive plan. The Planning Commission works with the professional planning staff and the City Council to build the comprehensive plan. The plan defines goals for creating a city that provides places for its citizens to live and work in a welcoming and supportive environment. The plan identifies development goals for housing, commercial/industrial spaces, parks, schools, effective transportation, and other uses. The Planning Commission reviews development proposals to make sure the proposed development conforms to the goals in the comprehensive plan and adheres to the zoning code. The Planning Commission makes recommendations to the City Council which takes final action on the proposals.

Civic and Volunteer Activities

1980-1983 Planning Commission Coon Rapids, Minnesota 1981-1990 School Board, Anoka-Hennepin District #11 Chair for five years 1990-1991 Anoka Technical College Foundation Founding board member 1990-1998 Anoka-Hennepin Educational Foundation Founding board member and first President 1991-2010 USA Cup Soccer Tournament Scheduling and Scoring Chair 2007-2010 National Sports Center Foundation Board

Work Experience

1964-1965 Junior high math teacher Independence, Missouri 1965-1966 Secondary math and physics teacher Raytown, Missouri Chair of the math and physics departments 1966-1968 Apollo Space Program aerospace engineer TRW Systems, Houston, Texas Supervised generation of displays used by flight controllers during Apollo missions 1973-1977 Assistant Professor of Computer Science University of Iowa 1977-1985 Compiler Development Sperry Corporation (now Unisys) Roseville, Minnesota Manager for Pascal and Ada programming languages 1985-2007 Professor of Computer Science Augsburg College in Minneapolis Chair of Computer Science Department

Education

1963 B.S. in Ed., Mathematics, University of Central Missouri 1964 M.A., Mathematics, University of Central Missouri 1973 Ph.D., Computer Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin

Is there additional information you would like the City Council to consider regarding your application?

I know that the Planning Commission work includes a lot of reading and studying to prepare for meetings. My work experience and volunteer activities have all included large amounts of reading and preparation. I know the importance of doing ones homework and I have always come prepared. Planning Commission work also includes a lot of discussion and back-and-forth with other commissioners, staff, and the public in order to formulate and refine the recommendation which will go to the City Council. My work and volunteer activities have given me extensive experience with the teamwork required to make a good group decision. A vigorous Planning Commission is an integral component of a vibrant, forward-looking city. Roseville has become a great place to live and work through good planning. I want to participate in the continuation of this through service on the Roseville Planning Commission.

Additional Information if you become Board or Commission Member Additional information may be emailed to <u>info@cityofroseville.com</u> or delivered to Administration Department, City of Roseville, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, MN 55113 or faxed to 651-792-7020.

Minnesota Government Data Practices Act	Yes
Minnesota Statute §13.601. subd. 3(b)	Home/Cell Phone, Email Address
Acknowledgement	Yes

Full Name:	Joseph Ayers-Johnson
_	DI :

Company: Planning

Home Address: Roseville, MN 55113

Home:

E-mail:

E-mail Display As: Joseph Ayers-Johnson

First Name	Joseph
Last Name	Ayers-Johnson
Address 1	
Address 2	Field not completed.
City	Roseville
State	MN
Zip Code	55113
Home or Cell Phone Number	
Email Address	
How many years have you been a Roseville resident?	20
Commissions	Planning, Public Works, Environment & Transportation
Commission preference	Planning
Commission preference	Field not completed.
This application is for	New Term
If this is a student application please list grade in school	Field not completed.
Note	

Why do you want to serve on this Commission?

I am applying to the position of Planning Commission Member with the City of Roseville, my hometown. My interest in this position stems from my desire to contribute to the process of planning and developing the Twin Cities of the future, and to see Roseville become the best possible version of itself. I've had the good fortune of living in many different types of communities - urban, rural, suburban, European - but my time growing up in Roseville is always the original experience to which I compare all others. Through these experiences, I have developed a sense of what makes a healthy city, and I think Roseville does a lot of things right. I also think that we are well poised to meet the challenges of ever-changing urban systems and thrive into the future. I am energized by the potential opportunities we have in Roseville for sustainable models of development; and, ultimately, it was my return to Roseville three years ago that prompted me to return to graduate school to further my ability to influence change right here in my home. I am currently a first-year candidate for my Masters in Urban and Regional Planning and a Certificate of Metropolitan Design at the University of Minnesota, and I have been rapidly strengthening my understanding of the different systems at play in our metropolitan areas. Serving on the Planning Commission will allow me to apply what I have learned to help guide the future development of my hometown.

What is your view of the role of this Commission?

It is my understanding that the Planning Commission works in concert with the city council, and offers the council recommendations for final action on planning cases. The commission reviews development plans and policies submitted to the City of Roseville, and works to resolve any issues or conflicts that arise in that process. For example, issues may arise in response to specific plans or applications that conflict with current master plans, or in response to public input, as the commission serves as a primary point of contact for concerned citizens. In these cases, the commission reviews the plans and public comments, checks it against existing regulations and planning documents, and makes an informed decision on how to proceed.

Civic and Volunteer Activities

Xperitas Public Interest Design (PID) Initiative | May 15-June 1 2016 -- Established an ongoing partnership with the Entonet Development Forum (EDF), a locally led platform for

community strength-building in the village of Bondeni in Entonet, Kenya. -- Advanced a Public Interest Design initiative around a community social hall as part of a team of architects, landscape architects, public health professionals and community stakeholders. -- Documented the initiative and created photo and video web content for EDF to use to connect locally and internationally. Rotary International | 2009-present -- Youth Ambassador in Spain: 2009-2010 -- Organized and led 30-day backpacking pilgrimage on the Camino de Santiago spanning northern Spain east to west. Boy Scouts of America | 1998-present -- Eagle Scout -- Order of the Arrow Inductee: An elite group scouts chosen by peers based upon skill, service, and cheerfulness. -- Numerous service projects designed, led, and served.

Work Experience

Science Museum of Minnesota | St. Paul, MN Visitor Experience Associate October 2014-present Assist visitors in the use of museum resources and activities in museum public spaces. A Interpret exhibits and programs as time and operational needs allow. . Monitor and address visitor behavior to ensure the safest and best possible visitor experience while ensuring safety and security of museum assets. 2016 Summer Institute of Sustainability and Energy (SISE), University of Illinois at Chicago | Chicago, IL SISE Alumni August 3-August 17 2016 ♣ Selected for two-week intensive programming around sustainability and energy with a focus on the nexus of water and energy. A Explored and developed innovative solutions to problems of energy and water sustainability in Chicago with an interdisciplinary team. Relevant solutions included retrofitting Big Box stores and parking lots for urban agriculture and innovating consumer relations in the recycling field. * Worked with Chicago teens to help them develop a plan to affect change in their own neighborhood. A Endorsed by the UIC Energy Initiative as a collaborator in energy and sustainability fields. Xperitas Public Interest Design (PID) Initiative | Entonet, Kenya Xperitas Team Member May 15-June 1 2016 ♣ Established an ongoing partnership with the Entonet Development Forum (EDF), a locally led platform for community strength-building in the village of Bondeni in Entonet, Kenya. Advanced a Public Interest Design initiative around a community social hall as part of a team of architects, landscape architects, public health professionals and community stakeholders. . Documented the initiative and created photo and video web content for EDF to

use to connect locally and internationally. Conservation Corps of Minnesota and Iowa | Glenwood, MN Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Apprentice May 2015-August 2015 A Served the state of MN by working to conserve our natural resources in conjunction with local county SWCD. . Assisted with onsite preparation and implementation of planting shoreline restorations. . Organized and participated in acts of community outreach, such as judging science fairs and operating a booth at the county fair. . Other projects: public water buffer inventory, rain garden maintenance, tree planting, digitizing conservation records, GIS shapefile creation, clerical services Historical Information Gatherers | Minneapolis, MN GIS Researcher November 2014-May 2015 A Researched the history of designated real estate holdings, in particular for use in Phase 1 environmental site assessments. A Utilized GIS skills and software to locate and georeference historical aerial photography. A Navigated historical archives for relevant and correct information. • Regularly submitted deliverables for sites including PDFs of historical aerials, topographic maps, and city directory pages. Top Box Foods | Chicago, IL GIS Mapping Intern September 2013-August 2014 A Produced a variety of maps displaying TBF's partners within Chicago Community Area food deserts, and their relationship to Chicago area demographics. DePaul University Teaching Assistant | Chicago, IL Teacher's Assistant to GIS I/GIS II professors August 2013-June 2014 Assisted geography professors in teaching GIS I/GIS II classes. A Maintained office hours, providing aid and guidance to students outside of class.

Education

University of Minnesota Humphrey School of Public Affairs |
Twin Cities, MN Candidate for Master in Urban and Regional
Planning; Certificate in Metropolitan Design Enrolled Fall 2016 |
Expected Graduation May 2018 DePaul University | Chicago,
IL Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy, May 2014 Minors:
Geographic Information Systems, Spanish, Digital Cinema
Honors: Graduated Summa C. Laude. Dean's Scholarship.
Honors Program. Dean's List. Member of Phi Kappa Phi
Honors Society and Gamma Theta Upsilon International
Geographical Honors Society.

Is there additional information you would like the City Council to consider regarding your

Field not completed.

application?

Additional Information if you become Board or Commission Member Additional information may be emailed to info@cityofroseville.com or delivered to Administration Department, City of Roseville, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, MN 55113 or faxed to 651-792-7020.

Minnesota Government Data Practices Act	Yes
Minnesota Statute §13.601. subd. 3(b)	Email Address
Acknowledgement	Yes

Full Name:	Jumi Kassim
Company:	Planning

Home Address: Roseville, MN 55113

Mobile:

E-mail:

E-mail Display As: Jumi Kassim

First Name	Jumi
Last Name	Kassim
Address 1	
Address 2	Field not completed.
City	Roseville
State	MN
Zip Code	55113
Home or Cell Phone Number	
Email Address	
How many years have you been a Roseville resident?	1.5
Commissions	Planning
Commission preference	Planning
Commission preference	Field not completed.
This application is for	New Term
If this is a student application please list grade in school	Field not completed.
Note	

There is no character limit for the fields below.

Why do you want to serve on this Commission?	As a resident of Roseville, I feel that it is important to be engaged in the future of our community.
What is your view of the role of this Commission?	The Planning Commission needs to make decisions today to help direct the future of the city. The Commission must balance the needs of current and future residents of a community in a fiscally responsible way. The Commission should recognize that a commitment to diversity be it age, race, socioeconomic status, family structure, or business types is vital to the healthy growth of the city going forward.
Civic and Volunteer Activities	Most recently, I served as a volunteer attorney for the Executive Order Rapid Response Team that was formed in partnership with the Immigrant Law Center of Minnesota. I provided legal and other assistance at MSP Airport for families and passengers affected by the executive orders passed by the new administration. In 2014-2015, I was the phone tree chair for the Family Readiness Group of the 34th Combat Aviation Brigade. I coordinated volunteer callers to make sure that the family members of deployed soldiers were given the information that they needed about the deployment and support services available to them. I have served on the crew for the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer 3-Day walk for 3 years, 1 year as a team captain.
Work Experience	2014-Present - Patent Attorney at Patterson Thuente IP 2013- 2014 - Law Clerk at Patterson Thuente IP 2002-2013 - Software Engineer at Boston Scientific (Formerly Guidant) Please see my LinkedIn page for more detail: https://www.linkedin.com/in/jumi-kassim-b5453b3/
Education	Juris Doctor, William Mitchell College of Law (St. Paul, MN) - 2014 Bachelor of Engineering and Management, McMaster University (Hamilton, ON) - 2002
Is there additional information you would like the City Council to consider regarding your application?	Field not completed.

Additional Information if you become Board or Commission Member Additional information may be emailed to <u>info@cityofroseville.com</u> or delivered to

Administration Department, City of Roseville, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, MN 55113 or faxed to 651-792-7020.

Minnesota Government Data Practices Act	Yes
Minnesota Statute §13.601. subd. 3(b)	Home/Cell Phone
Acknowledgement	Yes

Full Name:	Sharon Brown
Company:	Planning

Home Address: Roseville, MN 55113

Mobile:

E-mail:

E-mail Display As: Sharon Brown

First Name	Sharon
Last Name	Brown
Address 1	
Address 2	Field not completed.
City	Roseville
State	MN
Zip Code	55113
Home or Cell Phone Number	
Email Address	
How many years have you been a Roseville resident?	9 years
Commissions	Planning
Commission preference	Planning
Commission preference	Parks & Recreation
This application is for	New Term
If this is a student application please list grade in school	Field not completed.
Note	

There is no character limit for the fields below.

Why do you want to serve on this Commission?	I feel Roseville can be a vibrant and thriving community. We are in the heart of the Twin Cities with so much to offer. I would like to make a difference in my community by being an active member.
What is your view of the role of this Commission?	I feel the role is to make sound plans for the future of the community. To make sure that there is fiscal responsibility in the planning and create a community where everyone is included.
Civic and Volunteer Activities	I am a Vice President for Friends of Roseville Parks. I have been active for 5 years at various functions. I am Chairman of Tapped and Uncorked Roseville's Brewfest. I am a Gavel Club award winner.
Work Experience	I am an Interior Decorator and Stager. I have had my own business for 13 years. I currently work with 7 Realtors in the area part time to full time. I became a Realtor as of last year.
Education	I have a two year Associates Degree. I also have 3.5 years of additional college at the University of Minnesota
Is there additional information you would like the City Council to consider regarding your application?	I am committed to Roseville. I plan on being a life long resident and I would like to make a difference in my community and be a part of the bigger picture going forward.
Additional information may	u become Board or Commission Member be emailed to info@cityofroseville.com or delivered to c, City of Roseville, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, 1792-7020.
Minnesota Government Data Practices Act	Yes
Minnesota Statute §13.601. subd. 3(b)	Home/Cell Phone, Email Address
Acknowledgement	Yes

Full Name:	Kelli Johanson
Company:	Planning

Home Address: Roseville, MN 55113

Mobile:

E-mail:

E-mail Display As: Kelli Johanson

First Name	Kelli
Last Name	Johanson
Address 1	
Address 2	Field not completed.
City	Roseville
State	MN
Zip Code	55113
Home or Cell Phone Number	
Email Address	
How many years have you been a Roseville resident?	5
Commissions	Planning
Commission preference	Planning
Commission preference	Field not completed.
This application is for	New Term
If this is a student application please list grade in school	Field not completed.
Note There is no character limit fo	or the fields below.

Why do you want to serve on this Commission?	I would like to be a part of the planning committee and become more involved with a community that I live and plan to stay.
What is your view of the role of this Commission?	I have never been a part of a city government, but would very much enjoy learning more about all aspects. I would love to be involved in the planning process of future city projects.
Civic and Volunteer Activities	Give Kids A Smile- volunteer dental work Park cleanup in Roseville and St. Paul
Work Experience	I'm currently a practicing Registered Dental Hygienist
Education	Degree in Dental Hygiene
Is there additional information you would like the City Council to consider regarding your application?	Field not completed.

Additional Information if you become Board or Commission Member Additional information may be emailed to info@cityofroseville.com or delivered to Administration Department, City of Roseville, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, MN 55113 or faxed to 651-792-7020.

Minnesota Government Data Practices Act	Yes
Minnesota Statute §13.601. subd. 3(b)	Home/Cell Phone
Acknowledgement	Yes

Full Name:	Joseph Hartmann
Company:	Planning

Home Address: Roseville, MN 55113

Home:

E-mail:

E-mail Display As: Joseph Hartmann

First Name	Joseph
Last Name	Hartmann
Address 1	
Address 2	Field not completed.
City	Roseville
State	MN
Zip Code	55113
Home or Cell Phone Number	
Email Address	
How many years have you been a Roseville resident?	20
Commissions	Planning
Commission preference	Planning
Commission preference	Parks & Recreation
This application is for	New Term
If this is a student application please list grade in school	Field not completed.
Note	

Why do you want to serve on this Commission?

I graduated from the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities with a master's degree in Urban and Regional Planning. My background is in public health and I am interested in working for a local unit of government on environmental health issues, particularly how policies at a city-level can have positive health impacts for residents. This commission would be an opportunity to apply what I have learned; my skills and education would be asset to the Planning Commission because I have experience with the comprehensive planning process while working for the city of Brooklyn Center as a Code Enforcement Technician.

What is your view of the role of this Commission?

The Planning Commission is an outlet for residents of the city of Roseville to contact their government with any questions or concerns that they might have around planning or zoning. At the same time, the Planning Commission serves at the pleasure of the City Council to offer recommendations on plans, policies, and other applications. Members of the Planning Commission therefore have to maintain professional relationships with residents and City Council members and attempt to balance the concerns of both parties. Because of my experience serving on Commissions in the past and my experience with the City of Brooklyn Center, I am confident in my ability to remain professional in contentious public meetings with multiple competing viewpoints.

Civic and Volunteer Activities

In the past, I have served on the Willmar Zoning Board of Appeals from 2013-2014. Also while living in the city of Willmar, I worked with Habitat for Humanity of West Central Minnesota as an AmeriCorps VISTA, where I learned how to conduct volunteer recruitment and engagement for the affiliate. Currently, I volunteer with Bridging as a Warehouse Associate. I interact with the public extensively and in particular, I have experience interacting with diverse communities. Because of my experience, I can effectively communicate with a wide range of Roseville residents.

Work Experience

Most recently, I worked for the city of Brooklyn Center as a Code Enforcement Technician where I interpreted that city's Zoning Code of Ordinances and conducted proactive sweeps of the community looking for nuisance code violations. I am confident in my ability to explain the zoning code and

communicate planning and zoning technical data. Previously, I worked for the University of Minnesota as a Student Recycling Coordinator with Waste Recovery Services, where I conducted public outreach campaigns around a proposal to incorporate composting into campus operations. I have experience with writing policies and making policy recommendations in front of administrators. As an Inside Sales Representative with the Deluxe Corporation, I served our small business clients overthe-phone by completing orders for Deluxe products while educating them on other deals, sales, or opportunities for Deluxe products. Because of my experience, I can overcome objections and handle complaints from residents during meetings.

Education

As a part of my graduate school education, I completed a capstone project with the Carver County Parks and Recreation department where I assisted the department in their efforts to engage communities of color around the comprehensive planning process. My experience would be an asset to the Planning Commission because I can lead public awareness campaigns as part of the 2040 comprehensive planning process.

Is there additional information you would like the City Council to consider regarding your application?

Field not completed.

Additional Information if you become Board or Commission Member Additional information may be emailed to <u>info@cityofroseville.com</u> or delivered to Administration Department, City of Roseville, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, MN 55113 or faxed to 651-792-7020.

Minnesota Government Data Practices Act	Yes		
Minnesota Statute §13.601. subd. 3(b)	Home/Cell Phone		
Acknowledgement	Yes		

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: 05/15/17

Item No.: 7.b

Department Approval

City Manager Approval

Cttop K. mille

Item Description: Review Ramsey County's 2018 Assessed Market Value Report

BACKGROUND

At the March 20, 2017 City Council meeting, the Council endorsed a general timeline for the 2018 budget process with the understanding that the calendar could change. The general timeline is as follows:

2018 Budget Process Timeline			Estimated
_		Regular or	Discussion
Discussion Topic	<u>Date</u>	Worksess.	Time (mins.)
Review Ramsey County Assessed Market Value Data	5/15/2017	w/s	15
Receive 2018-2037 Capital Improvement Plan	5/15/2017	w/s	45
Review Impacts from the 2017 Legislative Session	6/12/2017	regular	10
Review Citizen Comments on 2018 Budget Priorities	6/12/2017	regular	30
EDA Budget & Tax Levy Discussion	7/17/2017	w/s	30
Receive City Council Budgetary Goals	7/17/2017	w/s	30
Receive the 2018 City Manager Recommended Budget	8/28/2017	regular	45
Adopt Preliminary EDA Tax Levy	9/11/2017	regular	10
Receive Budget Recommendations from the Finance Commission	9/18/2017	w/s	30
Adopt Preliminary Budget & Tax Levy	9/25/2017	regular	20
Review & Adopt 2018 Proposed Utility Rates	11/13/2017	w/s	30
Review & Adopt 2018 Proposed Fee Schedule	11/13/2017	w/s	30
Final Budget Hearing (Truth-in-Taxation Hearing)	12/4/2017	regular	20
Adopt Final EDA Tax Levy	12/11/2017	regular	10
Adopt Final Budget, CIP & Tax Levy	12/11/2017	regular	20

The Ramsey County Assessor's Office released its annual Report on Assessed Market Valuations on March 27, 2017. A copy of the report is included in *Attachment A*. Highlights of the Report include:

Roseville's overall market value (tax base) is projected to increase 5.13% (see page 18)

☐ The median-valued, single-family home is projected to increase 4.3%; from \$227,150 to \$236,900 (see page 21)

Because the percentage increase in overall tax base is somewhat higher than the increase in the median value for single-family homes; it essentially means that any percentage increase in the tax levy will result in a slightly lower change in the impact on a median valued, single-family home. For example, a levy

3

11

12

16

17

increase of 4.0% will result in a 3.5% tax increase on the median-valued home.

19 **POLICY OBJECTIVE**

20 Not applicable.

21 FINANCIAL IMPACTS

Not applicable.

23 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Not applicable.

25 REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION

For information purposes only. No formal Council action is requested, however Staff is seeking comment and guidance as it relates to the 2018 Budget.

28 29

Prepared by: Chris Miller, Finance Director

Attachments: A: Ramsey County Assessor's Office 2018 Assessed Market Value Report



Stephen Baker, SAMA, CAE – County Assessor 90 Plato Blvd West, Suite 400 Saint Paul, MN 55107 Tel: (651) 266-2131 Fax: (651) 266-2001

AskCountyAssessor@co.ramsey.mn.us

March 27, 2017

Dear Ramsey County Community,

We are respectfully submitting the 2017 Payable 2018 Ramsey County Assessor's Report.

The valuation notices mailed to each Ramsey County property owner on March 14, 2017 included the assessor's proposed 2017 estimated market value, the proposed taxable market value, and the proposed property classification for 2017 payable 2018.

Market conditions continue to recover and we are now seeing positive value trends that vary by market areas of the county and by property value and property type. Residential value growth continued to accelerate this past year. Commercial and apartment property values generally experienced greater appreciation than in the 1-3 unit residential property values.

Total growth in the 2017 assessed value of Ramsey County real property was \$3.78 billion, with \$1.98 billion of the growth in value coming from residential property. The total assessed estimated market value of Ramsey County property for 2017, taxes payable 2018, is \$49.49 billion, up from last year's \$45.71 billion (not-including personal property, utilities and railroad). The total countywide increase in market value of \$3.78 billion, included \$600 million of value from new construction.

As of the 2017 assessment, total estimated market value is \$245,871,400 below the peak 2007 estimated market value. The 2017 total estimated market value is also up \$10,853,797,400 from the most recent low point in the real estate cycle (2012 assessment). Growth in 2016 in many areas of Ramsey County was greater than it was in 2015. Differences in the increases in value between the three major property classes will likely lead to some tax shifting from residential to apartment, commercial and industrial property in 2018.

The Homestead Market Value Exclusion benefits most homesteaded residential property in Ramsey County, but it also continues to exaggerate the impact of rising property values on residential property taxes. Due to the nature of the homestead benefit, which declines as the value rises, many homestead property owners are experiencing a greater increase in taxable market value than in their estimated market value. This pattern is established by law and is not scheduled to change.

2017 Assessment

The percentage changes in 2017 aggregate value by property class for the City of St. Paul, and for all the suburbs taken together and countywide are as follows:

	<u>Overall</u>	<u>Residential</u>	Commercial/Industrial	<u>Apartments</u>
City of Saint Paul	+9.9%	+7.1%	+13.7%	+17.4%
Suburban Ramsey	+6.9%	+5.7%	+8.9%	+11.8%
Countywide	+8.3%	+6.3%	+11.0%	+15.2%

Median Values for 2016 and 2017 are as follows:

			<u>Residential</u>	Commercial/Industrial	<u>Apartments</u>
City of Saint Paul	-	2016	\$159,400	\$397,100	\$650,950
City of Saint Paul	-	2017	\$172,000	\$466,750	\$714,000
Suburban Ramsey	<u>-</u>	2016	\$208,100	\$772,200	\$1,255,700
Suburban Ramsey		2017	\$220,600	\$872,850	\$1,463,200
Countywide	-	2016	\$186,700	\$513,100	\$723,600
Countywide	-	2017	\$199,400	\$590,150	\$790,000

Residential Market Summary

Ramsey County experienced steady growth in the 2016 residential real estate market. According to Northstar MLS, the median sale price for residential property in Ramsey County was \$200,000 at the end of 2016, up from \$188,000 at 2015-year end. With continued job growth, positive wage increases, attractive rates, and rising rental rates, a healthy real estate market should continue.

A historic low supply of homes for sale and high demand are resulting in increasing sale prices and market values. In Ramsey County, foreclosures and short sales continue to fall. In 2016, foreclosures totaled 562, a drop from 714 in 2015, and a reduction of 80% from the 2008 peak.

Median values of single family homes increased most significantly in the St. Paul neighborhoods of North End, Thomas-Dale/Frogtown, and the Greater East Side. In the suburbs, the most significant value increases were in the cities of Arden Hills, White Bear Township and Shoreview.

The townhome and condo markets continue to show steady growth in value and strong sale volume. Townhomes in the Highland Park, Thomas-Dale/Frogtown, Greater East Side, New Brighton and Maplewood had the largest percentage increase in median value. Condos in Union Park, Macalester-Groveland, Highland Park Maplewood, White Bear Lake and Vadnais Heights had the largest percentage of increase in median value.

New home construction in Ramsey County in 2016 was strong once again. Notable developments included, Rapp Farm in North Oaks, Wheaton Woods in Roseville, Autumn Meadows Development in Shoreview and Pulte Enclave Development in New Brighton. The assessor's office continues to actively track all market activity and will continue to follow the prices determined by the market in 2017 for our 2018 assessment.

Commercial Market Summary

Office - While many areas of Ramsey County are still experiencing a soft office market, the overall vacancy rate for competitive office space in downtown Saint Paul is at its lowest level since 2001. With the addition of several new housing options, and the continued redevelopment of the Lowertown area, downtown is showing strength. Although new office development remains scarce countywide, a couple of notable projects underway include significant improvements to the First National Bank Building downtown and a major expansion to the Land O' Lakes corporate headquarters in Arden Hills.

The medical office market remains strong, which is evident by the construction of HealthPartners new neuroscience center on Phalen Boulevard in St. Paul. The continued strength of this property type is also evident by market fundamentals that make this sector a favorite among investors.

Retail – The retail market continues to adjust to different shopping trends. One of the brighter spots for retail is the result of intense competition among grocery stores competing for sites. Both, Kowalski's and Fresh Thyme Market added locations in Ramsey County in the past several months, and a new Aldi store is under construction

in Roseville. Rosedale Shopping Center is in the early stages of a major remodel, which will include the addition of a new Von Maur department store.

Well located retail properties continue to perform well, and have enjoyed value appreciation. Other properties are adjusting well to changing market trends. An example of this is the downtown Macy's store, which closed in 2013, but is now undergoing a major repurposing. The finished product will include a practice rink for the Minnesota Wild, an orthopedic clinic, a brewpub, and other retail and office space.

Industrial – The industrial market is showing considerable strength, partly due to the continued growth of ecommerce which is creating large demand for properties. This has resulted in dropping vacancy rates, strong sale volume, and price appreciation. Like office and multi-family developers and users in recent years, industrial users are beginning to look for properties that offer local amenities that are not available in outer tertiary locations. This bodes well for centrally located Ramsey County.

Several former St. Paul industrial properties have been redeveloped in the past year to new uses, including the former Silgan Can factory and former King Koil mattress factory. However, with strong market fundamentals, most properties are continuing to operate successfully as industrial uses.

Apartment – The Ramsey County apartment market remains very strong, with continued low vacancy, solid rent growth, robust development and continued strong sales volume and price appreciation. The continued strong sales activity has led to more competition from more parties. Capitalization rate compression is most evident in the Class B and C property classes.

In addition to the many new apartment projects either recently completed or in the works, several existing St. Paul buildings are being converted to apartments. These include the former Sibley Square office building, the Degree of Honor building and the former home of the Pioneer Press at 345 Cedar Street. Several new projects are also in the works in suburban Ramsey County. Although there are some signs that all of the new apartment units may begin to create competition for renters, demand is still strong enough to sustain growth for the foreseeable future.

Revaluation Activities

Once again, we will have appraisers out reviewing one-fifth of the properties in the county. Thank you in advance for your cooperation with our appraisers as they perform their work. I encourage you to allow them to review the entire property. Our appraisers will always have Ramsey County identification, as well as records describing your property.

Please contact or email our office if you would like additional information about this years' assessment. We are happy to provide you with any available information that would be helpful to your research.

Our office may be reached at 651-266-2131 or by email at: AskCountyAssessor@co.ramsey.mn.us

Our website address is: www.ramseycounty.us/property

Sincerely,
Stephen L. Baker
Stephen L. Baker, CAE, SAMA
Ramsey County Assessor

CC: Ramsey County Commissioners, Ramsey County Manager, City Managers of Ramsey County

RAMSEY COUNTY ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS SORTED BY PROPERTY TYPE AND CITY/SUBURBAN

2016 payable 2017 vs. 2017 payable 2018

CITY ST. PAUL	2016 pay 2017 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	2017 pay 2018 ADDED IMPROVEMENT	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE INCREASE FROM 2016 p 2017 TO 2017 p 2018 (Including Added Improvements)	ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE INCREASE FROM 2016 p 2017 TO 2017 p 2018 (Without Added Improvements)	Total Growth 16 to 17 Asmt
RESIDENTIAL	14,340,275,400	78,829,100	15,352,053,200	1,011,777,800	932,948,700	7.06%
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	1,162,500	0	1,162,500	0	0	0.00%
APARTMENT	3,381,179,900	189,708,300	3,968,856,900	587,677,000	397,968,700	17.38%
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	3,737,283,600	115,926,200	4,250,825,300	513,541,700	397,615,500	13.74%
TOTAL	21,459,901,400	384,463,600	23,572,897,900	2,112,996,500	1,728,532,900	9.85%
SUBURBS	2016 pay 2017 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	2017 pay 2018 ADDED IMPROVEMENT	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE INCREASE FROM 2016 p 2017 TO 2017 p 2018 (Including Added Improvements)	ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE INCREASE FROM 2016 p 2017 TO 2017 p 2018 (Without Added Improvements)	Total Growth 16 to 17 Asmt
RESIDENTIAL	17,060,386,550	115,429,500	18,028,055,100	967,668,550	852,239,050	5.67%
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	36,779,100	0	36,584,900	-194,200	-194,200	-0.53%
APARTMENT	2,188,788,550	61,506,600	2,447,301,500	258,512,950	197,006,350	11.81%
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	4,965,643,200	38,644,300	5,405,615,800	439,972,600	401,328,300	8.86%
TOTAL	24,251,597,400	215,580,400	25,917,557,300	1,665,959,900	1,450,379,500	6.87%
COUNTY WIDE	2016 pay 2017 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	2017 pay 2018 ADDED IMPROVEMENT	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE INCREASE FROM 2016 p 2017 TO 2017 p 2018 (Including Added Improvements)	ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE INCREASE FROM 2016 p 2017 TO 2017 p 2018 (Without Added Improvements)	Total Growth 16 to 17 Asmt
RESIDENTIAL	31,400,661,950	194,258,600	33,380,108,300	1,979,446,350	1,785,187,750	6.30%
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	37,941,600	0	37,747,400	-194,200	-194,200	-0.51%
APARTMENT	5,569,968,450	251,214,900	6,416,158,400	846,189,950	594,975,050	15.19%
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	8,702,926,800	154,570,500	9,656,441,100	953,514,300	798,943,800	10.96%
TOTAL	45,711,498,800	600,044,000	49,490,455,200	3,778,956,400	3,178,912,400	8.27%

Al is Added Improvement


(Reported Values Exclude Personal Property, Manufactured Homes, and State Assessed Utility & Railroad Property)

(All 2017 pay 2018 Values are subject to review and change until the conclusion of the Special Board of Appeal and Equalization in mid-June 2017)


(2016 p 2017 Values Taken From the 2016 Spring Mini Abstract Ran on 3/11/16 (2017 p 2018 Values Taken From the 2017 Spring Mini Abstract Ran on 3/13/17 (Total Growth Includes Added Improvement for 2016 p 2017 and 2017 p 2018) (Includes Vacant Land for all Property Types)

Prepared 3/14/17 JG/TG

TOTAL COUNTYWIDE ESTIMATED AND TAXABLE VALUE VS. MEDIAN RESIDENTIAL VALUE TRENDS* ASSESSMENT YEARS (2003 - 2017)




Ramsey County Residential Median Property Value Trends




ASSESSMENT YEAR


Ramsey County Commercial/Industrial Median Property Value Trends



Ramsey County Apartment Median Property Value Trends




City of Saint Paul – Overall Values (Allocated by Use) *




^{*} New construction value is included in values quoted above. Values exclude personal property, manufactured homes and state assessed railroad property.

Ramsey County Suburban – Overall Values (Allocated by Use) *





^{*} New construction value is included in values quoted above. Values exclude personal property, manufactured homes and state assessed railroad property.


Ramsey County – Overall Values (Allocated by Use) *





^{*} New construction value is included in values quoted above. Values exclude personal, property, manufactured homes and state assessed railroad property.














Ramsey County Breakdown of 2017 Estimated Market Value and Percent Change from 2016

2017	2017 Residential Est. Market Value Less Added Improvement*	% Change in Resid. Value '16 to '17	2017 Apartment Est. Market Value Less Added Improvement*	% Change in Apt. Value '16 to '17	2017 Commercial / Industrial Est. Market Value Less Added Imrovement*	% Change in Comm'l Value '16 to '17	2017 Agricultural Est. Market Value Less Added Improvement*	% Change in Ag Value '16 to '17	2017 Total Real Property Est. Market Value (Excludes Added Improvement, Utility, Leased Public, Manuf Homes and Railroad)	% Change in Total Value '16 to '17
Arden Hills	848,586,500	7.69%	48,942,200	2.70%	341,483,500	3.68%	-		1,239,012,200	6.35%
Blaine	0		0		44,719,700	10.36%	-		44,719,700	10.36%
Falcon Heights	356,924,500	4.13%	54,133,700	3.66%	27,335,200	24.78%	-		438,393,400	5.15%
Gem Lake	78,086,300	1.53%	0		26,563,800	12.08%	2,923,500	2.87%	107,573,600	3.99%
Lauderdale	121,414,600	2.74%	38,905,100	4.72%	21,784,200	14.04%	-		182,103,900	4.40%
Little Canada	602,629,500	4.77%	142,534,200	8.11%	263,628,600	10.28%	1,224,600	0.69%	1,010,016,900	6.62%
Maplewood	2,440,531,000	4.70%	395,040,900	10.12%	1,003,013,700	6.25%	5,773,900	0.00%	3,844,359,500	5.63%
Mounds View	640,022,800	6.29%	125,165,500	23.83%	301,845,200	5.44%	-		1,067,033,500	7.84%
North St Paul	659,413,000	2.99%	102,606,100	10.31%	91,868,000	11.01%	-		853,887,100	4.64%
New Brighton	1,524,574,500	5.78%	260,396,400	8.41%	406,506,400	12.95%	1,495,800	-15.90%	2,192,973,100	7.33%
North Oaks	1,172,106,200	-1.80%	62,069,300	9.72%	48,108,100	8.73%	11,964,100	0.00%	1,294,247,700	-0.92%
Roseville	2,641,122,100	3.57%	455,041,100	10.01%	1,410,251,000	6.60%	172,500	0.00%	4,506,586,700	5.13%
Shoreview	2,661,890,600	6.96%	149,796,900	-0.71%	363,804,600	7.51%	4,806,000	0.00%	3,180,298,100	6.62%
Spring Lake Park	11,752,100	4.57%	675,800	-16.59%	551,000	18.49%	-		12,978,900	3.72%
St Anthony	127,309,500	2.71%	148,273,800	9.23%	67,388,800	9.16%	-		342,972,100	6.70%
St Paul	15,273,224,100	6.51%	3,779,148,600	11.77%	4,134,899,100	10.64%	1,162,500	0.00%	23,188,434,300	8.05%
Vadnais Heights	1,054,034,800	6.57%	89,243,600	12.16%	385,010,600	10.81%	2,741,200	0.30%	1,531,030,200	7.91%
White Bear Lake	1,760,555,800	6.24%	305,923,600	7.97%	395,025,300	11.46%	-		2,461,504,700	7.26%
White Bear Town	1,211,671,800	7.13%	7,046,700	11.11%	168,083,800	12.45%	5,483,300	0.00%	1,392,285,600	7.73%
Suburban	17,912,625,600	5.00%	2,385,794,900	9.00%	5,366,971,500	8.08%	36,584,900	-0.50%	25,701,976,900	5.98%
Countywide	33,185,849,700	5.69%	6,164,943,500	10.68%	9,501,870,600	9.18%	37,747,400	-0.49%	48,890,411,200	6.95%

^{* 2017} values are from the 2016 Spring Mini Abstract and are subject to review and change until mid -June at the conclusion of the 2017 Special Board of Appeal and Equal.

^{**}The 2016 values have been updated since our previous report in March 2016.

Ramsey County Breakdown of 2016 Estimated Market Value and Percent Change from 2015

2016	2016 Residential Est. Market Value Less Added Improvement*	% Change in Resid. Value '15 to '16	2016 Apartment Est. Market Value Less Added Improvement*	% Change in Apt. Value '15 to '16	2016 Commercial / Industrial Est. Market Value Less Added Imrovement*	% Change in Comm'I Value '15 to '16	2016 Agricultural Est. Market Value Less Added Improvement*	% Change in Ag Value '15 to '16	2016 Total Real Property Est. Market Value (Excludes Added Imp.t, Utility, Leased Public, Manuf Homes and Railroad)	% Change in Total Value '15 to '16
Arden Hills	783,397,000	2.61%	45,253,600	7.96%	324,528,400	-0.10%	-		1,153,179,000	2.03%
Blaine	0		0		40,522,500	10.67%	-		40,522,500	10.67%
Falcon Heights	341,528,100	2.47%	51,637,900	16.78%	21,906,600	3.79%	-		415,072,600	4.13%
Gem Lake	75,494,000	3.06%	0		23,700,200	12.21%	2,841,800	-1.79%	102,036,000	4.90%
Lauderdale	117,631,400	-1.69%	37,151,200	14.80%	19,101,800	5.37%	-		173,884,400	2.20%
Little Canada	569,810,400	2.54%	131,837,400	18.47%	237,222,700	4.98%	1,216,200	9.41%	940,086,700	5.15%
Maplewood	2,323,978,200	4.06%	352,470,800	15.17%	921,624,400	-4.52%	5,773,900	0.00%	3,603,847,300	2.66%
Mounds View	599,221,600	4.99%	101,081,100	16.53%	282,940,400	5.12%	-		983,243,100	6.11%
North St Paul	638,764,100	4.40%	90,687,400	17.05%	82,754,900	0.64%	-		812,206,400	5.27%
New Brighton	1,423,109,850	3.67%	240,196,550	18.24%	350,776,500	6.04%	1,778,500	5.33%	2,015,861,400	5.63%
North Oaks	1,155,154,600	2.36%	56,568,600	5.21%	44,244,100	2.63%	11,964,100	28.57%	1,267,931,400	2.69%
Roseville	2,537,937,100	4.62%	413,651,300	16.26%	1,305,172,000	2.87%	172,500	370.03%	4,256,932,900	5.10%
Shoreview	2,476,153,900	4.55%	137,155,200	18.09%	337,996,500	-2.31%	4,806,000	0.00%	2,956,111,600	4.26%
Spring Lake Park	11,231,400	1.22%	810,200	19.89%	465,000	9.18%	-		12,506,600	2.53%
St Anthony	123,571,000	4.15%	129,580,900	11.31%	61,733,200	-5.01%	-		314,885,100	4.94%
St Paul	14,264,143,600	4.44%	3,318,576,000	18.70%	3,677,073,300	5.16%	1,068,900	2.15%	21,260,861,800	6.57%
Vadnais Heights	985,060,400	0.15%	71,311,600	15.96%	345,158,600	3.90%	2,732,900	8.09%	1,404,263,500	1.77%
White Bear Lake	1,652,979,100	4.43%	258,261,100	16.19%	345,246,500	4.88%	-	-100.00%	2,256,486,700	5.70%
White Bear Town	1,127,762,700	3.46%	6,342,000	3.23%	147,896,800	4.60%	5,483,300	-0.39%	1,287,484,800	3.57%
Suburban	16,942,784,850	3.67%	2,123,996,850	15.69%	4,892,991,100	1.49%	36,769,200	7.75%	23,996,542,000	4.18%
Countywide	31,206,928,450	4.02%	5,442,572,850	17.51%	8,570,064,400	3.03%	37,838,100	7.59%	45,257,403,800	5.29%

^{* 2016} values are from the 2016 Spring Mini Abstract and are subject to review and change until mid -June at the conclusion of the 2016 Special Board of Appeal and Equal.

^{**}The 2015 values have been updated since our previous report in March 2015.

Median Estimated Market Value Of Residential** In Ramsey County* 2016 Assessment Payable 2017 to 2017 Assessment Payable 2018

Jurisdiction	MUNI #	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	'16 p '17 Median Value	'17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median	'17 Average Value
Sunray-Battlecreek	1	4,829	4,840	0.2%	159,800	168,900	5.7%	177,253
Greater East Side	2	6,995	7,005	0.1%	139,500	153,900	10.3%	152,127
West Side	3	3,706	3,710	0.1%	134,400	144,250	7.3%	153,895
Dayton'S Bluff	4	3,950	3,958	0.2%	110,300	115,800	5.0%	119,070
Payne-Phalen	5	6,736	6,749	0.2%	122,100	131,200	7.5%	132,920
North End	6	4,399	4,404	0.1%	102,500	121,000	18.0%	126,078
Thomas Dale	7	2,787	2,803	0.6%	100,400	111,700	11.3%	113,916
Summit-University	8	3,688	3,711	0.6%	186,100	199,000	6.9%	255,888
West Seventh	9	3,353	3,359	0.2%	149,400	162,600	8.8%	178,847
Como	10	4,863	4,865	0.0%	195,400	204,700	4.8%	213,031
Hamline-Midway	11	3,299	3,300	0.0%	154,500	167,700	8.5%	171,890
St Anthony Park	12	1,683	1,687	0.2%	278,800	285,600	2.4%	311,766
Merriam	13	3,853	3,859	0.2%	266,500	287,600	7.9%	326,626
Macalester-Groveland	14	6,291	6,287	-0.1%	287,300	308,400	7.3%	340,371
Highland	15	6,481	6,489	0.1%	281,500	292,900	4.0%	335,376
Summit Hill	16	1,803	1,824	1.2%	355,800	367,600	3.3%	431,156
Downtown	17	1,836	1,833	-0.2%	152,600	160,200	5.0%	201,231
Airport	20							
Arden Hills	25	2,562	2,573	0.4%	284,700	307,000	7.8%	327,819
Blaine	29							
Fairgrounds	30							
Falcon Heights	33	1,292	1,292	0.0%	247,500	260,250	5.2%	276,110
Gem Lake	37	174	175	0.6%	246,900	262,500	6.3%	424,902
Lauderdale	47	647	643	-0.6%	177,600	183,600	3.4%	188,012
Little Canada	53	2,666	2,670	0.2%	203,300	214,750	5.6%	223,267
Maplewood	57	11,188	11,198	0.1%	190,900	199,800	4.7%	214,866
Mounds View	59	3,126	3,131	0.2%	182,400	193,700	6.2%	200,794
New Brighton	63	6,178	6,207	0.5%	215,000	228,500	6.3%	242,429
North Oaks	67	1,716	1,745	1.7%	585,200	568,900	-2.8%	646,026
North St. Paul	69	3,602	3,612	0.3%	166,800	170,950	2.5%	181,742
Roseville	79	10,774	10,790	0.1%	217,400	227,400	4.6%	240,100
St. Anthony	81	607	607	0.0%	182,200	186,800	2.5%	209,518
Shoreview	83	9,441	9,436	-0.1%	241,850	260,300	7.6%	279,044
Spring Lake Park	85	69	69	0.0%	150,500	158,000	5.0%	170,320
Vadnais Heights	89	4,414	4,406	-0.2%	207,200	220,150	6.3%	237,168
White Bear Lake	93	7,674	7,684	0.1%	191,500			227,804
White Bear Town	97	4,383	4,400	0.4%	232,000	251,400	8.4%	272,726
Suburbs		70,513	70,638	0.2%	208,800	220,600	5.7%	250,190
City of St. Paul		70,552	70,683	0.2%	159,700	172,000	7.7%	214,327
Countywide		141,065	141,321	0.2%	187,100	199,400	6.6%	232,253

^{*}Excludes: added improvement in 2017 values, leased public property, exempt property, and vacant land.

^{**}Residential property includes single-family, duplexes, triplexes, condos and townhomes.

Median Estimated Market Value Of Single-Family Homes In Ramsey County* 2016 Assessment Payable 2017 to 2017 Assessment Payable 2018

Jurisdiction	MUNI #	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	'16 p '17 Median Value	'17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median	'17 Average Value
Sunray-Battlecreek	1	4,361	4,363	0.0%	162,000	170,900	5.5%	181,433
Greater East Side	2	6,562	6,566	0.1%	139,700	154,400	10.5%	152,636
West Side	3	3,029	3,028	0.0%	134,200	144,000	7.3%	154,174
Dayton'S Bluff	4	3,188	3,192	0.1%	111,400	117,500	5.5%	119,598
Payne-Phalen	5	5,725	5,732	0.1%	122,950	133,200	8.3%	133,998
North End	6	3,683	3,688	0.1%	103,900	124,800	20.1%	127,990
Thomas Dale	7	2,166	2,183	0.8%	99,450	111,200	11.8%	112,482
Summit-University	8	1,893	1,896	0.2%	184,100	189,200	2.8%	263,692
West Seventh	9	2,369	2,371	0.1%	146,800	161,100	9.7%	164,344
Como	10	4,537	4,535	0.0%	197,600	207,100	4.8%	216,043
Hamline-Midway	11	2,912	2,914	0.1%	153,800	166,600	8.3%	170,091
St Anthony Park	12	1,092	1,094	0.2%	334,200	340,250	1.8%	356,778
Merriam	13	3,249	3,253	0.1%	269,100	286,600	6.5%	331,700
Macalester-Groveland	14	5,663	5,660	-0.1%	291,400	312,200	7.1%	351,212
Highland	15	5,725	5,727	0.0%	295,100	305,400	3.5%	351,998
Summit Hill	16	1,132	1,135	0.3%	410,050	422,700	3.1%	501,847
Downtown	17	26	31	19.2%	292,450	287,500	-1.7%	496,655
Airport	20							
Arden Hills	25	2,134	2,143	0.4%	308,200	333,800	8.3%	362,988
Blaine	29							
Fairgrounds	30							
Falcon Heights	33	1,135	1,135	0.0%	253,600	266,600	5.1%	283,822
Gem Lake	37	172	172	0.0%	246,900	262,850	6.5%	415,334
Lauderdale	47	483	479	-0.8%	184,800	189,100	2.3%	201,461
Little Canada	53	1,730	1,732	0.1%	229,200	240,800	5.1%	277,747
Maplewood	57	8,946	8,953	0.1%	200,550	209,600	4.5%	228,323
Mounds View	59	2,848	2,853	0.2%	184,800	197,300	6.8%	204,107
New Brighton	63	5,061	5,083	0.4%	227,600	242,400	6.5%	259,411
North Oaks	67	1,536	1,561	1.6%	578,800	558,400	-3.5%	645,074
North St. Paul	69	3,369	3,369	0.0%	168,450	172,800	2.6%	183,981
Roseville	79	8,553	8,553	0.0%	227,150	236,900	4.3%	262,530
St. Anthony	81	154	154	0.0%	263,700	278,700	5.7%	341,019
Shoreview	83	6,613	6,613	0.0%	266,200	289,800	8.9%	324,762
Spring Lake Park	85	34	34	0.0%	187,800	188,300	0.3%	192,438
Vadnais Heights	89	2,922	2,924	0.1%	229,250	246,200	7.4%	278,071
White Bear Lake	93	6,375	6,377	0.0%	194,700	208,400	7.0%	233,882
White Bear Town	97	3,416	3,424	0.2%	234,900	255,400	8.7%	285,452
Suburbs		55,481	55,559	0.1%	221,900	234,900	5.9%	270,972
City of St. Paul		57,312	57,368	0.1%	161,400	173,900	7.7%	218,783
Countywide		112,793	112,927	0.1%	197,400	209,900	6.3%	244,460

^{*}Excludes: added improvement in 2017 values, leased public property, exempt property, and vacant land.

^{**} Single-family includes half double dwellings (LUC: 510, 545)

Median Estimated Market Value Of Townhomes In Ramsey County* 2016 Assessment Payable 2017 to 2017 Assessment Payable 2018

Jurisdiction	MUNI #	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	'16 p '17 Median Value	'17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median	'17 Average Value
Sunray-Battlecreek	1	159	159	0.0%	108,600	114,000	5.0%	114,845
Greater East Side	2	152	152	0.0%	116,300	128,200	10.2%	133,284
West Side	3	107	107	0.0%	118,800	124,700	5.0%	121,041
Dayton'S Bluff	4	44	44	0.0%	158,000	165,900	5.0%	147,766
Payne-Phalen	5	60	60	0.0%	129,700	136,200	5.0%	146,097
North End	6	143	143	0.0%	120,500	126,500	5.0%	142,599
Thomas Dale	7	45	45	0.0%	134,800	148,800	10.4%	146,071
Summit-University	8	189	191	1.1%	170,600	186,400	9.3%	229,743
West Seventh	9	141	143	1.4%	193,600	206,600	6.7%	241,459
Como	10	40	40	0.0%	170,100	185,800	9.2%	185,643
Hamline-Midway	11							
St Anthony Park	12	85	85	0.0%	145,700	153,000	5.0%	154,192
Merriam	13	16	10	-37.5%	360,250	287,950	-20.1%	262,460
Macalester-Groveland	14	80	80	0.0%	247,800	265,500	7.1%	261,748
Highland	15	134	134	0.0%	176,700	199,800	13.1%	242,284
Summit Hill	16	36	36	0.0%	373,600	373,600	0.0%	404,494
Downtown	17	11	11	0.0%	402,800	402,800	0.0%	475,782
Airport	20							
Arden Hills	25	349	349	0.0%	133,000	139,900	5.2%	162,506
Blaine	29							
Fairgrounds	30							
Falcon Heights	33	53	53	0.0%	205,000	209,000	2.0%	265,236
Gem Lake	37							
Lauderdale	47	42	42	0.0%	190,250	199,750	5.0%	205,202
Little Canada	53	308	308	0.0%	211,450	219,250	3.7%	206,292
Maplewood	57	1,789	1,790	0.1%	148,500	163,300	10.0%	167,341
Mounds View	59	143	143	0.0%	166,200	171,400	3.1%	171,501
New Brighton	63	714	748	4.8%	163,600	172,900	5.7%	173,749
North Oaks	67	176	182	3.4%	609,400	622,200	2.1%	625,842
North St. Paul	69	111	117	5.4%	152,800	150,300	-1.6%	148,403
Roseville	79	867	873	0.7%	190,800	197,300	3.4%	226,085
St. Anthony	81	204	204	0.0%	154,850	162,900	5.2%	175,082
Shoreview	83	2,282	2,282	0.0%	161,000	168,000	4.3%	189,348
Spring Lake Park	85	35	35	0.0%	146,200	153,500	5.0%	148,834
Vadnais Heights	89	904	913	1.0%	145,500	156,100	7.3%	183,115
White Bear Lake	93	1000	1003	0.3%	162,000	181,800	12.2%	196,834
White Bear Town	97	672	678	0.9%	264,800	276,500	4.4%	273,630
Suburbs		9,649	9,720	0.7%	163,300	172,300	5.5%	200,488
City of St. Paul		1,442	1,440	-0.1%	145,700	153,000	5.0%	186,438
Countywide		11,091	11,160	0.6%	162,000	170,950	5.5%	198,675

^{*}Excludes added improvement from 2017 values, leased public property, exempt property, and vacant land.

^{**}Townhome property include LUCs: 570, 573, 574, 575

Median Estimated Market Value Of Condos/Co-Ops In Ramsey County* 2016 Assessment Payable 2017 to 2017 Assessment Payable 2018

Jurisdiction	MUNI #	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	'16 p '17 Median Value	'17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median	'17 Average Value
Sunray-Battlecreek	1	111	111	0.0%	79,000	86,300	9.2%	83,444
Greater East Side	2	81	86	6.2%	106,300	116,700	9.8%	110,021
West Side	3	80	102	27.5%	102,300	95,200	-6.9%	102,481
Dayton'S Bluff	4	113	120	6.2%	65,800	68,800	4.6%	70,093
Payne-Phalen	5	38	38	0.0%	74,400	79,100	6.3%	65,255
North End	6	164	168	2.4%	81,600	87,350	7.0%	93,968
Thomas Dale	7	183	183	0.0%	57,100	62,800	10.0%	64,514
Summit-University	8	1,048	1,053	0.5%	175,900	188,800	7.3%	216,033
West Seventh	9	413	508	23.0%	224,100	210,500	-6.1%	241,717
Como	10	94	94	0.0%	86,400	93,750	8.5%	98,503
Hamline-Midway	11	12	16	33.3%	73,100	80,400	10.0%	80,900
St Anthony Park	12	356	356	0.0%	197,900	208,700	5.5%	211,019
Merriam	13	112	118	5.4%	121,700	142,300	16.9%	189,477
Macalester-Groveland	14	246	246	0.0%	42,700	56,500	32.3%	70,726
Highland	15	461	461	0.0%	148,400	159,600	7.5%	170,505
Summit Hill	16	463	476	2.8%	189,800	200,450	5.6%	239,318
Downtown	17	1,878	1,880	0.1%	143,600	150,900	5.1%	185,627
Airport	20							
Arden Hills	25	72	72	0.0%	84,700	89,800	6.0%	84,846
Blaine	29							
Fairgrounds	30	i i i	 				 	
Falcon Heights	33	93	93	0.0%	198,600	198,600	0.0%	194,714
Gem Lake	37							
Lauderdale	47	104	104	0.0%	110,400	116,950	5.9%	108,833
Little Canada	53	612	612	0.0%	66,700	78,300	17.4%	78,244
Maplewood	57	512	511	-0.2%	108,700	122,900	13.1%	121,982
Mounds View	59	154	154	0.0%	114,750	121,000	5.4%	124,854
New Brighton	63	404	402	-0.5%	117,500	128,450	9.3%	125,724
North Oaks	67							
North St. Paul	69	77	77	0.0%	117,700	127,900	8.7%	129,796
Roseville	79	1,256	1,545	23.0%	76,000	86,900	14.3%	104,203
St. Anthony	81	238	238	0.0%	134,500	148,300	10.3%	151,121
Shoreview	83	515	592	15.0%	77,700	91,200	17.4%	103,570
Spring Lake Park	85							
Vadnais Heights	89	550	550	0.0%	93,900	111,600	18.8%	109,624
White Bear Lake	93	207	207	0.0%	120,100	135,500	12.8%	176,243
White Bear Town	97	277	276	-0.4%	98,100	111,800	14.0%	114,955
Suburbs		5,357	5,433	1.4%	91,800	102,300	11.4%	112,699
City of St. Paul		5,853		,	143,000	150,800	0.070	
Countywide		11,210	11,449	2.1%	106,800	116,300	8.9%	148,237

^{*}Excludes added improvement from 2017 values, leased public property, exempt property, and vacant land.

^{*}Starting with the 2017 report, Residential Co-Ops are included in this chart.

^{**}LUCs: 550 and 560

Residential Sales Between 10/1/15 and 9/30/16 By District / City

	MUNI	Sale	Median	Average	Standard	Minimum	Maximum
Jurisdiction	#	Count	Price	Price	Deviation	Price	Price
Sunray-Battlecreek	1	183	180,000	185,651	60,672	56,600	590,000
Greater East Side	2	238	157,464	154,968	33,134	37,000	335,000
West Side	3	107	156,589	157,572	47,767	40,000	315,000
Dayton'S Bluff	4	123	145,500	148,569	51,078	43,500	330,000
Payne-Phalen	5	273	148,847	146,658	46,364	20,000	309,000
North End	6	150	139,840	140,392	52,890	35,000	350,000
Thomas Dale	7	99	136,770	132,459	42,894	30,000	362,392
Summit-University	8	157	219,705	250,535	119,672	78,000	720,000
West Seventh	9	103	188,000	229,441	148,615	60,000	975,625
Como	10	204	203,376	212,263	69,262	67,000	600,000
Hamline-Midway	11	130	178,737	184,200	51,941	87,000	532,000
St Anthony	12	82	239,850	282,324	126,586	118,000	749,000
Merriam	13	152	274,075	307,148	142,686	80,000	905,000
Macalester-Groveland	14	313	306,900	336,399	179,057	37,580	1,495,000
Highland	15	330	277,500	321,848	173,818	79,000	2,245,000
Summit Hill	16	72	324,975	379,491	221,189	86,000	1,100,000
Downtown	17	181	170,000	200,300	125,639	55,000	850,000
Arden Hills	25	74	263,088	307,153	183,629	75,563	1,220,000
Falcon Heights	33	35	288,800	289,559	80,311	130,000	518,406
Gem Lake	37				İ	İ	
Lauderdale	47	24	176,815	166,896	55,766	86,755	304,600
Little Canada	53	122	213,715	216,734	130,986	51,500	740,000
Maplewood	57	432	199,330	215,347	76,120	55,900	530,000
Mounds View	59	117	190,000	193,964	56,431	75,000	362,900
New Brighton	63	219	232,000	254,644	109,116	78,000	805,000
North Oaks	67	71	593,000	612,946	285,287	162,300	1,690,000
North St. Paul	69	132	197,000	202,027	54,596	89,900	365,000
Roseville	79	381	219,000	229,206	111,140	42,100	785,000
St. Anthony	81	34	162,000	197,801	118,333	62,900	543,510
Shoreview	83	331	223,000	247,691	134,656	56,163	1,400,000
Spring Lake	85	3	147,750	164,599	31,594	145,000	201,046
Vadnais	89	146	207,200	225,645	108,471	84,000	641,000
White Bear	93	248	206,075	232,398	133,505	70,000	1,500,000
White Bear	97	150	240,775	259,643	170,865	50,000	1,775,000
City of St. Paul	 - 	2,897	186,735	226,211	138,830	20,000	2,245,000
Suburbs		2,519	216,326	242,575	140,127	42,100	1,775,000
Countywide		5,416	201,000	233,822	139,661	20,000	2,245,000

^{**}Residential property includes single-family, duplexes, triplexes, condos and townhomes.

^{**}Good for state study sales only.

Median Estimated Market Value Of Apartments In Ramsey County* 2016 Assessment Payable 2017 to 2017 Assessment Payable 2018 Sorted by City

Jurisdiction	MUNI #	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	'16 p '17 Median Value	'17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median	'17 Average Value
Sunray-Battlecreek	1	30	30	0.0%	7,490,150	8,019,700	7.1%	8,535,017
Greater East Side	2	96	96	0.0%	710,550			1,664,244
West Side	3	69	73	5.8%	304,800	335,300	10.0%	1,450,968
Dayton'S Bluff	4	101	105	4.0%	303,400	369,700	21.9%	989,328
Payne-Phalen	5	151	154	2.0%	303,400	326,000	7.4%	1,040,648
North End	6	112	114	1.8%	1,229,450	1,098,000	-10.7%	1,565,351
Thomas Dale	7	74	79	6.8%	278,600	330,800	18.7%	807,958
Summit-University	8	205	216	5.4%	526,500	579,850	10.1%	1,288,029
West Seventh	9	65	68	4.6%	424,500	482,350	13.6%	3,840,890
Como	10	46	49	6.5%	790,900	846,000	7.0%	4,041,265
Hamline-Midway	11	85	86	1.2%	384,600	453,050	17.8%	847,994
St Anthony Park	12	75	82	9.3%	702,300	850,600	21.1%	3,045,006
Merriam	13	240	247	2.9%	493,150	550,800	11.7%	1,203,123
Macalester-Groveland	14	122	123	0.8%	799,450	848,500	6.1%	1,156,773
Highland	15	144	151	4.9%	1,246,050	1,341,800	7.7%	3,721,437
Summit Hill	16	112	111	-0.9%	770,150	827,800	7.5%	1,169,079
Downtown	17	41	49	19.5%	4,819,400	5,440,900	12.9%	10,565,624
Airport	20	T						
Arden Hills	25	5	5	0.0%	5,615,700	6,264,000	11.5%	8,725,060
Blaine	29							
Fairgrounds	30							
Falcon Heights	33	24	24	0.0%	753,250	821,850	9.1%	2,354,908
Gem Lake	37							
Lauderdale	47	17	17	0.0%	1,029,900	1,124,600	9.2%	2,284,582
Little Canada	53	37	38	2.7%	322,600	379,100	17.5%	3,787,339
Maplewood	57	87	94	8.0%	2,089,400	2,392,450	14.5%	4,181,372
Mounds View	59	62	64	3.2%	335,650	500,800	49.2%	1,953,780
New Brighton	63	61	64	4.9%	1,768,800	2,038,450	15.2%	4,056,339
North Oaks	67		4			10695900		15127450
North St. Paul	69	63	64	1.6%	359,000	418,100	16.5%	1,592,497
Roseville	79	98	102	4.1%	1,520,850	1,669,850	9.8%	4,409,800
St. Anthony	81	24	25	4.2%	1,339,900	1,470,600	9.8%	5,920,968
Shoreview	83	16	16	0.0%	5,882,900	6,456,800	9.8%	8,807,594
Spring Lake Park	85	1	1	0.0%	810,200	675,800	-16.6%	675,800
Vadnais Heights	89	28	29	3.6%	1,397,400	1,552,600	11.1%	3,034,797
White Bear Lake	93	53	59	11.3%	2,970,000	3,038,900	2.3%	5,153,188
White Bear Twp	97	1	1	0.0%	6,342,000	7,046,700	11.1%	7,046,700
Suburbs		577	607	5.2%	1,255,700	1,463,200	16.5%	3,890,513
City of St. Paul		1,768	1,833	3.7%	650,950	714,000	9.7%	2,038,770
Countywide		2,345	2,440	4.1%	723,600	790,000	9.2%	2,499,429

^{*}Excludes added improvement in 2017 values, and leased public property and vacant land..

Median Estimated Market Value of Apartments in City Of St. Paul* 2016 Assessment Payable 2017 to 2017 Assessment Payable 2018, Sorted by LUC

Property Desc.	LUC	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	16 p '17 Median Value	17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median
4 – 6 Units****	401	670	796	18.8%	293,900	336,300	14.4%
7 – 19 Units****	402	652	668	2.5%	726,000	785,300	8.2%
20 – 49 Units	403	257	279	8.6%	1,873,000	1,979,900	5.7%
50 – 99 Units	404	86	99	15.1%	4,808,400	5,457,600	13.5%
100+ Units	408	106	145	36.8%	11,119,500	13,797,200	24.1%
Vacant Land**	405	172	189	9.9%	43,600	51,000	17.0%
Apt Misc. Improv	406	16	16	0.0%	129,200	142,100	10.0%
Fraternity/Sorority	407	7	7	0.0%	426,500	469,200	10.0%
Bed And Breakfast	409	2	3	50.0%	411,300	412,200	0.2%
Nursing Home	412	17	15	-11.8%	1,277,800	1,887,300	47.7%
Assisted Living Apt.	413	8	9	12.5%	2,050,850	4,835,500	135.8%
All City		1,993	2,226	11.7%	552,200	609,950	10.5%

^{*}Excludes added improvement in 2017 values, leased public property, exempt property.

Median Estimated Market Value of Apartments in Suburbs* 2016 Assessment Payable 2017 to 2017 Assessment Payable 2018, Sorted by LUC

Property Desc.	LUC	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	16 p '17 Median Value	17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median
4 – 6 Units****	401	137	147	7.3%	286,600	338,400	18.1%
7 – 19 Units****	402	177	179	1.1%	984,000	1,116,800	13.5%
20 – 49 Units	403	109	113	3.7%	2,422,900	2,735,700	12.9%
50 – 99 Units	404	85	91	7.1%	6,022,900	6,825,100	13.3%
100+ Units	408	67	77	14.9%	11,120,500	12,728,600	14.5%
Vacant Land**	405	68	73	7.4%	55,950	58,300	4.2%
Apt Misc. Improv	406	5	6	20.0%	69,300	111,400	60.8%
Fraternity/Sorority	407	_	_	_			-
Bed And Breakfast	409	_	_	_			_
Nursing Home	412	9	8	-11.1%	2,853,300	2,450,000	-14.1%
Assisted Living Apt.	413	12	14	16.7%	5,908,000	7,411,450	25.4%
All Suburban***		669	708	5.8%	1,130,800	1,286,100	13.7%

^{*}Excludes added improvement in 2017 values, leased public property, exempt property.

^{** #}Parcels include vacant land parcels (405)

^{****}For the 2017 report, LUC 412 and 413 data was added to this chart. 16P17 figures were updated as well.

^{** #}Parcels include vacant land parcels (405)

^{****}For the 2017 report, LUC 412 and 413 data was added to this chart. 16P17 figures were updated as well.

Median Estimated Market Value Of Commercial Property In Ramsey County* 2016 Assessment Payable 2017 to 2017 Assessment Payable 2018 Sorted by City / District

2016 Assessm	IEIIL F	ayable 20	17 10 2017	ASSESSIII	'16 p '17	'17 p '18	y City / Di	Strict
Jurisdiction	MUNI #	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	Median Value	Median Value	% Chg Median	Maximum Value
Sunray-Battlecreek	1	68	65	-4.41%	840,850	934,000	11.08%	23,859,100
Greater East Side	2	102	102	0.00%	286,400	318,200	11.10%	21,711,100
West Side	3	206	206	0.00%	391,850	448,600	14.48%	23,560,000
Dayton'S Bluff	4	151	156	3.31%	194,600	234,550	20.53%	19,800,000
Payne-Phalen	5	306	308	0.65%	206,050	251,350	21.98%	24,464,700
North End	6	285	282	-1.05%	282,800	336,750	19.08%	8,085,100
Thomas Dale	7	179	184	2.79%	375,400	456,100	21.50%	7,589,400
Summit-University	8	154	163	5.84%	363,850	408,500	12.27%	9,830,200
West Seventh	9	227	232	2.20%	402,000	476,150	18.45%	32,285,300
Como	10	82	86	4.88%	356,750	374,000	4.84%	19,750,400
Hamline-Midway	11	164	167	1.83%	431,800	495,300	14.71%	17,365,100
St Anthony Park	12	245	249	1.63%	739,200	858,800	16.18%	20,134,000
Merriam	13	221	221	0.00%	455,200	554,300	21.77%	27,581,400
Macalester-Groveland	14	144	144	0.00%	434,050	509,200	17.31%	3,563,500
Highland	15	137	136	-0.73%	650,000	728,350	12.05%	13,417,900
Summit Hill	16	111	111	0.00%	634,900	756,000	19.07%	11,175,300
Downtown	17	251	253	0.80%	397,950	499,900	25.62%	84,142,400
Airport	20							
Arden Hills	25	93	96	3.23%	1,675,200	1,825,650	8.98%	54,720,000
Blaine	29	24	24	0.00%	932,850	1,239,800	32.90%	6,318,700
Fairgrounds	30							
Falcon Heights	33	18	18	0.00%	708,350	801,200	13.11%	3,311,400
Gem Lake	37	34	34	0.00%	470,700	557,700	18.48%	3,912,400
Lauderdale	47	16	16	0.00%	759,850	866,800	14.08%	3,300,000
Little Canada	53	233	236	1.29%	389,800	448,100	14.96%	20,973,700
Maplewood	57	386	393	1.81%	832,200	958,000	15.12%	142,500,000
Mounds View	59	83	83	0.00%	932,100	1,100,000	18.01%	123,088,600
New Brighton	63	202	203	0.50%	740,200	862,500	16.52%	16,100,000
North Oaks	67	17	14	-17.65%	2,593,900	2,427,750	-6.41%	16,466,600
North St. Paul	69	106	105	-0.94%	370,200	421,100	13.75%	10,146,000
Roseville	79	427	424	-0.70%	1,501,000	1,647,050	9.73%	123,935,900
St. Anthony	81	41	40	-2.44%	1,006,200	1,154,950	14.78%	12,150,000
Shoreview	83	127	129	1.57%	1,081,600	1,144,000	5.77%	38,743,400
Spring Lake Park	85	2	2	0.00%	214,950	257,950	20.00%	304,700
Vadnais Heights	89	180	180	0.00%	874,750	1,021,450	16.77%	17,780,900
White Bear Lake	93	356	351	-1.40%	447,500	480,000	7.26%	13,769,500
White Bear Twp	97	72	76	5.56%	817,350	938,150	14.78%	9,606,000
Suburbs		2,417	2,424	0.29%	772,200	872,850	13.03%	142,500,000
City of St. Paul		3,033	3,065	1.06%	397,100	466,750	17.54%	84,142,400
		5,450	5,489	0.72%	513,100	590,150	15.02%	142,500,000

^{*}Excludes added improvement in 2017 values, leased public property, exempt property, and vacant land.

All Ramsey County Commercial Property By Land Use Code 2016 Payable 2017 Assessment vs. 2017 Payable 2018 Assessment By Land Use Code (LUC) -COUNTYWIDE

LUC	Property Use - Land use	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	'16 p '17 Median Value	'17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median	'17 Average Value
310	Food & Drink Process Plants & Storage	14		7.14%	1,200,550	1,696,700		2,695,947
320	Foundries & Heavy Manufact Plants	16			1,450,650	1,452,600		3,655,920
	Manufacturing & Assembly Light	268			1,102,600	1,307,050		1,986,360
398	Industrial - Minumum Improvement	9		-33.33%	553,100		**151.74%	1,605,367
399	Other Industrial Structures	24		12.50%	236,300		15.53%	827,200
	Motels & Tourist Cabins	16			1,843,750	2,137,800	15.95%	2,604,653
	Hotels	24		16.67%	5,356,450		23.88%	7,991,307
415	Trailer/ Mobile Home Park	26		3.85%	2,909,200	3,519,800	20.99%	4,026,289
420	Small Detached Retail (Under 10,000 Sf)	487	492	1.03%	315,000	378,000		457,941
	Supermarkets	31		3.23%	2,834,900	2,981,050		3,600,834
	Discount Stores & Jr Dept Stores	18			10,483,950			ii
423	Medium Detached Retail	103		3.88%	1,633,000	1,850,000		2,156,133
424	Full Line Department Stores	9	-	11.11%	8,050,100	7,240,250	-10.06%	6,888,260
425	Neighborhood Shopping Center	77		-2.60%	2,769,300	3,303,100		4,273,460
426	Community Shopping Center	25		0.00%	8,548,000		40.77%	
427	Regional Shopping Center	4	3	-25.00%	56,500,000		38.05%	76,497,600
428	Veterinary Clinic Mixed Residential/Commercial	27		0.00%	519,700			631,085
		596			275,750			469,132
430	Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar	203	209	2.96%	467,700		16.19%	849,978
431	Small Strip Center Convenience Store	82			906,650			1,262,851
432		134		-1.49%	579,350			804,039
	Mixed Retail /Commercial	45		20.00%	715,000			1,434,567
	Retail Condo Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility	6			137,350			
		131		0.00%	663,400			
437	Daycare Centers	38			816,900			
441	Funeral Homes	30			712,250			931,880
	Medical Clinics & Offices Medical Office	103 49			499,200			1,336,414 5,284,764
	Full Service Banks	80			2,927,600 1,273,000	3,478,050 1,428,850	12.24%	
	Corporate Campus	7			13,500,000		0.00%	1,784,531 51,739,529
447	Office Buildings (1-2 Stories)	477	7 505	5.87%	485,600			1,220,004
449	Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories)	122		7.38%	3,675,300	3,306,800		7,684,044
450	Condominium Office Units	457	452	-1.09%	197,100			
451	Gas Station	27	432 27	0.00%	435,200			558,974
	Automotive Service Station	322		-0.31%	404,450	476,500		
	Car Washes	18			466,600			
	Auto Car Sales & Service	72			843,450	1,063,550		1,986,949
	Parking Garage Structure & Lots	8		-12.50%	223,150	301,900	35.29%	765,229
457	Parking Ramp	57			12,600			1,157,267
460	Theaters	5			800,000			2,584,060
463	Golf Courses	23		4.35%	569,900	554,600	-2.68%	3,317,942
	Bowling Alleys	4			1,605,400	1,710,400		2,220,050
465	Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks	26			381,950	401,250		527,989
470	Fitness Center	2		-50.00%	5,178,200	9,539,000	**84.21%	9,539,000
	Flex Industrial Buildings	216		2.31%	2,375,400	2,690,900	13.28%	3,442,085
480	Commercial Warehouses	655			642,600	739,650		1,524,794
	Mini Warehouse	27		7.41%	2,449,000	2,820,000	15.15%	3,142,786
482	Commercial Truck Terminals	14			2,796,300	2,921,750		3,447,931
483	Condo Warehouse	39		-5.13%	268,800	260,900		341,308
485	Research & Development Facility	8			6,790,150	7,484,450		
498	Commercial Minimum Improvement	43	 	-25.58%	420,000	489,350	16.51%	871,056
499	Other Commercial Structures	109		-7.34%	288,800		14.99%	912,101
All Sub		2,417			772,200			
	of St. Paul	3,033			397,100		17.54%	1,295,731
All Cour	ntywide	5,450		0.72%	513,100	590,150	15.02%	1,664,190

^{*} Excludes added improvement, and State assessed railroad and utility property

^{*} Excludes Vacant Commercial and Industrial Land Parcels

^{**2016} median value updated for LUC 485 due to an open book value adjustment.

^{**}LUCs: 398 and 470 had higher median value shifts due to LUC shifts or parcel counts assigned between 2016 and 2017.

City Of St. Paul Commercial Property By Land Use Code 2016 Payable 2017 Assessment vs. 2017 Payable 2018 Assessment

By Land Use Code (LUC) -City of St. Paul only

LUC	Property Use - Land use	2016 #Parcels	2017 #Parcels	% Chg #Parcels	'16 p '17 Median Value	'17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median	'17 Average Value
310	Food & Drink Process Plants & Storage	7	8		897,600	857,950		1,904,075
320	Foundries & Heavy Manufact Plants		12		932,000			3,082,133
340	Manufacturing & Assembly Light		121	-0.82%	692,850			1,572,390
398	Industrial - Minumum Improvement	8	·		481,300	1,120,300		1,593,560
399	Other Industrial Structures	15	17		198,800		L	612,565
410	Motels & Tourist Cabins	6		L	1,588,850			2,360,767
411	Hotels	7	10	42.86%	8,900,000	9,157,700	2.90%	10,348,240
415	Trailer/ Mobile Home Park		 				 	
420	Small Detached Retail (Under 10,000 Sf)	364	369	1.37%	295,200			428,450
421	Supermarkets	19	!		2,307,500	2,538,300	L	2,539,453
422	Discount Stores & Jr Dept Stores	5		20.00%	8,548,300		L	8,323,767
423	Medium Detached Retail	48		0.00%	1,051,950			1,732,967
424	Full Line Department Stores	2	 	0.00%				10,464,800
425	Neighborhood Shopping Center	23	 	-4.35%	1,927,800			4,045,586
426	Community Shopping Center	10	10	0.00%	7,786,150	8,306,250	6.68%	10,780,700
427	Regional Shopping Center		ļ					
428	Veterinary Clinic	12	d	0.00%	417,700	492,400	L	516,867
429	Mixed Residential/Commercial	525	·!	1.33%	263,300	311,100		449,647
430	Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar	126		1.59%	369,700	412,450		648,214
431	Small Strip Center	31	 		915,800	·		1,285,809
432	Convenience Store	69			525,100			709,371
433	Mixed Retail /Commercial	29		24.14%	647,400	755,950	L	1,340,583
434	Retail Condo	6	-!	L	137,350	L — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —		309,660
435	Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility	61			603,200	710,200		718,337
437	Daycare Centers	17	21	23.53%	577,500	681,100		779,948
441	Funeral Homes	19			571,500			838,005
442	Medical Clinics & Offices	66		1.52%	473,950			1,144,019
443	Medical Office	19		0.00%	3,748,500		L	7,968,826
444	Full Service Banks	32	32	0.00%	1,324,150	1,499,500	13.24%	2,084,747
446	Corporate Campus	000	070	6.400/	40.4.000	400.000	40.000/	000 047
447	Office Buildings (1-2 Stories)	262	279	6.49%	404,000	460,000		886,047
449	Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories)	82	-;	6.10%	3,244,150			9,184,020
450	Condominium Office Units	146		-2.05%	230,000			437,824
451	Gas Station	15			450,000 325,750			517,421
452	Automotive Service Station	188						548,834
453	Car Washes Auto Car Sales & Service	8			516,100	500,000		593,811
454		28			260,350	319,600		364,096
456	Parking Garage Structure & Lots	8		-12.50%	223,150			765,229
457 460	Parking Ramp Theaters	57		5.26% 0.00%	12,600			1,157,267
	Golf Courses	12		·	650,000	·	L	747,500
463		13	13 1		539,300	539,300 1,475,800	L	2,789,969
464	Bowling Alleys	N/A		0.00% N/A	1,354,500 N/A			1,475,800
465 470	Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks Fitness Center	1N/A 2	14 1		5,178,200	301,150 9,539,000		475,721 9,539,000
470	Flex Industrial Buildings	42		-50.00% 11.90%				4,242,798
480	Commercial Warehouses	380		-0.26%	2,566,600 549,550			1,354,411
481	Mini Warehouse	13			2,200,000	·	L	3,024,221
482	Commercial Truck Terminals	13	14	0.00%	1,707,000	1,843,600	L	2,005,650
483	Condo Warehouse	11	{	0.00%	400,000	460,000		549,309
485	Research & Development Facility	1			9,180,300			9,948,309
498	Commercial Minimum Improvement	13			331,800			9,948,300
498	Other Commercial Structures	65	i	-23.06% -4.62%				632,519
733	All City Of Saint Paul Commercial	3,033		1.06%		466,750	25.42%	

^{*} Excludes added improvement, and State assessed railroad and utility property

^{*} Excludes Vacant Commercial and Industrial Land Parcels

^{**}LUCs: 398 and 470 had higher median value shifts due to LUC shifts or parcel counts assigned between 2016 and 2017.

Suburban Commercial Property By Land Use Code 2016 Payable 2017 Assessment vs. 2017 Payable 2018 Assessment By Land Use Code (LUC) -SUBURBAN ONLY

LUC	Property Use - Land Use	2016	2017 #Parcels	% Chg	'16p '17 Median Value	'17 p '18 Median Value	% Chg Median	'17 Average Value
310	Food & Drink Process Plants & Storage	7	7	0.00%	3,029,600	3,484,000	15.00%	3,600,943
320	Foundries & Heavy Manufact Plants	3	3	0.00%	2,817,500	2,901,600	2.98%	5,951,067
340	Manufacturing & Assembly Light	146	149	2.05%	1,337,700	1,517,300	13.43%	2,322,536
398	Industrial - Minumum Improvement		1	0.00%	1,447,300	1,664,400	15.00%	1,664,400
399	Other Industrial Structures	9	10	11.11%	472,500	466,750	-1.22%	1,192,080
410	Motels & Tourist Cabins	10	9	-10.00%	1,843,750	2,137,800	15.95%	2,767,244
411	Hotels	17	18	5.88%	4,427,500	5,703,000	28.81%	6,681,900
415	Trailer/ Mobile Home Park	26	27	3.85%	2,909,200	3,519,800	20.99%	4,026,289
420	Small Detached Retail (Under 10,000 Sf)	123	123	0.00%	386,500	446,000	15.39%	546,416
421	Supermarkets	12	13	8.33%	5,776,750	5,539,000	-4.12%	5,152,085
422	Discount Stores & Jr Dept Stores	13	12	-7.69%	11,481,000	11,815,500	2.91%	12,376,608
423	Medium Detached Retail	55	59	7.27%	2,228,100	2,394,100	7.45%	2,500,403
424	Full Line Department Stores	7		14.29%	7,500,000			5,994,125
	Neighborhood Shopping Center	54	53	-1.85%	3,005,450	l		4,368,049
	Community Shopping Center	15			13,099,900			15,221,660
	Regional Shopping Center	4	Y	F	56,500,000			
	Veterinary Clinic	15		r	602,000			722,460
	Mixed Residential/Commercial	71		r	330,000			609,212
	Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar	77		<u> </u>	877,000			1,168,816
	Small Strip Center	51		<u></u>	877,100	l		1,247,996
	Convenience Store	65			653,700			907,722
	Mixed Retail /Commercial	16			1,059,750			1,622,533
	Retail Condo			12.0070	.,000,.00	., .00,000	001.1070	.,0==,000
	Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility	70	68	-2.86%	766,300	866,850	13.12%	891,165
	Daycare Centers	21		4.76%	945,200			1,140,109
	Funeral Homes	<u></u> 11		0.00%	914,800			1,094,027
	Medical Clinics & Offices	37		0.00%	520,900			1,684,805
	Medical Office	30		3.33%	2,907,450			3,639,694
	Full Service Banks	48		0.00%	1,268,050			1,584,388
	Corporate Campus	7	 	r	13,500,000			51,739,529
	Office Buildings (1-2 Stories)	215		L	671,600			1,632,279
	Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories)	40		10.00%	4,305,750			4,718,184
	Condominium Office Units	311	309	-0.64%	195,000		2.00%	212,858
	Gas Station	12	 		 			603,723
	Automotive Service Station	134		F			17.87%	1,075,843
	Car Washes	10		r	355,150			622,460
	Auto Car Sales & Service	44		<u></u>	2,282,550			2,974,772
	Parking Garage Structure & Lots			7.00/0	2,202,000	2,007,700	. 0.00 /0	2,017,112
	Parking Ramp		<u> </u>	 	l			
	Theaters		3	N/A	l	4250000	N/A	3,808,433
	Golf Courses	10			666,350			3,941,909
	Bowling Alleys	3		F	1,856,300		4.78%	2,468,133
	Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks	14		<u> </u>	556,000		9.35%	580,257
	Fitness Center	14	. 14 !	0.00 /0	330,000	000,000	J.JJ /0	300,237
	Flex Industrial Buildings	174	174	0.00%	2,337,200	2,653,250	13.52%	3,225,800
	Commercial Warehouses	275		2.18%	821,500			1,754,599
	Mini Warehouse	14			2,544,100			3,253,447
	Commercial Truck Terminals	10		r	3,795,550			3,928,692
	Condo Warehouse	28		<u> </u>	225,950			253,308
	Research & Development Facility			<u></u>	4,400,000			13,210,086
+00	Research & Development Facility		} !					
	Commercial Minimum Improvement	30	ļ	20.01 /0	522,100		1.51 /0	864,718
499	Other Commercial Structures	44	39	-11.36%	529,150	554,500	4.79%	1,356,564
All Su	ıburban Commercial	2,396	2,424	1.17%	772,200	872,850	13.03%	2,130,235

^{*} Excludes added improvement, and State assessed railroad and utility property

^{*} Excludes Vacant Commercial and Industrial Land Parcels

^{**2016} median value updated for LUCs: 485 due to an open book value adjustment. 30

Aggregate Change For Countywide Commercial Values - By Land Use Code 2016 Payable 2017 vs. 2017 Payable 2018

		2016 Payable 2017 vs. 2017 Payable 2018										
1310 Food & Drink Process Plants & Storage	LUC	Property Use - Land use		_	_	<u>-</u>	-	Aggregate Change				
Second Power Seco	300	,	503	474	-5.77%	92,336,600	98,708,100	6.90%				
340 Manufacturing & Assembly Light 268 270 0.75% 480,621,800 536,317,100	310			<u></u>	7.14%			51.91%				
1938 Industrial - Minimum Improvement 9	320	•				49,979,900		9.72%				
399 Other Industrial Structures			268	270	i			16.46%				
400 Commercial, Vacant Land												
Morels & Tourist Cabins				 		18,412,700	 					
Hotels	400		1188	 			 	20.38%				
415 Trailer/ Mobile Home Park 26 27, 3.85% 188,008,800 108,709,800 420 Small Detached Retail (Under 10,000 Sf) 497 4922 1.03% 188,03500 225,307,100 421 Discount Stores & Jr Dept Stores 18 18 0.00% 199,705,000 198,451,900 422 Discount Stores & Jr Dept Stores 18 18 0.00% 199,705,000 198,451,900 423 Medium Detached Retail 103 107 3.88% 184,522,600 230,706,200 424 Full Line Department Stores 9 10 11,11% 62,438,600 68,882,600 425 Naighborhood Shopping Center 77, 75 2,60% 277,9500 320,509,500 426 Community Shopping Center 25 25 0.00% 296,565,600 336,131,900 427 Regional Shopping Center 4 3.25,00% 230,0000 229,428,800 428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 17,039,300 429 Mixed Residential/Commercial 586 606 1.66% 231,644,900 284,239,900 430 Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar 203 209 296, 449,800 17,039,300 431 Strip Center 82 84 2.44% 89,092,100 106,079,500 432 Convenience Store 134 132 1.49% 89,092,100 106,079,500 433 Mixed Retail Condor 66 516,67% 13,990,000 77,466,600 434 Retail Condor 66 516,67% 13,990,000 77,466,600 435 Daycare Centers 38 43 13,15% 32,332,300 41,461,300 436 Daycare Centers 30 0.00% 24,181,500 105,854,400 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 13,15% 32,332,300 41,461,300 438 Retail Condor 66 516,67% 135,600 136,987,100 439 Daycare Centers 30 0.00% 24,181,500 105,854,400 431 Funeral Homes 30 0.00% 42,762,500 434 Retail Condor 67,660 13,967,100 13,967,400 435 Daycare Centers 38 43 13,15% 32,332,300 41,461,300 436 Control Campus 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7								-2.30%				
A20			24					50.64%				
421 Supermarkets 31 32 3.23% 101,887,100 115,226,700 422 Discount Stores & 18 18 0.00% 199,705,800 198,461,900 423 Medium Detached Retail 103 107 3.88% 194,522,600 230,706,200 424 Full Line Department Stores 9 10 11,11% 62,438,600 68,832,600 425 Neighborhood Shopping Center 77 75 2.60% 277,9500 320,509,500 426 Community Shopping Center 25 25 0.00% 296,565,600 336,131,900 428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 17,039,300 428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 17,039,300 428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 17,039,300 430 Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar 203 209 2.96% 149,998,500 177,645,500 431 Small Strip Center 82 84 2.44% 89,092,100 106,079,500 432 Convenience Store 134 132 1.49% 89,150,000 163,310 433 Mixed Retail Condo 6 516,67% 15,950,000 15,483,300 343 432 1.49% 89,150,000 163,310 343 432 1.49% 89,150,000 163,310 343 432 1.49% 89,150,000 163,310 343 343 1.49% 89,150,000 163,310 343 34				ļi			{	20.67%				
Discourt Stores & Jr Dept Stores 18	420	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	487	492	i			19.71%				
423 Medium Detached Retail 103 107 3.88% 194,522,600 230,706,200 424 Full Line Department Stores 9 10 11.11% 62,438,600 68,882,600 425 Neighborhood Shopping Center 77 75 2.60% 296,565,600 330,509,500 427 Regional Shopping Center 4 3 25,00% 296,565,600 336,131,900 428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 17,039,300 429 Mixed Residential/Commercial 596 606 1.68% 231,644,900 284,283,900 430 Restaurant, Carteeria, And/Or Bar 203 209 2.96% 149,988,500 177,645,500 431 Small Strip Center 82 84 2.44% 89,991,500 106,079,500 432 Convenience Store 134 132 1.49% 89,991,500 106,079,500 433 Mixed Retail Condo 6 5 16,07% 1,529,600 1,548,300 434 </th <th>421</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td>L</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>13.09%</td>	421			L				13.09%				
424 Full Line Department Stores 9 10 11.11% 62.438,600 88,882,600 425 Neighborhood Shopping Center 77 75 25 0.00% 296,565,600 336,131,900 426 Community Shopping Center 25 25 0.00% 296,565,600 336,131,900 427 Regional Shopping Center 4 3 25,500% 230,500,000 229,482,800 428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 77,039,300 429 Mixed Residential/Commercial 596 606 1,58% 231,644,900 284,233,900 430 Restaurant, Caleteria, And/Or Bar 203 209 2,96% 149,885,500 177,645,500 431 Small Strip Center 8 8 2,244% 89,992,100 106,079,500 432 Corvenience Store 134 132 1,439% 89,915,000 106,133,100 433 Mixed Retail / Commercial 45 54 20,00% 26,569,900 77,746,600 434 Retail Condo 6 5 16,67% 1,529,600 1,548,300	422	Discount Stores & Jr Dept Stores		L				-0.62%				
426				L				18.60%				
426 Community Shopping Center 25 25 0.00% 296,565,600 33,131,900 427 Regional Shopping Center 4 3 25,00% 230,500,000 229,492,800 428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 17,039,300 429 Mixed Residential/Commercial 596 606 1.68% 231,644,900 284,293,900 430 Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar 203 209 2.98% 149,988,500 177,645,500 431 Small Strip Center 82 84 2.44% 89,092,100 106,079,500 432 Convenience Store 134 132 1.49% 89,915,000 106,133,100 433 Mixed Retail Condo 6 5 16,00% 52,299,000 17,466,000 434 Retail Condo 6 5 16,67% 1,529,600 1,548,300 435 Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility 131 131 0.00% 126,596,000 15,548,400 437 <th>424</th> <td>·</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10.32%</td>	424	·	9	10				10.32%				
427 Regional Shopping Center 4 3 25.00% 230,500,000 229,492,800 428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 17,039,300 429 Mixed Residential/Commercial 596 606 1.68% 231,644,900 284,293,900 430 Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar 203 209 2.96% 149,988,500 177,645,500 431 Small Strip Center 82 84 2.44% 89,092,100 106,079,500 432 Convenience Store 134 132 1.44% 89,915,000 106,133,100 433 Mixed Retail (Commercial 45 54 20,00% 56,569,900 7,7466,600 434 Retail Condo 6 5 16,67% 52,99,001 7,466,600 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 13,16% 32,332,300 1,461,300 441 Funeral Homes 30 30 0,00% 24,609,300 27,966,400 442 Medical Clinics & Of	425			L	 	277,997,500	320,509,500	15.29%				
428 Veterinary Clinic 27 27 0.00% 14,990,600 17,039,300 429 Mixed Residential/Commercial 596 606 1,68% 231,644,900 284,239,300 430 Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar 203 209 2,96% 149,988,500 177,645,500 431 Small Strip Center 82 84 2,44% 89,092,100 106,079,500 432 Convenience Store 134 132 1,44% 89,092,100 106,079,500 433 Mixed Retail Condo 6 5 16,67% 1,529,600 1,548,300 435 Divel-n Restaurant/Food Service Facility 131 131 131 130,00% 94,161,500 105,854,400 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 13,16% 32,332,300 27,954,400 441 Full Service Back 30 30 0.00% 94,615,500 138,864,400 442 Medical Clinics & Offices 103 104 0.97% 115,294,600 138,867,100 <	426	Community Shopping Center	25	25	0.00%	296,565,600	336,131,900	13.34%				
Mixed Residential/Commercial 596 606 1.68% 231,644,900 224,293,900 430 Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar 203 209 2.96% 149,988,500 177,645,500 177,645,500 133 131 132 -1.49% 89,915,000 106,133,100 103,3100 103,3100 103,3100 104,333 134 132 -1.49% 89,915,000 106,133,100 104,333 134 132 -1.49% 89,915,000 106,133,100 104,333 134 132 -1.49% 89,915,000 106,133,100 104,333 134 132 -1.49% 89,915,000 1.548,300 1437 100,00% 56,269,900 77,466,600 1.548,300 133 131 0.00% 56,269,900 77,466,600 1.548,300 131 131 0.00% 34,161,500 105,854,400 134,167 134,	427		4	3	-25.00%			-0.44%				
A30 Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar 203 209 2.96% 149,988,500 177,645,500 431 Small Strip Center 82 84 2.44% 89,092,100 106,079,500 432 Convenience Store 134 132 1.49% 89,915,000 106,133,100 433 Mixed Retail /Commercial 45 54 20.00% 56,269,900 77,466,600 434 Retail Condo 6 5 16,67% 1,529,600 15,843,00 435 Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility 131 131 10.00% 94,161,500 105,854,400 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 13,16% 32,332,300 41,461,300 441 Funeral Homes 30 30 0.00% 24,509,300 27,956,400 442 Medical Clinics & Offices 103 104 0.97% 115,294,600 139,987,100 443 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 238,842,800 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,5600 142,762,500 447 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 477 505 5,87% 544,437,300 616,102,100 449 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 477 505 5,87% 544,437,300 616,102,100 449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7,88% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5,56% 9,787,700 11,569,900 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 72 74 2,78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Darking Garage Structure & Lots 72 74 2,78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 457 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 75 60 5,26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 446 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 14,837,000 446 Bowling Alleys 4 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 14,837,000 447 Fitess Center 2 150,00% 14,267,200 12,203,000 448 Commercial Warehouse 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 448 Commercial Warehouse 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 448 Commercial Warehouse 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 448 Commercial Warehouse 655 660 0.76%	428			 				13.67%				
431 Small Strip Center 82 84 2.44% 89.092,100 106.079,500 432 Convenience Store 134 132 1.49% 88.915,000 106,133,100 433 Mixed Retail Commercial 45 54 20.00% 56.269,900 77,466,600 434 Retail Condo 6 5 -16.67% 1,529,600 1,548,300 435 Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility 131 131 0.00% 94,161,500 105,854,400 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 131,16% 32,332,300 41,461,300 441 Funeral Homes 30 30 0.00% 24,609,300 27,956,400 442 Medical Clinics & Offices 103 104 0.97% 15,294,600 138,987,100 443 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 447 Full Service Banks <th>429</th> <td>Mixed Residential/Commercial</td> <td>596</td> <td>606</td> <td>1.68%</td> <td>231,644,900</td> <td>284,293,900</td> <td></td>	429	Mixed Residential/Commercial	596	606	1.68%	231,644,900	284,293,900					
432 Convenience Store 134 122 1.49% 89.915,000 106,133,100 433 Mixed Retail Condo 6 516,67% 1,529,600 1,548,300 435 Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility 131 131 0.00% 94,161,500 105,854,400 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 13,166 32,332,300 41,461,300 441 Funeral Homes 30 30 30,00% 24,609,300 27,956,400 442 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 143,987,100 443 Hedical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 80 30,00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 445 Corporate Campus 7 7 7 0.00% 362,228,000 362,176,700 446 Corporate Campus 7 7 7 0.00% 362,83,600 142,762,500 445 <td< th=""><th>430</th><td>Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar</td><td>203</td><td>209</td><td>2.96%</td><td>149,988,500</td><td>177,645,500</td><td>18.44%</td></td<>	430	Restaurant, Cafeteria, And/Or Bar	203	209	2.96%	149,988,500	177,645,500	18.44%				
433 Mixed Retail / Commercial 45 54 20.00% 56,289,900 77,466,600 434 Retail Condo 6 5 -16,67% 1,529,600 1,548,300 435 Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility 131 131 10,00% 94,161,500 105,854,400 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 13,16% 32,332,300 41,461,300 441 Funeral Homes 30 30 0.00% 24,609,300 27,956,400 442 Medical Clinics & Offices 103 104 9,97% 115,294,600 138,987,100 443 Medical Clinics & Offices 103 104 9,97% 125,246,00 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 447 Full	431	Small Strip Center	82	84	2.44%			19.07%				
434 Retail Condo 6 5 -16.67% 1.529,600 1.548,300 435 Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility 131 131 0.00% 94,161,500 105,854,400 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 13.16% 32,332,300 41,461,300 441 Funeral Homes 30 30 0.00% 24,609,300 27,956,400 442 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 4445 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 77 7 0.00% 362,228,000 362,176,700 447 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451			134	132	-1.49%			18.04%				
435 Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility 131 131 0.00% 94,161,500 105,854,400 437 Daycare Centers 38 43 131,16% 32,332,300 41,461,300 441 Funeral Homes 30 30 0.00% 24,609,300 27,956,400 442 Medical Clinics & Offices 103 104 0.97% 115,294,600 138,987,100 443 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 264,238,200 264,238,200 244,2762,500 244,2762,500 244,2762,500 247,7	433	Mixed Retail /Commercial	45	54	20.00%	56,269,900	77,466,600	37.67%				
437 Daycare Centers 38 43 13.16% 32,332,300 41,461,300 441 Funeral Homes 30 30 0.00% 24,609,300 27,956,400 442 Medical Clínics & Offices 103 104 0.97% 115,294,600 138,987,100 443 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 446 Corporate Campus 7 7 0.00% 362,228,000 362,176,700 447 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 477 505 5.87% 544,437,300 61,602,100 449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 16,626,790 452 Automoti	434	Retail Condo	6	5	-16.67%	1,529,600	1,548,300	1.22%				
441 Funeral Homes 30 30 0.00% 24,609,300 27,956,400 442 Medical Clinics & Offices 103 104 0.97% 115,294,600 138,987,100 443 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 446 Corporate Campus 7 7 0.00% 362,228,000 362,176,700 447 Office Buildings (1-2 Stries) 477 505 5.87% 544,437,300 616,102,100 449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 -1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 126,679,900 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -3.1% 207,456,800 266,7900 453	435	Drive-In Restaurant/Food Service Facility	131	131	0.00%	94,161,500	105,854,400					
442 Medical Clinics & Offices 103 104 0.97% 115,294,600 138,987,100 443 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 446 Corporate Campus 7 7 0.00% 362,228,000 362,176,700 447 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 477 505 5.87% 544,437,300 616,102,100 449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 -1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9,787,700 11,568,900 454	437	Daycare Centers	38	43	13.16%	32,332,300	41,461,300	28.23%				
443 Medical Office 49 50 2.04% 236,842,800 264,238,200 444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 446 Corporate Campus 7 7 0.00% 362,228,000 362,176,700 447 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 477 505 5.87% 544,473,300 616,102,100 449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 -1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9,787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 <t< th=""><th>441</th><td>Funeral Homes</td><td>30</td><td>30</td><td>0.00%</td><td>24,609,300</td><td>27,956,400</td><td>13.60%</td></t<>	441	Funeral Homes	30	30	0.00%	24,609,300	27,956,400	13.60%				
444 Full Service Banks 80 80 0.00% 126,783,600 142,762,500 446 Corporate Campus 7 7 0.00% 362,228,000 362,176,700 447 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 477 505 5.87% 544,437,300 616,102,100 449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 -1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -3.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9.787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 5 50 5.595,400 69,436,000 457	442	Medical Clinics & Offices	103	104	0.97%	115,294,600		20.55%				
446 Corporate Campus 7 7 0.00% 362,228,000 362,176,700 447 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 477 505 5.87% 544,437,300 616,102,100 449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 -1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9,787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 457 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000	443		49	50	2.04%			11.57%				
447 Office Buildings (1-2 Stories) 477 505 5.87% 544,437,300 616,102,100 449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 -1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9,787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 455 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 5,356,600 465 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35%	444	Full Service Banks	80			126,783,600	142,762,500	12.60%				
449 Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories) 122 131 7.38% 866,108,500 1,006,609,800 450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 -1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9.787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 5,356,600 147,034,200 457 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4,35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 <	446	Corporate Campus	7	7	0.00%	362,228,000	362,176,700	-0.01%				
450 Condominium Office Units 457 452 -1.09% 123,433,600 128,381,800 451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9,787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 457 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26	447		477	505	5.87%	544,437,300	616,102,100	13.16%				
451 Gas Station 27 27 0.00% 13,576,800 15,092,300 452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9,787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 7 5,356,600 457 600 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 457 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7,69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470	449	Office Buildings (3 Or More Stories)	122	131	7.38%			16.22%				
452 Automotive Service Station 322 321 -0.31% 207,456,800 246,267,900 453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9,787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 5,356,600 457 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,80,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7,69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900	450	Condominium Office Units	457	452	-1.09%	123,433,600	128,381,800	4.01%				
453 Car Washes 18 19 5.56% 9,787,700 11,568,900 454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 5,356,600 457 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7,69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 479 Fitness Center 2 1 -50,00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7,41% 69,481,100 91,140,	451	Gas Station	27	27	0.00%	13,576,800	15,092,300	11.16%				
454 Auto Car Sales & Service 72 74 2.78% 119,768,500 147,034,200 456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 5,356,600 457 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7.69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100	452	Automotive Service Station	322	321	-0.31%	207,456,800	246,267,900	18.71%				
456 Parking Garage Structure & Lots 7 5,356,600 457 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7.69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14,29% 46,629,100 <th>453</th> <td>Car Washes</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>5.56%</td> <td>9,787,700</td> <td>11,568,900</td> <td>18.20%</td>	453	Car Washes	18	19	5.56%	9,787,700	11,568,900	18.20%				
457 Parking Ramp 57 60 5.26% 55,595,400 69,436,000 460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7.69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39	454	Auto Car Sales & Service	72	74	2.78%	119,768,500	147,034,200	22.77%				
460 Theaters 5 5 0.00% 14,367,200 12,920,300 463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7,69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility	456	Parking Garage Structure & Lots		7			5,356,600					
463 Golf Courses 23 24 4.35% 79,403,200 79,630,600 464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7,69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7,41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14,29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improv	457	Parking Ramp	57	60	5.26%	55,595,400	69,436,000	24.90%				
464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7.69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	460	Theaters			0.00%	14,367,200	12,920,300	-10.07%				
464 Bowling Alleys 4 4 0.00% 7,958,100 8,880,200 465 Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks 26 28 7.69% 12,473,100 14,783,700 470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	463	Golf Courses			4.35%	79,403,200	79,630,600	0.29%				
470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	464	Bowling Alleys	4	4	0.00%	7,958,100	8,880,200	11.59%				
470 Fitness Center 2 1 -50.00% 10,356,400 9,539,000 479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	465	Lodge Halls & Amusement Parks	26	28	7.69%			18.52%				
479 Flex Industrial Buildings 215 221 2.79% 644,962,900 760,700,700 480 Commercial Warehouses 655 660 0.76% 871,908,100 1,006,364,000 481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	470	Fitness Center	2	1	-50.00%	10,356,400		-7.89%				
481 Mini Warehouse 27 29 7.41% 69,481,100 91,140,800 482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	479	Flex Industrial Buildings	215	221	2.79%	644,962,900	760,700,700	17.94%				
482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	480	Commercial Warehouses	655	660	0.76%	871,908,100	1,006,364,000	15.42%				
482 Commercial Truck Terminals 14 16 14.29% 46,629,100 55,166,900 483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	481	Mini Warehouse	27	29	7.41%	69,481,100	91,140,800	31.17%				
483 Condo Warehouse 39 37 -5.13% 13,292,700 12,628,400 485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	482	Commercial Truck Terminals		t				18.31%				
485 Research & Development Facility 8 8 0.00% 95,517,100 102,418,900 498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200				+				-5.00%				
498 Commercial Minimum Improvement 43 32 -25.58% 34,457,400 27,873,800 499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200			8	8				7.23%				
499 Other Commercial Structures 109 101 -7.34% 85,956,400 92,122,200	+			T			~	-19.11%				
				-	·			7.17%				
* Evolution added improvement, and State appropriate and utility property	Total		7095				i					


^{*} Excludes added improvement, and State assessed railroad and utility property

^{*} Includes vacant land (LUC 300 and 400)


^{*}The 2017 values are subject to change until the conclusion of County the Board of Appeal and Equalization.

^{**2016} median value updated for LUC 485 due to an open book value adjustment.


ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE PERCENT CHANGES FROM 2016 TO 2017 (SINGLE FAMILY - RAMSEY COUNTY)




ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE PERCENT CHANGES FROM 2016 TO 2017 (SINGLE FAMILY - CITY OF SAINT PAUL)




ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE PERCENT CHANGES FROM 2016 TO 2017 (SINGLE FAMILY - SUBURBAN RAMSEY COUNTY)




APARTMENT GROWTH RATES 2016 TO 2017 ASSESSMENTS (RAMSEY COUNTY)




APARTMENT GROWTH RATES 2016 TO 2017 ASSESSMENTS (CITY OF SAINT PAUL)




APARTMENT GROWTH RATES 2016 TO 2017 ASSESSMENTS (SUBURBAN RAMSEY COUNTY)




COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL GROWTH RATES 2016 TO 2017 ASSESSMENTS (RAMSEY COUNTY)



COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL GROWTH RATES 2016 TO 2017 ASSESSMENTS (CITY OF SAINT PAUL)



COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL GROWTH RATES 2016 TO 2017 ASSESSMENTS (SUBURBAN RAMSEY COUNTY)



TEN YEAR CHANGE IN ASSESSED VALUE 2007 - 2017

	Change 2007 to 2017	2017 Assess	ment	2007 Assessi	ment
City St. Paul	Assessed value change in the ten years since the 2007 assessment	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '16 to '17 Asmt	2007 pay 2008 Est. Market Value Totals (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '07 to '08 Asmt
RESIDENTIAL	-1,798,109,400	15,352,053,200	7.06%	17,150,162,600	-7.31%
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	-4,177,500	1,162,500	0.00%	5,340,000	-0.56%
APARTMENT	1,691,357,200	3,968,856,900	17.38%	2,277,499,700	1.82%
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	152,185,100	4,250,825,300	13.74%	4,098,640,200	5.25%
TOTAL	41,255,400	23,572,897,900	9.85%	23,531,642,500	-4.26%
Suburbs	Assessed value change in the ten years since the 2007 assessment	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '16 to '17 Asmt	2007 pay 2008 Est. Market Value Totals (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '07 to '08 Asmt
RESIDENTIAL	-1,282,801,700	18,028,055,100	5.67%	19,310,856,800	-4.70%
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	-38,136,000	36,584,900	-0.53%	74,720,900	-16.19%
APARTMENT	986,697,400	2,447,301,500	11.81%	1,460,604,100	-0.98%
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	47,113,500	5,405,615,800	8.86%	5,358,502,300	4.78%
TOTAL	-287,126,800	25,917,557,300	6.87%	26,204,684,100	-2.60%
County-wide	Assessed value change in the ten years since the 2007 assessment	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '16 to '17 Asmt	2007 pay 2008 Est. Market Value Totals (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '07 to '08 Asmt
RESIDENTIAL	-3,080,911,100	33,380,108,300	6.30%	36,461,019,400	-5.93%
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	-42,313,500	37,747,400	-0.51%	80,060,900	-15.06%
APARTMENT	2,678,054,600	6,416,158,400	15.19%	3,738,103,800	0.72%
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	199,298,600	9,656,441,100	10.96%	9,457,142,500	4.98%
TOTAL	-245,871,400	49,490,455,200	8.27%	49,736,326,600	-3.38%

Per capita value change in ten years (2007 to 2017) in 1 - -5,725 3 unit residential property-

The total estimated market value for Ramsey County was highest in the 2007 Assessment. U.S Census Population estimates, July 1, 2015, (V2015) 538,133

FIVE YEAR CHANGE IN ASSESSED VALUE 2012 - 2017 (2012 was Value Low Point of Real Estate Cycle)

	Change 2012 to 2017	2017 Assess	ment	2012 Assessment (Low Point for Total Value)		
City St. Paul	Assessed value change in the five years since the low point of the 2012 assessment	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '16 to '17 Asmt	2012 pay 2013 Est. Market Value Totals (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '12 to '13 Asmt	
RESIDENTIAL	3,247,655,200	15,352,053,200	7.06%	12,104,398,000	-0.48%	
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	-4,170,500	1,162,500	0.00%	5,333,000	-5.94%	
APARTMENT	1,694,457,100	3,968,856,900	17.38%	2,274,399,800	6.21%	
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	739,280,300	4,250,825,300	13.74%	3,511,545,000	-0.66%	
TOTAL	5,677,222,100	23,572,897,900	9.85%	17,895,675,800	0.33%	
Suburbs	Assessed value change in the five years since the low point of the 2012 assessment	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '16 to '17 Asmt	2012 pay 2013 Est. Market Value Totals (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '12 to '13 Asmt	
RESIDENTIAL	3,627,335,600	18,028,055,100	5.67%	14,400,719,500	0.91%	
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	-997,300	36,584,900	-0.53%	37,582,200	2.06%	
APARTMENT	940,537,000	2,447,301,500	11.81%	1,506,764,500	5.86%	
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	609,700,000	5,405,615,800	8.86%	4,795,915,800	0.72%	
TOTAL	5,176,575,300	25,917,557,300	6.87%	20,740,982,000	1.23%	
County-wide	Assessed value change in the five years since the low point of the 2012 assessment	2017 pay 2018 ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE TOTALS (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '16 to '17 Asmt	2012 pay 2013 Est. Market Value Totals (with Added Improvement)	Pecentage Value Change '12 to '13 Asmt	
RESIDENTIAL	6,874,990,800	33,380,108,300	6.30%	26,505,117,500	0.27%	
AGRICULTURAL HIGH VALUE	-5,167,800	37,747,400	-0.51%	42,915,200	1.06%	
APARTMENT	2,634,994,100	6,416,158,400	15.19%	3,781,164,300	6.07%	
COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL	1,348,980,300	9,656,441,100	10.96%	8,307,460,800	0.14%	
TOTAL	10,853,797,400	49,490,455,200	8.27%	38,636,657,800	0.81%	

Per capita value change over five years (2012 to 2017) in 12,776 1 - 3 unit residential property-

The total estimated market value for 2012 was was lowest point in current market cycle for Ramsey County. U.S Census Population estimates, July 1, 2015, (V2015) 538,133

Ramsey County Breakdown of 2015 Estimated Market Value and Percent Change from 2014

2015	2015 Residential Est. Market Value*	% Change in Resid. Value '14 to '15	2015 Apartment Est. Market Value*	% Change in Apt. Value '14 to '15	2015 Commercial / Industrial Est. Market Value*	% Change in Comm'I Value '14 to '15	2015 Agricultural	% Change in Ag Value '14 to '15	2015 Total Real Property Est. Market Value (Excludes Utility, Leased Public, Manuf Homes and Railroad)	% Change in Total Value '14 to '15
Arden Hills	763,531,400	2.53%	42,664,900	19.75%	323,214,400	-0.61%	-	0.00%	1,129,410,700	2.16%
Blaine	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	36,616,800	0.21%	-	0.00%	36,616,800	0.21%
Falcon Heights	333,747,100	-0.42%	43,908,800	0.54%	21,106,600	-0.35%	-	0.00%	398,762,500	-0.31%
Gem Lake	73,377,800	11.82%	0	0.00%	21,692,400	0.19%	2,893,600	-7.74%	97,963,800	8.36%
Lauderdale	119,708,500	8.00%	40,367,600	69.71%	18,703,300	0.22%	-	0.00%	178,779,400	16.63%
Little Canada	556,284,700	3.67%	111,279,200	9.67%	226,264,100	2.18%	1,111,600	0.00%	894,939,600	3.99%
Maplewood	2,234,510,800	2.61%	316,846,500	8.54%	968,271,500	3.82%	5,773,900	-0.12%	3,525,402,700	3.45%
Mounds View	572,061,500	4.87%	88,118,300	3.86%	269,148,800	4.34%	-	0.00%	929,328,600	4.62%
North St Paul	612,413,800	6.12%	77,656,400	19.46%	82,515,400	-0.05%	-	0.00%	772,585,600	6.61%
New Brighton	1,372,358,600	4.74%	204,111,500	9.66%	320,116,900	-0.59%	1,688,500	0.00%	1,898,275,500	4.29%
North Oaks	1,130,578,100	5.58%	53,768,000	9.00%	43,109,400	3.26%	9,305,800	0.00%	1,236,761,300	5.60%
Roseville	2,428,157,200	0.83%	355,799,100	7.30%	1,285,808,200	0.93%	36,700	0.00%	4,069,801,200	1.40%
Shoreview	2,370,352,700	2.55%	116,148,800	9.40%	350,214,500	2.43%	4,806,000	0.00%	2,841,522,000	2.79%
Spring Lake Park	11,096,200	2.18%	675,800	2.44%	425,900	0.00%	-	0.00%	12,197,900	2.12%
St Anthony	112,569,500	8.31%	116,415,300	24.20%	64,988,900	1.68%	-	0.00%	293,973,700	12.38%
St Paul	13,670,997,000	4.07%	2,790,889,900	7.94%	3,530,952,300	3.22%	1,046,400	-76.02%	19,993,885,600	4.42%
Vadnais Heights	984,776,400	3.37%	62,367,000	10.16%	335,248,000	4.67%	2,528,400	0.00%	1,384,919,800	3.96%
White Bear Lake	1,584,656,100	2.83%	219,985,800	9.86%	331,186,300	0.78%	-	-100.00%	2,135,828,200	3.16%
White Bear Town	1,092,091,600	2.02%	6,143,400	15.30%	141,634,000	0.71%	5,504,900	0.00%	1,245,373,900	1.92%
Suburban	16,352,272,000	3.02%	1,856,256,400	10.75%	4,840,265,400	1.87%	33,649,400	-2.10%	23,082,443,200	3.35%
Countywide	30,023,269,000	3.50%	4,647,146,300	9.04%	8,371,217,700	2.44%	34,695,800	-10.43%	43,076,328,800	3.84%

^{* 2015} values are from the 2015 Spring Mini Abstract and are subject to review and change until mid -June at the conclusion of the 2015 Special Board of Appeal and Equal.

Note: Lauderdale Apt % Change reflects a 14M property going from exempt in 2014 to taxable in 2015

^{**}The 2014 values have been updated since our previous report in March 2014.

Ramsey County
Breakdown of 2014 Estimated Market Value and Percent Change from 2013

2014	2014 Residential Est. Market Value*	% Change in Resid. Value '13 to '14	2014 Apartment Est. Market Value*	% Change in Apartmen t Value '13 to '14	2014 Commercial / Industrial Est. Market Value*	% Change in Commerc ial Value '13 to '14	2014 Total Real Property Est. Market Value (Excludes Utility, Leased Public, Manuf Homes and Railroad)	% Change in Total Value '13 to '14
ARDEN HILLS	745,920,500	8.63%	32,267,200	12.93%	331,922,200	2.48%	1,110,109,900	6.83%
BLAINE	0	0.00%	0	0.00	36,709,500	-2.58%	36,709,500	-2.58%
FALCON HEIGHTS	335,337,600	10.59%	41,627,800	8.55%	22,850,200	-8.60%	399,815,600	9.06%
GEM LAKE	65,633,900	7.29%	0	0.00	21,650,200	-2.20%	87,284,100	4.77%
LAUDERDALE	110,871,000	5.16%	23,785,700	4.64%	18,831,600	-4.37%	153,488,300	3.81%
LITTLE CANADA	537,318,300	7.89%	101,463,500	2.72%	222,848,500	-1.91%	861,630,300	4.57%
MAPLEWOOD	2,180,056,300	14.81%	292,243,600	2.61%	938,192,200	0.30%	3,410,492,100	9.34%
MOUNDS VIEW	545,709,000	8.24%	84,789,000	3.63%	265,403,100	1.14%	895,901,100	5.60%
NORTH ST PAUL	578,935,100	7.78%	64,998,800	4.79%	82,723,200	-1.55%	726,657,100	6.36%
NEW BRIGHTON	1,311,249,500	6.87%	185,425,600	3.30%	323,318,400	0.22%	1,819,993,500	5.26%
NORTH OAKS	1,075,204,000	8.75%	49,328,900	8.83%	41,794,400	0.67%	1,166,327,300	8.44%
ROSEVILLE	2,410,505,600	9.60%	328,424,300	3.87%	1,290,482,000	-0.33%	4,029,411,900	5.75%
SHOREVIEW	2,313,666,100	9.35%	105,427,200	16.75%	344,798,000	0.69%	2,763,891,300	8.45%
SPRING LAKE PARK	10,859,500	12.14%	659,700	0.20	425,900	0.00%	11,945,100	12.06%
ST ANTHONY	103,934,000	3.24%	93,733,500	8.47%	64,694,700	0.57%	262,362,200	4.36%
ST PAUL	13,159,649,550	9.41%	2,586,795,050	7.39%	3,483,105,200	0.91%	19,229,549,800	7.50%
VADNAIS HEIGHTS	953,566,000	8.81%	56,617,200	3.50%	323,341,500	3.76%	1,333,524,700	7.31%
WHITE BEAR LAKE	1,542,211,800	7.67%	195,042,400	5.08%	336,116,300	0.25%	2,073,370,500	6.15%
WHITE BEAR TOWN	1,071,580,400	9.91%	5,328,000	6.64%	142,519,500	4.09%	1,219,427,900	9.18%
SUBURBAN	15,892,558,600	9.46%	1,661,162,400	5.09%	4,808,621,400	0.45%	22,362,342,400	7.06%
COUNTYWIDE	29,052,208,150	9.44%	4,247,957,450	6.48%	8,291,726,600	0.64%	41,591,892,200	7.26%

^{* 2014} values are from the 2014 Spring Mini Abstract and are subject to review and change until mid -June at the conclusion of the 2014 Special Board of Appeal and Equalization .

^{**}The 2013 values have been updated since our previous report in March 2013.

Ramsey County Breakdown of 2013 Estimated Market Value and Percent Change from 2012

2013	2013 Residential Estimated Market Value*	% Change in Resid. Value '12 to '13	2013 Apartment Estimated Market Value*	% Change in Apartment Value '12 to '13	2013 Commercial / Industrial Estimated Market Value*	% Change in Commercial Value '12 to '13	2013 Total Real Property Estimated Market Value (Excludes Utility, Leased Public, Manuf Homes and Railroad)	% Change in Total Value '12 to '13
ARDEN HILLS	676,761,500	1.78%	9,902,200	8.43%	322,840,800	-3.69%	1,009,504,500	0.02%
BLAINE	0	0.00%	0	0.00	37,822,300	-2.96%	37,822,300	
FALCON HEIGHTS	299,890,800	1.29%	40,295,700	4.73%	21,332,000	-2.47%	361,518,500	1.43%
GEM LAKE	56,740,000	-7.16%	0	0.00%	24,684,200	-0.91%	81,424,200	
LAUDERDALE	105,072,100	-1.64%	22,731,500	-2.29%	17,856,100	0.27%	145,659,700	-1.51%
LITTLE CANADA	493,433,800	-0.46%	102,056,000	5.56%	232,868,400	-1.86%	828,358,200	-0.16%
MAPLEWOOD	1,886,331,000	0.35%	263,404,200	-0.63%	915,326,300	0.29%	3,065,061,500	0.24%
MOUNDS VIEW	503,050,900	-2.69%	79,843,400	1.28%	266,006,400	0.89%	848,900,700	-1.23%
NORTH ST PAUL	533,957,000	-2.72%	61,231,100	-0.49%	85,629,400	-1.87%	680,817,500	-2.42%
NEW BRIGHTON	1,223,517,200	-0.81%	166,768,600	3.95%	326,246,200	-0.66%	1,716,532,000	-0.34%
NORTH OAKS	951,484,900	0.58%	2,392,500	0.00%	62,956,400	-17.56%	1,016,833,800	-0.78%
ROSEVILLE	2,175,922,700	1.47%	298,397,900	7.73%	1,280,002,500	-0.25%	3,754,323,100	1.34%
SHOREVIEW	2,108,178,300	-0.24%	74,529,700	3.53%	345,176,600	-0.59%	2,527,884,600	-0.18%
SPRING LAKE PARK	9,683,600	-4.31%	639,300	0.00%	425,900	-3.38%	10,748,800	-8.59%
ST ANTHONY	100,572,400	-1.08%	80,203,100	3.38%	70,377,400	-1.02%	251,152,900	0.32%
ST PAUL	11,924,748,600	3.53%	2,276,941,000	-0.94%	3,497,745,900	-1.38%	17,699,435,500	-3.80%
VADNAIS HEIGHTS	865,306,600	-0.84%	52,420,300	4.70%	310,443,700	-1.49%	1,228,170,600	-0.78%
WHITE BEAR LAKE	1,425,610,600	0.80%	179,727,300	9.81%	342,118,800	0.60%	1,947,456,700	1.53%
WHITE BEAR TOWN	966,839,700	-780.00%	4,996,100	18.95%	141,683,700	0.26%	1,113,519,500	3.16%
SUBURBAN	14,382,353,100	0.29%	1,439,538,900	4.25%	4,803,797,100	-0.81%	20,625,689,100	0.30%
COUNTYWIDE	26,307,101,700	-0.27%	3,716,479,900	3.66%	8,301,543,000	-1.05%	38,325,124,600	-0.08%

^{* 2013} values are subject to review and change until mid -June at the conclusion of the 2013 Special Board of Appeal and Equalization.
**The 2012 values have been updated since our previous report in March 2012.


Ramsey County Breakdown of 2012 Estimated Market Value and Percent Change from 2011

<u> </u>								
2012	2012 Residential Estimated Market Value	% Change in Resid. Value '11 to '12	2012 Apartment Estimated Market Value	% Change in Apartment Value '11 to '12	2012 Commercial / Industrial Estimated Market Value	% Change in Commerci al Value '11 to '12	2012 Total Real Property Estimated Market Value (Excludes Utility, Leased Public, Manuf Homes and Railroad)	% Change in Total Value '11 to '12
ARDEN HILLS	656,584,400	-5.90%	9,132,200	-50.86%	332,434,500	-5.41%	998,151,100	-6.52%
BLAINE	0		0		40,609,000	-7.54%	40,609,000	-7.54%
FALCON HEIGHTS	298,684,400	-9.00%	27,975,200	-23.64%	32,373,200	30.19%	359,032,800	-7.87%
GEM LAKE	66,062,200	-10.34%	0	-100.00%	24,912,000	1.05%	90,974,200	-9.12%
LAUDERDALE	106,828,000	-7.56%	23,414,400	1.65%	18,007,600	2.85%	148,250,000	-5.04%
LITTLE CANADA	497,228,800	-6.19%	89,957,000	-5.18%	248,532,200	-0.62%	835,718,000	-4.49%
MAPLEWOOD	1,882,039,080	-11.47%	268,248,600	10.23%	898,802,600		3,049,090,280	-8.15%
MOUNDS VIEW	517,011,770	-7.33%	78,866,900	-2.86%	264,545,300	-1.24%	860,423,970	-5.13%
NORTH ST PAUL	547,860,200	-10.64%	60,917,300	-2.72%	84,363,200	-7.83%	693,140,700	-9.66%
NEW BRIGHTON	1,236,753,600	-7.16%	152,333,000	-3.74%	322,856,800	-3.10%	1,711,943,400	-6.12%
NORTH OAKS	963,200,710	-6.73%	48,277,800	-2.67%	57,094,200	-0.40%	1,068,572,710	-6.23%
ROSEVILLE	2,134,635,030	-8.03%	280,939,700	-2.60%	1,200,237,900	-9.03%	3,615,812,630	-7.97%
SHOREVIEW	2,114,030,500	-6.02%	73,253,200	-2.87%	338,307,700	-10.01%	2,525,591,400	-6.49%
SPRING LAKE PARK	10,119,700	-4.58%	498,500	0.00%	440,800	-0.27%	11,059,000	-4.21%
ST ANTHONY	106,920,300	-8.45%	77,578,600	-5.09%	70,478,000	2.86%	254,976,900	-4.52%
ST PAUL	12,067,800,410	-7.60%	2,116,457,950	-4.05%	3,612,587,925	-2.07%	17,796,846,285	-6.11%
VADNAIS HEIGHTS	879,371,930	-7.63%	44,691,800	-0.22%	296,741,700	-14.75%	1,220,805,430	-9.23%
WHITE BEAR LAKE	1,414,832,520	-8.78%	174,515,900	-2.59%	331,833,500	-6.15%	1,921,181,920	-7.80%
WHITE BEAR TOWN	932,448,800	-7.93%	4,200,000	-33.88%	132,689,600	-10.12%	1,069,338,400	-8.35%
SUBURBAN	14,364,611,480	-8.04%	1,419,514,000	-1.85%	4,695,687,100	-6.58%	20,479,812,580	-7.30%
COUNTYWIDE	26,432,411,890	-7.84%	3,535,971,950	-3.18%	8,308,275,025	-4.67%	38,276,658,865	-6.75%

Ramsey County Breakdown of 2011 Estimated Market Value and Percentage Chage from 2010

2011	2011 Residential Estimated Market Value	% Change in Resid. Value '10 to '11	2011 Apartment Estimated Market Value	% Change in Apartment Value '10 to '11	2011 Commercial / Industrial Estimated Market Value	% Change in Commercial Value '10 to '11	2011 Total Real Property Estimated Market Value (Excludes Utility, Leased Public, Manuf Homes and Railroad)	% Change in Total Value '10 to '11
ARDENHILLS	697,733,300	-3.58	18,582,800	1.80	351,460,200	-0.64	1,067,776,300	-2.54
BLAINE	0	0.00	0	0.00	43,919,200	-1.85	43,919,200	-1.85
FALCON HEIGHTS	328,211,500	-2.24	36,634,700	1.40	24,866,300	1.64	389,712,500	-1.67
GEM LAKE	73,683,300	-6.86	1,772,100	15.39	24,652,500	0.15	100,107,900	-4.90
LAUDERDALE	115,568,000	-4.43	23,033,700	3.16	17,508,900	-0.70	156,110,600	-2.97
LITTLE CANADA	530,018,000	-3.86	94,870,000	3.89	250,084,500	-1.39	874,972,500	-2.37
MAPLEWOOD	2,125,923,700	-6.20	243,355,800	3.72	950,374,100		3,319,653,600	-4.39
MOUNDS VIEW	557,907,000	-4.28	81,186,100	3.17	267,867,000	-1.20	906,960,100	-2.75
NORTH ST PAUL	613,122,400	-3.80	62,618,000	1.72	91,526,200	-3.41	767,266,600	-3.33
NEW BRIGHTON	1,332,193,900	-5.08	158,244,400	2.90	333,180,600	-1.88	1,823,618,900	-3.86
NORTH OAKS	1,032,664,100	-2.60	49,603,400	-20.10	57,322,000	-3.34	1,139,589,500	-3.55
ROSEVILLE	2,321,106,300	-4.00	288,440,700	2.15	1,319,412,900	-4.35	3,928,959,900	-3.69
SHOREVIEW	2,249,378,500	-4.84	75,419,400	4.78	375,960,000	-4.09	2,700,757,900	-4.49
SPRING LAKE PARK	10,605,000	-9.70	498,500	0.00	442,000	0.00	11,545,500	-8.98
ST ANTHONY	116,791,200	-5.54	81,741,300	2.89	68,520,400	-3.15	267,052,900	-2.48
ST PAUL	13,060,644,500	-4.48	2,205,799,700	0.56	3,689,087,600	-2.95	18,955,531,800	-3.62
VADNAIS HEIGHTS	952,018,500	-4.54	44,789,700	7.59	348,080,200	-2.43	1,344,888,400	-3.64
WHITE BEAR LAKE	1,551,027,200	-4.92	179,150,800	5.62	353,582,200	-3.78	2,083,760,200	-3.91
WHITE BEAR TOWN	1,012,801,900	-5.69	6,352,000	-0.33	147,637,700	-4.26	1,166,791,600	-5.48
SUBURBAN	15,620,753,800	-4.64	1,446,293,400	2.41	5,026,396,900	-2.88	22,093,444,100	-3.81
COUNTYWIDE	28,681,398,300	-3.72	3,652,093,100	1.28	8,715,484,500	-2.91	41,048,975,900	-3.72

RAMSEY COUNTY SHERIFF FORECLOSURE SALES (2003 - 2016)



Sources: Ramsey County Sheriff's Department and Ramsey County Assessor's Office

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: 05/15/17

Item No.: 7.c

Department Approval

City Manager Approval

Cttyl K. mille

Item Description: Receive the 2018-2037 Capital Improvement Plan

BACKGROUND

At the March 20, 2017 City Council meeting, the Council endorsed a general timeline for the 2018 budget process with the understanding that the calendar could change. The general timeline is as follows:

2018 Budget Process Timeline			Estimated
		Regular or	Discussion
Discussion Topic	<u>Date</u>	Worksess.	Time (mins.)
Review Ramsey County Assessed Market Value Data	5/15/2017	w/s	15
Receive 2018-2037 Capital Improvement Plan	5/15/2017	w/s	45
Review Impacts from the 2017 Legislative Session	6/12/2017	regular	10
Review Citizen Comments on 2018 Budget Priorities	6/12/2017	regular	30
EDA Budget & Tax Levy Discussion	7/17/2017	w/s	30
Receive City Council Budgetary Goals	7/17/2017	w/s	30
Receive the 2018 City Manager Recommended Budget	8/28/2017	regular	45
Adopt Preliminary EDA Tax Levy	9/11/2017	regular	10
Receive Budget Recommendations from the Finance Commission	9/18/2017	w/s	30
Adopt Preliminary Budget & Tax Levy	9/25/2017	regular	20
Review & Adopt 2018 Proposed Utility Rates	11/13/2017	w/s	30
Review & Adopt 2018 Proposed Fee Schedule	11/13/2017	w/s	30
Final Budget Hearing (Truth-in-Taxation Hearing)	12/4/2017	regular	20
Adopt Final EDA Tax Levy	12/11/2017	regular	10
Adopt Final Budget, CIP & Tax Levy	12/11/2017	regular	20

The CIP contains assumptions and estimations on asset lifespans and replacement costs. It also assumes that all existing city functions and programs will continue at current service levels and the City's asset and infrastructure needs will remain unchanged moving forward.

In addition, the CIP represents a projection of when asset replacements are <u>likely</u> to occur. Each individual asset is scrutinized prior to replacement to determine whether it's still needed and if so, whether it truly has reached the end of its useful life. It's not uncommon to defer the replacement of assets if they're still in good working condition. Conversely, we sometimes determine that the replacement of an asset needs to be expedited because it's failing sooner than expected.

8

9

4

13

14

15

Because of these uncertainties, we tend to focus on the long-term sustainability of our asset replacement programs rather than committing to a rigid replacement plan.

It is suggested that the CIP be considered in conjunction with the City Council's budget priorities. This is an important consideration given the strong interdependence between the availability of capital assets and the operational decision-making used to achieve desired outcomes. The remainder of this memo addresses the following topics:


- 2018-2037 CIP Summary
- Analysis of Asset Replacement Funds: *Property Tax-Supported*
- Analysis of Asset Replacement Funds: Fee-Supported
- ☐ Funding Strategies and Impacts

Each of these topics are addressed separately below.

2018-2037 CIP Summary

 In total, the City's asset replacement needs over the next 20 years is \$188.5 million. This is summarized by major City function in the table and chart below.

	2018-2037	
City Function	CIP Amount	% of Total
General Services	\$ 8,411,350	4%
Public Safety	13,953,195	7%
Facilities	11,584,300	6%
Streets & Pathways	62,438,200	33%
Water & Sewer	72,499,500	38%
Parks & Recreation	19,659,620	10%
Total	\$ 188,546,165	100%



In contrast to the projected CIP spending of \$188.5 million, the City expects to have only \$166.5 million available over that same time period based on current funding and cash reserve levels; leaving a <u>funding deficit of \$22.0 million</u>. In comparison, the funding deficit just five years ago was nearly \$70 million.

For both legal and planning purposes, the City has created a number of separate capital replacement funds to promote greater transparency and accountability. This necessitates a review of individual funds to determine whether they're financially sustainable. Asset replacement funds categorized by *property tax-supported* and *fee-supported* are shown below.

Analysis of Asset Replacement Funds: Property Tax-Supported

The following table summarizes the City's *tax-supported* asset replacement funds along with their funding status based on current revenues, existing cash balances, and projected expenditures.


	5-Year	5-Year	10-Year	20-Year
Tax-Supported	Funding	Surplus	Funding	Funding
Capital Replacement Fund	<u>Status</u>	(Deficit)	<u>Status</u>	Status
Administration	875%	\$ 38,725	99%	134%
Finance	125%	25,124	113%	99%
Central Services	118%	71,775	105%	99%
Police	122%	373,906	108%	101%
Fire	113%	312,233	112%	113%
Public Works	138%	518,907	127%	102%
Parks & Recreation	130%	219,411	123%	136%
General Facility Improvements	35%	(3,589,533)	41%	47%
Information Technology	148%	472,181	136%	114%
Park Improvements	43%	(2,106,045)	32%	29%
Street Improvements	162%	6,952,762	112%	82%
Street Lighting	116%	27,368	108%	109%
Pathways/Parking Lots (Existing)	86%	(228,440)	95%	102%

As shown in the table above, there are three *tax-supported* funds that have <u>less</u> than a 95% funding level over the next five years and will require near-term corrective measures to bring them closer to financial sustainability. A funding level of 100% means that it has sufficient cash flows to pay for all items included in the CIP. This is not however representative of what a particular city function needs for day-to-day operations.

It should also be noted that while the Street Improvements Fund has sufficient cash flows to meet its needs over the next decade, it is projected to incur annual deficits throughout this period ranging from \$439,000-\$952,000. A closer look at the General Facility Replacement and Park Improvement Funds are presented below.

General Facility Replacements

 The City's general facilities include; City Hall, Public Works Building, Skating Center, Fire Station, and Community gyms. Over the next 20 years, \$11.6 million in planned improvements are scheduled with only \$5.0 million in available funding based on current revenues and cash reserves. This is depicted in the chart below.




As shown in the graph, the General Facilities Replacement Fund is projected to run out of money in 2019 and will have an accumulated deficit of \$6.1 million by 2037 unless additional funds are appropriated or planned improvements are delayed or scaled back.

By previous Council action, the Council did tentatively commit to re-purposing \$355,000 of expiring debt levy towards facility improvements beginning in 2019. This will significantly improve the Fund's long-term financial condition, but additional corrective measures will need to be taken before then. Another potential revenue source includes State grant funding for some of the Skating Center's capital needs including the scheduled \$2.9 million in improvements in 2020.

Park Improvements (Park Improvement Program)

Over the next 20 years, \$15.5 million in planned park improvements are scheduled with only \$4.6 million available based on current revenues and cash reserves. This is depicted in the chart below.




As shown above, the Park Improvement Fund is projected to run out of money in 2019 and will have an accumulated deficit of \$10.9 million by 2037 unless additional funds are appropriated or planned improvements are delayed or scaled back.

By previous Council action, the Council did tentatively commit to re-purposing \$650,000 of expiring debt levy towards park improvements beginning in 2020. This will significantly improve the Fund's long-term financial condition, but additional corrective measures will need to be taken before then.

Street Improvements (Pavement Management Program)

Over the next 20 years, \$51.5 million in planned street improvements are scheduled with only \$42.5 million available based on current revenues and cash reserves. This is depicted in the chart below.



As shown above, the Pavement Management Fund is projected to run out of money in 2030 and will have an accumulated deficit of \$9.0 million by 2037 unless additional funds are appropriated or planned improvements are delayed or scaled back.

By previous Council action, the Council tentatively committed to an additional tax levy of \$160,000 in 2018, and \$200,000 more in 2019. This will significantly improve the Fund's long-term financial condition, but additional corrective measures will need to be taken at some point in the future.


The Pathway Maintenance Fund is also underfunded over the next several years due to a revised cost estimate for the replacement of the City Hall parking lot. This too will require near-term corrective measures, but it may also be mitigated through other measures.

Analysis of Asset Replacement Funds: Fee Supported

The following table summarizes the City's *fee-supported* asset replacement funds along with their funding status based on current revenues, existing cash balances, and projected expenditures.

	5-Year	10-Year	20-Year
Fee-Supported	Funding	Funding	Funding
Capital Replacement Fund	<u>Status</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Status</u>
Communications	611%	125%	75%
License Center	587%	115%	133%
Community Development	2287%	1033%	683%
Water	106%	108%	98%
Sanitary Sewer	87%	96%	108%
Storm Sewer	96%	92%	92%
Golf Course	87%	23%	16%

As shown in the table above, most fee-supported capital funds are in good financial condition with the exception of the Sanitary Sewer and Golf Course Fund. The Golf Course Fund will be unable to provide for the scheduled replacement of the clubhouse and maintenance building improvements. A graphical depiction of the Golf Course's capital replacement fund <u>excluding the Clubhouse</u> is shown below.



The City Council is currently evaluating options for replacing the clubhouse and perhaps maintenance building.

The city's water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer funds will continue to require regular rate increases to provide for infrastructure replacement needs. In particular, the Sanitary Sewer Fund will likely require a base rate increase of 9-10% over the next few years.

Funding Strategies and Impacts

☐ Golf Course Fund

 As noted earlier, most of the city's asset replacement funds are at or near financially sustainability as long as property tax and fee revenue increases commensurate with projected costs. However, there are four asset replacement programs that will require corrective measures in the near term including:

General Facility Replacement Fund
Park Improvement Fund (PIP)
Street Improvement Fund (PMP)

The projected deficits in these areas have long been identified as a funding need. On November 19, 2012 the City Council adopted Resolution #11027 which, along with an accompanying staff memo, outlined the following CIP-related funding recommendations for 2018 and beyond:

Year	Amount	Program	Description
2018	160,000	Pavement Management Program	Add additional tax levy
2019	355,000	General Facilities	Repurpose levy from Arena Bond issue #28
2019	200,000	Pavement Management Program	Add additional tax levy
2020	650,000	Park Improvement Program	Repurpose levy (partial) from Bond issue #27

In adopting the resolution, it was noted that the referenced amounts did not account for inflationary-type impacts and may need to be adjusted in future years. It was also recognized that the CIP projections will fluctuate from year-to-year due to changing operational priorities and market conditions.

Given these considerations and revised CIP cost projections, Staff recommends the city continue with previous Council's funding recommendations including the following for 2018.

Funding Recommendation #1

In 2018, enact a \$160,000 tax levy increase towards the Pavement Management Program as originally recommended by the Council in 2012.

Funding Recommendation #2

Take the one-time measure of dedicating \$500,000 of the \$1.1 million in excess TIF District #13 funds that were returned to the City in 2016; towards General Facility Replacements.

Funding Recommendation #3

For 2017, continue to adjust the base rates for the water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer as needed to accommodate planned capital replacements. A more specific recommendation will be forthcoming after the annual utility rate analysis is complete.

Funding Recommendation #4


For the \$2 million in OVAL improvements scheduled for 2020, assume that the City will receive an equivalent appropriation from a future State Bonding Bill.


With these funding recommendations, along with those prescribed by the Council in 2012 that impact future years, the revised funding status for the tax-supported asset replacement funds will be as follows:


	Revised
	5-Year
Tax-Supported	Funding
Capital Replacement Fund	Status
Administration	875%
Finance	125%
Central Services	118%
Police	122%
Fire	113%
Public Works	137%
Parks & Recreation	130%
General Facility Improvements	97%
Information Technology	140%
Park Improvements	96%
Street Improvements	176%
Street Lighting	116%
Pathways (Existing)	86%

Although the table above depicts all tax-supported replacement funds except Pathways as being at least 95% funded, it should be noted that the City's Street Improvements Fund (Pavement Management Program) relies on the consistent spend-down of cash reserves over the next 20 years. Even with the planned additional monies noted above, it will continue to have a deficit of approximately \$1 million per year in 2037.

If we employ the funding strategies noted above, the General Facilities, Park Improvement, and Street Improvement Funds will look as follows:








Property Tax Impacts

Based on the funding recommendations set forth above, the monthly CIP impact on a median-valued single family home would rise from the current \$9.88 per month to \$10.51 in 2018 holding all other factors constant.

If we factor in all planned levy increases referenced in Resolution #11027, the impact would be as follows:



215 216 217

218

219

Under this scenario, the impact would rise from the current \$9.88 per month to \$11.29 in 2019 before it starts to level off. Again, this assumes that all other factors remain constant, and no additional tax levies are enacted. In all likelihood, additional repurposing of expired debt levies will be a consideration in future years to address remaining funding shortfalls.

220 221 222

223

224

Final Comments

From time to time, it has been suggested that the city consider alternative revenue sources to help bridge the funding gaps described above. State or regional grants, local option sales tax, street utility, increased

225 226 227

228

229

230

While any of these avenues may prove viable in the future, only special assessments and the local bonding options are currently within the City's control. Special Assessments could potentially be utilized to a greater extent, however under State Law the amount of the assessment must be equal to or greater than the property's market value increase that results from the associated public improvements. This has proven to be problematic at times as it is sometimes difficult to demonstrate this nexus.

special assessments, and issuing bonds have all been discussed over the past several years.

231 232 233

234

235

236

The bonding option can provide a significant revenue source especially as a means of financing improvements that have been deferred due to lack of funding. However, these bonds need to be repaid over time. As a result, the tax burden on property owners is not avoided and in fact is larger due the interest that has to be paid on the bonds.

237

POLICY OBJECTIVE

The establishment and review of the City's CIP is consistent with industry-recommended practices as 238 well as the City's Financial Policies. 239

240

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

Not applicable.

See 'Funding Strategies & Impacts' section above.

242

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

243 244

241

REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION

For information purposes only. No formal Council action is requested, however Staff is seeking comment and guidance on the 2018-2037 CIP and its Budget Impact.

247248

245

246

Prepared by: Chris Miller, Finance Director

Attachments: A: 2018 Project / Initiative Summary

B: 2018-2022 Summary of CIP Scheduled Items

C: 2018-2037 Capital Improvement Plan Detailed Worksheets

D: 2018 Scheduled Items: Summary of Changes

E: 2018 CIP Utility Maps



2018 Capital Improvement Plan Project / Initiative Summary

Updated May 15, 2017

Table of Contents

	Page
Department & Division Summaries	
Administration Division	N/A
Finance Division	1
Central Services Division	2
Police Department	4
Fire Department	
Public Works/Engineering Department	
Parks & Recreation Department	
General Facilities Division	
Information Technology Division	32
Park Improvements	36
Street Lighting Division	39
Pathways & Parking Lots Division	
License Center Division.	
Community Development Department	43
Water Division	
Sanitary Sewer Division	
Storm Sewer Division	
Golf Course Division	52

Department/Division: Finance & Accounting Division
Project/Initiative Title: Financial Software Version Upgrade

Total Estimated Cost: \$80,000

Funding Source: Finance Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Finance Department utilizes the Springbrook/Accela financial application suite to perform various accounting and financial reporting functions. The current version (purchased in 2010) will no longer be supported and the City will need to upgrade to the most current version.

Upgrading to the newest version represents the most cost-effective means to continue providing the same level of accounting & financial reporting capabilities. Purchasing a new, yet comparable software system is estimated to cost at least \$150,000.

Location:

Department/Division: Central Services Division
Project/Initiative Title: Postage Machine Lease

Total Estimated Cost: \$4,000

Funding Source: Central Services Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Postage Machine is currently in the second year of a 5-year lease cycle and is used by all City Departments. The amount shown above represents the annual lease amount, and does not include postage.

Location:

Department/Division: Central Services Division

Project/Initiative Title: Multi-Function Copier/Printer/Scanner Units Lease

Total Estimated Cost: \$82,000

Funding Source: Central Services Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The multi-function copier/printer/scanner units are currently in the first year of a 3-year lease cycle and are used by all City Departments. The City leases 12 units to serve the needs of City Hall, Maintenance Building, Fire Station, Skating Center, License Center, and Nature Center. The amount shown above represents the annual lease amount including all copy charges.

Location:

Department/Division: Police Department
Project/Initiative Title: Vehicle Replacements

Total Estimated Cost: \$165,000

Funding Source: Police Vehicle & Equipment Fund (Property Taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Police Department generally replaces marked squad cars every three years and unmarked vehicles every 10 years. The decision on whether to replace a vehicle is based on each individual vehicle's age, mileage, overall condition, and potential re-sale value.

For 2018, a total of five marked squads and one unmarked vehicle are scheduled for replacement. Money recouped from selling retired police vehicles is the funding source used to purchase the unmarked vehicle and not the current CIP.

Location:

Department/Division: Police Department Project/Initiative Title: Vehicle Equipment

Total Estimated Cost: \$70,645

Funding Source: Police Vehicle & Equipment Fund (Property Taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Police vehicles are equipped with a variety of technology, tools and other items to perform their assigned duties.

- 1) Radar equipment
- 2) Stop sticks
- 3) Rear transport seats
- 4) Control boxes
- 5) Visabars
- 6) Computer equipment
- 7) Squad surveillance cameras
- 8) Defibrillators
- 9) Police Radios and equipment

Location:

Project/Initiative Title: Office Equipment and Furniture

Total Estimated Cost: \$26,700

Funding Source: Police Vehicle & Equipment Fund (Property Taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

- 1) Interview rooms
- 2) Evidence room
- 3) Report room
- 4) Roll call equipment
- 5) Conference rooms
- 6) Furniture, appliances, etc.
- 7) Computer replacements

Location:

Department/Division: Police Department Project/Initiative Title: Total Estimated Cost: Life Safety Equipment

\$18,080

Funding Source: Police Vehicle & Equipment Fund (Property Taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: Not applicable

- 1) Bullet resistant vests
- 2) Less Lethal equipment
- 3) Lethal weapon parts and equipment

Location:

Project/Initiative Title: ImageTrend Integration Reporting Software

Total Estimated Cost: \$11,000

Funding Source: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: \$1,500 starting in 2019

Project/Initiative Description:

To upgrade the current state exporting software to a mobile Field Bridge to better document and collect data on EMS calls. The mobile field bridge will collect live data and times with CAD integration. Current Medical Direction through Regions Hospital EMS will be able to pull data for training and quality assurance. The data collection will assist in our progression toward more advanced EMS skills to provide the best patient care to the community.

Location:

Department/Division: Fire Department
Project/Initiative Title: Fitness Equipment

Total Estimated Cost: \$10,000

Funding Source: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: Not applicable.

Project/Initiative Description:

Firefighting is a very physically demanding job. A leading cause of death of firefighters is sudden cardiac arrest. Being physically fit helps to ward off the effects of stress on the brain and heart that firefighters have to endure.

In an effort to continue to support the wellbeing of the firefighters, it is important to replace the equipment that is worn. We would like to add additional low-impact equipment that will be beneficial to all firefighters.

Location:

Project/Initiative Title: Command Response Vehicle

Total Estimated Cost: \$52,500

Funding Source: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: Not Applicable

Project/Initiative Description:

The fire department replaces vehicles on a rotating basis based on each individual vehicles need. The Command Response Vehicle will be utilized by Fire Department Command Staff to respond to emergency incidents 24 hours a day 365 days per year to provide adequate incident command and support.

Location:

Project/Initiative Title: Furniture Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: \$1,500

Funding Source: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Furniture replacement for the kitchen area of the fire station. Currently the chairs are worn and in need of replacement. The legs and seat are loose and not stable.

Location:

Roseville Fire Department

Project/Initiative Title: Personal Protective Equipment

Total Estimated Cost: \$40,000

Funding Source: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: Not Applicable

Project/Initiative Description:

The fire department replaces firefighting gear in accordance with NFPA standards. The standard that covers firefighter protective gear is NFPA 1851. Within this standard there are mandates that specify when firefighter personal protective gear should be replaced.

It has been found that the particles within smoke contain carcinogens, which are believed to play a key role in the high rate of firefighter cancer relative to the general population. Replacing gear on a regular basis is a relatively inexpensive way to keep firefighters safe and healthy.

Location:

Project/Initiative Title: East Metro SWAT Medic Program

Total Estimated Cost: \$10,000

Funding Source: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: Not Applicable

Project/Initiative Description:

Roseville Fire Department works in cooperation with the East Metro SWAT team in the capacity of tactical medics. Currently two active members are equipped to respond and train with the team. The goal is to appoint and equip two more SWAT medics and add replacement funds for current or expired equipment. There is a heavy focus on current and new personal protective equipment to handle the everchanging tasks and dangers of the SWAT program. Some items may need to be customized to meet the needs of the individual or the team.

Location:

Department/Division: Fire Department
Project/Initiative Title: 800 MHz Radios

Total Estimated Cost: \$20,000

Funding Source: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: Not Applicable

Project/Initiative Description:

The fire department utilizes 800 MHz radios in nearly every aspect of our emergency response. These radios provide a key link between the firefighter and dispatch center. Each year the Fire Department replaces radios that have failed, or are exhibiting signs of excessive wear and tear.

Location:

Department/Division: Fire Department
Project/Initiative Title: Training Equipment

Total Estimated Cost: \$1,500

Funding Source: Fire Vehicle & Replacement Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Firefighters are faced with an ever changing world and environment in which they respond to calls for service. Because of this, they are lifelong learners. In order to facilitate the training, there is a need to keep the training equipment up to date. This includes things such as software, hardware, and training props.

Location:

Roseville Fire Department.

Department/Division: Public Works / Engineering

Project/Initiative Title: Vehicle Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: \$330,000

Funding Source: PW Vehicle and Equipment Fund (Property Taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Continuing with the practice of replacing vehicles and equipment in a timely manner to reduce maintenance costs and down time and to maximize the trade in or resale value of the asset, Public Works is proposing to replace the following:

- Boom Truck
- 5-ton Roller
- Bobcat attachments: bucket, 18" millhead, sweeper broom
- Engineering Technician Pickup truck

Location:

Department/Division: Public Works / Vehicle Maintenance

Project/Initiative Title: Vehicle Maintenance Equipment/Shop equipment

replacements

Total Estimated Cost: \$15,500

Funding Source: PW Vehicle and Equipment Fund (Property Taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

<u>Project/Initiative Description</u>:

Based on equipment age and wear and tear on the existing assets, staff is recommending the replacement of a brake lathe and band saw for a total cost of \$15,500.

Location:

Department/Division: Parks and Recreation Maintenance

Project/Initiative Title: Replacement of #512 Ford Tractor with a Skid Steer

Total Estimated Cost: \$41,000

Funding Source: P&R Vehicle & Equip. Replacement Fund (property taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

This is replacing unit #512, the 1996 New Holland/Ford Tractor with a Skid Steer Unit #512 will be traded for a Skid Steer which is more appropriate and in line with the needs of the Department at this time. This piece of equipment would be used by both the Skating Center and Parks and Recreation Maintenance. This multi-function piece of equipment will be able to serve multiple department functions over the year.

Staff is proposing to use the lease option program that Streets and Utilities use for similar pieces of equipment. This would allow us to replace this piece of equipment every couple of years.

Location:

The Skid-Steer will be stored in the Parks and Recreation Maintenance garage.

Department/Division: Parks and Recreation Maintenance Project/Initiative Title: Replacement of #511 Toolcat

Total Estimated Cost: \$55,000

Funding Source: P&R Vehicle & Equip. Replacement Fund (property taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

This is replacement of the 2006 Toolcat unit #511. This Toolcat is an important part of both the Skating Center Winter Operations and Parks and Recreation Summer Maintenance. During the winter months it is used heavily by Skating Center for the OVAL snow removal. In the summer this multi-purpose vehicle is used for a variety of turf and landscaping maintenance functions by Parks and Recreation Maintenance.

Location:

This vehicle during the winter months is stored at the Skating Center and at the Parks and Recreation Maintenance garage in the summer.

Department/Division: Parks and Recreation Maintenance

Project/Initiative Title: Replacement of #553 2007 John Deere Tractor

Total Estimated Cost: \$80,000

Funding Source: P&R Vehicle & Equip. Replacement Fund (property taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

This is the replacement of unit #553, a 2007 John Deere Tractor Loader. The John Deere Tractor Loader is an integral part of both the Skating Center Operation and Parks and Recreation Maintenance. The John Deere is used for snow removal, installation and removal of hockey boards, playground removals, skate park removal and installation, and many other day to day operations. With the replacement of #512 with a skid steer this will give us more flexibility to have two different size pieces of equipment to accomplish our projects. Without this piece of equipment it will limit us with being able to accomplish larger jobs inhouse.

Location:

This vehicle is stored in the Parks and Recreation Maintenance Garage all year.

Department/Division: General Facilities: Skating Center

Project/Initiative Title: Replace One of Three OVAL Micro Processors

Total Estimated Cost: \$20,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Microprocessors are automatic control mechanisms for the OVAL compressors. The replacement of the microprocessor is important to help run the compressors more efficiently. The original control pads are outdated and are nearing the end of their useful life. This mechanism works to control the operation of the compressors. There is one processor on each of the three compressors. One has been replaced. The goal is to replace the other two over the next couple of years. These were originals in 1993, parts are becoming more difficult and expensive to obtain.

Location:

OVAL Mechanical Room.

Department/Division: General Facilities: Skating Center

Project/Initiative Title: Arena Bathroom Remodel

Total Estimated Cost: \$75,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The arena bathrooms are original to the building in 1969 and are in need of a remodel. The goal is bring them up to accessibility code as well as address a general need to accommodate more people during large events. The project is anticipated to improve and expand restroom facility conditions as possible for all users.

Location:

Indoor Arena.

Department/Division: General Facilities: Skating Center
Project/Initiative Title: Indoor Arena Dehumidification System

Total Estimated Cost: \$90,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Arena Dehumidification System was installed in 1987 and is nearing the end of its useful life. The Dehumidification System serves to improve energy efficiencies, improve comfort level of facility users and prevent moisture loads in the indoor facility. A Dehumidification System prevents a number of undesirable conditions including: fog from above the ice surface, frosting up situations, poor ice condition, hindered views of events, facility and mechanical systems corrosion, mold and the overall discomfort of users.

Location:

Indoor Ice Arena.

Department/Division: General Facilities: Skating Center Project/Initiative Title: Banquet Center Wall Coverings

Total Estimated Cost: \$25,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The state of the wallcovering in the Banquet Center is in need of replacement. The existing wallpaper is peeling and in need of regular repair by staff. The update is needed to keep the rooms desirable and competitive to potential customers. Replacing the wallpaper with paint would be a sufficient solution for this project.

Location:

Banquet Facilities.

Department/Division: General Facilities: Fire Station Project/Initiative Title: Firefighter Office Countertops

Total Estimated Cost: \$3,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

These funds will be used to repair and replace counter tops in the fire station front office that have become damaged or worn out. Due to the 24/7/365 nature of the fire department operations some components of the fire station have seen wear and tear. To prevent additional cost or damage to these areas repairs and replacements must be completed as part of the routine maintenance of the building.

Location:

Department/Division: General Facilities: Maintenance Building

Project/Initiative Title: Maintenance Facility Door Card Readers and Security

Improvements

Total Estimated Cost: \$25,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

<u>Project/Initiative Description</u>:

In order to improve overall building security in the Maintenance Facility staff is recommending the installation of door card readers on several doors throughout the facility and other minor improvements to secure the office area yet continue to provide public access during business hours.

Location:

Maintenance Facility.

Department/Division: General Facilities: Maintenance Building Project/Initiative Title: Plumbing and Heating Replacements

Total Estimated Cost: \$16,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Several smaller area heaters are scheduled for replacement this year as are two water heaters located in the City Hall and Maintenance Facility. The age of the assets are appropriate for replacement to avoid catastrophic failures.

Location:

City Hall and Maintenance Facility.

Department/Division: General Facilities: Maintenance Building

Project/Initiative Title: Fuel System Tank Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: \$220,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The existing fuel tanks in the Maintenance Facility yard are over 30 years old and have a capacity of 6,000 gallons unleaded fuel and 8,000 gallons diesel. Staff is recommending replacing the tanks to avoid a catastrophic failure of the tanks (some leaking is very likely occurring now), and also to expand the capacity to at least 10,000 gallons for each unleaded and diesel in order to provide more flexibility in purchasing fuel through the State contract and spot pricing. This project will also include updating/replacing the pumps.

Location:

Maintenance Facility Yard.

Department/Division: General Facilities: City Hall

Project/Initiative Title: City Hall Painting and Furniture Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: \$45,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Building Maintenance CIP has money identified in 2017 (\$30,000) and 2018 (\$30,000) for furniture replacement and wall painting. Over these two years staff will be replacing much of the furniture in the public spaces of City Hall (conference rooms, hallways and sitting areas) as much of this furniture predates the expansion of City Hall in 2003 and is showing significant wear and tear. Also, many of the walls in the public areas and some in the office areas will be painted in 2018 to cover up several years of scuff marks and general wear and tear.

Location:

Department/Division: General Facilities: City Hall Project/Initiative Title: City Hall Elevator Rehabilitation

Total Estimated Cost: \$95,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The only elevator located in City Hall needs extensive maintenance work in order to provide reliable long term operation. Over the past 12-18 months it has been out of service at least twice for maintenance. It also needs several significant upgrades in order to meet current building codes.

Location:

Department/Division: General Facilities: Maintenance Building

Project/Initiative Title: Maintenance Yard Security Gate

Total Estimated Cost: \$25,000

Funding Source: General Facilities Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: Assume approximately \$200 annually for preventive

maintenance of the motor, chains and other mechanical

components.

Project/Initiative Description:

The Maintenance Facility Yard is used for the storage of many items including stockpiles of salt, sand, and fill material as well as other bulky items that are difficult to store inside such as light poles and utility castings. The City's fueling operations are also located in the Yard and are unprotected although they do require a key fob to operate the pumps.

Staff is requesting funds to replace the gate which was removed several years ago due to the condition of the gate in order to provide a secure area during non-business hours.

Location:

North side of Maintenance Facility Yard.

Department/Division: Information Technology Division
Project/Initiative Title: Computer/Monitor Replacements

Total Estimated Cost: \$78,500

Funding Source: Information Technology Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The City generally replaces desktop/laptop/tablet computers on a five-year replacement cycle. The amount shown represents the average annual impact of this replacement program.

Location:

Department/Division: Information Technology Division Project/Initiative Title: Microsoft Office Licensing

Total Estimated Cost: \$8,100

Funding Source: Information Technology Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The City utilizes the Microsoft Office application suite for all desktop-located computers/laptops/tablets and must renew these licensing subscriptions on a rotating basis.

Location:

Department/Division: Information Technology Division

Project/Initiative Title: Network Infrastructure

Total Estimated Cost: \$168,280

Funding Source: Information Technology Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The City generally replaces various network infrastructure components on a 5-10 year replacement cycle depending on the component. The components include network switches, routers, UPS devices, wireless access points (Wi-Fi), servers, and file storage units.

Location:

Department/Division: Information Technology Division

Project/Initiative Title: Surveillance Cameras

Total Estimated Cost: \$9,180

Funding Source: Information Technology Equipment Fund (property tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The City generally replaces surveillance cameras on a 10-year replacement cycle. The city has over 50 cameras located throughout various city buildings.

Location:

Department/Division: Park Improvement Program (PIP)

Project/Initiative Title: General Improvements

Total Estimated Cost: \$200,000

Funding Source: Park Improvement Fund (property taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Park Improvement Program (PIP) includes mid-range budget items that can be more timely scheduled (with some flexibility from year to year) and planned for but need to be more closely prioritized than daily maintenance items that are more definite. These projects include safety items that require scheduled mid-level maintenance (play surface, field upgrades), items that aid in maintenance efficiencies (landscaping, mulch), and items that help to maintain park system facilities up to expected standards (amenities, sign maintenance, court color coating, landscape work, tree plantings). This account is currently managed as a CIP account allowing staff to be more strategic with projects and budgeting from year to year and maximizing outside contributions.

Location:

Park and Recreation System.

Department/Division: Park Improvement Program
Project/Initiative Title: Upper Villa Park Shelter

Total Estimated Cost: \$60,000

Funding Source: Park Improvement Fund (property taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Upper Villa Park Picnic Shelter was installed in the early 1970's and is showing its age and signs of serious deterioration. For these reasons the shelter is due to be replaced and/or significantly remodeled. This is expected to be a joint project with the B- Dale Club of Roseville.

Location:

Upper Villa Park near the B- Dale Club.

Department/Division: Parks Improvement Program

Project/Initiative Title: Natural Resources Restoration Program

Total Estimated Cost: \$40,000

Funding Source: Park Improvement Fund (property taxes)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Natural Resources Program Management & Restoration

This task involves an ecologist consultant and is planned to include management and coordination of activities to conduct natural areas restoration work within parks as they transition out of the Park Renewal Program and into normal parks maintenance efforts. Activities include coordination of on-the-ground restoration activities; identification of grant funding sources and grant application development; responses to residents when questions regarding Parks natural resources management arise; meetings with staff and others as natural resources issues arise; as well as other similar tasks as needed/requested.

Volunteer Program Assistance

This task will involve an ecologist consultant to work with Parks & Recreation staff, City Volunteer Coordinator and others to assist in coordination of volunteer events and support sustaining the volunteer stewardship network developed during the Park Renewal Program effort. Examples of work will include assisting Volunteer Coordinator and volunteer Sector/Constellation Leaders with identification of volunteer event types/locations (e.g. regular (third Saturday) volunteer event planning), citizen-scientist monitoring efforts (including gathering/analyzing data from resource monitoring such as frog/toad call surveys, etc.), and similar related activities as needed/ requested.

Location:

Park and Recreation System.

Department/Division: Street Lighting
Project/Initiative Title: Signal Pole Painting

Total Estimated Cost: \$20,000

Funding Source: Street Light Maintenance Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The City is responsible for the maintenance of the painted surface of most of the traffic signals located within the City limits. This is true for both MnDOT and Ramsey County jurisdiction signals.

The City has not had a comprehensive plan for repainting signal systems and many of the signal systems are showing significant areas of peeling/chipping paint as well as very advanced stages of rust.

Staff is proposing to paint three signals in 2018. We will work with Ramsey County and MnDOT to identify signals that will be replaced within the next 10 years and avoid those signals. The Street Light Maintenance Fund CIP identifies \$20,000 every other year through 2030 to continue this program. Staff will prioritize signal systems based on age and condition and the respective agency's replacement schedule.

Location:

Department/Division: Street Lighting

Project/Initiative Title: Misc. Pole Fixture Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: \$25,000

Funding Source: Street Light Maintenance Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Street Light Maintenance Fund is primarily used to maintain City owned light fixtures, address City maintenance responsibilities on traffic signal systems and also for the maintenance and replacement costs of pedestrian flasher systems throughout the City.

The CIP identifies monies on a regular interval for the replacement of poles and fixtures that have met their service life. In 2018 the CIP identifies \$25,000 for this item. Staff will work to identify older poles and fixtures to replace with newer aluminum poles and/or LED fixtures for long term sustainability and to reduce maintenance and power consumption costs.

Location:

Various locations to be determined.

Department/Division: Pathway & Parking Lots
Project/Initiative Title: Acorn Park East Parking Lots

Total Estimated Cost: \$70,000

Funding Source: Pathway and Parking Lot Maintenance Fund (Property Tax)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Based on the age and condition of the parking lot, staff is proposing to repave the east parking lots at Acorn Park. This is part of a comprehensive pavement management plan for our parking lots.

Staff anticipates about a 25 to 30 year life of parking lot pavements before a mill and overlay is required. Once repaved, the parking lot will undergo normal routine maintenance such as crack sealing (every three to five years) and some sort of fog seal treatment (every 5-10 years).

Location:

Acorn Park: East Lots (near Park Shelter and playground).

Department/Division: License Center Division
Project/Initiative Title: Office Equipment & Furniture

Total Estimated Cost: \$8,100 (tentative)

Funding Source: License Center Equipment Fund (fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The License Center has a need to replace some office tables and chairs, as well as one security cameras. The amount of replacements for 2018 and beyond will depend on future discussions regarding a new License Center facility.

Location:

Department/Division: Community Development/Code Enforcement

Project/Initiative Title: Inspection Vehicles

Total Estimated Cost: \$21,000

Funding Source: Community Development Fund (fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The Community Development Departments' Building Code Division replaces inspection vehicles every eight years. The decision on whether to replace a vehicle is based on each individual vehicle's age, mileage, overall condition, and potential re-sale value.

The Community Development Department currently has four inspection vehicles. For 2018, one inspection vehicle is scheduled for replacement.

Location:

Department/Division: Water Services

Project/Initiative Title: Booster Station Rehabilitation and Improvements

Total Estimated Cost: \$1,600,000

Funding Source: Water Fund (Fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

The City's Water Booster Station is in need of a complete rehabilitation including a new generator, new control electronics, new/refurbished pumps, site security improvements, and general building maintenance and updates. The current long term CIP identifies \$475,000 for Booster Station improvements (over several line items). Staff is recommending increasing that amount to \$1,600,000 to address a more thorough rehabilitation.

In order to reduce impacts to the CIP fund staff is recommending delaying some water main rehabilitation and reduce that budgeted amount from \$1,000,000 to \$500,000 in 2018 and from \$1,000,000 to \$700,000 in 2019 and 2020.

Location:

Roseville Water Booster Station.

Department/Division: Water Services

Project/Initiative Title: Valve Operator and Vacuum Excavator

Total Estimated Cost: \$70,000

Funding Source: Water Fund (Fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

City staff is requesting a new piece of equipment to be purchased through the Water Utility Fund for the purpose of maintaining and testing the 1,600 valves across the City. Larger valves are very difficult to turn and requires a great deal of repetitive motion. Using a valve operator will make the operation quicker, safer, and prevent repetitive injuries amongst the maintenance workers.

The vacuum operation will allow staff to clean out around the valves in order to better maintain and repair the valves. It can also be used to clean out catch basins and other utility structures.

Location:

Department/Division: Sanitary Sewer Services
Project/Initiative Title: Vehicle Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: \$40,000

Funding Source: Sanitary Sewer Fund (Fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Continuing with the practice of replacing vehicles and equipment in a timely manner to reduce maintenance costs and down time and to maximize the trade in or resale value of the asset, Public Works is proposing to replace the following:

• #209 1-Ton Flat Bed Crane – used for removing and placing pumps and other equipment in lift stations and manholes.

Location:

Department/Division: Sanitary Sewer Services Project/Initiative Title: Pipe Camera System

Total Estimated Cost: \$75,000

Funding Source: Sanitary Sewer Fund (*Property Tax*)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Staff is requesting the purchase of a pipe camera system at a cost of \$70,000 that will be used for video investigation of both Sanitary and Storm sewer pipes. This will allow staff to better troubleshoot potential blockages, structural issues and verify thorough cleaning of pipes. Currently the City uses a subcontractor, sometimes on an emergency basis, to televise our pipes when needed.

Location:

Department/Division: Sanitary Sewer Services

Project/Initiative Title: Lounge Lift Station Rehabilitation

Total Estimated Cost: \$350,000

Funding Source: Sanitary Sewer Fund (Fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Based on a recent lift station condition study it was recommended that many of the City's storm and sanitary lift stations are due, if not overdue, for rehabilitation. Staff has been working to rehabilitate one lift station per year in order to spread out the costs but complete the rehabilitation of these key pieces of infrastructures in a reasonable time frame.

For 2018 staff has identified the Lounge Lift Station for rehabilitation. This work will involve replacing the pump and electronics as well as potentially reconstructing the wet well component of the lift station. The design for this project was budgeted in the 2017 CIP and is underway.

Location:

West of Lincoln Drive south of County Road C2.

Department/Division: Sanitary Sewer Services

Project/Initiative Title: Fernwood Lift Station Rehabilitation Design

Total Estimated Cost: \$60,000

Funding Source: Sanitary Sewer Fund (Fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Based on a recent lift station condition study it was recommended that many of the City's storm and sanitary lift stations are due, if not overdue, for rehabilitation. Staff has been working to rehabilitate one lift station per year in order to spread out the costs but complete the rehabilitation of these key pieces of infrastructures in a reasonable time frame.

For 2019 staff has identified the Fernwood Lift Station for rehabilitation. The amount budgeted in the 2018 CIP is for the design of this rehabilitation work.

Location:

Fernwood Street north of Larpenteur Ave.

Department/Division: Storm Sewer Services

Project/Initiative Title: Walsh Lift Station Rehabilitation

Total Estimated Cost: \$450,000

Funding Source: Storm Sewer Fund (Fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Based on a recent lift station condition study it was recommended that many of the City's storm and sanitary lift stations are due, if not overdue, for rehabilitation. Staff has been working to rehabilitate one lift station per year, per division (storm or sanitary), in order to spread out the costs but complete the rehabilitation of these key pieces of infrastructures in a reasonable time frame.

For 2018 staff has identified the Walsh Lift Station for rehabilitation. This work will involve replacing the pump and electronics as well as potentially reconstructing the wet well component of the lift station. The design for this project was budgeted in the 2017 CIP and is underway.

Location:

Southwest portion of Midland Hills Golf Course.

Department/Division: Storm Sewer Services

Project/Initiative Title: Vehicle and Equipment Replacement

Total Estimated Cost: \$15,000

Funding Source: Storm Sewer Fund (Fees)

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

Continuing with the practice of replacing vehicles and equipment in a timely manner to reduce maintenance costs and down time and to maximize the trade in or resale value of the asset, Public Works is proposing to replace the following in the Storm Sewer division:

• #172 Zero Turn Mower - \$15,000

Location:

Department/Division: Golf Course Division

Project/Initiative Title: Replace Irrigation Controller and Satellite

Total Estimated Cost: \$30,000

Funding Source: Golf Course Green Fees

Annual Operating Budget Impact: N/A

Project/Initiative Description:

This includes replacement of the six Irrigation Satellite Controllers that were purchased in 1988. They would coordinate with the main controller that is located in the maintenance shop. This system is nearing the end of its useful life with parts very difficult if not impossible to get.

Location:

Cedarholm Golf Course Maintenance Shop.

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Administration					
Office Furniture	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Finance					
Financial Software: Upgrade	80,000	-	-	-	-
Investment & Debt Mgmt. Software	-	-	-	20,000	-
Central Services					
Postage Machine Lease	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Copier/Printer/Scanner Lease	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000
Police					
Marked squad cars (5 / yr)	165,000	165,000	165,000	165,000	165,000
Unmarked vehicles (1 / yr)	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000
CSO Vehicle	-	-	33,950	-	-
Community relations vehicle - new	-	-	22,660	-	-
Squad conversion	-	-	15,450	15,450	15,450
Park Patrol vehicle	-	-	10,500	-	-
Radar Units	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120
Stop Sticks	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030
Rear Transport Seats	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705
Control Boxes	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Visabars	-	8,250	-	8,250	-
Computer Equipment	8,800	7,400	7,400	8,800	7,400
Computer replacements for fleet	-	-	150,000	-	-
Cell phones/computer devices	-	-	5,645	-	-
Printer replacements for fleet	-	-	7,210	7,210	-
Speed notification unit	-	-		-	6,000
GPS Devices	-	_	-	5,150	-
New K-9	-	16,000	-	16,000	-
Non-lethal weapons	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600
Long guns replacement	-	-	- -	-	11,330
Long gun parts (squads)	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090
Sidearms (officers)	-	-	9,270	-	-
Sidearm parts (officers)	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060
Tactical gear	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150
SWAT Bullet Proof Vests	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180
IBIS Fingerprinting Equipment	-	3,000	-	-	3,000
Crime scene equipment	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
McGruff Costume	5,000	1,750	5,000	5,000	5,000
K-9 Training Equipment	_	1,730	_	1,545	_
8 Squad Surveillance Cameras	41,715	_	_	1,545	_
Digital Interview Room Equipment	71,/13	_	_	_	15,450
Evidence Room	-	_	2,575	-	13,430
Report Room Monitors	2,500	-		-	2,500
		-	2,500	-	2,300
Roll Call Equipment	4,000	-	-	-	2.500
Investigation Conf. Room	1 575	1 575	1 575	1 575	2,500
Defibrillators	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575
Shredder	15.500	15.500	15.500	15.500	5,150
Radio Equipment	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500
Office furniture	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	8,400
Patrol area cubicles	-	-	-	9,500	-
Window treatments	6,300	-	-	-	_
Dishwasher	-	-	-	-	2,060

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Microwave	-	500	-	-	-
Detention Room	-	-	2,000	-	-
Fire					
Staffed engine replacement	-	-	575,000	-	-
Medic Unit	-	100,000	-	-	-
Ladder truck	-	-	-	1,100,000	-
Command Response Vehicle	52,500	-	55,000	-	60,000
Exercise room-fitness equipment	10,000	-	15,000	-	-
Ventilation fans	_	_	_	-	7,000
Power equipment	_	_	10,000	-	-
Personal Protective Equipment	40,000	40,000	40,000	-	-
Cardiac Monitoring and Response Equipment	_	5,000	13,000	5,000	5,000
Medical bags and O2 bags	_	6,500	_	-	-
Training equipment	1,500	_	_	-	-
Camera to assist with rescue/firefighting	_	_	-	7,000	_
Portable and mobile radios	20,000	20,000	20,000	5,000	20,000
Apparatus Based IT Infrastructure	_	20,000	_	-	-
Air monitoring equipment	-	5,000	-	-	-
Rescue equipment	-	-	-	-	32,500
Reporting software	11,000	-	-	-	-
SWAT Gear/Equipment	10,000	-	-	-	-
Training room tables & chairs	-	15,000	-	-	-
Conf room Furniture	-	5,000	-	-	-
Kitchen appliances	-	· -	4,500	-	-
Kitchen table & chairs	1,500	-	, -	-	-
Day room chairs	-	-	8,000	-	-
AV equipment-training room	-	4,000	, -	-	_
Second floor washer & dryer	-	1,400	=	-	_
Bed Mattresses	-	· -	=	8,000	_
Public Works				-	
Eng. vehicle #304: Proj. Cord. C1500	30,000		-		-
#101 F-150 Pickup 2wd	-	-	30,000	-	-
#104 1-ton pickup	-	35,000	-	-	-
#106 3-ton dump w/ plo	-	-	-	-	180,000
#109 3-ton dump w/ plow	-	180,000	-	-	-
#111 Skidsteer Replacement	-	· -	=	45,000	-
#111 Bobcat, hydro hammer	-	8,000	-	, -	-
#111 Bobcat, bucket	5,000	_	-	-	_
#111 Bobcat, millhead (18")	22,000	-	-	-	-
#112 3-ton dump w/ plow	-	-	-	180,000	-
#133 - Walk behind saw	-	-	10,000	-	-
#134 Sign truck and box and lift	-	-	-	55,000	-
#143 Portable line striper	-	10,000	-	-	-
#152 Int'l boom truck	-	-	-	-	225,000
#157 Ingersoll 5-ton roller	40,000	_	=	-	, -
#111 Bobcat sweeper broom	8,000	-	=	-	-
#111 Bobcat 78" grapple bucket	-	-	=	-	5,000
Street Signs	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Mower/Snow Blower Combo (1/2 w/ storm)	-	-	, -	30,000	-
Lee Boy Road Grader (#519)	-	-	15,000	, -	-
Felling Trailer for Road Grader (#541)	-	-	10,000	-	-
· · · /			,		

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Wacker J-Tamper (Jumping Jack)*	-	-	2,500	-	-
Salt Truck Calibration Scale*	-	-	-	5,000	-
Eng. Survey equipment	-	-	30,000	-	-
Eng. Large format scanner/copier	-	10,000	-	-	-
Band saw	4,500	-	-	-	-
Tire changer	-	15,000	-	-	-
Air compressor	-	-	4,000	-	-
Vehicle analyzer update (SW ea 2yrs, HW ea 6	-	1,000	-	1,000	-
Jib crane (overhead motor & trolly)	-	7,500	-	-	-
Brake lathe	11,000	-	-	-	-
Column Lifts rehab/replace	-	-	-	100,000	-
Welder Wire Feed*	-	-	2,000	-	-
Parks & Recreation					
Puppet Wagon (2003)	-	-	-	-	14,000
#506 Ford 3/4-ton (2012)	-	-	40,000	-	-
#510 Water truck (1/2 cost) (2006)	-	65,000	-	-	-
#511 Toolcat (2006)	55,000	-	-	-	-
Replace 1996 FORD Tractor with Skid Steer					
(Lease Program)	41,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
#517 Ford F350 SD (2013)	-	-	-	40,000	-
#515 Ford 350 w. plow (2013)	-	-	-	40,000	-
#516 Ford with plow (2013)	-	-	-	40,000	-
Zero Turn Replace (Arb.) (1999)	-	9,500	-	-	-
#535 Ford Passenger van (2006)	-	40,000	-	-	-
#545 John Deere tractor (2007)	-	-	30,000	-	-
#560 Ford Passenger van (2006)	-	40,000	-	-	-
Skating Center Plow Truck (2002)	-	-	-	-	15,000
#553 John Deere loader (2007)	80,000	-	-	-	-
#538 portable generator	-	-	-	-	3,000
#543 Felling trailer (2010)	-	-	5,000	-	-
#548 Towmaster trailer (2000)	-	-	-	-	12,000
#585 Belos snow machine (2010)	-	-	145,000	-	-
Pickup sander (2013)	-	-	-	-	8,000
General Facility Improvements					
Replace garage Co Ra Vac Heaters	-	-	60,000	-	-
Door Card Reader	25,000	_	_	_	-
Liebert condensing unit (IT Server Room)	-	-	60,000	-	-
Liebert AHV (IT Server Room)	-	-	30,000	-	-
Make Up Air Units (Maintenance Garage)	-	90,000	-	-	35,000
Circulating pumps	-	_	_	15,000	-
Water heaters (CH and Maintenance)	_	_	-	_	25,000
Police & PW garage Co2/No2 detectors	_	_	-	_	10,000
Exhaust fans (10)	-	-	30,000	-	-
Unit heaters (4)	6,000	-	-	-	-
VAV's heat/cool	-	-		10,000	-
VAV/s cool	-	-		10,000	-
workstation replacement city hall	-	-	-	-	350,000
Overhead door replacement	-	-	20,000	-	-
Roof Rehab/Replace Park Maintenance	-	120,000	, -	-	-
Tables and chairs City Hall	30,000	, -	-	-	-
Fuel system tank replacement	-	220,000	-	-	-
		,			

W.'. V. 10 '. C.	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Maintenace Yard Security Gate	25,000	-	-	25,000	-
Paint walls city hall	15,000	-	-	200,000	-
Geothermal Expansion to PW Building City Hall Elevator	95,000	-	-	200,000	-
Gymnastics Center	93,000	-	70,000	-	-
Commons: Water Heater- Domestic H20	-	8,000	70,000	=	-
Commons: Water Heater- Zamboni (2007)	-	10,000	-	=	-
Commons: Water Storage Tank	-	8,000	-	=	-
Commons: South Entry RTU (2007)	-	8,000	-	-	20,000
Arena: Dehumidification	90,000	-	-	-	20,000
Arena: Roof (2004)	90,000		-	-	300,000
	-	30,000	-	-	300,000
Arena: Scoreboard Large	-	•	-	-	-
Arena: Zamboni Foyer Divider Wall	75.000	12,000	-	-	-
Arena: Restroom Remodeling	75,000	-	750,000	-	-
OVAL: Refrigeration piping (1993)	-	-	750,000	-	-
OVAL: Compressors (1993)	-	_	450,000	-	_
OVAL: Refrigeration components (2005)	-	-	425,000	-	_
OVAL: Concrete Floor (1993)	-	=	1,000,000	=	-
OVAL: Lighting (1993)	-	=	100,000	=	-
OVAL: Micro Processors	20,000	_	20,000	-	-
OVAL: Soft Starts	-	-	35,000	-	-
OVAL: Tarmac Blacktop (2010)	-	15,000	-	-	-
OVAL: Perimeter Fencing	-	-	-	30,000	-
OVAL: Lobby Roof (1993)	-	85,000	-	-	-
OVAL: Mech. Bldg Roof (1993)	-	60,000	-	-	-
OVAL: Zamboni (2003)	-	125,000	_	-	_
OVAL: Inline Hockey Rink	-	0	25,000	-	-
OVAL: Ammonia Alarm System	-	10,000	-	=	-
Banquet Ctr: Fitness Room RTU (2007)	-	-	-	-	20,000
Banquet Ctr: Roof (1999)	-	-	100,000	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Carpet (2009)	-	-	-	35,000	-
Banquet Ctr: Wallcoverings/bqt.improv	-	25,000	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Divider Wall	-	25,000	_	-	_
Fire: Shift office counter tops	3,000	_	-	-	-
Fire: Laundry room Washer & dryer- gear	-	-	-	15,000	-
Fire: Laundry room Washer & dryer	-	1,400	-	-	-
Fire: Security system	-	-	8,000	=	-
Fire: Air Monitoring Sensors	-	9,000	-	-	-
formation Technology					
Computers (Notebooks, Desktop)	69,800	30,150	35,100	29,850	10,900
Monitor/Display	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700
MS Office License	8,100	11,700	15,000	9,900	11,100
Desktop Printer	1,200	_	_	-	_
Network Switches/Routers (Roseville)	38,000	9,000	13,000	12,000	78,000
Power/UPS - Closets (11)	1,700	1,700	3,000	1,700	400
Power/UPS - Server Room (1)	, -	18,000	, -		_
Air Conditioner - Server Room Unit #1	_		38,000	_	_
Fire Protection - Server Room (1)	_	_	, , · · · · -	19,000	_
Surveillance Cameras (53)	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180
Wireless Access Points (38)	23,200	-,100	-	-,100	-,100
Telephone Routers (Shared)		_	-	45,000	_
1 -1-priorio 1 to atorio (Dilatou)				12,000	

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Telephone Servers (Shared)	-	-	-	-	40,000
Servers - Host - Shared (5)	30,000	20,000	-	-	-
Storage Area Network Nodes- Shared (8)	55,000	-	55,000	-	55,000
Network Switches/Routers (Shared)	10,000				77,000
Office Furniture	-	25,000	-	-	-
New IT Offices	-	-	-	-	-
Park Improvements					
Tennis & Basketball Courts	-	175,000	20,000	135,000	10,000
Shelters & Structures	60,000	5,000	50,000	-	25,000
Playground Areas	-	600,000	275,000	125,000	250,000
Volleyball & Bocce Ball Courts	-	-	-	-	-
Athletic Fields	-	5,000	75,000	200,000	33,000
Irrigation Systems	-	-	25,000	-	-
Bridges & Boardwalks	-	-	-	-	-
Other Capital Items	-	130,880	-	-	-
Natural Resources	40,000	70,000	120,000	120,000	120,000
PIP/CIP Category	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Street Improvements					
Mill & overlay - local streets	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Reconstruction/M & O - MSA streets	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Street Lighting					
Pedestrian light @ Victoria	-	-	-	-	20,000
Misc. pole fixture replacement	25,000	-	25,000	-	-
Pedestrian light @ Nature Ctr	-	-	20,000	-	-
Pedestrian light @ Lexington Central Prk	-	-	-	20,000	-
Signal Pole Painting (3 every other year)	20,000	-	20,000	-	20,000
Pathways & Parking Lots					
Pathway maintenance	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
Acorn 2 east lots	70,000	-	=	-	-
Acorn west lot		-	-	-	30,000
Central Pk W Victoria (Foundation)	-		80,000		-
City Hall(2004)	=	400,000		-	-
Langton Lk S lot off C2 Soccer Lot	=	-	-	20,000	-
Lexington Pk off Cty B (1999)	=		-	-	20,000
Nature Center	=	20,000	-	-	-
Veterans VFW Lot (1995)	-	-	-	100,000	-
Communications					
Conference Room Equipment	=	-	1,500	-	-
Council Camera Replacement	=	-	-	-	-
Council Control/Sound Sytem	=	-	-	-	-
General Audio/Visual Equipment	10,000	5,000	5,000	4,000	15,000
License Center					
General office equipment (minor)	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Computer equipment (4)		2,800	-	2,800	
Passport camera	-	-	2,000	-	-
Office chair replacement	2,100	2,100	-	-	-
Security camera replacement	5,000	-	-	-	-
Bathroom improvements	<u>-</u>	-	1,500	-	-
Facility Improvements (add'l in 2017?)	200,000	-	-	-	-
Community Development					
Inspection vehicles	19,000	19,000	20,000	-	-

City of Roseville 2018-2022 CIP Detail by Function

Computars	2018 2,500	2019 4,300	2020 4,300	2021 3,500	2022 8,000
Computers Office furniture	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Water	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
#207 Pickup	_	_	_	35,000	_
#208 Meter van	_	_	30,000	-	_
#211 360 Backhoe (3-way split)	_	_	-	_	60,000
#234 4x4 Pickup	_	30,000	_	_	-
#213 Water Utility Mobile Workshop Van	_	-	30,000	_	_
Replace/Upgrade SCADA system (1/3)	_	_	75,000	_	_
GPS Unit (1/3 share)	_	_	7,000	_	_
Field Computer Replacement/add	5,000	_	-	_	5,000
#236 Trailer	-	5,000	_	_	_
Valve Operator and Vac	70,000	-	_	_	_
Booster Station Rehabilitation	1,600,000	_	_	_	_
Water main replacement	500,000	700,000	700,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Sanitary Sewer	200,000	700,000	700,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
#202 1-ton with dump box/plow	_	_	_	40,000	_
#209 1-ton "Flat Bed Crane"	40,000		_	-	_
#213 Extend-a-jet replacement	-	_	_	35,000	_
#220 Towmaster trailer - 10 ton	_	_	_	10,000	_
Water Truck (1/2)	_	60,000	_	-	_
Pipe Camera	75,000	-	_	_	_
Replace/Upgrade SCADA system (1/3)	-	75,000	_	_	_
Computer replacement	_	-	5,000	_	_
Replace 1990 air compressor(1/3)	_	15,000	-	_	_
GPS with computer (1/3 share)	_	-	_	4,000	_
Replace Onan portable generator	_	_	_	-,000	75,000
Galtier LS Rehab	-	50,000	500,000	_	-
Lounge LS Rehab	350,000	-	-	_	_
Dale/Owasso LS Rehab	-	_	_	45,000	405,000
Cohansey LS upgrade	_		_	-	30,000
Long Lake Lift Station	_	_	35,000	315,000	-
Fernwood LS Rehab/Roof/Tuckpoint	60,000	540,000	-	-	_
Sewer main repairs	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
I & I reduction	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	_
Storm Sewer	,	,	,	,	
#103 Ford 450 w/ Plow	_	65,000	_	_	-
#122 Wheel Loader	_	205,000	_	_	_
#167 Elgin Sweeper 2006 3-wheel	_	,	200,000	_	_
#126 Bobcat Skidsteer	_	_	-	45,000	_
#171 Tennant 6600 sweeper	_	_	32,000	-	_
#163 Electronic message board	_	_	20,000	_	_
#139 Vacall	_	_	-	_	250,000
#130 Steamer "Amazing Machine"	_	_	15,000	_	
#172 Zero Turn Dixie Chopper	15,000			_	_
Mower/Snow Blower Combo (1/2 w/ streets)	,	_	_	30,000	_
#168 Wildcat Compost Turner	_	_	250,000	,	-
Field Computer Add/Replacements	_	_	-	_	5,000
GPS Unit (1/3)	_	_	4,000	_	-
#211 Backhoe 1/3 water. Sewer, storm	-	_	-,	-	60,000
Walsh Storm station Upgrades	450,000	_	_	_	-
maisir storm station opgrades	750,000	-	-	-	

2018-2022 CIP Detail by Function

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Replace/Upgrade SCADA (1/3)	-	75,000	-	-	-
Pond improvements/infiltration	275,000	300,000	350,000	350,000	400,000
Storm sewer replacement/rehabilitationPMP	350,000	400,000	450,000	450,000	500,000
Leaf site water quality improvements	-	-	-	75,000	-
Golf Course					
Pickup Truck 2012	-	-	-	-	28,000
Greens Mowers 2000		30,000		-	-
Greens/Tee Mowers 2002	-	-	35,000		-
Computer equipment 2014	-			7,000	-
Turf equipment/aerators 2001	-		-	21,000	-
Cushman #1 & 2 2014 and 1988	-	17,000	-		-
Top Dresser Tufco 1993	-	-		15,000	-
Operational power equipment 1980-2010	-	-	-	-	5,000
Shop heating and other/upgrades 1967	-	20,000	-	-	-
Course improvements, landscaping (yearly)	-		5,000	-	5,000
Irrigation system upgrades 1960/1988/1994 7gl_	30,000		-		-

Annual Total \$ 9,513,905 \$ 9,710,820 \$12,298,550 \$ 9,558,645 \$ 9,111,030

5-Year Total \$50,192,950

City of Roseville Capital Improvement Plan: Summary of All Capital Funds

2018-2037

Summary by Function

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	2021	2022	<u>2023</u>	2024	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	<u>2028</u>	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	<u>Total</u>
Tax Levy: Current	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000 \$	\$ 2,541,000 \$	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000 \$	5 2,541,000 \$	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 2,541,000 \$	50,820,000
Tax Levy: Add/Sub	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fees, Licenses, Permits, MSA	A 4,688,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	4,678,100	93,572,000
Sale of Assets	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	24,500	490,000
Interest Earnings	342,603	331,331	300,414	279,470	256,116	250,476	219,502	214,646	194,508	189,993	171,999	156,310	144,815	101,919	113,888	127,355	130,957	134,467	124,168	127,030	3,911,969
Revenue	ses \$ 7,596,203	\$ 7,574,931	7,544,014	\$ 7,523,070	\$ 7,499,716 \$	7,494,076	7,463,102	\$ 7,458,246	\$ 7,438,108	\$ 7,433,593	\$ 7,415,599	\$ 7,399,910	\$ 7,388,415	\$ 7,345,519	\$ 7,357,488	\$ 7,370,955	\$ 7,374,557	\$ 7,378,067	\$ 7,367,768	\$ 7,370,630 \$	5 148,793,969
Administration	\$ -	\$ - 5	- 5	5,000	§ - \$	71,000	40,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ - 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 80,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - \$	206,000
Finance	80,000	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	80,000	-	-	-	-	80,000	20,000	-	-	-	80,000	-	-	360,000
Central Services	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	1,640,000
Police	304,425	278,010	510,270	313,015	318,250	371,425	300,925	455,630	312,175	320,965	280,790	351,480	495,745	329,285	336,640	289,205	287,790	507,880	275,705	340,985	6,980,595
Fire	146,500	221,900	740,500	1,125,000	124,500	182,400	182,000	701,500	149,000	356,400	103,000	57,500	948,500	183,900	182,000	95,000	119,000	955,000	345,000	54,000	6,972,600
Public Works	130,500	276,500	113,500	426,000	420,000	235,000	136,000	255,500	95,000	361,600	478,100	153,000	165,500	259,000	210,000	406,000	349,500	493,000	420,000	79,500	5,463,200
Parks & Recreation	176,000	157,500	223,000	123,000	55,000	273,000	231,000	148,000	38,000	153,000	178,000	285,500	186,000	58,000	171,000	253,000	3,000	148,000	43,000	17,000	2,920,000
General Facility Improvemen		853,400	3,183,000	340,000	760,000	1,320,300	259,000	406,500	67,000	49,400	405,500	448,500	60,500	1,171,900	401,000	237,800	404,000	366,500	398,000	68,000	11,584,300
Information Technology	254,880	133,430	176,980	135,330	290,280	235,230	257,530	102,730	167,580	94,530	181,580	146,130	662,230	154,330	120,780	187,230	205,180	248,130	165,230	117,830	4,037,150
Park Improvements	300,000	1,185,880	765,000	780,000	638,000	1,661,500	520,000	539,070	830,000	720,000	640,000	488,500	1,042,500	516,670	728,000	677,500	1,010,000	1,145,000	955,000	365,000	15,507,620
Street Improvements	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	51,500,000
Street Lighting	45,000	-	65,000	20,000	40,000	45,000	20,000	-	45,000	-	20,000	25,000	20,000	-	45,000	20,000	20,000	25,000	20,000	-	475,000
Pathways (Existing)	250,000	600,000	260,000	300,000	230,000	180,000	180,000	245,000	200,000	340,000	280,000	195,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	280,000	200,000	200,000	260,000	200,000	5,000,000
Communications	10,000	5,000	6,500	4,000	15,000	76,500	1,500	88,000	10,000	12,000	10,000	5,000	6,500	4,000	15,000	76,500	1,500	88,000	10,000	12,000	457,000
License Center	208,100	5,900	4,500	3,800	1,000	1,005,800	1,000	28,100	3,000	14,400	8,100	7,900	2,500	3,800	3,000	29,000	1,000	5,800	-	-	1,336,700
Community Development	22,500	24,300	25,300	4,500	9,000	5,300	27,300	27,500	33,000	29,300	5,300	4,500	9,000	32,300	33,300	33,500	39,000	5,300	4,300	-	374,500
Water	2,175,000	735,000	842,000	1,035,000	1,065,000	1,025,000	1,000,000	1,037,000	1,055,000	1,242,500	1,200,000	1,205,000	1,252,000	1,100,000	1,180,000	1,330,000	1,810,000	1,117,000	1,970,000	1,130,000	24,505,500
Sanitary Sewer	1,625,000	1,840,000	1,640,000	1,549,000	1,510,000	1,355,000	1,245,000	1,260,000	1,319,000	1,047,500	1,400,000	1,055,000	1,085,000	1,039,000	1,000,000	1,040,000	1,000,000	1,015,000	1,099,000	1,107,500	25,231,000
Storm Sewer	1,090,000	1,045,000	1,321,000	950,000	1,215,000	1,174,000	1,080,000	1,173,000	1,370,000	1,057,500	995,000	1,102,000	1,014,000	1,485,000	1,082,000	1,020,000	1,760,000	1,034,000	1,438,000	357,500	22,763,000
Golf Course	30,000	67,000	40,000	43,000	38,000	518,000	73,000	12,500	20,000	7,000	57,000	87,000	72,000	17,500	-	40,000	5,000	15,000	58,000	32,000	1,232,000
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expenditure	res \$ 9,513,905	\$ 9,710,820	\$ 12,298,550	\$ 9,558,645	\$ 9,111,030 \$	12,216,455	8,036,255	\$ 9,042,030	\$ 8,400,755	\$ 8,488,095	\$ 8,924,370	\$ 8,299,010	\$ 10,083,975	\$ 9,361,685	\$ 8,589,720	\$ 8,976,735	\$ 10,096,970	\$ 10,330,610	\$ 10,543,235	\$ 6,963,315 \$	188,546,165
Beginning Cash Balance	\$ 17,751,330	\$ 15.833.629	§ 13.697.739 §	§ 8.943.203 S	§ 6.907.628 §	5,296,314	573,936	¢ 702	¢ (1.592.001)	¢ (2.545.649)	\$ (3,600,150) \$	£ (5.109.021)	¢ (6,009,021)	\$ (8,703,581)	¢ (10 710 746)	¢ (11 051 079)	¢ (12 557 759)	¢ (16 290 172)	¢ (10 222 714)	¢ (22 400 101)	
0 0		,,		,,,	,,			(1.583.784)	, ,	. (, , ,				,	,		,		,		
Annual Surplus (deficit)	(1,917,702)	(2,135,889)	(4,754,536)	(2,035,575)	(1,611,314)	(4,722,379)	(573,153)	())	(962,647)	(1,054,502)	(1,508,771)	(899,100)	(2,695,560)	(2,016,166)	(1,232,232)	(1,605,780)	(2,722,413)	(2,952,543)	(3,175,467)	407,315	
Ending Cash Balance	\$ 15,833,629	\$ 13,697,739	8,943,203	\$ 6,907,628	\$ 5,296,314 \$	573,936	§ 783	\$ (1,583,001)	\$ (2,545,648)	\$ (3,600,150)	\$ (5,108,921) \$	\$ (0,008,021)	\$ (8,/03,581)	\$ (10,/19,/46)	\$ (11,951,978)	\$ (13,557,758)	\$ (16,280,172)	\$ (19,232,/14)	\$ (22,408,181)	\$ (22,000,866)	

1

Capital Improvement Plan: **Administration Equipment Fund (405)** 2018-2037


		20)18	2019		2020		2021	<u>2022</u>	20	23	2024	2025	202	<u> 26</u>	<u>2027</u>	2028	2029	9	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036		2037	
Tax Levy: Current		\$ 1	5,000 \$	15,0	000 \$	15,00	0 \$	15,000 \$	15,000		5,000 \$	15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15	5,000 \$	15,000 \$	15,000	\$ 15.	,000 \$	15,000 \$	15,000 \$	15,000 \$	15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,00		15,000	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub			_		-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	_	-	-	-	-	_		-	-	
Other			_		_		_	_	_		_	_	_		_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	
Sale of Assets			_		_		_	_	_		_	_	_		_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	
Interest Earnings			-		-		-	260	465		775	-	-		-	_	-		270	575	887	1,105	1,427	155	458	76	58	1,083	
=	Revenues	\$ 1	5,000 \$	15,0	000 \$	15,00	0 \$	15,260 \$	15,465	\$ 1	5,775 \$	15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15	5,000 \$	15,000 \$	15,000	\$ 15,	,270 \$	15,575 \$	15,887 \$	16,105 \$	16,427	\$ 15,155	15,458	\$ 15,76	58 \$	16,083	308,227
Vehicles		\$	- \$	3	- \$		- \$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$	- \$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	-	\$ - :	-	\$	- \$	-	
Equipment			-		-		-	-	-	7	1,000	40,000	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	80,000	-	-		-	-	
Furniture & Fixtures			-		-		-	5,000	-		-	-	-		5,000	-	-		-	=	5,000	-	-	-	=		-	-	
Buildings			-		-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	
Improvements			-		-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	=	=	=	-	-	=		-	-	
Ex	penditures	\$	- \$	5	- \$		- \$	5,000 \$	-	\$ 7	1,000 \$	40,000	\$ -	\$ 5	5,000 \$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	- \$	5,000 \$	- \$	80,000	\$ -	-	\$	- \$	- 5	\$ 206,000
Beginning Cash Balance		\$ (3	2 000) \$	(17)	000) \$	(2.00	n) ¢	13,000 \$	23,260	¢ 2	0775 ¢	(16,500)	\$ (41.500)) \$ (2 <i>i</i>	6,500) \$	(16,500) \$	(1,500)	¢ 12	.500 \$	28.770 \$	44.345 \$	55,232 \$	71,337	\$ 7.763	\$ 22,919	\$ 38.37	77 ¢	54,145	
		,		15,0	, +	(2,00	, .		- ,		8,725 \$	(/ /	\$ (41,500)	,	, , ,	(- / / -	())	Ψ 10,	,000 4	, +	,5 .6 \$. ,	4 ,,,,,,,,	, , ,	/			
Annual Surplus (deficit)			5,000			15,00		10,260	15,465	,	5,225)	(25,000)	15,000		0,000	15,000	15,000		,270	15,575	10,887	16,105	(63,573)	15,155	15,458	15,76		16,083	
Cash Balance		2 (1	7,000) \$) (2,0	000) \$	13,00) \$	23,260 \$	38,725	\$ (1	6,500) \$	(41,500)	\$ (26,500)) \$ (10	5,500) \$	(1,500) \$	13,500	\$ 28,	,//0 \$	44,345 \$	55,232 \$	71,337 \$	7,763	\$ 22,919	\$ 38,377	\$ 54,14	15 \$	70,227	
						5-Yea	r Fund	ing Status	875%				10-Year	Funding	Status	99%									Long-Term Fu	nding Stat	tus	134%	
		5	-Year Fun	ding So	urces (I	Rev + Be	g Cash	Balance) \$	43,725	10-	Year Fund	ing Sources	(Rev + Beg	Cash Ba	lance) \$	119,500						Lo	ong-Term Fu	anding Sources	(Rev + Beg C	ash Balanc	ce) \$	276,227	

 Cash Balance (Year-End)
 \$ (47,000)
 2016

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 15,000
 2017

 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$ (32,000)
 2018



Key Description	2018	20	019	2020	<u>2021</u>	2022	2023	<u>2024</u>	2025	2026	<u>2027</u>	2028	2029	<u>20</u>	030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	<u>2036</u> <u>20</u>	037
E Voting Equipment	\$	- \$	- 5	-	\$	- \$	- \$ 71,000	- \$	\$ -	- \$ -	\$ -	\$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	80,000 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$ 151,000
E HR Software package		_	-	-		-	-	40,000	-		-		-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	- 40,000
F Administration Office Furniture		-	-	_	5,000	0	-		-	5,000	-		-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	- 15,000
		-	-	-		-	-		-		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-		-	-		-		-		-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-
	\$	- \$	- 5	-	\$ 5,000	0 \$	- \$ 71,000	\$ 40,000	\$ -	- \$ 5,000	\$ -	\$	- \$	- \$	- \$	5,000 \$	- \$	80,000 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$ 206,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Finance Equipment Fund (404)

2018-2037


		2018	201	9	2020		2021	2022	- 1	2023	2024	2025		2026	2027	2028	2029	203	30	2031	20	032	2033	2034		2035	2	2036	2037	
Tax Levy: Current		15,000 \$	8 15	,000 \$	15,00	0 \$	15,000 5	15,000	\$	15,000 \$	15,000	15,00	0 \$	15,000 \$	15,000	\$ 15,000 \$	15,000	\$ 15	5,000 \$	15,000	\$ 1	5,000 \$	15,000	\$ 15,0	00 \$	15,000	\$	15,000 \$	15,000	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub				-		-	_			_	_		-	-	_	-	_		_	_		-	-		-	_		_	_	
Other				_		_	_	_			_		_	_	_	_	_		_	_		_	_		_	_		_	_	
Sale of Assets				_		_	_	_			_		_	_	_	_	_		_	_		_	_		_	_		_	_	
Interest Earnings		973		-		_	293	199		502	813	1,12	9	-	151	454	763	1	1,079	-		-	0	3	00	606		-	_	
	Revenues	\$ 15,973 \$	3 15	,000 \$	15,00	0 \$	15,293 5	15,199	\$	15,502 \$	15,813	16,12	9 \$	15,000 \$	15,151	\$ 15,454 \$	15,763	\$ 16	6,079 \$	15,000	\$ 1	5,000 \$	15,000	\$ 15,3	00 \$	15,606	\$	15,000 \$	15,000	\$ 307,263
Vehicles		\$ - 8	S	- \$		- \$	- 5	-	\$	- \$	- 5	\$	- \$	- \$	-	\$ - \$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	_	\$	- \$	-	
Equipment		80,000		-		-	20,000	-		-	-	80,00	0	-	-	-	-	80	0,000	20,000		-	-		-	80,000		-	-	
Furniture & Fixtures		-		-		-	-	_		-	-		-	-	-	-	_		-	-		-	-		-	_		-	-	
Buildings		-		-		-	-	_		-	-		-	-	-	-	_		-	-		-	-		-	_		-	-	
Improvements		-		-		_	-	_		_	-		-	-	-	-	_		-	-		-	-		-	_		_	_	
E	Expenditures	\$ 80,000 \$	S	- \$		- \$	20,000	-	\$	- \$	- 5	80,00	0 \$	- \$	-	\$ - \$	-	\$ 80	0,000 \$	20,000	\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	80,000	\$	- \$	-	\$ 360,000
Beginning Cash Balance	e	\$ 48,660	8 (15	,367) \$	(36	7) \$	14,633	9,926	\$	25,124 \$	40,627	56,43	9 \$	(7,432) \$	7,568	\$ 22,720 \$	38,174	\$ 53	3,937 \$	(9,984)	\$ (1	4,984) \$	16	\$ 15,0	17 \$	30,317	\$ ((34,077) \$	(19,077)	
Annual Surplus (deficit))	(64,027)	15	,000	15,00	0	(4,707)	15,199		15,502	15,813	(63,87	1)	15,000	15,151	15,454	15,763	(63	3,921)	(5,000)	1	5,000	15,000	15,3	00	(64,394)		15,000	15,000	
Cash Balance		\$ (15,367) \$	S	(367) \$	14,63	3 \$	9,926	25,124	\$	40,627 \$	56,439	(7,43	2) \$	7,568 \$	22,720	\$ 38,174 \$	53,937	\$ (9	9,984) \$	(14,984)	\$	16 \$	15,017	\$ 30,3	17 \$	(34,077)	\$ ((19,077) \$	(4,077)	
							_							_														_		
							ng Status	125%						ng Status	113%											ng-Term F			99%	
		5-Year Fur	nding S	Sources (I	Rev + Be	g Cash	Balance) S	125,124	1	0-Year Fund	ing Sources	(Rev + Be	g Cash	Balance) \$	202,720							Lo	ng-Term Fu	nding So	urces (R	.ev + Beg (Cash P	Balance) \$	355,923	

 Cash Balance (Year-End)
 \$ 33,000
 2016

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 (4,340)
 2017

 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 20,000
 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$ 48,660
 2018



Key Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	20	30	2031 2	032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E Financial Software: Upgrade	\$ 80,000	\$ -	\$	- \$ -	\$ -	\$ -	- S	- \$ 80,000	\$ -	\$	- \$	- \$	- \$ 8	0,000 \$	- \$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$ 80,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 320,000
E Investment & Debt Mgmt. Softwar	e -	-		- 20,000	-	-			-		-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000
	-	-			-	-			-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-			-	-			-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-			-	-	-		-		_	-	-	-	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	_
	\$ 80,000	\$ -	\$	- \$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	- \$	- \$ 80,000	\$ -	\$	- \$	- \$	- \$ 8	0,000 \$	20,000 \$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$ 80,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 360,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Central Services Equipment Fund (409)

2018-2037

		2	018	2	019	20	020	20	021	2022		2023	2024	2025	2026		2027	2028	2029	2	2030	2031		2032	2033	2034	2	035	2036		2037	
Tax Levy: Current		\$	75,000	\$	75,000 \$	7	5,000 \$	7	5,000 \$	75,000	\$	75,000 \$	75,000 \$	75,000	\$ 75,000	\$	75,000 \$	75,000 \$	75,000	\$	75,000 \$	75,000	\$	75,000 \$	75,000 \$	75,000	\$	75,000 \$	75,00	0 \$	75,000	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub			-		-		-		-			-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-		-	-	
Other			-		-		-		-			-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-		-	-	
Sale of Assets			-		-		-		-			-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-		-	-	
Interest Earnings			1,960		1,859		1,756		1,652	1,545	,	1,435	1,324	1,211	1,095		977	856	733		608	480		350	217	81		-		-	-	
	Revenues	\$	76,960	\$	76,859 \$	7	6,756 \$	7	6,652 \$	76,545	\$	76,435 \$	76,324 \$	76,211	76,095	\$	75,977 \$	75,856 \$	75,733	\$	75,608 \$	75,480	\$	75,350 \$	75,217 \$	75,081	\$	75,000 \$	75,00	0 \$	75,000	\$1,518,140
Vehicles		\$	-	\$	- \$;	- \$;	- \$		- \$	- \$	- \$	- :	\$ -	\$	- \$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	- \$	-	\$	- \$		- \$	-	
Equipment			32,000		82,000	8	32,000	8	2,000	82,000)	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000		82,000	82,000	82,000		82,000	82,000		82,000	82,000	82,000		82,000	82,00	0	82,000	
Furniture & Fixtures			-		-		-		-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-		-	-	
Buildings			-		-		-		-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-		-	-	
Improvements			-		-		-		-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-		-	-	
E	xpenditures	\$	32,000	\$	82,000 \$	8	32,000 \$	8	2,000 \$	82,000) \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000	\$ 82,000	\$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000	\$	82,000 \$	82,000	\$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000	\$	82,000 \$	82,00	0 \$	82,000	\$1,640,000
Beginning Cash Balance	2	\$	98,003	\$	92,963 \$	8	37,822 \$	8	2,579 \$	77,230	\$	71,775 \$	66,210 \$	60,535	\$ 54,745	\$	48,840 \$	42,817 \$	36,673	\$	30,407 \$	24,015	\$	17,495 \$	10,845 \$	4,062	\$	(2,857) \$	(9,85	7) \$	(16,857)	
Annual Surplus (deficit))		(5,040)		(5,141)	((5,244)	((5,348)	(5,455	5)	(5,565)	(5,676)	(5,789)	(5,905)	(6,023)	(6,144)	(6,267)		(6,392)	(6,520))	(6,650)	(6,783)	(6,919)		(7,000)	(7,00	0)	(7,000)	
Cash Balance		\$	2,963	\$	87,822 \$	8	32,579 \$	7	7,230 \$	71,775	\$	66,210 \$	60,535 \$	54,745	48,840	\$	42,817 \$	36,673 \$	30,407	\$	24,015 \$	17,495	\$	10,845 \$	4,062 \$	(2,857)	\$	(9,857) \$	(16,85	7) \$	(23,857)	
						5-	-Year Fun	ding	Status	1189	6			10-Year Fu	nding Statu	s	105%										Long	-Term Fund	ling Stat	us	99%	

5-Year Funding Status 118% 10-Year Funding Status 105%
5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 481,775 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 862,817


Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,616,143

 Cash Balance (Year-End)
 \$ 99,000
 2016

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 (997)
 2017

 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 2017
 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$ 98,003
 2018



Key Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E Postage Machine Lease	\$ 4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000 \$	4,000	\$ 80,000
E Copier/Printer/Scanner Lease	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	1,560,000
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	_	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000 \$	82,000	\$1,640,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Police Vehicle & Equipment Fund (400)

2018-2037

	20	18	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033 2	034 203	5 2036	2037	
Tax Levy: Current	\$ 30	0,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$	300,000 \$ 3	00,000 \$ 300	000 \$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub		_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	
Other: K-9 Donation	1	0,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	
Sale of Assets	2	4,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000 24	000 24,000	24,000	
Interest Earnings		8,513	9,274	10,380	6,862	7,219	7,478	6,679	7,274	4,787	5,119	5,282	6,252	5,828	2,509	2,454	2,250	2,991 3	775 173	1,142	
	Revenues \$ 34	2,513	\$ 333,274	\$ 334,380	\$ 330,862	\$ 331,219	\$ 331,478 \$	330,679 \$	331,274 \$	328,787 \$	329,119 \$	329,282	330,252 \$	329,828 \$	326,509 \$	326,454 \$	326,250 \$ 3	26,991 \$ 327	775 \$ 324,173	\$ 325,142	\$6,596,243
Vehicles		0,855	\$ 209,105	\$ 283,415	\$ 224,555	\$ 216,305	\$ 258,505 \$	\$ 200,855 \$	231,765 \$	234,805 \$	3 219,605 \$	200,855	258,505 \$	238,965 \$	224,555 \$	250,255 \$	200,100 0 2	,555 0 205	715 \$ 200,855	\$ 209,105	
Equipment	9	5,170	66,305	222,755	76,860	91,485	110,820	91,170	221,765	68,635	87,700	71,535	90,375	248,380	102,630	80,225	68,500	57,535 240	065 61,815	127,720	
Furniture & Fixtures		8,400	2,600	4,100	11,600	10,460	2,100	8,900	2,100	8,735	13,660	8,400	2,600	8,400	2,100	6,160	11,600	8,900 2	.100 13,035	4,160	
Buildings		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	
Improvements		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
E	xpenditures \$ 30	4,425	\$ 278,010	\$ 510,270	\$ 313,015	\$ 318,250	\$ 371,425 \$	300,925 \$	455,630 \$	312,175 \$	320,965 \$	280,790	351,480 \$	495,745 \$	329,285 \$	336,640 \$	289,205 \$ 2	37,790 \$ 507	880 \$ 275,705	\$ 340,985	\$6,980,595
Beginning Cash Balance		5,629	\$ 463,717	\$ 518,981	\$ 343,091	\$ 360,937	\$ 373,906 \$	333,959 \$	363,713 \$	239,358 \$	\$ 255,970 \$	264,124	312,617 \$	291,389 \$	125,472 \$	122,696 \$			756 \$ 8,652	\$ 57,120	
Annual Surplus (deficit)		8,088	55,264	(175,890)	17,847	12,969	(39,947)	29,754	(124,356)	16,612	8,154	48,492	(21,228)	(165,917)	(2,776)	(10,186)	37,045	39,201 (180	.105) 48,468	(15,843)	
Cash Balance	\$ 46	3,717	\$ 518,981	\$ 343,091	\$ 360,937	\$ 373,906	\$ 333,959 \$	\$ 363,713 \$	239,358 \$	255,970 \$	3 264,124 \$	312,617	291,389 \$	125,472 \$	122,696 \$	112,510 \$	149,555 \$ 1	88,756 \$ 8	652 \$ 57,120	\$ 41,277	
				5 Voor I	Funding Statue	1220/			10 Voor Fun	dina Statue	108%							Long T	arm Funding Statu	101%	

 5-Year Funding Status
 122%
 10-Year Funding Status
 108%

 5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance)
 \$2,097,876
 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance)
 \$3,749,214


Long-Term Funding Status 101% Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$7,021,872

 Cash Balance (Year-End)
 \$ 459,000
 2016

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 (33,371)
 2017

 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 2017
 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$ 425,629
 2018



\$10K Donation (see above)

Key Des	scription	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V Marked squad c	cars (5 / yr)	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000	\$3,300,000
V Unmarked vehice	icles (1 / yr)	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	480,000
V CSO Vehicle		_	_	33,950	_	_	33,950	_	_	33,950	_	_	33,950	_	_	33,950	_	_	33,950	_	_	203,700
V Community rela	ations vehicle - new	-	-	22,660	-	-	-	-	22,660	-	-	-	-	22,660	-	-	-	-	22,660	-	-	90,640
V Squad conversion	ion	_	_	15,450	15,450	15,450	15,450	_	_	-	_	_	15,450	15,450	15,450	15,450	_	_	_	_	_	123,600
V Park Patrol vehi	nicle	_	_	10,500	_	_	_	_	_	-	10,500	_	_	-	_	_	_	10,500	_	_	_	31,500
V Radar Units		4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	4,120	82,400
V Stop Sticks		1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	1,030	20,600
V Rear Transport	t Seats	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	54,100
V Control Boxes		4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	80,000
V Visabars		-	8,250	-	8,250	-	8,250	-	8,250	-	8,250	-	8,250	-	8,250	-	8,250	-	8,250	-	8,250	82,500
E Computer Equip	ipment	8,800	7,400	7,400	8,800	7,400	7,400	8,800	7,400	7,400	8,800	7,400	7,400	8,800	7,400	7,400	8,800	7,400	7,400	8,800	7,400	157,800
E Computer replac	acements for fleet	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000	-	-	600,000
E Cell phones/con	mputer devices	-	-	5,645	-	-	5,645	-	-	5,645	-	-	5,645	-	-	5,645	-	-	5,645	-	-	33,870
E Printer replacen	ments for fleet	-	-	7,210	7,210	-	-	-	7,210	7,210	-	-	-	7,210	7,210	-	-	-	7,210	7,210	-	57,680
E Speed notification	ion unit	-	-	-	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	6,000	-		-	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	6,000	24,000
E GPS Devices		-	-	-	5,150	-	-	-	-	5,150	-	-	-	-	5,150	-	-	-	-	5,150	-	20,600
E New K-9		-	16,000	-	16,000	-	-	-	16,000	-	16,000	-	16,000	-	-	-	16,000	-	16,000	-	16,000	128,000
E Non-lethal weap	pons	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	32,000
E Long guns repla	acement	-	-	-	-	11,330	11,330	-	-	-	-	11,330	11,330	-	-	-	-	11,330	11,330	-	-	67,980
E Long gun parts	(squads)	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	3,090	61,800
E Sidearms (office	ers)	-	-	9,270	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,270	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18,540
E Sidearm parts (o	(officers)	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	2,060	41,200
E Tactical gear		5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	5,150	103,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Police Vehicle & Equipment Fund (400) 2018-2037

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E SWAT Bullet Proof Vests	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	123,600
E IBIS Fingerprinting Equipment	_	3,000	_	_	3,000	_	_	3,000	_	_	3,000	_	_	3,000	_	_	3,000	_	_	3,000	21,000
E Crime scene equipment	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	60,000
E McGruff Costume	_	1,750	_	_	<u>-</u>	_	_	_	_	1,750	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	1,750	_	- 1	5,250
E K-9 Training Equipment	_	_	_	1,545	_	_	_	_	_	1,545	_	_	_	_	_	1,545	_	_	_	-	4,635
E 8 Squad Surveillance Cameras	41,715	_	_	_	_	41,715	41,715	_	_	_	_	-	41,715	41,715	_	_	-	_	_	41,715	250,290
E Digital Interview Room Equipment	_	_	_	_	15,450	_	_	_	_	15,450	_	_	_	_	15,450	_	_	_	_	15,450	61,800
E Evidence Room	-	-	2,575	-	-	2,575	-	-	2,575	-	-	2,575	-	-	2,575	-	-	2,575	-	-	15,450
E Report Room Monitors	2,500	_	2,500	_	2,500	_	2,500	_	2,500	_	2,500	_	2,500	_	2,500	_	2,500	_	2,500		25,000
E Roll Call Equipment	4,000	_	_	_	_	4,000	_	_	_	_	4,000	_	_	_	_	4,000	_	_	_	-	16,000
E Investigation Conf. Room	_	_	_	_	2,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	2,500	_	-	_	_		5,000
E Defibrillators	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	1,575	31,500
E Shredder	-	-	-	-	5,150	-	-	-	-	-	5,150	-	-	-	-	-	5,150	-	-	-	15,450
E Radio Equipment	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	310,000
F Office furniture	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	8,400	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	8,400	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	8,400	2,100	2,100	2,100	60,900
F Patrol area cubicles	-	-	-	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	9,500	-	-	-	-	28,500
F Window treatments	6,300	_	_	_	_	_	6,300	_	_	_	_	_	6,300	_	_	_	_	_	6,300	-	25,200
F Dishwasher	-	-	-	-	2,060	-	-	-	-	2,060	-	-	-	-	2,060	-	-	-	-	2,060	8,240
F Kitchen Stove	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	2,060	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	2,060		4,120
F Microwave	-	500	-	-	-	-	500	-	-	-	-	500	-	-	-	-	500	-	-	-	2,000
F Kitchen Refrigerator	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	2,575	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	2,575		5,150
F Detention Room	-	-	2,000	-	-	-	-		2,000	-	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	6,000
	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	_
	\$ 304,425	\$ 278,010	\$ 510,270	\$ 313,015	\$ 318,250	\$ 371,425	\$ 300,925	\$ 455,630	\$ 312,175	\$ 320,965	\$ 280,790	\$ 351,480	\$ 495,745	\$ 329,285	\$ 336,640	\$ 289,205 \$	287,790	\$ 507,880	\$ 275,705	\$ 340,985	\$6,980,595


6

Capital Improvement Plan: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (401)

2018-2037

		2018	2019	2	2020	2021	2022		2023	2024		2025	2026		2027	20	28	2029	20	30	2031	2	032	2033	2034	2035	2036	203	<u>7</u>
Tax Levy: Current		335,000	\$ 335,00	0 \$ 3	35,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 335,00	0 \$	335,000	\$ 335,000	0 \$	335,000	\$ 335,0	00 \$	335,000	\$ 33	5,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 33:	5,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 3	35,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 335,000	\$ 335	,000
Tax Levy: Add/Sub		-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-
Other		-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-
Sale of Assets		-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-
Interest Earnings	_	18,212	22,34	6	25,055	17,446	1,99	5	6,245	9,422	2	12,670	5,5	93	9,425		9,186	14,009	19	9,840	7,966		1,148	14,431	19,519	24,230	12,314	12	361
R	Revenues	\$ 353,212	\$ 357,34	6 \$ 3	360,055	\$ 352,446	\$ 336,99	5 \$	341,245	\$ 344,422	2 \$	347,670	\$ 340,5	93 \$	344,425	\$ 34	4,186	\$ 349,009	\$ 354	4,840	\$ 342,966	\$ 3	16,148	\$ 349,431	\$ 354,519	\$ 359,230	\$ 347,314	\$ 347	361 \$6,973,411
Vehicles		\$ 52,500	\$ 100.00	0 \$ 6	530,000	\$1,100,000	\$ 60.00	0 \$	105,000	\$ 62,500	n s	632,000	\$ 65,0	2 00	65,000	\$ 6	5,000	s -	\$ 830	0.000	\$ 106,000	\$	70,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 877.000	\$ 70,000	\$	_
Equipment		92,500	96,50		98,000	17,000	64,50		76,000	91,00		68,000	76,0		290,000		3,000	45,000		7,000	76,500		9,000	25,000	25,000	4 0,000	255,000		.000
							04,50	U																					
Furniture & Fixtures		1,500	25,40	0	12,500	8,000		-	1,400	28,50)	1,500	8,0	00	1,400		5,000	12,500	2	1,500	1,400		13,000	20,000	24,000	5,000	20,000	9	,000
Buildings		-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-
Improvements	_	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-	-	-	_		<u>-</u>
Expe	enditures	146,500	\$ 221,90	0 \$ 7	740,500	\$1,125,000	\$ 124,50	0 \$	182,400	\$ 182,000	0 \$	701,500	\$ 149,0	00 \$	356,400	\$ 10	3,000	\$ 57,500	\$ 94	8,500	\$ 183,900	\$ 1	32,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 119,000	\$ 955,000	\$ 345,000	\$ 54	,000 \$6,972,600
Beginning Cash Balance		\$ 910,580	\$1.117.29	2 612	252,737	\$ 872,292	\$ 99.73	0 6	312,233	\$ 471.07	7 €	633,499	\$ 279,6	60 ¢	471,262	\$ 45	9.288	\$ 700,473	\$ 00	1.983	\$ 398.322	e 5	57,389	\$ 721,537	\$ 975,967	\$1,211,487	\$ 615,717	\$ 618	021
		,		,-	. ,	, .			. ,	,		,	, .		. , .		-,	,		,	,		. ,	. , ,		. , ,	,		
Annual Surplus (deficit)		206,712	135,44		880,445)	(772,554)	212,49		158,845	162,422		(353,830)	191,5		(11,975)	24	1,186	291,509	,	3,660)	159,066		54,148	254,431	235,519	(595,770)	2,314	293	
Cash Balance		\$1,117,292	\$1,252,73	7 \$ 8	372,292	\$ 99,738	\$ 312,23	3 \$	471,077	\$ 633,499	9 \$	279,669	\$ 471,2	62 \$	459,288	\$ 70	00,473	\$ 991,983	\$ 39	8,322	\$ 557,389	\$ 7	21,537	\$ 975,967	\$1,211,487	\$ 615,717	\$ 618,031	\$ 911	391
					5-Year Fu	unding Status	113	%				10-Year F	anding Sta	tus	112%											Long-Term	Funding Statu	s 1	13%

Cash Balance (Year-End)	\$ 754,000	2016
Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit	156,580	2017
Adjust for Delayed CIP Items	-	2017
Cash Balance (Beg. Year)	\$ 910,580	2018



Key <u>Description</u>	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V Staffed engine replacement	\$ -	s -	\$ 575,000	\$ - 5	- :	s <u> </u>		\$ 632,000	\$ -	4	s - :		\$ 695,000	s - :	\$ - :	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 765,000	s - :		\$2,667,000
V Medic Unit	_	100,000	_	_	_	60,000	_	_	_	65,000	_	_	_	106,000	_	_	_	112,000	_	- /	443,000
V Utility-foam transport/trailer	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	65,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	- /	65,000
V Ladder truck	-	-	-	1,100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,100,000
V Command Response Vehicle	52,500	-	55,000	-	60,000	-	62,500	-	65,000	-	65,000	-	70,000	-	70,000	-	70,000	-	70,000	-	640,000
V Fire Inspector vehicle	-	_	_	_	_	45,000	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	50,000	_	_	_	- /	95,000
E Exercise room-fitness equipment	10,000	-	15,000	-	-	18,000	-	-	18,000	-	-	20,000	-	-	20,000	-	-	20,000	-	-	121,000
E Rescue boat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	35,000
E Self contained breathing apparatus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150,000	-	350,000
E Ventilation fans	-	-	-	-	7,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
E Power equipment	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
E Personal Protective Equipment	40,000	40,000	40,000	-	-	-	35,000	30,000	15,000	-	-	-	35,000	25,000	10,000	-	-	-	35,000	-	305,000
E Cardiac Monitoring and Response	B -	5,000	13,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	13,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	13,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	13,000	5,000	5,000	127,000
E Medical bags and O2 bags	-	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	19,500
E Training equipment	1,500	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,500
E Camera to assist with rescue/firefig		-	-	7,000	-	-	-	-	6,500	-	-	-	-	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
E Portable and mobile radios	20,000	20,000	20,000	5,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	-	365,000
E Firefighting Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000
E Response to water related emergence		-	-	-	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,000
E Apparatus Based IT Infrastructure	-	20,000	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	100,000
E Air monitoring equipment	-	5,000	-	-	-	5,000	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
E Rescue equipment	-	-	-	-	32,500	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	37,500	-	-	-	-	40,000	145,000
E Off-site paging equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E Reporting software	11,000	-	-	-	-	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	- /	23,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Fire Vehicle & Equipment Fund (401) 2018-2037

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E SWAT Gear/Equipment	10,000		_	_		-	10,000	_	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	_	_	_	10,000	-	40,000
E Nozzles	_	_	_	_	-	_	15,000	-	_	-	_	-	_	-	_	_	_	_	-	-	15,000
F Fire admin- office furniture	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	20,000	_	_		20,000
F Training room tables & chairs	_	15,000	_	_	_	_	15,000	_	_	_	_	_	15,000	_	_	_	_	_	15,000	-	60,000
F Conf room Furniture	_	5,000	_	_	_	_	5,000	_	_	_	_	_	5,000	_	_	_	_	_	5,000	-	20,000
F Kitchen appliances	_	_	4,500	_	_	_	4,500	_	_	_	5,000	_	_	-	5,000	_	_	5,000	-	-	24,000
F Kitchen table & chairs	1,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	1,500	_	_	_	_	1,500	-	_	_	_	_	-	-	4,500
F Day room chairs	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	24,000
F AV equipment-training room	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	16,000
F Second floor washer & dryer	_	1,400	_	_	_	1,400	_	_	_	1,400	_	_	_	1,400	_	_	_	_	_		5,600
F Bed Mattresses	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,500	-	-	-	-		-	-	9,000	25,500
F Bed Structure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	20,000
		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	-
	\$ 146,500	\$ 221,900	\$ 740,500	\$1,125,000	\$ 124,500	\$ 182,400	\$ 182,000	\$ 701,500	\$ 149,000	\$ 356,400	\$ 103,000 \$	\$ 57,500	\$ 948,500	\$ 183,900	8 182,000	95,000	\$ 119,000	\$ 955,000	\$ 345,000	54,000	\$6,972,600


Capital Improvement Plan: Public Works Vehicle & Equipment Fund (403)

2018-2037

		2018	2019		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
Tax Levy: Current		\$ 241,000	\$ 241,0	00 \$	241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	\$ 241,000	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub		(6,000)	(6,0	00)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	
Other		-		-	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Sale of Assets		_		-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_	-	
Interest Earnings		12,739	15,0	84	14,555	17,277	13,802	10,378	10,586	12,777	12,623	15,675	13,457	8,864	10,681	12,285	12,051	12,792	9,628	7,530	2,521	-	
	Revenues	\$ 247,739	\$ 250,0	84 \$	249,555	\$ 252,277	\$ 248,802	\$ 245,378	\$ 245,586	\$ 247,777	\$ 247,623	\$ 250,675	\$ 248,457	\$ 243,864	\$ 245,681	\$ 247,285	\$ 247,051	\$ 247,792	\$ 244,628	\$ 242,530	\$ 237,521	\$ 235,000	\$4,925,305
Vehicles		\$ 97,000	\$ 233,0	00 \$	40,000	\$ 280,000	\$ 405,000	\$ 205,000	\$ 76,000	\$ 192,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 284,500	\$ 437,500	\$ 115,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 233,000	\$ 210,000	\$ 405,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 368,000	\$ 242,000	\$ 7,500	
Equipment		33,500	43,5	00	73,500	146,000	15,000	25,000	60,000	53,500	81,000	77,100	40,600	38,000	125,500	26,000	-	1,000	49,500	125,000	178,000	67,000	
Furniture & Fixtures		-		-	-	-	_	5,000	-	10,000	-	-	_	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	_	_	5,000	
Buildings		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Improvements		-		-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_	-	
E	xpenditures	\$ 130,500	\$ 276,5	00 \$	113,500	\$ 426,000	\$ 420,000	\$ 235,000	\$ 136,000	\$ 255,500	\$ 95,000	\$ 361,600	\$ 478,100	\$ 153,000	\$ 165,500	\$ 259,000	\$ 210,000	\$ 406,000	\$ 349,500	\$ 493,000	\$ 420,000	\$ 79,500	\$5,463,200
Beginning Cash Balance	e	\$ 636,950	\$ 754,1	89 \$	727,773	\$ 863,828	\$ 690,105	\$ 518,907	\$ 529,285	\$ 638,871	\$ 631,148	\$ 783,771	\$ 672,847	\$ 443,203	\$ 534,068	\$ 614,249	\$ 602,534	\$ 639,585	\$ 481,376	\$ 376,504	\$ 126,034	\$ (56,445)	
Annual Surplus (deficit))	117,239	(26,4	16)	136,055	(173,723)	(171,198)	10,378	109,586	(7,723)	152,623	(110,925)	(229,643)	90,864	80,181	(11,715)	37,051	(158,208)	(104,872)	(250,470)	(182,479)	155,500	
Cash Balance		\$ 754,189	\$ 727,7	73 \$	863,828	\$ 690,105	\$ 518,907	\$ 529,285	\$ 638,871	\$ 631,148	\$ 783,771	\$ 672,847	\$ 443,203	\$ 534,068	\$ 614,249	\$ 602,534	\$ 639,585	\$ 481,376	\$ 376,504	\$ 126,034	\$ (56,445)	\$ 99,055	

5-Year Funding Status 138% 10-Year Funding Status 127% 5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,885,407 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$3,122,447

Cash Balance (Year-End)	\$ 944,000	2016
Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit	(307,050)	2017
Adjust for Delayed CIP Items	-	2017
Cash Balance (Beg. Year)	\$ 636,950	2018



Ke	Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V	Eng. Vehicle #307: ROW Equinox	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	_	-	_	-	- 5	\$ -	\$ - :	S - S		\$ 25,000
V	Eng. vehicle #302: Intern Astro	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000
	Eng. vehicle #303: Survey F150		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
	Eng. vehicle #308: Proj.Cord.Escap	-		-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	25,000	-	-	50,000
V	Eng. vehicle #304: Proj. Cord. C150	30,000		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000
	#101 F-150 Pickup 2wd	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	60,000
	#104 1-ton pickup	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70,000
	#128 F250 4x4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27,500
	#106 3-ton dump w/ plo	-	-	-	-	180,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	180,000	-	-	-	-	360,000
	#107 Wheel Loader (621)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	205,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	205,000
	#109 3-ton dump w/ plow	-	180,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	180,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	360,000
	#111 Skidsteer Replacement	-	-	-	45,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45,000	-	-	-				90,000
	#111 Kage plow	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,000	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	6,000	-	-	12,000
	#111 - Bobcat, snow blower	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
	#111 Bobcat, hydro hammer	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	16,000
	#111 Bobcat, bucket	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
	#111 Bobcat, millhead (18")	22,000	-	-	.	-	-	-	-	-	22,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22,000	-	66,000
	#112 3-ton dump w/ plow	-	-	-	180,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	180,000	-	-	.	-	-	360,000
	#123 Patch Hook Body	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	-	-	75,000
	#125 5-ton Dump (tandem)	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	230,000	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	230,000
	#133 - Walk behind saw	-	-	10,000	.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	10,000	-	-	-	20,000
	#134 Sign truck and box and lift	-	-	-	55,000	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	155,000
	#141 Asphalt roller	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	14,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	14,000
V	#143 Portable line striper	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	20,000

City of Roseville Capital Improvement Plan: Public Works Vehicle & Equipment Fund (403) 2018-2037

144 3-ton dump w/ plow	2018	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025 180,000	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	2028	<u>2029</u>	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036 180,000	2037
16 3-ton dump w/ plow	_	_	_	_	_	180,000		-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	180,000	180,000		_
1 1-Ton Dump	_	_	_	_	_		40,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	40,000	_	_
2 Int'l boom truck	_	_	_	_	225,000	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	225,000	_		_	_
55 Sterling 3-ton w/ plow	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	180,000	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	
56 3/4 ton pickup 2wd w/ lift	_	_	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	
57 Ingersoll 5-ton roller	40,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	40,000	
159 Crafco Router	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	12,000		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	12,000	-	_
Electronic message board-attenuato	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	7,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	7,500
166 Cimline Melter	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	.,	_	40.000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
108 Hydro Seeder	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
111 Bobcat Forks	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	1,100	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
111 Bobcat sweeper broom	8,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	8,000	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	_	_	_		_	_	8,000	_	_	_
111 Bobcat 2 1/2 slot mill	-	_	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_
111 Bobcat 78" grapple bucket	_	_	_	_	5.000	_	,	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	,	_	_	_
11 Bobcat angle broom	_	_	_	_	-,	_	_	_	5,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	5,000	_
11 Bobcat Forks 42"	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-,	_	1,100	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-,	_
113 Tree chipper	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	55,000	-,	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	55,000
pray Injection Patcher			_	_		_	_	_	65,000	-	_	_		_	_		_	_	65,000	-
142 Replace plate compactor	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	3,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	3,000	_
153 Trailer Felling			_	_		_	_	_	-	10,000	_	_		_	_		_	_	-	_
treet Signs	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	50,000	50,000	_
Iower/Snow Blower Combo (1/2 w				30,000		_	_	_	_		30,000	_		_	_		_	30,000	-	_
ffice equipment	_			-	_	20,000			_	_	50,000	_		_	_	_	_	-	20,000	_
gn equipment/plotter cutter/signs			_	_		20,000	30,000	_	_		_	_		_	_		_	_	30,000	_
29 Sullair Compressor			_	_		_	-	30,000	_		_	_		_	_		_	_	-	_
ractor/snowblower (1/2 storm)	_			_	_	_		-	_	_		35,000	_	_	_	_	_			_
ee Boy Road Grader (#519)			15,000	_		_	_	_	_			-		_	_		_	15,000		_
elling Trailer for Road Grader (#5	_		10,000	_	_	_			_	_		_		_	_	_	_	10,000		_
600 Gal Anti-Icing Hook Setup				_	_	_	20,000	_	_		_	_		_	_		20,000	-		_
acker J-Tamper (Jumping Jack)*	_		2,500	_	_	_	20,000		_	_		_		_	_	_	20,000	2,500		_
alt Truck Calibration Scale*			2,500	5,000	_	_	_	_	_			_		_	_		_	2,500	5,000	_
riue Tank 3000 Gallons*	_				_	_			_	10,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		-	_
ng. Survey equipment			30,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	-		_	30,000	_	_		_	_		_
ng. Large format scanner/copier	_	10,000	50,000	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	50,000	10,000	_	_	_	_	_	10,000
uel Mgmt system and pumps		-		_	_	_	_	-	_			_	60,000	10,000			_		_	10,000
and saw	4,500					_							4,500					_		
ire changer	4,500	15,000		_	_	_	_	_	_			_	4,500	15,000			_	_	_	
ire Balancer	_	15,000	_	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	_	15,000	_	_	_	10,000	_	_
rill Press				_	_	_	_	2,500	_		_	_					_	2,500	_	
ubrication filling heads, reels, hose	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	2,500	_	_	6,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	2,500	_	_
ubrication tank pumps (3)				_	_	_	_	_	_		3,000	_	_				_	_	_	
ir compressor		_	4.000	_	_	_	_	_	_		-	_	_	_	_	_	4,000	_	_	_
ehicle analyzer update (SW ea 2yr		1,000	-,000	1.000		3.000		1.000		1.000		3.000		1.000		1,000	-,000	3,000		
o crane (overhead motor & trolly)		7,500		1,000		5,000		1,000		1,000		5,000		1,000		1,000	7,500	5,000		
rive-on hoist rehab		7,500		_				_					20,000			_	7,500			
ake lathe	11,000			_				_					11,000			_				
olumn Lifts rehab/replace	11,000	_	_	100,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	11,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Velder Wire Feed*	-	-	2,000	100,000	-	_	_	-	_	-	-	-		_	-	-	-	2,000	-	_
elder Wire Feed*	-	-	2,000	-	-	2,000	_	-	_	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	2,000	-	2,000
arage: Office furniture	-	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,000
ffice furniture	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000
THEC TURNITURE	-	-	_	_	-	5,000	_	-	-	_	_	_	5,000		_	-	-	-	-	5,000

Engineering Streets Garage

Capital Improvement Plan: Parks & Recreation Vehicle & Equipment Fund (402)

2018-2037

Tax Levy: Current Tax Levy: Add/Sub (to Gen Other Sale of Assets Interest Earnings	n Fac.)	2018 \$ 218,00	- - -	2019 218,00 (25,00	0) - - 66	2020 218,000 (25,000	\$ 2	2021 218,000 (25,000) - - 192	(2	8,000 5,000) - - 1,596	\$\frac{2023}{218,00}\$\$ (25,00)	0) - - 8	2024 218,000 (25,000) - - 2,876	\$	2025 218,000 (25,000) - - 2,174	\$ 21	026 18,000 25,000) - 3,117	\$\frac{2027}{218,00} \tag{25,00}	0) - - 9	2028 218,000 (25,000) - - 7,205		000 S 000) - - 649	2030 \$ 218,000 (25,000) - - 5,952) (2	8,000 5,000) - - 6,211	\$ 2032 \$ 218,000 (25,000) - - 9,035	\$ 2:	033 18,000 25,000)	8	3,000 5,000) - - 3,649	\$ 2035 \$ 218,000 (25,000) - - 12,622	\$ 1	2036 218,000 (25,000) - - 13,774	\$ 218,4 (25,4	000 000) - - 050	100120
K	levenues	\$ 218,0	00 \$	193,06	0 2	193,777	\$	193,192	\$ 19	4,596	\$ 197,38	5 5	195,876	3	195,174	\$ 19	96,117	\$ 199,27	9 \$	200,205	\$ 200,	649	198,952	\$ 19	9,211	\$ 202,035	\$ 20	02,656	\$ 201	,649	\$ 205,622	3	206,774	\$ 210,0	30 \$4	4,004,269
Vehicles Equipment		\$ 96,00 80,00	,,,	157,50	0 \$	73,000 150,000	\$ 1	123,000	\$ 3 2	2,000 3,000	\$ 68,00 205,00		136,000 95,000	\$	3,000 145,000	\$ 3	3,000 35,000	\$ 3,00 150,00		98,000 80,000	\$ 277, 8,	500 S	33,000 153,000	-	3,000 5,000	\$ 151,000 20,000		28,000 25,000	\$ 3	3,000	\$ 3,000 145,000	\$	43,000	\$ 17,0	000	
Furniture & Fixtures			-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-		-	-		-		-	
Buildings			-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-		-	-		-		-	
Improvements	_		-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-			-		-			
Exper	nditures	\$ 176,0	00 \$	157,50	0 \$	223,000	\$ 1	123,000	\$ 5	5,000	\$ 273,00	0 \$	231,000	\$	148,000	\$ 3	88,000	\$ 153,00	0 \$	178,000	\$ 285,	500 5	\$ 186,000	\$ 5	8,000	\$ 171,000	\$ 25	53,000	\$ 3	3,000	\$ 148,000	\$	43,000	\$ 17,0	000 \$2	2,920,000
Beginning Cash Balance		\$ (38,7)	20) \$	3,28	0 \$	38,846	\$	9,623	\$ 7	9,815	\$ 219,41	1 \$	143,799	\$	108,675	\$ 15	55,849	\$ 313,96	6 \$	360,245	\$ 382,	450	\$ 297,599	\$ 31	0,551	\$ 451,762	\$ 48	82,797	\$ 432	2,453	\$ 631,102		688,725	\$ 852,		
Annual Surplus (deficit)		42,0	00	35,56	6	(29,223)	70,192	13	9,596	(75,61	2)	(35,124)		47,174	15	58,117	46,27	9	22,205	(84,	851)	12,952	14	1,211	31,035	(:	50,344)	198	3,649	57,622		163,774	193,)50	
Cash Balance		\$ 3,2	80 \$	38,84	6 \$	9,623	\$	79,815	\$ 21	9,411	\$ 143,79	9 \$	108,675	\$	155,849	\$ 31	13,966	\$ 360,24	5 \$	382,450	\$ 297,	599	310,551	\$ 45	1,762	\$ 482,797	\$ 43	32,453	\$ 631	,102	\$ 688,725	\$	852,499	\$1,045,	549	
						5-Year	Fundir	ng Status		130%					10-Vear F	undino	Status	123	%												Long-Term I	Fundi	ng Status	11	36%	

5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 953,911 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,937,745

Long-Term Funding Status 136% Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$3,965,549

 Cash Balance (Year-End)
 \$ 97,000
 2016

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 (135,720)
 2017

 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 - 2017
 - 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$ (38,720)
 2018

Parks & Recreation Vehicle & Equipment
S1,200,000
S1,000,000
S800,000
S400,000
S-2018 2021 2024 2027 2030 2033 2036

Revenues Expenditures — Cash Balance

Key	Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V P	Puppet Wagon (2003)	s -	\$ - :	\$ - :	\$ - 5	14,000	\$ - :	s - s	- 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - 5	\$ - :	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - :	\$ - :	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,000	\$ 28,000
	530 Ford F350 with Plow (2016)	-	-	-	-	-		40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-		40,000	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
	506 Ford 3/4-ton (2012)	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	120,000
V #	507 Chevy 1/2-ton (2003)	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
V #	528 Ford F350 Dump (2016)	-	-	-	-	-		53,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53,000	-	-	-	-	-	106,000
V #	510 Water truck (1/2 cost) (2006)	-	65,000	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	65,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		130,000
	511 Toolcat (2006)	55,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	110,000
	Replace 1996 FORD Tractor with	41,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	98,000
	517 Ford F350 SD (2013)	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
	515 Ford 350 w. plow (2013)	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
V #	516 Ford with plow (2013)	-		-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
	Zero Turn Replace (Arb.) (1999)	-	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19,000
	532 Ford F350 (2016)	-	-	-	-	-		40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-		40,000	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
	534 Kromer field liner (2003)	-		-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	50,000
	535 Ford Passenger van (2006)	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
	545 John Deere tractor (2007)	-		30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000
	560 Ford Passenger van (2006)	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
	Skating Center Plow Truck (2002)	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
	504 Kubota Drag Tractor (2011)	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	60,000
	509 Toro 4000 Mower (2013)	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	100,000
	513 Toro 4000 Mower (2013)	-	-	-		-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	100,000
	520 Single axle trailer (1987)	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	5,000
	553 John Deere loader (2007)	80,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	160,000
Е#	2536 Toro 16' mower (2016)	-	-	-	-	-	-	95,000		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95,000			-	-	190,000

City of Roseville
Capital Improvement Plan: Parks & Recreation Vehicle & Equipment Fund (402)
2018-2037

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E #538 portable generator	_	_	_	_	3,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	3,000	_	_	_		_	_	-	6,000
E #543 Felling trailer (2010)	_	_	5,000	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	5,000	_	-	-	_	_	_		10,000
E #546 Toro groundmaster (2017)	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	35,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	-	35,000
E #548 Towmaster trailer (2000)	-	-	-	-	12,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,000	-	-	-	-		24,000
E #565 Smithco sweeper (1992)	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-		_	8,000	_	_	-	-	_	_	_		8,000
E Mower blade sharpener (2015)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-		15,000
E #505 Holder snow machine (2017)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	145,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		145,000
E #518 Holder Snow machine (2015)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	145,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	145,000	-		290,000
E #585 Belos snow machine (2010)	-	-	145,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	145,000	-	-	-	-	-	-		290,000
E Park security systems		_	_	_	_	75,000		_	-	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	_	_		75,000
E Pickup sander (2013)	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	16,000
_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-
-	\$ 176,000	\$ 157,500	\$ 223,000	\$ 123,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 273,000	\$ 231,000	\$ 148,000	\$ 38,000	\$ 153,000	\$ 178,000	\$ 285,500	\$ 186,000 \$	58,000	171,000	\$ 253,000 \$	3,000	\$ 148,000 S	43,000 \$	17,000	\$2,920,000

Park Maintenance Skating Center

Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 5,485,867

City of Roseville

Capital Improvement Plan: **General Facilities Replacement Fund (410)** 2018-2037

5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 1,930,867

		2018	2019		2020	2021	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	2025	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	2028	<u>2029</u>	2030	2031	2032	<u>2033</u>	2034	<u>2035</u>	<u>2036</u>	<u>2037</u>
Tax Levy: Current	\$	212,000	\$ 212,0	00 \$	212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 212,000 \$	212,000
Tax Levy: Add/Sub (a)		-	25,0	00	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Other		-		-	_	-	-	-	_	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sale of Assets		_		-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interest Earnings		14,885	11,7	42	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reve	enues \$	226,885	\$ 248,7	42 \$	237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000	\$ 237,000 \$	237,000 \$ 4,741,627
Vehicles	\$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - \$	-
Equipment		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Furniture & Fixtures		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Buildings		384,000	853,4	00	3,183,000	340,000	760,000	1,320,300	259,000	406,500	67,000	49,400	405,500	448,500	60,500	1,171,900	401,000	237,800	404,000	366,500	398,000	68,000
Improvements		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expendi	itures \$	384,000	\$ 853,4	00 \$	3,183,000	\$ 340,000	\$ 760,000	\$ 1,320,300	\$ 259,000	\$ 406,500	\$ 67,000	\$ 49,400	\$ 405,500	\$ 448,500	\$ 60,500	\$ 1,171,900	\$ 401,000	\$ 237,800	\$ 404,000	\$ 366,500	\$ 398,000 \$	68,000 \$11,584,300
Beginning Cash Balance	\$	744,240	\$ 587,1	25 \$	(17,533)	\$(2,963,533)	\$(3,066,533)	\$(3,589,533)	\$(4,672,833)	\$(4,694,833)	\$(4,864,333)	\$(4,694,333)	\$(4,506,733)	\$(4,675,233)	\$(4,886,733)	\$(4,710,233)	\$(5,645,133)	\$(5,809,133)	\$(5,809,933)	\$(5,976,933)	\$(6,106,433) \$	(6,267,433)
Annual Surplus (deficit)		(157,115)	(604,6	58)	(2,946,000)	(103,000)	(523,000	(1,083,300)	(22,000)	(169,500)	170,000	187,600	(168,500)	(211,500)	176,500	(934,900)	(164,000)	(800)	(167,000)	(129,500)	(161,000)	169,000
Cash Balance	\$	587,125	\$ (17,5	33) \$	(2,963,533)	\$(3,066,533)	\$(3,589,533	\$(4,672,833)	\$(4,694,833)	\$(4,864,333)	\$(4,694,333)	\$(4,506,733)	\$(4,675,233)	\$(4,886,733)	\$(4,710,233)	\$(5,645,133)	\$(5,809,133)	\$(5,809,933)	\$(5,976,933)	\$(6,106,433)	\$(6,267,433) \$	(6,098,433)
				•						, , , ,		, , ,							, , , ,		, , , , ,	
					5-Year F	unding Status	35%)		10-Year I	Funding Status	41%								Long-Term F	unding Status	47%

10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 3,115,867


 Cash Balance (Year-End)
 \$ 200,000
 2016

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 544,240
 2017

 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$ 744,240
 2018

(a) \$160K in 2018, \$30K, \$25K from PR Fund in 2019



<u>Key</u>	Description	2018	2019	<u>2020</u>	2021	2022	2023	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	2028	<u>2029</u>	2030	<u>2031</u>	<u>2032</u>	<u>2033</u>	2034	<u>2035</u>	<u>2036</u>	2037	
B Re	eplace Rooftop Heat/AC	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - 5	-	\$ 275,000 \$	- \$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 290,000	\$ -	\$ - 5	\$ - :	- \$	-	\$ 565,000
B Re	eplace garage Co Ra Vac Heaters	-	-	60,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	120,000
B Do	oor Card Reader	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000
В Не	eating boilers Police	-	-	-	-	-	-	70,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	70,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	140,500
B Lie	ebert condensing unit (IT Server F	-	-	60,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	-	120,000
B Lie	ebert AHV (IT Server Room)	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	60,000
B Ma	ake Up Air Units (Maintenance G	-	90,000	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	195,000
B Ci	rculating pumps	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,500
B Wa	ater heaters (CH and Maintenance	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	50,000
B Re	eplace boiler City Hall	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	60,000
B Po	olice & PW garage Co2/No2 detec	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	30,000
B Ex	chaust fans (10)	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	55,000
B Un	nit heaters (4)	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,500
B VA	AV's heat/cool	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	60,000
B VA	AV/s cool	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	_	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	_	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	60,000

Capital Improvement Plan: **General Facilities Replacement Fund (410)** 2018-2037

	<u>2018</u>	2019	<u>2020</u>	2021	2022	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	2025	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	2028	<u>2029</u>	<u>2030</u>	<u>2031</u>	<u>2032</u>	2033	<u>2034</u>	2035	<u>2036</u>	<u>2037</u>
B Update Flooring CH/PD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Update Restrooms CH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-
B workstation replacement city hall	-	-	-	-	350,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Overhead door replacement	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-
B Roof Rehab/Replace Park Maintena	-	120,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Rehab of north roof PW building	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	120,000	-	-	-
B City Hall Entrance Walkway Improv	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Card access system replacement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-
B Replace new Roof City Hall	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	225,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Emergency generator		-	-	-	-	-	-	90,000	-	<u>-</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>-</u>	-
Tables and chairs City Hall	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-
Fuel system tank replacement	-	220,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maintenace Yard Security Gate	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>-</u>	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
Paint walls city hall	15,000	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	20,000			-	-
LED conversion CH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	-
Geothermal Expansion to PW Build	-	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
City Hall Elevator	95,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brimhall gymnasium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Central Park gymnasium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gymnastics Center	-	-	70,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commons: Exterior Painting (2014	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-
Commons: Water Heater- Domestic	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-
Commons: Water Heater- Zamboni	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-
Commons: Water Storage Tank	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-
Commons: South Entry RTU (2007)	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commons: Parking Lot - North (200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commons: Parking Lot - South (200	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commons: Parking Lot Lighting - N	-	-	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	-	_	_	_	-	_	-	-	-	_	-
Commons: Parking Lot Lighting - S	-	-	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	-	25,000	_	_	-	_	-	-	-	_	-
Commons: County Road C Sign (20	_	_	_		_	40,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	40,000	_	-
Commons: Entry way rubber floorin	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
Commons: Electronic Lock System	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
Arena: Roof Top units (2) (2008)	_	_	_	_	_	165,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
Arena: Rubber flooring - changing a	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
Arena: Rubber flooring - locker room	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
Arena: Dehumidification	90,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Mezzanine HP (2009)		_	_	_	_	_	45,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Roof (2004)	_	_	_	_	300,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Mezzanine glass system	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: refrigeration system (2008)	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	700,000	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Fluid Cooler (2008)	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	125,000	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Concrete Floor (2008)	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	125,000	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Dasher Boards (2008)	_	_	_	_	_	135,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Zamboni (2014)	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	115,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Locker Room HP (2008)	_	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	-	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_			
Arena: Scoreboard Large	_	30,000	_	_	-	-	_	-	_	_	-	_	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_
Arena: Ice Show Curtain	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	-	=	_			_
Arena: Zamboni Foyer Divider Wall	_	12,000	_	_	_	-	_			_	_			_	-	_		_	_	_
Arena: Restroom Remodeling	75,000	12,000	-	_	_	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	-	-	-	_	_
Variable speed pump-skating center	73,000	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OVAL: Refrigeration piping (1993)	-	_	750,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OVAL: Refrigeration piping (1993) OVAL: Compressors (1993)	-	-	450,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-
OVAL: Compressors (1993) OVAL: Refrigeration components (2)	-	-	430,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	- [
	-	-	423,000	-	-	-	-		_	-	_	-	-	-	05.000	-	-	-	-	- 1
OVAL: Cooling Tower (1993)	-	-	1 000 000	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85,000	-	-	-	-	-
OVAL: Concrete Floor (1993)	-	-	1,000,000	-	-	250,000	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OVAL: Scoreboard (2008)	-	-	100.000		-	250,000	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	_	-
OVAL: Lighting (1993)	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	10.000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OVAL: lobby rubber flooring	-	-	-	-	-	25.000	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OVAL: Lobby HP (2008)	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OVAL: Micro Processors	20,000	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-

Capital Improvement Plan: General Facilities Replacement Fund (410) 2018-2037

	<u>2018</u>	2019	2020	2021	<u>2022</u>	2023	<u>2024</u>	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	<u>2035</u>	2036	<u>2037</u>
3 OVAL: Soft Starts			35,000																	
3 OVAL: Tarmac Blacktop (2010)		15,000		_	_	_	_	65,000	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	-	_	_
B OVAL: Garage Doors (2)	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	12,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
OVAL: Perimeter Fencing	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
OVAL: Lobby Roof (1993)	_	85,000	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
OVAL: Mech. Bldg Roof (1993)	_	60,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
OVAL: Bathroom Partitions	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	5,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
OVAL: Snow Melt Pit	_								3,000					50.000						_
OVAL: Zamboni (2003)		125,000				_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	_	_	
OVAL: Inline Hockey Rink		123,000	25,000			_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	25,000	_	_	_	
OVAL: Ammonia Relief Valves (20			23,000			_	_	6,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	23,000	_	6,500	_	-
OVAL: Ammonia Alarm System	_	10,000	-	-	_	-	_	0,500	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	_	-	0,300	_	-
Banquet Ctr: Office Area HP (2008)	_	10,000	-	-	_	20,000	_	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	_	-	-	_	-
	-	-	-	-	20.000	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Fitness Room RTU (20	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Roof (1999)	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Carpet (2009)	-	••••	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Wallcoverings/bqt.imp	-	25,000	-	-	-	<u>-</u>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>-</u>	-	-	-	25,000
Banquent Ctr: Locker Room HP (20	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Rose Room HP (2008)	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Fireside Room HP (20	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Raider Room HP (200	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Banquet Ctr: Divider Wall	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fire admin- carpet	-	-	-	-	_	8,000	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	-	-	8,000	_	-	_	-
Fire admin-paint	-	_	-	-	_	15,000	-	-	-	_	_	_	-	-	-	15,000	_	_	_	-
Conf room carpet	_	_	_	_	_	800	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	800	_	_	_	_
Conf room paint	_	_	_	_	_	3,000		_	_	_	_		_	_	_	3,000	_	_	_	_
Hallway wall paper	_	_	_	_	_	3,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	3,000	_	_	_	_
Training room carpet	_	_	_	_	_	4,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	4,000	_	_	_	_
Training room paint	_	_	_	_	_	1,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	1,500	_	_	_	_
Shift office counter tops	3,000	_	_	_	_	-,	_	_	_	_	3,500	_	_	_	_	-,	_	_	_	_
Shift office paint	-	_	_	_	_	1,500	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	1,500	_	_	_	_
Basement paint	_	_	_	_	_	3,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	3.000	_	_	_	_
Exercise room-flooring	_	_	_	_	_	3,000	_	3,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	3,000	_	_	_	
Stair way paint		_				15,000	_	3,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Day room carpet	_	-	-	-	_	10,000	_	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	_	-	-	10,000	
	-	-	-	-	_		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-		-
Day room paint	-	-	-	-	_	5,000	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	_	_	-		5,000	-
Second floor common area paint	-	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	8,000	-
Second floor common area carpet	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-
Bedroom carpet	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		5,000	-
Bedroom paint	-	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bay painting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Exterior gate & Controls	-	-	-	-	-	17,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCBA room Compressor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Laundry room Washer & dryer- gear	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18,000
Laundry room Washer & dryer	-	1,400	-	-	_	1,400	-	-	-	1,400	_	-	_	1,400	-	-	_	-	_	-
Station Roof	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	150,000	-	_	-
Hotsy replacement	_	_	_	-	_	7,500	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
Hot water heaters	_	_	_	_	_	45,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Generator	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Fire Station access control	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	12,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	14,000	_	_	_	_
Security system	_	_	8.000	_	_	_	_	,000	_	8,000	_	_	_	_	_	,000	_	_	_	_
Station Alerting system	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	_	-	_	_	100.000		
House air compressor				_	_		_	_	_	_	2,000		_		_	_	_	100,000	_	
Overhead door replacement	_	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	100,000	-	_	-	_	_	-	_	_	
Bi-fold door operators	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	120,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	_	40.000	_	-	-	-	120,000	-	-	-	-	_	_	-	_	-
Energy recovery unit	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.000	-	-	-	-
Make-up air units	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14,000	-	-	-	-
Heat pumps (24)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		96,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Water to water heat pump	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
Boiler	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-

Capital Improvement Plan: **General Facilities Replacement Fund (410)** 2018-2037

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	<u>2035</u>	2036	2037	
B Boiler pump	-	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,000
B Core loop pump	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	15,000
B Heat loop pump	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
B Exhust fans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
B Cabnit unit heaters	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
B Engine generator set	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	40,000
B Campus loop pump	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
B Fluid cooler fan	-	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,000
B Heat zone pumps (6)	-	-	-	-	-	3,600	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,600
B Concrete Exterior	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000
B Exterior Lighting	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
B Interior Lighting	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
B Parking Lot	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000
B Air Monitoring Sensors	-	9,000	-	-	-	-	9,000	-	-	-	-	9,000	-	-	-	-	9,000	-	-	-	36,000
	_	-	_	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	_	_	-	-	_	-	-	-	-
	\$ 384,000	\$ 853,400	\$ 3,183,000	340,000	760,000 \$	1,320,300 \$	259,000	406,500	\$ 67,000	\$ 49,400	\$ 405,500	\$ 448,500 \$	\$ 60,500	\$ 1,171,900	\$ 401,000	\$ 237,800	\$ 404,000	\$ 366,500	\$ 398,000	68,000	\$11,584,300

City Hall & PW Building, Community Gyms

Skating Center Fire Station

City of Roseville Capital Improvement Plan: IT Support Equipment Fund (113 & 114) 2018-2037


Tax Levy: Current	2018 \$ 200,000	2019 \$ 200,000	\$\frac{2020}{200,000}	\$ 2021 \$ 200,000	\$\frac{2022}{200,000}	\$ 2023 \$ 200,000	2024 \$ 200,000 \$	2025 200,000 \$	2026 200,000	2027 5 200,000 S	2028 200,000	2029 \$ 200,000	2030 \$ 200,000	2031 \$ 200,000	2032 \$ 200,000	2033 \$ 200,000	2034 \$ 200,000	2035 \$ 200,000	2036 \$ 200,000	\$\frac{2037}{200,000}	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub	T,	,	-		-	-	,					,	-	,	-	-	,	-	-	-	
Other	_		_	_		_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_		_	
Sale of Assets	_		_	_		_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_			
Interest Earnings	8,356	7,426	8,906	9,544	11.029	9,444	8.928	7,956	10,060	10,910	13,238	13,871	15,226	6,285	7,325	9,055	9,492	9,578	8,807	9,679	
merest Earnings	Revenues \$ 208,356		- /	\$ 209,544	\$ 211,029	\$ 209,444	\$ 208,928 \$	3 207,956 \$	210,060	3 210,910 \$	3 213,238	\$ 213,871	\$ 215,226	\$ 206,285	\$ 207,325	\$ 209,055	\$ 209,492	\$ 209,578	\$ 208,807		\$4,195,114
Vehicles	\$ -	- \$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - \$	- \$	- 5	s - s	3 -	\$ -	\$ - :	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Equipment	254,880	108,430	176,980	135,330	290,280	235,230	257,530	102,730	167,580	69,530	181,580	146,130	662,230	154,330	120,780	187,230	205,180	223,130	165,230	117,830	
Furniture & Fixtures	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	
Buildings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Improvements	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_	-	
-	Expenditures \$ 254,880	\$ 133,430	\$ 176,980	\$ 135,330	\$ 290,280	\$ 235,230	\$ 257,530 \$	102,730 \$	167,580	94,530	8 181,580	\$ 146,130	\$ 662,230	\$ 154,330	\$ 120,780	\$ 187,230	\$ 205,180	\$ 248,130	\$ 165,230	\$ 117,830	\$4,037,150
Beginning Cash Balance	e \$ 417,820	\$ 371,296	\$ 445,292	\$ 477,218	\$ 551,433	\$ 472,181	\$ 446,395 \$	397,793 \$	503,019	5 545,499	661,879	\$ 693,536	\$ 761,277	\$ 314,273	\$ 366,228	\$ 452,773	\$ 474,598	\$ 478,910	\$ 440,358	\$ 483,936	
Annual Surplus (deficit)	(46,524	73,996	31,926	74,214	(79,251)	(25,786)	(48,602)	105,226	42,480	116,380	31,658	67,741	(447,004)	51,955	86,545	21,825	4,312	(38,552)	43,577	91,849	
Cash Balance	\$ 371,296	\$ 445,292	\$ 477,218	\$ 551,433	\$ 472,181	\$ 446,395	\$ 397,793 \$	5 503,019 \$	545,499	661,879	693,536	\$ 761,277	\$ 314,273	\$ 366,228	\$ 452,773	\$ 474,598	\$ 478,910	\$ 440,358	\$ 483,936	\$ 575,784	
			5-Year F	unding Status	148%			10-Year Fun	ding Status	136%								Long-Term F	unding Status	114%	

5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,463,081 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$2,510,379

Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$4,612,934

(Cash Balance (Year-End) *	\$	398,750	2016
1	Less Amt Needed for Operations		N/A	2017
1	Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit		19,070	2017
1	Adjust for Delayed CIP Items		-	2017
(Cash Balance (Beg. Year)	\$	417,820	2018
١.	Adopted Budget (Evel Capital)	\$2	010 600	2017

* Current Assets - Current Liabilities




Key Description	2018	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	2022	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	2025	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E Computers (Notebooks, Desktop)	\$ 69,800	\$ 30,150 \$	35,100	\$ 29,850	\$ 10,900	\$ 37,450	\$ 35,850	\$ 30,150	\$ 35,100 \$	\$ 29,850	\$ 10,900 \$	37,450	\$ 35,850 \$	30,150	\$ 35,100	\$ 29,850	\$ 10,900	\$ 37,450	\$ 35,850	+,	\$ 637,850
E Monitor/Display	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	174,000
E MS Office License	8,100	11,700	15,000	9,900	11,100	8,100	11,700	15,000	9,900	11,100	8,100	11,700	15,000	9,900	11,100	8,100	11,700	15,000	9,900	11,100	223,200
E Desktop Printer	1,200	-	-	-	-	-	1,300	-	-	-	-	-	1,400	-	-	-	-	-	1,500	-	5,400
E Network Switches/Routers (Rosevil	38,000	9,000	13,000	12,000	78,000	-	-	38,000	38,000	9,000	13,000	12,000	78,000	-	-	38,000	38,000	9,000	13,000	12,000	448,000
E Power/UPS - Closets (11)	1,700	1,700	3,000	1,700	400	800	400	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	2,100	1,700	400	1,700	400	1,700	800	1,700	1,700	28,70
E Power/UPS - Server Room (1)	-	18,000	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	33,00
E Air Conditioner - Server Room Unit	-	-	38,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38,000	-	-	76,00
E Air Conditioner - Server Room Unit	_	-	_	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_	18,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	18,00
E Fire Protection - Server Room (1)	_	-	_	19,000	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	39,00
E Surveillance Cameras (53)	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	9,180	183,60
E Telephone Handsets (283)	_	-	_	_	-	_	85,000	-	-	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	-	85,000	-	-	170,000
E Fiber Network Replacements	_	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	_	-	-	_	350,000	_	-	-	_	-	-	_	350,000
E Network Racks	_	-	-	-	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	-	-	_	
E Wireless Access Points (38)	23,200	-	_	_	-	_	30,400	_	_	_	_	_	30,400	_	-	-	-	-	30,400	_	114,400
E Telephone Routers (Shared)	-	-	-	45,000	-	18,000	-	-	-	-	-	45,000	-	18,000	-	-	-	-	-	45,000	171,00
E Telephone Servers (Shared)	-	-	_	_	40,000						40,000						40,000	-	-	-	120,00
E Servers - Host - Shared (5)	30,000	20,000	-	-	-	30,000	20,000	-	-	-	30,000	20,000	-	-	-	30,000	20,000	-	-	_	200,00
E Storage Area Network Nodes- Share	55,000		55,000	_	55,000		55,000	_	55,000	-	55,000		55,000	-	55,000		55,000	_	55,000	_	550,00
E Wireless LAN Controllers (Shared)		_	· -	_		58,000				-	-	_		-		58,000		_		_	116,00
E Network Switches/Routers (Shared)	10,000				77,000	60,000			10,000				77,000	60,000			10,000	_	_	_	304,00
F Office Furniture	_	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	75,00
В	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_			_	_			_	_	
-	\$ 254,880	\$ 133,430 \$	5 176,980	\$ 135,330	\$ 290,280	\$ 235,230	\$ 257,530	\$ 102,730	\$ 167,580 \$	94,530	\$ 181,580 \$	146,130	\$ 662,230	154,330	\$ 120,780	\$ 187,230	\$ 205,180	\$ 248,130	\$ 165,230	\$ 117,830	\$4,037,150

Capital Improvement Plan: Park Improvement Fund (411)

201	0 2027	
701	8-2037	

Tax Levy: Current Tax Levy: Add/Sub Other		\$ 2018 \$ 200,00	2019 0 \$ 2009	<u>9</u> ,000 S - -	\$\frac{2020}{200,000}\$	\$ 2021 \$ 200,000 -	\$\frac{2022}{200,000}\$	\$\frac{2023}{200,000}	\$\frac{2024}{200,000}\$ -	\$\frac{2025}{200,000}\$	\$\frac{2026}{200,000}	\$\frac{2027}{200,000}\$ -	\$\frac{2028}{200,000}\$ -	\$\frac{2029}{200,000}	\$\frac{2030}{200,000} \\$	2031 200,000	\$\frac{2032}{200,000}\$	\$\frac{2033}{200,000}	\$\frac{2034}{200,000}	\$\frac{2035}{200,000}	\$\frac{2036}{200,000}	\$\frac{2037}{200,000}\$	
Sale of Assets Interest Earnings		88	- n 0	.075	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	-	-	-	_	_	-	-	-	_	-	
microst Lamings	Revenues				\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000 \$	200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000		\$ 4,009,955
	110 / 011000	4 200,00	J 2009	,0,0	200,000	4 200,000	200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	200,000	\$ 200,000	4 200,000	\$ 200,000	4 200,000	2 00,000 4	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	ψ .,005,522
Vehicles		\$	- \$	- 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Equipment			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Furniture & Fixtures			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Buildings			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Improvements		300,00	1,185	,880	765,000	780,000	638,000	1,661,500	520,000	539,070	830,000	720,000	640,000	488,500	1,042,500	516,670	728,000	677,500	1,010,000	1,145,000	955,000	365,000	
Ex	xpenditures	\$ 300,00	0 \$ 1,185	,880	\$ 765,000	\$ 780,000	\$ 638,000	\$ 1,661,500	\$ 520,000	\$ 539,070	\$ 830,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 640,000	\$ 488,500	\$ 1,042,500 \$	516,670	\$ 728,000	\$ 677,500	\$ 1,010,000	\$ 1,145,000	\$ 955,000	\$ 365,000	\$15,507,620
Beginning Cash Balance Annual Surplus (deficit) Cash Balance		\$ 552,88 (99,12 \$ 453,76	0) (976	,805)	(565,000)	(580,000)	\$(1,668,045) (438,000) \$(2,106,045)	(1,461,500)	(320,000)	(339,070)	(630,000)	\$(4,856,615) (520,000) \$(5,376,615)	(440,000)	(288,500)	(842,500)	(316,670)	\$ (7,264,285) (528,000) \$ (7,792,285)	(477,500)	(810,000)	\$ (9,079,785) (945,000) \$(10,024,785)	(755,000)	(165,000)	
		5-Ye	ar Funding	Sources		Funding Status Cash Balance)	43% \$ 1,562,835		Funding Source		Funding Status Cash Balance)							Long-Te	erm Funding So	Long-Term surces (Rev + Beg	Funding Status g Cash Balance)	29% \$ 4,562,835	

Cash Balance (Year-End)	\$ 552,000	2016
Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit	880	2017
Adjust for Delayed CIP Items	-	2017
Cash Balance (Reg. Vear)	\$ 552 880	2018



Expenditure Breakdown

Key <u>Description</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	2023	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	2028	<u>2029</u>	<u>2030</u>	<u>2031</u>	<u>2032</u>	2033	<u>2034</u>	<u>2035</u>	<u>2036</u>	<u>2037</u>	
I Tennis & Basketball Courts	\$ -	\$ 175,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 10,000 \$	- 5	5 - \$	-	\$ 400,000	125,000	\$ 275,000	\$ -	\$ - \$	125,000 \$	145,000 \$	185,000 \$	75,000 \$	75,000 \$	- \$	-	\$ 1,745,000
I Shelters & Structures	60,000	5,000	50,000	-	25,000	510,000	75,000	34,070	-	-	-	10,000	42,500	-	35,000	27,500	10,000	-	100,000	-	984,070
I Playground Areas	-	600,000	275,000	125,000	250,000	150,000	-	-	-	225,000	-	-	-	-	125,000	-	400,000	600,000	450,000	-	3,200,000
I Volleyball & Bocce Ball Courts	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
I Athletic Fields	-	5,000	75,000	200,000	33,000	311,500	115,000	185,000	110,000	50,000	45,000	5,000	180,000	25,000	78,000	145,000	70,000	110,000	60,000	45,000	1,847,500
I Irrigation Systems	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000
I Bridges & Boardwalks	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	150,000	500,000	40,000	-	-	40,000	40,000	-	-	770,000
I Other Capital Items	-	130,880	-	-	-	350,000	-	-	-	-	-	3,500	-	6,670	25,000	-	95,000	-	25,000	-	636,050
I Natural Resources	40,000	70,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	2,270,000
I PIP/CIP Category	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	4,000,000
		-	-	=	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	=	-	-	-	-	=	-	-	-	-
	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,185,880	\$ 765,000	\$ 780,000	638,000 \$	5 1,661,500	520,000 \$	539,070	\$ 830,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 640,000	\$ 488,500	\$ 1,042,500 \$	516,670 \$	728,000 \$	677,500 \$	1,010,000 \$	1,145,000 \$	955,000 \$	365,000	\$15,507,620

<u>Ke</u> y	Description	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	<u>2028</u>	<u>2029</u>	<u>2030</u>	<u>2031</u>	2032	2033	<u>2034</u>	<u>2035</u>	<u>2036</u>	<u>2037</u>

Capital Improvement Plan: **Park Improvement Fund (411)** 2018-2037

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	2023	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	<u>2028</u>	<u>2029</u>	2030	<u>2031</u>	<u>2032</u>	2033	<u>2034</u>	<u>2035</u>	<u>2036</u>	<u>2037</u>
Tennis & Basketball Courts																				
Acorn Grove: 2 lighted tennis, 1 lig \$ Autumn Grove: 2 lighted tennis, 1 light		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		_	\$ -	\$ -	\$250,000 \$	-	_	_	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - \$	- \$	65,000	75,000 \$	- \$	- \$
Bruce Russell: 2 lighted tennis, 1 ba	_		_	_	_	_	_		_		150,000	_	_		_	_	-	_	_	_
Central Park Victoria: 2 lighted teni	_	125,000	_	_	_		_		_	_	150,000	_	_	125,000		_	_	_	_	
Evergreen: 2 lighted tennis, galvani:	_	123,000	_		_	_	_	_	_	125,000	_	_	_	125,000	_	50,000	_	_	_	_
Howard Johnson: 2 lighted tennis, g	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	123,000	125,000		_			50,000	_		_	_
Lexington Park: 1 basketball, 2 hoo	_	50,000		_	_	_	_	_		_	-	_		_	50,000	_	_	_	_	_
Owasso Hills: 1/2 court basketball	_	-	_	_	10.000	_	_	_	_	_		_	_		-	_	10,000	_	_	_
Pioneer: 1/2 court basketball	_	_	_	10,000	-	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	10,000	-	_	_	_
Pocahontas Park: 2 lighted tennis, 1	_			10,000	_		_	_	150,000			_			\$ 75,000	10,000			_	
Rosebrook Park: 2 lighted tennis, co	_			125,000					130,000						φ /3,000 -	125.000			_	
Valley: 1/2 court basketball	_		10,000	123,000	_		_	_							10,000	123,000			_	
Veterans: 1.2 court basketball	-		10,000	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-			10,000	-	-	-	-	-
Shelters & Structures																				
Acorn neighborhood shelter	_					10,000			_	_	_		12,500	_		_	_	_	_	
Applewood Shade Structure	_	-		-		10,000	-	-	-	_		-	14,500	- -	-	- -	-	-	-	
Arb Entry Pavillion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
Arb Kiwanis	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arb Maintenance Facility	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_			_	_	_	_	7,500	_			_	-
Arboretum Center	_	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	7,300	15,000	-	-	-	- [
Autumn Grove sector shelter	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	13,000	-		25.000	-
	60,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	25,000	-
Upper Villa/Shade Structure	60,000	_	_	_	-	-	-		-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CP Amphitheater city/regional facil	_	_	_	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CP Foundation pavillion shelter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.570	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-
CP Lexington Restrooms - Replace	-	-	-	-	-	500,000	-	11,570	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
CP Pumphouse	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
CP Victoria Ballfields pavillion she	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-
CP Volleyball	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evergreen Concession	-	-			5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evergreen neighborhood shelter	-	-		-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FORParks pasvillion shelter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
HANC city/regional facility	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-
JC pavillion shelter	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Langton Lake Shade Structure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Legion Pumphouse	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-
Lexington sector shelter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,000	-	-	-	25,000	-
Lions pavillion shelter	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	10,000	-	-	-
Mapleview	-	-	50,000	-	_		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oasis nieghborhood shelter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	15,000	-
Owasso Ballfields Concession	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-
Pioneer Pergola	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reservoir Woods Overlook	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reservoir Woods Pump House	_	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reservoir Woods Sign Structure	_	_	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- [
Rosebrook sector shelter	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	-	-	7,000	-	_	20,000	-
Sandcastle neighborhood shelter	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	5,500	· -	_	_		-
Shirle Klaus Pavillion	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_		-	_	-	-	_
Veterans Park Restrooms	_	5,000		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Villa neighborhood shelter	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	5,500	_	_	15,000	_
Wetherston	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	_
Building Flooring/lighting/mechanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Play Areas																				
Acorn - 2014	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	125,000	_	_	_
Applewood - 2005	_		75,000	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_		_		_	_	_
Autumn Grove - 2006	_		, 0		125,000		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_
Bruce Russell - 2015	_	_	_	_		_		_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	125,000	_	_
Central Park Lexington Park - 2010		_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_		225,000	_ [

Capital Improvement Plan: **Park Improvement Fund (411)** 2018-2037

ntral Park Victoria West - 2015	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	<u>2028</u>	<u>2029</u>	<u>2030</u>	<u>2031</u>	<u>2032</u>	<u>2033</u>	<u>2034</u>	2035 225,000	<u>2036</u>	2037
ral Park Victori ballfields - 201	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_		75,000		_	_
green - 2010	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	125,000	_	75,000	_	_	_
vard Johnson - 2014	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	125,000	_	_	_
gton Lake @ Ballfields - 2014	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	-	125,000	_	_
gton Lake @ C2 - 2015	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_		_	-	75,000	
ngton - 1999		225,000	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_
er Villa - 2009	_	-	_	_		75,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	
le View - 2016	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	75,000	_
erion - 2014	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_		75,000		-	_
s - 2015	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	-	125,000	_	_
sso Ballfields - 1993	_		75,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_
sso Hills Park - 1998	_	125,000	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
eer - 1998	_	125,000		_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
hontas - 2004	_	- ,	125,000		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_
brook - 2000	_	_	-	125,000	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
castle - 2006	_		_		125,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_
rack - 1998	_	_	_	_	- ,,,,,,,	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
er Villa - 2016	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	75,000	_
ey - 2009	_		_	_		75,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_		_
erans - 1997	_	125,000	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_
		- / - 0 -																		
leyball & Bocce Ball Courts	;																			
ral Park Sand Volley Ball Cour	_	_		_	_	20,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
er Villa Bocce: 2 lanes	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
ex Bocce ball: 4 lanes	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Street Shelter Volleyball: 1 sar	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
dation Shelter: 1 concrete cour	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Park Bocce	_		_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_
ıletic Fields																				
rn: Baseball Field East	_	_	_		_	_	_		15,000	_	_	_	_	5,000	-	_	_	_	5,000	_
n: Baseball Field West	_	_	_	_		_	_		15,000		_	_	_		5,000	_	_	_	· -	5,000
n: Batting Cage	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	<u>-</u>
n: Disc Golf	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
er Villa Park: Softball Field	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_
er Villa Park Softball Field Lig	_	_		_	_	_	_	· -	_	_	_	_	· -	_	_	_	_	· -	_	_
ordia: Softball Field	_	_	_	75,000	_	_	_		10,000	_	_	_			_	_	_	10,000	_	_
cordia: Baseball Field	_	_	_	75,000		_	_	_		10,000	_	_	_			_	_		_	_
cordia: Netting	_	_	_	10,000		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Pale Street Athletic: Multi-Purp	_	_	_		10,000	_	_		_		_	_	85,000	_	-	_	_	10,000	_	_
Pale Street Athletic: Multi-Purp	_	_	_	10,000	,	_	_	_	_		_	_		_	10,000	75,000	_	,	_	_
Pale Street Athletic: Multi-Purp	_	_	_	10,000	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	-		- -	_	_	_	_
Dale Street Athletic: Black Viny	_	_	_	=	_	_	20,000	20,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	20,000	20,000
Pale Street Athletic: Irrigation	_	_	_	_	_	_			_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	=	- -
exington: Softball Field North	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	
exington: Softball Field South	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	,	30,000	_	-	_		10,000	_	_	_	_
exington: Softball Black Vinyl	_	_	_	_	,	_	_	_	_	_	,	_	_	_	-		_	_	_	_
ictoria: Softball Field 1	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	_	10,000	_
ictoria: Softball Field 2	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	_	10,000	_
ictoria: Softball Field 3	_	_	-	10,000	_	_	_	-	30,000	_	_	_	-	10,000	_	_	_	_	-	10,000
ictoria: Softball Field 4	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	_	10,000
ictoria: Softball Field 5	_	_	10,000	- 3,000	_	_	_	30,000		_	_	_	10,000		_	_	_	_	_	-
-	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	_	10,000	_
ictoria: Softball Field 6	_	_		_	_	1,500	_	-	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	-	_
		_	_	_	_	-,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
ctoria: Netting over play area	_						_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
ctoria: Netting over play area ctoria: Lighting	-	_	_	_												-	· ·			-
ictoria: Netting over play area ictoria: Lighting ictoria: Irrigation	- - -	-	-	-	_	_	10.000	_	_	_				_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Victoria: Netting over play area Victoria: Lighting Victoria: Irrigation gereen: Baseball Field NW	-	-	-	-	_	-	10,000	- 10 000	-	-				_	- 20 000	- 20.000	-	-	-	-
Victoria: Softball Field 6 Victoria: Netting over play area Victoria: Lighting Victoria: Irrigation gereen: Baseball Field NW gereen: Baseball Field NE gereen: Baseball Field SW	- - -	- - -	-	- - -	-	-	10,000	10,000	- - 10,000	- -				-	20,000	20,000	20,000	-	-	-

Capital Improvement Plan: **Park Improvement Fund (411)** 2018-2037

Evergreen: Batting Cage	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	2021	2022 3,000	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	<u>2028</u>	<u>2029</u>	<u>2030</u>	<u>2031</u>	2032 3,000	<u>2033</u>	<u>2034</u>	<u>2035</u>	<u>2036</u>	<u>2037</u>	6,000
Langton Lake: Baseball Field East	_	-	10,000	-	3,000	75,000	-	10,000	-	-	_	-	10,000	-	3,000	10,000	_	_	-	-	115,000
Langton Lake: Baseball Field West	_		10,000	-		75,000	-	10,000	-	-		-	10,000	-	-	10,000	_	-	-	-	115,000
Langton Lake: Multi-Purpose	_		10,000	-		50,000	5,000	10,000	-	-	5,000	-	10,000	-	-	10,000	-	_	5,000	-	65,000
Langton Lake: Black Vinyl Fence	-					30,000	3,000	-	-	-	3,000	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	3,000	-	05,00
Legion Field: Baseball Field	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	_	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	20.000	-	_	-	-	60,000
Legion Field: Batting Cage	_	_	_	_	_	30,000	_		_	_	10,000	_	_	_	_	20,000	_	_	_	-	00,00
Owasso Ballfields: Baseball Field Ea	et	_	_	_	_	75,000	_		_		_				15,000		_			- 1	90,00
Owasso Ballfields: Baseball Field V	_			_	_	73,000	75,000		_	_	_	_		_	15,000	_	_		_	_ /	90,00
Owasso Ballfields: Batting Cage	_		_	_	_	5,000	75,000	_	_	_	_		_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_ /	5,00
Rosebrook: Multi-Purpose North	_	5,000	_	_	_	-	5,000	_	_	_	_	5,000	_	_	_	_	50,000	_	_	_ /	65,00
Rosebrook: Multi-Purpose South	_	-	5,000	_	_	_	-	5,000	_	_	_	-	5,000	_	_	_	-	50,000	_	_ /	65,00
Rosebrook: Lighting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	02,00
Irrigation Systems																					
Arboretum: 2 Wire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
CP Amphitheater: Standard	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,00
Bridges & Boardwalks																					
CP Dale Street: Bridge	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	-	_	-	-	_	_	40,000	-	- /	40,00
CP Frog Pond: Bridge	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	40,000	_	_	- /	40,00
CP Vict. Ballfields: Bridge	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	40,000	_	_	_	_	_	- /	40,00
HANC: Boardwalk Phase 2	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	_	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	- /	
HANC: Boardwalk Phase I	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	-	500,000	-	-	_	_	-	-	- /	500,00
Langton Lake: Boardwalk	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	75,000	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	- /	75,00
Langton Lake: Bridge	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	75,000	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	- /	75,00
Villa Park: 3 Bridges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Other Capital Items																					
Brimhall School: Divider Door	_	75,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_ /	75,00
Brimhall School: BB Standards	_	4,620	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_ /	4,62
Brimhall School: Scoreboard	_	4,300	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_ /	4,30
Brimhall School: VB Standards	_	6,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	- /	6,50
Brimhall School: Other	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	6,500	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_ /	6,50
CP School: Gym	_	4,620	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	6,670	_	_	75,000	_	_	- /	86,29
CP School: Scoreboard	_	4,170	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	-	_	- /	4,17
CP School: VB Standards	_	6,670	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	- /	6,67
CP Lexington Marquee Sign	_	.,	_	_	_	300,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	- /	300,00
Gymnastics Center Flooring	_	20,000	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	20,000	_	_	- /	40,00
Park Buildings: Patio Furniture	-		_		_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	-	_	_		_	_	- /	
Park Buildings: Tables & Chairs	-		_		_		_	_	-		_	_	_	-	25,000	_	_	_	25,000	- /	50,00
Park Pathway Lighting: General	_		_		_	50,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-		_	_	_	- -	- /	50,00
Veterans Park Restroom re-roof	_	5,000	_	_	_		_	_	-	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	- /	5,00
Adj to Balance Original Submittal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(3,000)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(3,000
PIP Items																					
General Items (see below)	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	4,000,00
Natural Resources																					
General Items (see below)	40,000	70,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	2,270,00
_	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,185,880	\$ 765,000	\$ 780,000	\$ 638,000	\$ 1,661,500	\$ 520,000	\$ 539,070 S	8 830,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 640,000	\$ 488,500	\$ 1,042,500	\$ 516,670	\$ 728,000	\$ 677,500	\$ 1,010,000	\$ 1,145,000 \$	955,000 \$	265,000	\$15,507,62

PIP Note

Includes tree mulch, picnic tables, aglime, playground safety flooring, etc.

1 Playground Safety Surface	\$ 20,000
2 Playground Components	15,000
3 Landscape Mulch	5,000

⁴ Amenities (trash cans/recyle stations, picnic tables, benches, grills,

City of Roseville

Capital Improvement Plan: **Park Improvement Fund (411)** 2018-2037

	<u>2018</u>	2019
	patio and building furnishings, soccer goals,	
	appliances, dog drop stations, facility netting)	25,000
5	Signage (replacment, additions	
	and improvements)	5,000
6	Tennis Court Crack Seal/Color Coat	40,000
7	Water Feature Components	
		5,000
8	Landscaping and Site Work	25,000
9	Fencing Replacement	15,000
10	Facility Improvements	15,000
11	Limited planning Services as necessary	5,000
12	Ag-Lime for pathways/ballfields	15,000
13	Park Tree Plantings	10,000
	TOTAL PIP	\$ 200,000

Natural Resources Notes:

Further refining is beng done to the Natural Resources maintenance/upkeep program in 2018-19

<u>2020</u>

<u>2028</u>

<u>2035</u>

Capital Improvement Plan: Street Replacement Fund (530 & 590)

2018-2037

		<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	202	20	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>	2024	2025	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	<u>2028</u>	<u>2029</u>	2030	2031	<u>2032</u>	2033	<u>2034</u>	2035	<u>2036</u>	<u>2037</u>	
Tax Levy: Current	5	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000) \$ 47	0,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	\$ 470,000	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	<u>-</u>	-	-	
Other - MSA, Assessmen	nts	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,10	0,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	
Sale of Assets		_		-	-	_	_	-	-	-	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	
Interest Earnings		190,880	182,098	3 17	3,140	162,002	150,642	139,055	125,236	111,141	96,764	78,099	59,061	39,642	19,835	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	
_	Revenues	\$ 1,760,880	\$ 1,752,098	\$ 1,74	3,140	\$ 1,732,002	\$ 1,720,642	\$ 1,709,055	\$ 1,695,236	\$1,681,141	\$1,666,764	\$1,648,099	\$1,629,061	\$1,609,642	\$ 1,589,835	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 1,570,000	\$32,927,596
Vehicles	9	\$ -	\$	- \$	- !	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	· \$ -	\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	s -	s -	
Equipment		-		_	_ `	_	-	-	-	_	_		-	_	_	_	-	_	-	<u> </u>	-	-	
Furniture & Fixtures		_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Buildings		_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Improvements		2,200,000	2,200,000	2,30	0,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	
•	xpenditures	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 2,30	0,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$51,500,000
Beginning Cash Balance		\$ 9,544,000	\$ 9.104.880) \$ 8.65	6 . 978	\$ 8,100,117	\$ 7.532.119	\$ 6,952,762	\$ 6,261,817	\$5,557,053	\$4,838,195	\$3,904,958	\$2,953,058	\$1,982,119	\$ 991,761	\$ (118,404)	\$(1.248.404)	\$(2.478.404	\$(3,708,404) \$(4,938,404)	\$ (6.168.404)	\$ (7.598.404)	1
Annual Surplus (deficit)		(439,120)	(447,902		6,860)	(567,998)	* -)) -		. , ,	. , ,						` ' '				, , , , ,	(1,430,000)		
Cash Balance		\$ 9,104,880	\$ 8,656,978	/	, ,	\$ 7,532,119	\$ 6,952,762		\$ 5,557,053	\$4,838,195		´ ` ´ ´	´ ` ´ ´	\$ 991,761	\$ (118,404)		\$(2,478,404)) \$(6,168,404)	(, , ,		


5-Year Funding Status 162% 5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$18,252,762

10-Year Funding Status 112% 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) #########

Long-Term Funding Status 82% Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 42,471,596

Fund 530 \$10,199,000 ** Fund 590 (655,000) 9,544,000

** \$500K was left for up-front financing



Key Description	2018	<u>2019</u>	2020	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>	2024	2025	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	<u>2028</u>	2029	<u>2030</u>	<u>2031</u>	2032	2033	2034	2035	<u>2036</u>	2037	
I Mill & overlay - local streets	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 1,300,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$27,500,000
I Reconstruction - local streets	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I Reconstruction/M & O - MSA stree	e 1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	24,000,000
I Co Road B2 (Snelling to Fairview)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$51,500,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Street Light Maintenance Fund (406)

2018-2037


Tax Levy: Current Tax Levy: Add/Sub Other Sale of Assets Interest Earnings	D	\$	2018 15,000 \$ 6,000 - 1,718	6,	000 \$ 000 - - 272	2020 15,000 6,000 - - 1,717 22,717	\$ 1	021 15,000 \$ 6,000 - 872	2022 15,000 \$ 6,000 - 909	2023 15,000 6,000 547	2024 5 15,000 6,000 - 78 6 21,078	\$ 1	025 15,000 \$ 6,000	2026 15,000 \$ 6,000	2027 15,000 6,000 - - 52 21,052	\$	2028 15,000 \$ 6,000 - 473	2029 15,000 \$ 6,000 - - 503 21,503 \$	2030 15,000 6,000 433	6,	1 000 \$ 000 \$ - 462 462 \$	2032 15,000 6,000	\$\frac{2033}{15,00}\$ \$\frac{6,00}{6,00}\$	0 \$ 0 9	2034 15,000 6,000 - 457 21,457	\$\frac{2035}{15,00} \\ 6,00 \\ \frac{48}{5} \\ 21.48	00 \$ 10 - - 86	2036 15,000 6,000 - 416 21,416	2037 5 15,000 6,000	\$ 432,781
	Revenues	5 5	22,718 \$	> 22,	2/2 \$	22,/1/	D 2	21,872 \$	21,909 \$	21,547	21,078	3 2	21,100 \$	21,522 \$	21,052	3	21,473 \$	21,503 \$	21,433	\$ 21,	462 \$	21,891	\$ 21,42	9 \$	21,457	\$ 21,48	0 3	21,416	21,444	\$ 432,/81
Vehicles		\$	- S	S	- \$	-	\$	- \$	- \$	- 5		\$	- \$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	- \$		\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	- \$	-	
Equipment			-		-	-		-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-	-	
Furniture & Fixtures			_		-	_		-	_	-	_		-	-	_		-	-	_		-	_		-	_		_	_	_	
Buildings			-		-	-		-	_	-	_		-	-	-		-	-	_		-	-		-	_		-	-	_	
Improvements 45,000 - 65,000 20,000 40,000 45,000 20,000 - 45,000 20,000 - 45,000 20,000 - 45,000 20,000 - 45,000 20,000 20,000 20,000 20,000 20,000 20,000 - 45,000 80,00																														
Furniture & Fixtures Buildings 45,000 5 65,000 5 05,0															\$ 475,000															
2.	npenanare.	, ,	15,000		Ψ	05,000	Ψ -	20,000 0	10,000 \$	15,000	20,000		Ψ.	15,000 \$			20,000 0	25,000	20,000	•	Ψ	.5,000	20,00	0 4	20,000	22,00	, ,	20,000		\$ 175,000
		-	,			,	\$ 4	- ,	15,157	.,	,,	-	.,,,,,	20,000	2,010	\$	25,000	25,171 0	,	J 25,	011	,	,	-	,			.,		
)								(- / - /																					
Annual Surplus (deficit) (22,282) 22,272 (42,283) 1,872 (18,091) (23,453) 1,078 21,100 (23,478) 21,052 1,473 (3,497) 1,433 21,462 (23,109) 1,429 1,457 (3,514) 1,416 21,444 Cash Balance \$ 63,598 \$ 85,870 \$ 43,587 \$ 45,459 \$ 27,368 \$ 3,915 \$ 4,994 \$ 26,093 \$ 2,615 \$ 23,668 \$ 25,141 \$ 21,644 \$ 23,077 \$ 44,538 \$ 21,429 \$ 22,857 \$ 24,315 \$ 20,801 \$ 22,217 \$ 43,661														43,661																
			5-Year Fun	nding S	ources (F	5-Year l Rev + Beg			116% 197,368	10-Year Fur	iding Sources		-Year Fund + Beg Cash	ing Status n Balance) \$	108% 303,668								Long-Terr	n Fundi		Long-Tern (Rev + Be		ng Status Balance) \$	109% 5 518,661	

 Cash Balance (Year-End)
 \$ 70,000
 2016

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 15,880
 2017

 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 2017
 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$ 85,880
 2018



Key Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
I Pedestrian light @ Victoria	_	_	_	_	20,000	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_		\$ 20,000
I Misc. pole fixture replacement	25,000	-	25,000	-	-	25,000	-	-	25,000	-	-	25,000	-	-	25,000		-	25,000	-		175,000
I Pedestrian light @ Nature Ctr	_	_	20,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_		20,000
I Pedestrian light @ Lexington Centra	_	_	_	20,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_		20,000
I Pedestrian light @ Hamline and Gar	_	_	_	_	_	20,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		20,000
I Pedestrian Light Cnty Rd D at Mills	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	10,000	_	_	_		10,000
I Speed Display Sign Cnty D	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	10,000	_	_	_		10,000
I Signal Pole Painting (3 every other y	20,000	_	20,000	_	20,000	_	20,000	_	20,000	_	20,000	_	20,000	-	20,000	_	20,000	_	20,000		200,000
_	-	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	_	_		
•	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ 65,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 40,000	45,000	\$ 20,000 \$	-	\$ 45,000 \$	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 20,000 \$	- 5	45,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000 \$	25,000	\$ 20,000 \$	-	\$ 475,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Pathway & Parking Lot Maintenance Fund (408)


2018-2037

Tax Levy: Current Tax Levy: Add/Sub Other Sale of Assets			018 45,000 - -	\$ 24	19 5,000 - -	\$ 200 \$ 243	2 <u>0</u> 5,000 : - -	2021 \$ 245,0	00 \$	2022 245,000	2023 \$ 245,0		2024 245,000	\$	2025 245,000		2 <u>026</u> 45,000 - -	\$ 202 \$ 245	7.000 - -	2028 \$ 245,0	00 \$	2029 245,000		030 45,000 - -	\$ 245		2032 \$ 245,00	00 \$	2033 245,000 -		2034 245,000 - -		35 5,000	\$ 245,		2037 \$ 245,00) - -
Interest Earnings			-		3,560		-		-	-		-	-		-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-	31		-		232	1,	136	85	<u> </u>
	Revenues	\$ 24	15,000	\$ 24	8,560	\$ 24:	5,000	\$ 245,0	00 \$	245,000	\$ 245,0	000 \$	245,000	\$	245,000	\$ 2	45,000	\$ 245	,000	\$ 245,0	00 \$	245,000	\$ 24	45,000	\$ 245	,000	\$ 245,0	00 \$	245,031	\$ 2	245,000	\$ 24	5,232	\$ 246,	136	\$ 245,85	\$ 4,905,819
Vehicles		\$	-	\$	-	\$	- :	\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	- :	8	-
Equipment			-		-		-		-	-		-	-		-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-		-
Furniture & Fixtures			-		-		-		-	-		-	-		-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-		-
Buildings			-		-		-		-	-		-	-		-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-	-		-		-		-		-
Improvements		25	50,000	60	0,000	260	0,000	300,0	00	230,000	180,0	000	180,000		245,000	2	00,000	340	,000	280,0	00	195,000	20	00,000	200	,000	200,0	00	280,000	- 2	200,000	20	0,000	260,	000	200,00)
E	Expenditures	\$ 25	50,000	\$ 60	0,000	\$ 260	0,000	\$ 300,0	00 \$	230,000	\$ 180,0	000 \$	180,000	\$	245,000	\$ 2	00,000	\$ 340	,000	\$ 280,0	00 \$	195,000	\$ 20	00,000	\$ 200	,000	\$ 200,0	00 \$	280,000	\$ 2	200,000	\$ 20	0,000	\$ 260,	000	\$ 200,00	\$ 5,000,000
Beginning Cash Balance	e	\$ 18	33,000	\$ 17	8,000	\$ (17.	3,440)	\$ (188,4	40) \$	(243,440)	\$ (228,4	140) \$	(163,440) \$	(98,440)	\$ (98,440)	\$ (53	,440)	\$ (148,4	40) \$	(183,440)	\$ (13	33,440)	\$ (88	,440)	\$ (43,4	40) \$	1,560	\$	(33,409)	\$ 1	1,591	\$ 56,	823	42,95)
Annual Surplus (deficit)	t)		(5,000)	(35	1,440)	(1:	5,000)	(55,0	00)	15,000	65,0	000	65,000		-		45,000	(95	,000)	(35,0	00)	50,000	4	45,000	45	,000	45,0	00	(34,969))	45,000	4	5,232	(13,	864)	45,85)
Cash Balance		\$ 17	78,000	\$ (17	3,440)	\$ (188	8,440)	\$ (243,4	40) \$	(228,440)	\$ (163,4	140) \$	(98,440) \$	(98,440)	\$ (53,440)	\$ (148	,440)	\$ (183,4	40) \$	(133,440)	\$ (8	88,440)	\$ (43	,440)	\$ 1,50	50 \$	(33,409)	\$	11,591	\$ 5	6,823	\$ 42,	959	88,81)

5-Year Funding Status 86% 10-Year Funding Status 95% 5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,411,560 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$2,636,560

Long-Term Funding Status 102% Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$5,088,819

Cash Balance (Year-End)	\$ 118,000	2016
Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit	65,000	2017
Adjust for Delayed CIP Items	-	2017
Cash Balance (Beg. Year)	\$ 183,000	2018



Key	Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
I Pathy	vay maintenance	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 3,760,000
I Pathy	vay construction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I Acor	12 east lots	70,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	70,000
I Acor	ı west lot		-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
I Arbo	retum(2001)	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
	nn Grove(2016)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-
I B-Da	le(2016)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
I Centi	al Park Lexingtion(2008)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000	_	-	-	-	80,000
	al Park Lions-Victoria(2005)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
I Centi	al Pk W Victoria(Foundation)	-		80,000		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
I Centi	al Pk EVictoria(Ballfields)201	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I Centi	al Pk EDale(Soccer Fields)201	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Hall(2004)	-	400,000		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400,000
I Ever	reen(2000)	-	-	-	-			-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
	Station 1 Lexington(2015)																					
I Fire S	Station Fairview	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	rd Johnson(2002)	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000
I Kent	St Dog Park(2000)	-	-		-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
	ton Lk S lot off C2+ Soccer Lo	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
I Lexir	gton Pk off Cty B(1999)	-		-	-	20,000	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
I Natu	re Center	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
I Oasis	Park(2016)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
I Publi	c Works Yard(2006)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	60,000
I Owas	so Cherrywood ballfield(2017)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-

City of Roseville
Capital Improvement Plan: Pathway & Parking Lot Maintenance Fund (408)
2018-2037

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
I Rosebrook North Lot(2002)	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	25,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	25,000
I Rosebrook Wading Pool Lot(2007)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
I Roseville Skating Center North Lot(_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	100,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	100,000
I Roseville Skating Center South Lot(-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000
I Reservior Woods(2000)	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	15,000	_	_	_	_	-	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	15,000
I Sandcastle(2004)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
I Veterans VFW Lot(1995)	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000
_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	\$ 250,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 260,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 230,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 340,000	\$ 280,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 280,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 260,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 5,000,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Communications Equipment Fund (110)


2018-2037

		2018		2019	20	020	2021		2022	20	23	2024		2025	2026		2027	2	2028	2029	2030	2031	2	032	2033	20	134	2035	2036	20	37	
Tax Levy: current	\$	_	\$	-	\$	-	\$	- \$	_	\$	- 5	\$ -	- \$	- 5	3	- \$	-	\$	- \$	- \$:	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$	-	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub		_				-		-	_		_	-		-		-	-			_	_			_	_		-		_		_	
Fees, Licenses, & Permits		5,000		5,000		5,000	5,00	00	5,000		5,000	5,000)	5,000	5,0	000	5,000		5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	5,000		5,000	
Sale of Assets		-		_		-		-	_		-	-		-		-	-		-	-	-	-		-	-		-	_	-		-	
Interest Earnings		4,040		4,021		4,101	4,15	53	4,256		4,141	2,794	1	2,920	1,3	319	1,245		1,130	1,052	1,073	1,065		1,106	928		-	_	_			
Revenue	es \$	9,040	\$	9,021	\$	9,101	9,1:	53 \$	9,256	\$	9,141	\$ 7,794	\$	7,920 \$	6,3	319 \$	6,245	\$	6,130 \$	6,052 \$	6,073	6,065	\$	6,106 \$	5,928	\$	5,000 \$	5,000	\$ 5,000	\$	5,000 \$	139,346
Vehicles	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	- 5	\$ -	- \$	- 5	S	- \$	-	\$	- \$	- \$	- :	-	\$	- \$	-	\$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$	-	
Equipment		10,000		5,000		6,500	4,00	00	15,000	7	6,500	1,500)	88,000	10,0	000	12,000		10,000	5,000	6,500	4,000		15,000	76,500		1,500	88,000	10,000	1:	2,000	
Furniture & Fixtures		-		-		-		-	-		-	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-	
Buildings		-		-		-		-	-		-	-		-		-	-		-	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-		-	
Improvements		-		-		-		-	-		-	-		-		-	-		-	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	_			
Expenditure	es \$	10,000	\$	5,000	\$	6,500	\$ 4,00	00 \$	15,000	\$ 7	6,500	\$ 1,500	\$	88,000	5 10,0	000 \$	12,000	\$	10,000 \$	5,000 \$	6,500	4,000	\$	15,000 \$	76,500	\$	1,500 \$	88,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 1	2,000 \$	457,000
																		_					_									
Beginning Cash Balance	\$	202,000	Ψ.	201,040	\$ 20	05,061	\$ 207,66		212,816		7,072	\$ 139,713	-	146,008	65,9		62,246	\$	56,491 \$	52,621 \$	53,673	53,247		55,312 \$	46,418	. (4,154) \$	(20,654)	\$ (103,654)			
Annual Surplus (deficit)		(960)		4,021		2,601	5,13		(5,744)	(6	7,359)	6,294		(80,080)	(3,6		(5,755)		(3,870)	1,052	(427)	2,065		(8,894)	(70,572)		3,500	(83,000)	(5,000)		7,000)	
Cash Balance	\$	201,040	\$ 3	205,061	\$ 20	07,662	\$ 212,8	6 \$	207,072	\$ 13	9,713	\$ 146,008	\$	65,928	62,2	246 \$	56,491	\$	52,621 \$	53,673	53,247	55,312	\$	46,418 \$	(24,154)	\$ (2	0,654) \$	(103,654)	\$ (108,654)	\$ (11	5,654)	
					_																											
				_			nding Sta		611%					10-Year Fur			125%												inding Status		75%	
		5-Year I	Fundir	ng Source	s (Rev	+ Beg Ca	ish Balan	ce) \$	247,572	10-	Year Fui	nding Sourc	ces (R	ev + Beg Ca	sh Bala	nce) \$	284,991							L	ong-Term I	unding	Sources (F	Rev + Beg C	ash Balance	\$ 34	1,346	

Cash Balance (Year-End) * \$ 335,000 2016 Less Amt Needed for Operations ** (128,269) 2017 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit (4,731) 2017 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items 2017 Cash Balance (Beg. Year) \$ 202,000 2018 Adopted Budget (Excl.Capital, Dept \$ 513,075 2017

* Current Assets - Current Liabilities

^{** 25%} of Annual Budget Needed for Cash-Flow Purposes



Key Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E Conference Room Equipment	S - S	- \$	1,500 \$	-	\$	- S	- \$	1,500 \$	- :	\$ - :	s - s	- \$	1,500 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	1,500 \$	- \$		\$ 6,000
E Council camera replacement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85,000	-		170,000
E Council Control/Sound System	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	-	-	-		150,000
E General Audio/Visual Equip. **	10,000	5,000	5,000	4,000	15,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	10,000	12,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	4,000	15,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	10,000	12,000	131,000
		_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	-	-	-	_	-	-
	\$ 10,000 \$	5,000 \$	6,500 \$	4,000 \$	15,000 \$	76,500 \$	1,500 \$	88,000 \$	10,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 10,000 \$	5,000 \$	6,500 \$	4,000 \$	15,000 \$	76,500 \$	1,500 \$	88,000 \$	10,000 \$	12,000	\$ 457,000

Capital Improvement Plan: License Center Facility & Equipment Fund (265)

2018-2037


	2018	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>20</u>	022 2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
Tax Levy: current \$	- \$	- 5	s - s	- \$	- \$ -	S - S	- \$	- \$	- :	5 - 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Fees, Licenses, & Permits	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000 2	25,000 25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
Sale of Assets	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Interest Earnings	21,713	18,485	19,237	20,032	20,856 21,753	2,572	3,104	3,104	3,606	3,890	4,306	4,734	5,279	5,808	6,364	6,412	7,020	7,544	8,195	
Revenues \$	46,713 \$	43,485	\$ 44,237 \$	45,032 \$ 4	45,856 \$ 46,753	\$ 27,572 \$	28,104 \$	28,104 \$	28,606	28,890	\$ 29,306	\$ 29,734	\$ 30,279	\$ 30,808	\$ 31,364	\$ 31,412	\$ 32,020	\$ 32,544	\$ 33,195 \$	6 694,014
Vehicles \$	- \$	- \$	s - s	- \$	- \$ -	S - S	- \$	- \$	- :	- :	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Equipment	1,000	3,800	3,000	3,800	1,000 5,800	1,000	3,800	3,000	4,800	1,000	5,800	1,000	3,800	3,000	3,800	1,000	5,800	-	-	
Furniture & Fixtures	2,100	2,100	-	-		-	2,100	-	9,600	2,100	2,100	-	-	-	2,200	-	-	-	-	
Buildings	205,000	-	1,500	-	- 1,000,000	-	22,200	-	-	5,000	-	1,500	-	-	23,000	-	-	-	-	
Improvements	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Expenditures \$	208,100 \$	5,900 \$	4,500 \$	3,800 \$	1,000 \$1,005,800	\$ 1,000 \$	28,100 \$	3,000 \$	14,400	8,100	\$ 7,900	\$ 2,500	\$ 3,800	\$ 3,000	\$ 29,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 5,800	\$ -	S - S	31,336,700
Beginning Cash Balance \$1	,085,642 \$	924,254	\$ 961,839 \$	31,001,576 \$1,04	12,808 \$1,087,664	\$ 128,617 \$	155,190 \$	155,193 \$	180,297	194,503	\$ 215,293	\$ 236,699	\$ 263,933	\$ 290,412	\$ 318,220	\$ 320,584	\$ 350,996	\$ 377,216	\$ 409,760	
Annual Surplus (deficit)	(161,387)	37,585	39,737	41,232	14,856 (959,047)	26,572	4	25,104	14,206	20,790	21,406	27,234	26,479	27,808	2,364	30,412	26,220	32,544	33,195	
Cash Balance \$	924,254 \$	961,839	\$1,001,576 \$	1,042,808 \$1,08	37,664 \$ 128,617	\$ 155,190 \$	155,193 \$	180,297 \$	194,503	\$ 215,293	\$ 236,699	\$ 263,933	\$ 290,412	\$ 318,220	\$ 320,584	\$ 350,996	\$ 377,216	\$ 409,760	\$ 442,955	

5-Year Funding Status 5-Year Funding Status 5-Year Funding Status 10-Year Funding Status 115% Long-Term Funding Status 133% Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,310,964 ul-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,470,103 ul-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,779,655

Cash Balance (Year-End) *	\$1,536,000	2016
Less Amt Needed for Operations **	(434,088)	2017
Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit	(16,271)	2017
Adjust for Delayed CIP Items	_	2017
Cash Balance (Beg. Year)	\$1,085,642	2018
Adopted Budget (Excl.Capital)	\$1,736,350	2017

^{*} Current Assets - Current Liabilities

^{** 25%} of Annual Budget Needed for Cash-Flow Purposes



Key Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E General office equipment (minor)	\$ 1,000 5	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	1,000 \$	- \$	- S	18,000
E Computer equipment (4)		2,800	-	2,800		2,800		2,800	-	2,800		2,800	-	2,800		2,800		2,800	-		25,200
E Printers (2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		1,000
E Passport camera	-	-	2,000	-	-	2,000	-	-	2,000	-	-	2,000	-	-	2,000	-	-	2,000	-		12,000
F Office chair replacement	2,100	2,100	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	2,100	2,100	2,100	_	_		_	_	_	_		10,500
F Conference table & chairs	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	2,100	_	-	_	_	_	_		2,200	_	_	_		4,300
F Workstation changes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		7,500
B Security camera replacement	5,000	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	5,000	_	_	_		_	_	_	_		10,000
B Bathroom improvements	-	-	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500	-	-	-	-	-	-		3,000
B Office painting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,700	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,000	-	-	-		13,700
B Office carpeting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16,000	-	-	-		31,500
B Facility Improvements **	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		200,000
B New Facility Construction	-	-	-	-	-	1,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000,000
		-	-	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	_	_	-	_
	\$ 208,100	5,900 \$	4,500 \$	3,800 \$	1,000 \$	1,005,800 \$	1,000 \$	28,100 \$	3,000 \$	14,400 \$	8,100 \$	7,900 \$	2,500 \$	3,800 \$	3,000 \$	3 29,000 \$	1,000 \$	5,800 \$	- \$	- S	\$1,336,700

$\textbf{Capital Improvement Plan: \textbf{Community Development Vehicle \& Equipment Fund (260)}}$

2018-2037

		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037
Tax Levy: current		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S -
Tax Levy: Add/Sub		-	-	-		<u>-</u>	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
Fees, Licenses, & Permit	its	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
Sale of Assets		-	-	-		<u>-</u>	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
Interest Earnings		35,547	35,807	36,038	36,252	36,887	37,445	38,088	38,304	38,520	38,630	38,817	39,487	40,187	40,811	40,981	41,135	41,287	41,333	42,054	42,809
	Revenues	\$ 35,547	\$ 35,807	\$ 36,038	\$ 36,252	\$ 36,887	\$ 37,445	\$ 38,088	\$ 38,304	\$ 38,520	\$ 38,630	\$ 38,817	\$ 39,487	\$ 40,187	\$ 40,811	\$ 40,981	\$ 41,135	\$ 41,287	\$ 41,333	\$ 42,054	\$ 42,809 \$ 780,418
Vehicles		\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	- \$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,000	\$ 23,000	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 29,000	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Equipment		2,500	4,300	4,300	3,500	8,000	4,300	4,300	3,500	8,000	4,300	4,300	3,500	8,000	4,300	4,300	3,500	8,000	4,300	4,300	=
Furniture & Fixtures		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	-	-
Buildings		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	=
Improvements		-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ex	xpenditures	\$ 22,500	\$ 24,300	\$ 25,300	\$ 4,500	\$ 9,000	\$ 5,300	\$ 27,300	\$ 27,500	\$ 33,000	\$ 29,300	\$ 5,300	\$ 4,500	\$ 9,000	\$ 32,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,500	\$ 39,000	\$ 5,300	\$ 4,300	\$ - \$ 374,500
Beginning Cash Balance	:	\$1,777,326	\$1,790,372	\$1,801,879	\$1,812,617	\$1,844,369	\$1,872,257	\$1,904,402	\$1,915,190	\$1,925,994	\$1,931,514	\$1,940,844	\$1,974,361	\$2,009,348	\$2,040,535	\$2,049,046	\$2,056,727	\$2,064,361	\$2,066,648	\$2,102,681	\$2,140,435
Annual Surplus (deficit)		13,047	11,507	10,738	31,752	27,887	32,145	10,788	10,804	5,520	9,330	33,517	34,987	31,187	8,511	7,681	7,635	2,287	36,033	37,754	42,809
Cash Balance		\$1,790,372	\$1,801,879	\$1,812,617	\$1,844,369	\$1,872,257	\$1,904,402	\$1,915,190	\$1,925,994	\$1,931,514	\$1,940,844	\$1,974,361	\$2,009,348	\$2,040,535	\$2,049,046	\$2,056,727	\$2,064,361	\$2,066,648	\$2,102,681	\$2,140,435	\$2,183,244
					E 11 0	22050/			10.77		10220/									11 0	6000/

5-Year Funding Status 2287% 10-Year Funding Status 1.033% 5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$1,957,857 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$2,148,844

Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$2,557,744

 Cash Balance (Year-End) *
 \$2,212,000
 2016

 Less Amt Needed for Operations **
 (394,748)
 2017

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 (39,927)
 2017


 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$1,777,326
 2018

 Adopted Budget (Excl. Capital)
 \$1,578,990
 2017

* Current Assets - Current Liabilities

^{** 25%} of Annual Budget Needed for Cash-Flow Purposes



Key Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V Inspection vehicles	\$ 19,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 20,000 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	22,000 \$	23,000 \$	24,000	\$ 24,000 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	27,000 \$	28,000 \$	29,000 \$	30,000	-	-	- 1	\$ 265,000
E Computers/monitors	2,500	4,300	4,300	3,500	8,000	4,300	4,300	3,500	8,000	4,300	4,300	3,500	8,000	4,300	4,300	3,500	8,000	4,300	4,300	- 7	91,500
E Permit Database conversion	_	_	-	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	- /	-
E Online Permit/Schedul. Software	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- 1	-
F Office furniture	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	-	- 1	18,000
	_	_	-	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	- /	-
	\$ 22,500	\$ 24,300	\$ 25,300 \$	4,500 \$	9,000 \$	5,300 \$	27,300 \$	27,500 \$	33,000	\$ 29,300 \$	5,300 \$	4,500 \$	9,000 \$	32,300 \$	33,300 \$	33,500 \$	39,000 \$	5,300 \$	4,300 \$	- /	\$ 374,500

Capital Improvement Plan: Water Vehicle & Equipment Fund (610)

2018-2037

T I		2018	2019		2020	2021	<u>202</u>		2023	2024)25	2026		2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
Tax Levy: current	3		3	- 3	-	3	- 3	-	s -	3 -	\$	-	3 -	\$	-	\$ -		. \$	- 5 -	\$ -		3 -	3 -	\$ -	3 -	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub			4.480.4	-				-				-								4.450.000			4.450.000			
Fees, Licenses, & Permits		1,178,960	1,178,9	60	1,178,960	1,178,96	1,178	,960	1,178,960	1,178,960	1,1	78,960	1,178,960	1	1,178,960	1,178,960	1,178,960	1,178,96	1,178,960	1,178,960	1,178,960	1,178,960	1,178,960	1,178,960	1,178,960	
Sale of Assets				-	-		-	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	
Interest Earnings	_	5,794		-	-	1,60	3 4	,519	6,889	10,106		13,887	17,004		19,823	18,949	18,907	18,76		19,612	19,983	17,362	5,088	6,429	-	
Reve	enues \$	1,184,754	\$ 1,178,9	60 \$	1,178,960	\$ 1,180,56	8 \$ 1,183	,479	\$ 1,185,849	\$ 1,189,066	\$ 1,19	92,847	\$ 1,195,964	\$ 1	1,198,783	\$ 1,197,909	\$ 1,197,867	\$ 1,197,72	\$ 1,196,639	\$ 1,198,572	\$1,198,943	\$1,196,322	\$1,184,048	\$ 1,185,389	\$ 1,178,960	\$23,801,603
Vehicles	\$		\$ 30,0	00 \$	60,000	\$ 35,00) \$ 60	,000	\$ 25,000	S -	\$	-	\$ -	\$	30,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ 60,00) \$ -	\$ 80,000	\$ 90,000	\$ -	S -	\$ 60,000	\$ -	
Equipment		75,000	5,0	100	82,000		- 5	,000	-	-		37,000	55,000		112,500	50,000	65,000	92,00) -	-	-	10,000	17,000	110,000	-	
Furniture & Fixtures																										
Buildings		1,600,000		-			_	_	_	-		_	-		_	50,000				_	140,000	700,000		700,000	30,000	
Improvements		500,000	700.0	00	700,000	1,000,00	1.000	.000	1,000,000	1.000.000	1.0	00.000	1.000.000	- 1	.100.000	1,100,000	1.100.000	1,100,00	1.100.000	1,100,000	1.100.000	1,100,000	1.100.000	1,100,000	1,100,000	
Expendit	ituroe \$	2,175,000	\$ 735,0		842,000	\$ 1,035,00	\$ 1,06	000	\$ 1,025,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1.0	37,000	\$ 1,055,000		.242,500	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1.205,000	\$ 1,252,00	, ,	\$ 1 180 000	\$1,330,000	\$1,810,000	\$1.117.000	\$ 1,970,000		\$24,505,500
Experien	itures p	2,175,000	0 /55,	.00 \$	012,000	\$ 1,055,00	, 91,00.	,000	5 1,025,000	\$ 1,000,000	Ψ 1,0.	37,000	\$ 1,055,000		1,2 12,500	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,205,000	0 1,202,00	, 5 1,100,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$1,550,000	\$1,010,000	\$1,117,000	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 1,150,000	92 1,505,500
Beginning Cash Balance		289,714	\$ (700.5	22) 6	(256,572)	\$ 80.38		.956	s 344,435	\$ 505,284		94,350	\$ 850,197		001 160	\$ 947.444	\$ 045353	s 938,22	S 883,944	\$ 980,583	\$ 999,155	\$ 868.098	\$ 254,420	\$ 321,468	\$ (463,143)	
	3							,						3	991,100		9 745,555				,	4 000,000				
Annual Surplus (deficit)		(990,246)			336,960	145,56		,479	160,849	189,066		55,847	140,964	_	(43,717)					18,572	(131,057			(784,611)		
Cash Balance	\$	(700,532)	\$ (256,	72) \$	80,388	\$ 225,95	5 \$ 344	,435	\$ 505,284	\$ 694,350	\$ 8:	50,197	\$ 991,160	\$	947,444	\$ 945,353	\$ 938,220	\$ 883,94	\$ 980,583	\$ 999,155	\$ 868,098	\$ 254,420	\$ 321,468	\$ (463,143)	\$ (414,183)	

5-Year Funding Status 106% 5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 6,196,435 10-Year Funding Status 108% 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$12,158,944 Long-Term Funding Status 98%
Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) #########

 Cash Balance (Year-End)*
 \$ 995,000
 2016

 Less Amt Needed for Operations **
 (629,645)
 2016

 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit
 (75,641)
 2017


 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items
 2017

 Cash Balance (Beg. Year)
 \$ 289,714
 2018

 Adopted Budget (Excl.Capital, Dep \$ 6,296,450
 2017

* Current Assets - Current Liabilities

** 10% of Annual Budget Needed for Cash-Flow Purposes



Expenditure Detail

Key Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V #207 Pickup	s -	\$ -	s -	\$ 35,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		_	0 000	\$ -		s -	_	\$
V #208 Meter van	-	-	30,000	100	-	-		-	-	-	-		-		30,000	100	_		-	-	
V #210 4x4 pickup	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-		30,000		100	-	_		-	-	3
V #211 360 Backhoe (3-way split)	-		-	-	60,000		-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	60,000	_	12
V #214 Ford Transit - Locate Vehicle	-	-	-	-	-	25,000		-	-	-	-		-			25,000	_			-	5
V #230 Ford 1/2-ton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
V #234 4x4 Pickup	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
V #225 Mini Backhoe (1/3) Water, Sa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	9
V #213 Water Utility Mobile Workshi	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	
E Water AMR meter system replacem	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	3
E Replace/Upgrade SCADA system (-	-	75,000	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	1
E GPS Unit (1/3 share)	-	-	7,000	-	-	-	-	7,000	-		-	-	7,000		-	-	-	7,000	-	-	
E Field Computer Replacement/add	5,000	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	
E Replace Air Compressor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	
E Sand Bucket 24"x36" for #211	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
E #236 Trailer	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	
E #237 Wacker Compacter		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
E Electronic message board-attenuate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
E Compactor for #211 360 Backhoe (-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
E Valve Operator and Vac	70,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1-
E Replace Trench Box	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	
B Elevated storage tank repainting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	700,000	-	700,000	-	1,4
B Booster Station Rehabilitation	1,600,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	140,000	-	-	-	30,000	1,8
B Replace Water Tower Fence	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
I Water main replacement	500,000	700,000	700,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	20,00
	-		-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-		-	-	

Capital Improvement Plan: Sewer Vehicle & Equipment Fund (600)

Tax Levy: current		2018	<u>2019</u>	2020	2021	2022	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2027</u>	<u>2028</u>	<u>2029</u>	2030	<u>2031</u>	<u>2032</u>	2033 \$	2034	2035	<u>2036</u>	<u>2037</u>	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub		-		, -	φ - -						· -				-	J -	φ -		, -	ъ - -		
Fees, Licenses, & Permit	ts	1,329,640	1 329 640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1.329,640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1.329.640	1,329,640	1,329,640	1 329 640	1,329,640	1,329,640	
Sale of Assets			1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	1,525,010	
Interest Earnings		8,874	3,144	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	2,024	8,657	14,623	21,508	28,231	33,408	
· ·	Revenues	\$1,338,514	\$1,332,784	\$1,329,640	\$1,329,640	\$ 1,329,640	\$ 1,329,640	\$ 1,329,640	\$ 1,329,640	\$1,329,640	\$1,329,640	\$1,329,640	\$1,329,640	\$1,329,640	\$1,329,640	\$1,331,664	\$1,338,297	\$1,344,263	\$1,351,148	\$1,357,871	\$ 1,363,048	\$26,713,269
Vehicles		\$ 40,000	\$ 60,000	S -	\$ 85,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ 35,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ -	S -	\$ 95,000	\$ 100,000	
Equipment		75,000	90,000	5,000	4,000	75,000	-	-	25,000	4,000	17,500	-	15,000	85,000	4,000	-	-	-	15,000	4,000	7,500	
Furniture & Fixtures		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Buildings		410,000	590,000	535,000	360,000	435,000	295,000	245,000	235,000	315,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Improvements		1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Ex	xpenditures	\$1,625,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,640,000	\$1,549,000	\$ 1,510,000	\$ 1,355,000	\$ 1,245,000	\$ 1,260,000	\$1,319,000	\$1,047,500	\$1,400,000	\$1,055,000	\$1,085,000	\$1,039,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,040,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,015,000	\$1,099,000	\$ 1,107,500	\$25,231,000
Beginning Cash Balance		\$ 443,701	\$ 157,215	\$ (350,001)	\$ (660,361)	. (,-)	\$(1,060,081)					, ,	\$ (708,741)	\$ (434,101)	\$ (189,461)	\$ 101,179	\$ 432,843	\$ 731,140	\$1,075,403	\$1,411,551	\$ 1,670,422	
Annual Surplus (deficit)		(286,486)					(25,360)		69,640	10,640	282,140	(70,360)	274,640	244,640	290,640	331,664	298,297	344,263	336,148	258,871	255,548	
Cash Balance		\$ 157,215	\$ (350,001)	\$ (660,361)	\$ (879,721)	\$(1,060,081)	\$(1,085,441)	\$(1,000,801)	\$ (931,161)	\$ (920,521)	\$ (638,381)	\$ (708,741)	\$ (434,101)	\$ (189,461)	\$ 101,179	\$ 432,843	\$ 731,140	\$1,075,403	\$1,411,551	\$1,670,422	\$ 1,925,970	


5-Year Funding Status 10-Year Funding Status 5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 7,103,919 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) ########

Long-Term Funding Status 108% Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$27,156,970

Cash Balance (Year-End) * Less Amt Needed for Operations ** (404,905) 2016 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit (128,394) 2017 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items 2017 Cash Balance (Beg. Year) \$ 443,701 2018 Adopted Budget (Excl.Capital, Dept \$4,049,050 2017

* Current Assets - Current Liabilities

^{** 10%} of Annual Budget Needed for Cash-Flow Purposes



Key <u>Description</u>	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V #201 Jetter/Vactor	\$ -	\$ -	S -	\$ -	S -	\$ - 5	-	S -	S -	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ -	S -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400,000
V #202 1-ton with dump box/plow	-	-	-	40,000	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	80,000
V #217 1-ton service truck	_	_	-	_	-	-	_	_	_	30,000	_	_	-	-	_	_	-	_	_	_	30,000
V #209 1-ton "Flat Bed Crane"	40,000		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	80,000
V #213 Extend-a-jet replacement	-	-	-	35,000	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	70,000
V #220 Towmaster trailer - 10 ton	-	-	-	10,000	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
V #225 Mini Backhoe (1/3) Water, Sa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000
V #211 360 Backhoe (3-way split)	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	120,000
V #237 Wacker compactor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000
V Water Truck (1/2)	-	60,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	120,000
E Pipe Camera	75,000	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150,000
E #211A Sand Bucket (1/3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000
E Compactor for #211 360 Backhoe (-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
E Electronic message board-attenuator		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,500	15,000
E Replace/Upgrade SCADA system (1	-	75,000	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	115,000
E Computer replacement	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	20,000
E Replace 1990 air compressor(1/3)	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
E GPS with computer (1/3 share)	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	16,000
E Replace Onan portable generator	-	-	-	-	75,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75,000
B LS repairs/upgrades	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Fulham LS Rehab	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	315,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	350,000
B Josephine LS Rehab	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Wagner LS Rehab	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Galtier LS Rehab	-	50,000	500,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	550,000
B Lounge LS Rehab	350,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	350,000
B Dale/Owasso LS Rehab	-	-	-	45,000	405,000		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	450,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Sewer Vehicle & Equipment Fund (600)

2018-2037

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
B Cleveland LS upgrade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
B Cohansey LS upgrade	-		-	_	30,000	270,000	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	300,000
B Center Street LS upgrade	-	-	-	_	_	25,000	225,000	_	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	250,000
B Brenner LS upgrade	-	_	-	_	_	-	20,000	200,000	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	220,000
B Long Lake Lift Station	-	-	35,000	315,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	350,000
B Fernwood LS Rehab/Roof/Tuckpoir	60,000	540,000	-	_	_	-	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	600,000
I Sewer main repairs	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	20,000,000
I I & I reduction	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400,000
_	-	-	-	-	_	_	-	-	-	_	_	_	-	-	-	_	-	_	_	-	-
_	\$1,625,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,640,000	\$1,549,000	\$ 1,510,000	\$ 1,355,000	\$ 1,245,000	\$ 1,260,000	\$1,319,000	\$1,047,500	\$1,400,000	\$1,055,000	\$1,085,000	\$1,039,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,040,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,015,000	\$1,099,000	\$ 1,107,500	\$25,231,000

Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) #########

City of Roseville


Capital Improvement Plan: Storm Sewer Vehicle & Equipment Fund (640)

2018-2037

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
Tax Levy: current	S -	S -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - 5	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Tax Levy: Add/Sub		_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Fees, Licenses, & Permits	1,039,500	1,039,500	1,039,500	1.039,500	1.039.500	1,039,500	1.039,500	1.039.500	1,039,500	1,039,500	1.039,500	1,039,500	1.039,500	1.039,500	1.039,500	1.039,500	1,039,500	1.039.500	1.039,500	1,039,500	
Sale of Assets	-	_	-	_	-	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Interest Earnings	3,952	3,022	2.972	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
_	Revenues \$1,043,452	- / -	\$1,042,472	\$1,039,500	\$1.039.500	\$1.039.500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1.039.500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$1,039,500	\$20,799,946
	. ,, .	. ,. ,.		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, , ,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	. ,,	. ,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	. ,,.	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,,
Vehicles	s -	\$ 270,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 45,000	S - 5	\$ 240,000	\$ 180,000	s -	\$ 220,000	s -	s -	\$ 35,000	s -	\$ 470,000	\$ 45,000	s -	\$ 200,000	s -	\$ 180,000	\$ 240,000	
Equipment	465,000	75,000	321,000	30,000	315,000	34,000	-	273,000	200,000	17,500	45,000	67,000	14,000	15,000	37,000	20,000	560,000	34,000	258,000	27,500	
Furniture & Fixtures	102,000	72,000	521,000	-	515,000	5 1,000	_	275,000	200,000	17,500	.5,000		- 1,000	15,000	57,000	20,000	-	2 1,000	250,000	27,500	
Buildings	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_				_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Improvements	625,000	700,000	800,000	875,000	900 000	900,000	900.000	900,000	950,000	1.040.000	950,000	1 000 000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1.000.000	1,000,000	1 000 000	1,000,000	90,000	
	penditures \$1,090,000	,	,	\$ 950,000	\$1,215,000	\$1,174,000	\$1.080.000	\$1,173,000	\$1,370,000	\$1,040,000	\$ 995,000	\$1,102,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,485,000	\$1,082,000	\$1,020,000	\$1,760,000	\$1,034,000	\$1,438,000		\$22,763,000
Ехр	penditures \$1,090,000	\$1,045,000	\$1,521,000	\$ 950,000	\$1,213,000	\$1,174,000	\$1,080,000	\$1,175,000	\$1,570,000	\$1,037,300	\$ 995,000	\$1,102,000	\$1,014,000	\$1,465,000	\$1,082,000	\$1,020,000	\$1,700,000	\$1,034,000	\$1,436,000	\$ 337,300	\$22,703,000
Designing Cost Delege	e 107.622	6 151 075	¢ 149.507	£ (120.021)	e (40.421) e	e (215.021)	6 (250 421)	e (200.021)	\$ (524,431)	e (954.021)	¢ (972.021)	6 (929 421)	e (900 021)	e (965 421)	##########				***************************************	***************************************	
Beginning Cash Balance	\$ 197,623	. , ,	,	\$ (129,931)		. (-/- /	. (, - ,	. (,,	. (- , - ,	. (/- /	. ())	\$ (828,431)	. (,	\$ (865,431)			(520 500)		""""		
Annual Surplus (deficit)	(46,548				(175,500)	(134,500)		(133,500)	(330,500)		44,500	(62,500)	25,500	(445,500)	(42,500)	19,500	(720,500)	5,500	(398,500)	682,000	
Cash Balance	\$ 151,075	\$ 148,597	\$ (129,931)	\$ (40,431)	\$ (215,931) \$	\$ (350,431)	\$ (390,931)	\$ (524,431)	\$ (854,931)	\$ (872,931)	\$ (828,431)	\$ (890,931)	\$ (865,431)	#########	##########	#########	##########	#########	##########	##########	
			5-Year F	unding Status	96%			10-Year F	unding Status	92%								Long-Term F	unding Status	92%	

Cash Balance (Year-End) * \$ 329,000 2016 Less Amt Needed for Operations ** (83,830) 2016 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit (47,547) 2017 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items 2017 Cash Balance (Beg. Year) \$ 197,623 2018 Adopted Budget (Excl.Capital, Dept \$ 838,300 2017

^{** 10%} of Annual Budget Needed for Cash-Flow Purposes



Key Description	2	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V #103 Ford 450 w/ Plow	\$		\$ 65,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -			s -	\$ -		s - :			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s - :	s -	130,000
V #121 Regenerative Air Broom	m (Swe		_	_	_	_	240,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	240,000	480,000
V #122 Wheel Loader			205,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	205,000	_	_	_	_	_		410,000
V #132 Elgin sweeper 2002 3-v	wheel	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	_		200,000		-	-	-	-	-	200,000
V #147 3-Ton dump truck		-	-	-	-	_	-	180,000	-	-	-	-	_	_	-	-	-	-	-	180,000	-	360,000
V #145 5-Ton hook dump		-	-	-	-	_	-	-		220,000	-	-	_	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	220,000
V #167 Elgin Sweeper 2006 3-	wheel	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	400,000
V #126 Bobcat Skidsteer		-	-	-	45,000	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_	-	45,000	-	-	-	-	-	90,000
V Tractor/snowblower (1/2 stre	eets)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000
E Cement mixer		-	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	8,000
E #171 Tennant 6600 sweeper		-	-	32,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32,000	-	-	-	-	-	64,000
E #163 Electronic message boa	ırd	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	40,000
E #139 Vacall		-	-	-	-	250,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	250,000	-	-	-	500,000
E #130 Steamer "Amazing Mac	chine"	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
E #131 LCT 600 Leaf Machine	e	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
E #172 Zero Turn Dixie Chopp	per	15,000		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
E Mower/Snow Blower Combo	o (1/2 w	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	90,000
E #164 Bobcat UTV		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	30,000
E #168 Wildcat Compost Turn		-	-	250,000		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	250,000	-	-	-	500,000
E Electronic message board-at		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,500	15,000
E Field Computer Add/Replace	ements	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000	20,000
E GPS Unit (1/3)		-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,000
E Generator for St Croix		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		180,000	-	180,000
E #225 Cat Mini Back-hoe (1/3	3 san, 1	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000

^{*} Current Assets - Current Liabilities

Capital Improvement Plan: Storm Sewer Vehicle & Equipment Fund (640) 2018-2037

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
E #211 360 Backhoe (Grapple Bucket	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	18,000	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	18,000	-	36,000
E #165 5 ton trailer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	12,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,000
E #211 Backhoe 1/3 water. Sewer, sto	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60,000	-	120,000
E #211A Sand Bucket (1/3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000
E Arona Storm Station Upgrades	-	-	-	-	-		-	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
E Millwood Storm Station Upgrades	-	-	-	-	-		-	200,000	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200,000
E Owasso Hills Storm Station Upgrad	-	-		-	-		-	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200,000
E Walsh Storm station Upgrades	450,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	450,000
E Gottfreid Storm Station Upgrades	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E Mount Ridge Storm Station Upgrad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	50,000
E Bennet Lake Pump Upgrade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E St. Croix Storm Station Upgrade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E Replace/Upgrade SCADA (1/3)	-	75,000	-	-	-	-		20,000	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	115,000
E Compactor for #211 360 Backhoe (-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
I Pond improvements/infiltration	275,000	300,000	350,000	350,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-	8,225,000
I Storm sewer replacement/rehabilitat	350,000	400,000	450,000	450,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-	9,150,000
I Leaf site water quality improvement	-	-	-	75,000	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75,000
I Update stormwater mgmt plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,000	180,000
_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	_	-	-	_	_	-	-	_
	\$1,090,000	\$1,045,000	\$1,321,000	\$ 950,000	\$1,215,000	\$1,174,000	\$1,080,000	\$1,173,000	\$1,370,000	\$1,057,500	\$ 995,000	\$1,102,000	\$1,014,000	\$1,485,000	\$1,082,000	\$1,020,000	\$1,760,000	\$1,034,000	\$1,438,000	\$ 357,500	\$22,763,000

Capital Improvement Plan: Golf Vehicle & Equipment Fund (620)

Tax Levy: current Tax Levy: Add/Sub Other / TBD Sale of Assets Interest Earnings	: 	\$ 2018 - - 500 3,568	\$	- \$ - 500 3,049	2020 - - 500 1,780	\$ <u>202</u>	- \$ - 500 ,026	2022 - - 500 197	\$ \frac{2023}{-} \\ 500 \\ -}	\$ \frac{2024}{	\$ 2025 - - 500	\$ 2026 - - 500	\$ - - - 500	\$ - - - 500	\$ - - - 500	\$ \frac{2030}{-} \\ \frac{500}{-} \\ \frac{500}{-} \\ \frac{1}{2}	\$ 2031 - - 500	\$ - - - 500	\$ = \frac{2033}{-} = \frac{500}{-} = \frac{2033}{-} = \frac{1}{2000} = \fr	\$ - - - 500	\$ - - - 500	\$ - - - 500	\$ - - - 500	
	Revenues	\$ 4,068	\$	3,549 \$	2,280	\$ 1	,526 \$	697	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 19,620
Vehicles Equipment Furniture & Fixtures Buildings	:	s - - -	4	- \$ 17,000 - 20,000	35,000	\$ 43	- \$,000	28,000 5,000	\$ - 13,000 - 505,000	\$ - 58,000 - 5,000	s - - -	\$ - 20,000 -	\$ - 7,000	\$ - 28,000 - 9,000	\$ - 70,000 - 17,000	\$ - 35,000 - 7,000	s - - -	s - - -	\$ 35,000	\$ 5,000	\$ - 10,000 - 5,000	\$ - 58,000	\$ - 22,000 - 10,000	
Improvements		30,000	-	-	5,000			5,000	-	10,000	12,500	-	-	20,000		30,000	17,500		-	5,000	-	-	-	
•	penditures	\$ 30,000	\$ 6	57,000 \$	40,000	\$ 43	,000 \$	38,000	\$ 518,000	\$ 73,000	\$ 12,500	\$ 20,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 57,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 17,500	s -	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 58,000	\$ 32,000	\$ 1,232,000
Beginning Cash Balance Annual Surplus (deficit) Cash Balance)	\$ 178,403 (25,932) \$ 152,471) (6	52,471 \$ 53,451) 89,020 \$	89,020 (37,720) 51,301	(41	,301 \$,474) ,827 \$	9,827 (37,303) (27,477)	\$ (27,477) (517,500) \$ (544,977)	\$ (544,977) (72,500) \$ (617,477)	(12,000)	\$ (629,477) (19,500) \$ (648,977)	(6,500)	\$ (655,477) (56,500) \$ (711,977)	\$ (711,977) (86,500) \$ (798,477)	\$ (798,477) (71,500) \$ (869,977)	\$ (869,977) (17,000) \$ (886,977)	\$ (886,977) 500 \$ (886,477)	(39,500)	\$ (925,977) (4,500) \$ (930,477)	(14,500)	(57,500)	\$(1,002,477) (31,500) \$(1,033,977)	

5-Year Funding Status 87% 5-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 190,523

10-Year Funding Status 10-Year Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 193,023

Long-Term Funding Status Long-Term Funding Sources (Rev + Beg Cash Balance) \$ 198,023

Cash Balance (Year-End) * \$ 268,000 Less Amt Needed for Operations * (70,930) 2016 Planned CIP Surplus/Deficit (18,667) 2017 Adjust for Delayed CIP Items Cash Balance (Beg. Year) 2017 \$ 178,403 2018 Adopted Budget (Excl.Capital, Der \$ 354,650 2017

^{** 20%} of Annual Budget Needed for Cash-Flow Purposes



Expenditure Detail


Kei Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031 2	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	
V Pickup Truck 2012 S	s - \$	- \$	- S	- S	28,000		s - s	- 5	s - s		s -	\$ -	s - s	- S	- S	35,000 \$	- 5	5 - 5	s - :	-	63,000
E Gas pump / tank: est: 1967/1997									-							-				-	-
E zero turn mower 2008	-	-	-	-	-	13,000	-	-	-	-	-	14,000	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	27,000
E Fairway mower 2008	-	-	-	-	-	-	58,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58,000	-	116,000
E Greens Mowers 2000	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-		-		-	-	-	60,000
E Greens/Tee Mowers 2002	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000	-		-	-	-	-	-	70,000
E Computer equipment 2014	-			7,000					-	7,000						-		10,000			24,000
E Turf equipment/aerators 2001	-			21,000	-				-			21,000				-		-		22,000	64,000
E Cushman #1 & 2 2014 and 1988		17,000					-		-		28,000	-				-				-	45,000
E Greens covers 1997/replaced 2 -20		-					-		-							-					-
E Course netting/patio/shelter 1985/1		-					-		20,000							-				-	20,000
E Top Dresser Tufco 1993				15,000				-	-	-		-	-		-		-			-	15,000
E Operational power equipment 198					5,000	-		-	-			5,000	-		-					-	10,000
B Clubhouse kitchen equipment 1970					100		5,000		-			5,000	-				5,000				15,000
B Clubhouse upkeep/repairs 1999/2						5,000	100		-		9,000		-				- 1 - 1			10,000	24,000
B Clubhouse furnace / AC 199									-		- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1		-		100					100	
B Clubhouse roof replace 1988												-			100						-
B Clubhouse /carpeting/flooring 1998									-			12,000									12,000
B Replace Clubhouse CH 1970est.						-									100						
B Replace Shop						500,000						-	7,000		100	5,000					512,000
B Shop heating and other/upgrades	-	20,000	-						-			-			100	100		5,000			25,000
I Sidewalk/exterior repairs 1985			_			-		_	_	_	15,000	_	_		_	_	_	- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1		-	15,000
I Course improvements, landscaping		_	5,000	_	5,000		_	5,000	_		5,000	_		10,000		_		_	_		30,000
I Parking lot repairs/sealing 1990/20		_		_	-		_	7,500	_		-	_		7,500		_		_		_	15,000
I Irrigation system upgrades 1960/19	30,000	_	_	_	_		10,000	-		_	2		30,000	-		_	_	2	_		70,000
,	-	_	_				-			_		_	-		- 2	_	_	_	_		
_	30,000 \$	67 000 S	40 000 S	43 000 S	38 000	\$ 518,000	\$ 73,000 \$	12 500 5	\$ 20,000 \$	7 000	\$ 57,000	\$ 87,000	\$ 72,000 \$	17 500 S	- \$	40 000 \$	5,000 5	\$ 15,000 \$	\$ 58,000	32 000	\$ 1 232 000


	Current CIP 2018 Amount	Prior Year 2018 <u>Amount</u>	<u>Diff.</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Administration	<u>r mount</u>	7 Hillount	<u> </u>	<u>110005</u>
Office Furniture	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Finance				
Financial Software: Upgrade	80,000	-	80,000	Moved up from 2019
Central Services	,		,	
Postage Machine Lease	4,000	3,440	560	Change in cost estimate
Copier/Printer/Scanner Lease	78,000	74,400		Change in cost estimate
Police	,		,	
Marked squad cars (5 / yr)	165,000	165,000	-	
Unmarked vehicles (1 / yr)	24,000	24,000	-	
Community Relations Vehicle	-	22,660	(22,660)	Moved to 2020
Radar Units	4,120	4,120	-	
Stop Sticks	1,030	1,030	-	
Rear Transport Seats	2,705	2,705	-	
Control Boxes	4,000	4,000	-	
Computer Equipment	8,800	8,800	_	
Non-lethal weapons	1,600	1,600	_	
New K-9	-,	16,000	(16,000)	Moved to 2019
Long gun parts (squads)	3,090	3,090	(10,000)	1.10 (0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.0
Sidearm parts (officers)	2,060	2,060	_	
Tactical gear	5,150	5,150	_	
SWAT Bullet Proof Vests	6,180	6,180	_	
Crime scene equipment	3,000	3,000	_	
8 Squad Surveillance Cameras	41,715	41,715	_	
Report Room Monitors	2,500	2,500	_	
Roll Call Equipment	4,000	4,000	_	
Defibrillators	1,575	1,575	_	
Radio Equipment	15,500	15,500	_	
Office furniture	2,100	2,100	_	
Window treatments	6,300	6,300	_	
Fire	0,500	0,500		
Command Response Vehicle	52,500	65,000	(12,500)	Change in cost estimate
Ventilation fans	-	7,000	` ' /	Moved to 2022
Exercise room-fitness equipment	10,000	-,,,,,,		Moved from 2020
Personal Protective Equipment	40,000	40,000	-	110 ved 110111 2020
Training equipment	1,500	1,500	_	
Portable and mobile radios	20,000	20,000	_	
Reporting software	11,000	4,500	6 500	Change in cost estimate
SWAT Gear/Equipment	10,000	1,500		Moved from 2017
Kitchen table & chairs	1,500	3,000	,	Change in cost estimate
Public Works	1,500	3,000	(1,500)	Change in cost estimate
Eng. vehicle #304: Proj. Cord. C1500	30,000	25,000	5,000	Change in cost estimate
#104 1-ton pickup	50,000	35,000		Moved to 2019
#111 Bobcat, bucket	5,000	5,000	(55,000)	. 1.10 (04 (0 201)
#111 Bobcat, bucket #111 Bobcat, millhead (18")	22,000	22,000	_	
#133 Walk behind saw	22,000	10,000	(10,000)	Moved to 2020
#152 Int'l boom truck	225,000	225,000		Moved to 2022 per recent inspection
#157 Ingersoll 5-ton roller	40,000	40,000	_	1.10 vod to 2022 per recent inspection
#111 Bobcat hydro hammer	-	8,000	(8,000)	Moved to 2019


	Current CIP 2018	Prior Year 2018		
	Amount	Amount	<u>Diff.</u>	<u>Notes</u>
#111 Bobcat sweeper broom	8,000	8,000	-	
Street Signs	10,000	50,000	(40,000)	Spread over five years instead of one
Band saw	4,500	4,500	-	
Drive-on hoist rehab	-	20,000		Moved up to 2017 in lieu of brake lathe
Brake lathe	11,000	-	11,000	Moved from 2017 in lieu of hoist
Parks & Recreation				
#510 Water truck (1/2 cost)	-	65,000	(65,000)	Moved to 2019
#511 Toolcat (2006)	55,000	55,000	-	
#535 Ford passenger van	-	40,000		Moved to 2019
#560 Fored passenger van	-	40,000	(40,000)	Moved to 2019
Replace 1996 FORD Tractor with Skid				
Steer (Lease Program)	41,000	-	41,000	Moved from 2020
#553 John Deere loader (2007)	80,000	80,000	-	
Park security system improvements	-	150,000	(150,000)	Moved to 2023
General Facility Improvements			,	
Water heater	-	25,000		Moved to 2022
Door Card Reader	25,000	-	25,000	Moved from 2017
Unit heaters (4)	6,000	6,000	-	
Tables and chairs City Hall	30,000	30,000	-	
Maintenace Yard Security Gate	25,000	25,000	-	
Paint walls city hall	15,000	15,000	-	NEW MED A
City Hall Elevator	95,000	-	•	NEW ITEM
Commons: Water heater-Domestic H20	-	8,000	· · /	Moved to 2019
Commons: Water heater-Zamboni (2007)	-	10,000		Moved to 2019
Commons: Water storage tank	-	8,000		Moved to 2019
Arena: Dehumidification	90,000	87,500		Change in cost estimate
Arena: Restroom Remodeling	75,000	50,000		Change in cost estimate
OVAL: Micro Processors	20,000	15.000	,	Moved from 2016
OVAL: Tarmac blacktop (2010)	-	15,000		Moved to 2019
OVAL: Lobby Roof (1993) OVAL: Mech. Bldg roof (1993)	-	85,000	` ' /	Moved to 2019
	-	60,000		Moved to 2019
OVAL: Zamboni (2003) Banquet Ctr: Roof (1999)	-	125,000 100,000		Moved to 2019 Moved to 2020
Fire: Shift office counter tops	3,000	3,000	(100,000)	Moved to 2020
Information Technology	3,000	3,000	-	
Computers (Notebooks, Desktop)	69,800	46,650	23 150	Change in cost estimate
Monitor/Display	8,700	8,700	23,130	Change in cost estimate
MS Office License	8,100	14,721	(6.621)	Change in cost estimate
Desktop Printer	1,200	1,200	(0,021)	Change in cost estimate
Network Printers/Copiers/Scanners (13)	1,200	17,000	(17,000)	
Network Switches/Routers (Roseville)	38,000	26,000		Change in cost estimate
Power/UPS - Closets (11)	1,700	1,320		Change in cost estimate
Surveillance Cameras (53)	9,180	9,180	-	Change in cost estimate
Wireless Access Points (38)	23,200	3,000	20 200	Change in cost estimate
Telephone handsets	-	8,190		Moved to 2024 for citywide purchase
Servers - Host - Shared (5)	30,000	22,500		Change in cost estimate
Storage Area Network Nodes- Shared (8)	55,000	27,500		Change in cost estimate
Network Switches/Routers (Shared)	10,000	18,509		Change in cost estimate
Park Improvements	10,000	- 0,0 0 7	(0,00)	g

	Current CIP	Prior Year		
	2018	2018		
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Diff.</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Tennis & Basketball Courts	-	135,000		Moved to Future Date
Shelters & Structures	60,000	7,500		Change in cost estimate
Playground Areas	-	755,000	,	Moved to Future Date
Volleyball & Bocce Ball Courts	-	15,000		Moved to Future Date
Athletic Fields	-	260,000		Moved to Future Date
Other Capital Items	-	419,590		Moved to Future Date
Natural Resources	40,000	300,000	(260,000)	Change in cost estimate
PIP/CIP Category	200,000	200,000	-	
Street Improvements				
Mill & overlay - local streets	1,100,000	1,100,000	-	
Reconstruction/M & O - MSA streets	1,100,000	1,100,000	-	
Street Lighting				
Misc. pole fixture replacement	25,000	40,000		Change in cost estimate
Signal Pole Painting (3 every other year)	20,000	-	20,000	Change in cost estimate
Pathways & Parking Lots				
Pathway maintenance	180,000	180,000	-	
Acorn 2 east lots	70,000	-	70,000	Change in cost estimate
Communications				
General Audio/Visual Equipment	10,000	10,000	-	
License Center				
General office equipment (minor)	1,000	1,000	-	
Office chair replacement	2,100	2,100	-	
Security camera replacement	5,000	5,000	-	
Facility Improvements (2017/2018)	200,000	600,000	(400,000)	Change in cost estimate
Community Development				
Inspection vehicles	19,000	19,000	-	
Computers	2,500	2,500	-	
Office furniture	1,000	1,000	-	
Permitting software	-	25,000	(25,000)	Annual Support - moved to Op. Budget
Water				
Field Computer Replacement/add	5,000	5,000	-	
Valve Operator and Vacuum	70,000	-	,	NEW ITEM
Booster Station Rehabilitation	1,600,000	475,000		Combines multiple items into one
Water main replacement	500,000	1,000,000	(500,000)	Temporarily reduced
Sanitary Sewer				
Water truck (1/2 cost)	-	60,000		Moved to 2019
#209 1-ton "Flat Bed Crane"	40,000	-		New (missed in previous CIP's)
Pipe Camera	75,000	-	75,000	NEW ITEM
Lounge LS Rehab	350,000	350,000	-	
Fernwood LS Rehab/Roof/Tuckpoint	60,000	-		Moved from 2017
Sewer main repairs	1,000,000	1,300,000	(300,000)	Change in cost estimate
I & I reduction	100,000	100,000	-	
Storm Sewer				
#172 Zero Turn Dixie Chopper	15,000	14,000	1,000	Change in cost estimate
#168 Compost Turner	-	225,000		Moved to 2020
Walsh Storm station Upgrades	450,000	540,000		Change in cost estimate
Pond improvements/infiltration	275,000	350,000		Change in cost estimate
Storm sewer replacement/rehabilitationPMP	350,000	400,000		Change in cost estimate
Leaf Composte Site water quality improv.	-	75,000	(75,000)	Moved to 2021

	С	urrent CIP 2018 Amount	Prior Year 2018 <u>Amount</u>	<u>Diff.</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Golf Course					
Replace clubhouse		-	1,000,000	(1,000,000)	Moved to 2017 Decision
Irrigation system upgrades 1960/1988/1994		30,000	26,000	4,000	Change in cost estimate
·	\$	9,738,905	\$ 13,399,085	\$ (3,660,180)	•








Prepared by: Engineering Department May 10, 2017

2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

* City of Roseville Engineering Department
For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:







REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: 05/15/2017

Item No.: 7.d

Department Approval

City Manager Approval

Cttyl x. mill

Item Description: Consider License Center Proposed Lease Terms and Expansion Option

BACKGROUND

At the April 17, 2017 City Council Meeting, the Council made the decision to discontinue current efforts to secure a new site to address the space needs for the License Center and other city functions. Given this decision, City Staff recommends that the City proceed with renewing a long-term lease for the License Center at its current location along with an option to expand into an adjacent space.

6

4

5

This site remains a preferred location given our customer base, proximity to the general campus area, and overall familiarity with the existing property owner – Gaughan Companies. The decision to remain in our current location features a number of important topics that warrant discussion including:

9 10 11

12

8

- Evaluating Proposed Lease Terms
- ☐ Considering an Expansion Option
- ☐ Identifying Desired Capital Improvements

131415

Each of these topics is discussed in greater detail below.

16 17 18

19

20

21

Proposed Lease Terms

The City is currently paying a lease rate of \$19.14 per square foot including CAM charges (2016 rate). Gaughan Companies originally proposed a new lease rate of \$24.35 which would have represented a 27% increase, although it would have also featured smaller increases thereafter. They noted that the higher amount was based on improved market conditions compared to 2012 when the last lease was renewed, as well as lease terms they've recently secured at similar properties.

222324

Since making their original offer, Gaughan Companies has agreed to accept a counter-offer that is more favorable to the City both for cash-flow purposes as well as the overall sum of payments over the lease term. The terms are summarized in the table below.

26 27

25

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	2018	<u>2019</u>	2020	<u>2021</u>
Gaughan Proposal	19.14	24.35	24.71	25.06	25.40	25.75
% Incr.	n/a	27.2%	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%
City Proposal	19.14	21.05	23.16	25.06	25.40	25.75
% Incr.	n/a	10.0%	10.0%	8.2%	1.4%	1.4%

** Depicts the amount per square foot

Based on these terms, the annual lease amount for the existing space will be as follows:

Option #1: Existing Space						
	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Leased Square Footage: Motor Vehicle	2,315	2,315	2,315	2,315	2,315	2,315
Leased Square Footage: Passports	1,017	1,017	1,017	1,017	1,017	1,017
Leased Square Footage: Addition	-	-	_	_	-	-
Total Square Footage	3,332	3,332	3,332	3,332	3,332	3,332
Lease Rate per SF: Gross	\$ 19.14	\$ 21.05	\$ 23.16	\$ 25.06	\$ 25.40	\$ 25.75
Proposed Lease Rate Increase (Annual)		10.0%	10.0%	8.2%	1.4%	1.4%
Annual Lease Amount	63,774	70,139	77,169	83,500	84,633	85,799

Expansion Option

 Alternatively, if the City chooses to secure additional adjacent space under the same lease terms, the annual lease amount will be as follows:

Option #2: 1,587 SF Addition						
	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Leased Square Footage: Motor Vehicle	2,315	2,315	2,315	2,315	2,315	2,315
Leased Square Footage: Passports	1,017	1,017	1,017	1,017	1,017	1,017
Leased Square Footage: Addition	-	1,587	1,587	1,587	1,587	1,587
Total Square Footage	3,332	4,919	4,919	4,919	4,919	4,919
Lease Rate per SF: Gross	19.14	21.05	23.16	25.06	25.40	25.75
Annual Lease Amount	63,774	103,545	113,924	123,270	124,943	126,664

Because the expansion option potentially involves the relocation of an existing tenant, the City would likely have to pay for relocation costs that could amount to tens of thousands of dollars.

Capital Items

As identified in the License Center Strategic Plan as well as in recent discussions, the decision to remain in the current location should be accompanied by a discussion on the types of capital improvements that will allow the City to expand its passport and auto dealer services, while also improving the customer service experience.

The existing space on the motor vehicle side would likely require a new service counter configuration with more emphasis on separating quicker transactions from lengthier ones, improving customer privacy, the replacement of customer waiting area chairs, worn workstations and carpeting, and painting of the walls.

The new space would likely be reconfigured to accommodate a larger passport service counter and customer waiting area, along with more work space for the auto-dealer function. This area would also require new carpeting and painting of the walls, and involve the partial tear-down of existing walls.

At this time, Staff has not sought architectural or design services nor have we requested any formal construction/furnishing estimates. But based on casual conversations and previous experience, it could take an investment of \$250,000 or more to fully take advantage of the space and restore customer service levels to what they used to be. The License Center has approximately \$1 million in available cash reserves that could be used for this purpose.

66

75

Staff will be available at the Council meeting to provide additional information and address any inquiries.

68 POLICY OBJECTIVE

69 Not applicable.

70 FINANCIAL IMPACTS

71 See above.

72 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

City Staff recommends that the City enter into a 5-year lease with Gaughan Companies, and secure additional adjacent space.

REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION

For discussion purposes only. Formal approvals will come at a subsequent date.

77 Prepared by:

Attachments:

Chris Miller, Finance Director
A: Proposed Lease Addendum #6

Addendum Six

This Addendum Six shall amend the Retail Lease Agreement ("Lease") dated December 30, 1999 between Roseville Center Limited Partnership (the "Landlord"), and City of Roseville (the "Tenant").

In consideration of the mutual covenants herein contained and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the parties hereto agree that said Lease shall be and hereby is amended to include the following:

- 1. <u>Lease Extension.</u> Tenant hereby wishes to renew its lease; the lease termination date shall be extended to May 31st, 2022.
- 2. <u>Premises Size.</u> Tenant's Leased Premises consists of approximately 3,332 rentable square feet.
- 3. Gross Rental Schedule: The Gross Rental Rate shall be amended as follows:

```
a. 6/1/17 – 5/31/18 $5,844.88 per month ($21.05 psf)
b. 6/1/18 – 5/31/19 $6,430.76 per month ($23.16 psf)
c. 6/1/19 – 5/31/20 $6,958.33 per month ($25.06 psf)
d. 6/1/20 – 5/31/21 $7,052.73 per month ($25.40 psf)
e. 6/1/21 – 5/31/22 $7,149.91 per month ($25.75 psf)
```

- 4. Option to Expand. During the term of this agreement or any renewal thereof, Tenant shall have the right of first refusal to lease suite 2733 consisting of approximately 1,587 which will hereafter be known as (the "Expansion Space"). Upon Tenant exercising its right to expand Landlord and Tenant shall come to mutually agreed upon terms regarding Expansion Space.
- 5. <u>Expansion Space Delivery Condition.</u> Upon Tenant exercising its Expansion Option Landlord shall deliver Option Space in "as-is" condition.
- 6. <u>Relocation Costs.</u> In the event the Expansion Space is occupied by an existing occupant Tenant shall be responsible to relocate said occupant within the Shopping Center based on the terms of said occupants lease agreement.
- 7. Article 4. of Lease Addendum 5 shall be null and void upon full execution of this addendum.

All other terms and conditions set forth in the lease, riders and addendums thereto shall remain as provided herein.

LANDLORD

Lexington Shoppes Limited

Partnership, a Minnesota limited partnership						
Its:						
Agreed:						
Date:						
TENANT						
City of Roseville						
Its:						
Agreed:						
Date:						

Agenda Date: 5/15/2017

Agenda Item: 7.e

Department Approval

Yai & Callin

City Manager Approval

Item Description:

Review and provide comment on the last chapter of a comprehensive technical update to the requirements and procedures for processing subdivision proposals as regulated in City Code Title 11 (Subdivision) (PROJ-0042)

BACKGROUND

1

14

16

17

18

2 The consultants engaged to lead the update of Roseville's Subdivision Code, Mike Lamb and

3 Leila Bunge, have drafted updated code text based on the feedback received from the

4 Planning Commission and City Council regarding the annotated outline of Roseville's

existing code; the minutes of the City Council's March 20 discussion are included as Exhibit

6 A. The Planning Commission reviewed the last chapter of the draft subdivision code at its

7 meeting of May 3, and tabled the final review and public hearing of the complete draft until

8 its upcoming meeting of June 7; the draft minutes of the May 3 discussion are included with

9 this report as Exhibit B.

The draft of the subdivision code update is included with this report as Exhibit C. Because

presenting a comprehensive update like this entirely in the typical *track changes* format

would be difficult to read, the proposed update is presented side-by-side with the existing

code text. In this way, each provision of the proposed draft (in the right-hand column) can be

compared to the existing text (in the left-hand column). Because the draft presented to the

15 City Council has been updated since May 3 based on the Planning Commission's feedback,

such edits to the draft subdivision code are typographically emphasized with strikethrough

and underlined text representing deletions and insertions, respectively.

PLANNING DIVISION COMMENT

Many of the proposed amendments to the subdivision code involve modernizing outdated

20 language and removing technical requirements that are better regulated elsewhere. As has

been discussed, this is a process of finding a balance between providing applicants

information pertinent to how Roseville regulates plats and gathering elsewhere information

about how Roseville regulates the developments that might be facilitated by the plats. Also,

24 the entire contents of Chapter 1104 of the existing code are proposed to be distributed to

other parts of the code (as exemplified by the May 8 discussion of "platting alternatives" and

26 minor plats). Once this process of draft review is complete, Planning Division staff intends to

prepare appropriate applications and a template for a standard developer agreement that can

be reviewed with the final draft of the updated code to verify that they appropriately

29 complement the updated Subdivision Code.

- Roseville's Public Works Department staff is reviewing the entire proposal to ensure that the revised subdivision code and their forthcoming design standards manual combine to provide all of the necessary regulations without unintended gaps and unnecessary redundancies. The draft subdivision code update has been developed with the design standards manual as a reference; therefore any changes to the draft resulting from this review are expected to be technical in nature. A final draft of the Public Works Design Standards manual will be prepared after this review to account for the balance struck between subdivision regulations and development regulations in the Subdivision Code.
- The City Attorney has been reviewing the draft, in general, as well as responding to specific questions. Nevertheless, prior to final action on the proposed subdivision code update, the City Attorney will be reviewing the entire proposal to ensure that the final ordinance is sound.
- Proposed amendments to the park dedication regulations have been a major focus of review; perhaps, then, there is value in detailing the rationale behind the proposed changes here.
- 44 <u>Purpose section</u> (line 253 in Exhibit C)

- The existing code does cite legislation that enables the City to require park dedication as a condition of approval of a subdivision application, but the citation in incomplete. It puts a subdivider on notice that Roseville will exercise its authority to require park dedication, but it appears to ignore the City's obligation to ensure that dedications of land or cash bear a rough proportionality to the recreational need created by the proposed subdivision or development.
- Subdivision 2c of the enabling legislation further requires the City to demonstrate an "essential nexus" or a connection between the requirement to dedicate land (or cash in lieu of land) and the public purpose being served by the requirement. This is why the proposed draft of the subdivision code specifies that Roseville will consult its Comprehensive Plan, Parks and Recreation System Master Plan, and Pathways Master Plan when deciding whether to accept land or fees—or both—in satisfaction of the park dedication requirement. This seems particularly important when the Parks and Recreation System Master plan only discusses acquisition of additional park land in one general area (i.e., the southwestern quadrant of the city) and one other specific location (i.e., connecting Villa Park with Reservoir Woods), and when the Pathways Master Plan identifies several planned-but-undeveloped pathway connections throughout the community

Condition to Approval section (line 254 in Exhibit C)

- This is where the proposed draft notifies subdividers that Roseville intends to utilize its park dedication authority and attempts to clarify the attributes of a subdivision proposal that qualify it for park dedication. While Planning Commissioners had some uncertainty about the rationale behind the current "more than 1 acre" qualifier for park dedication, the proposed draft does not intend to change the qualifying attributes; further refinement of the current draft may be necessary if it seems at odds with the existing provisions or if the qualifying size needs to be adjusted.
- The proposed draft of this section also attempts to clearly demonstrate "nexus" by expanding on the description of how the City will evaluate the most appropriate

application of the park dedication requirement for each proposal. The draft language specifies that Roseville will review how each particular location compares to the City's approved plans and policies for expansion of recreational facilities as it weighs its park dedication options.

Amount to be Dedicated section (line 255 in Exhibit C)

• This section was initially interpreted as a statement of the monetary value of cash dedications; consequently, the proposal called for the replacement of the existing code text with a reference to the Fee Schedule, which is where the cash fees are established. Parks and Recreation Department staff explained that the existing text refers to the amount of land to be dedicated, so the text was restored and amended for greater clarification.

If this existing code language does pertain to *land* dedications, however, the current figures seem to be inconsistent with the required fees in lieu of land dedication. As a specific example, the existing code says that 5% of land area will be required for dedication in non-residential subdivisions, but the 2017 fee schedule requires a cash alternative equal to 10% of the value of the land area in non-residential subdivisions. By contrast, one would expect 5% of the land area to exactly equal 5% of the land value. Since this was a topic of concern by the Planning Commission, Planning Division staff reviewed City Council Ordinance 1061, which established the park dedication requirements, and found that the current land dedication figures are unchanged from their original adoption in 1989. Because the cash alternative has increased significantly since then, it would seem that a current analysis is necessary to update the land dedication figures to demonstrate the "rough proportionality" required by statute.

Payment in Lieu of Dedication section (line 257 in Exhibit C)

- In order to formalize the process of making and receiving payment of a park dedication fee, the updated subdivision code proposes to require a developer agreement with each plat approval, and proposal to make itemization of park dedication fees a component of the development agreement. This is the reason for the reference to City Code Section 1102.07, which is where the developer agreement provision was located at the time the current draft was prepared; this citation may need to change as the final draft of the subdivision code update is prepared.
- This section is also proposed to include a reference to the Fee Schedule for specification of the applicable park dedication fees.

Line 258 in Exhibit C

• This section has historically acknowledged the City Council's authority to waive or reduce park dedication fees to facilitate development of affordable housing units, presumably because affordable housing development is particularly sensitive to costs and not because residents of affordable housing do not demand recreational facilities. The proposed draft strikes this provision, however, in recognition of the City Council's recent adoption of the Public Financing and Business Subsidy Policy that outlines a variety of ways to support development without waiving fees.

- The Parks and Recreation Commission reviewed the proposed revision to the park dedication
- regulations at its meeting of May 2, 2017. A memo from Parks and Recreation Department
- staff detailing that review and illustration of how the review would affect the proposed draft
- of the subdivision code update is included with this RCA as Exhibit D, but the main points
- are as follows:

120

121

124

125

126

127

128

136

- Keep the Park Dedication Ordinance simple, clear and concise
 - Do not use language that creates potential for negotiation
- Limit the opportunity for potential conflicts and competition for funds (funds are limited and unpredictable)
 - Limit Park Dedication to land for parkland purposes only, cash or combination (not to expand to trails, pathways,) for use within park boundaries only
 - Add back the Land Dedication amount of 5% and 10% (this should be very specific)
 - Important that all Park Dedication issues are referred to the Parks and Recreation Commission

129 PUBLIC COMMENT

- Despite being noticed as a public hearing, no members of the public were present at the April
- 5 or May 3 Planning Commission meetings to comment on the proposed draft subdivision
- code. At the time this report was prepared, Planning Division staff has not received any
- communications from the public beyond an email received prior to the Planning
- 134 Commission's March 1 review of the annotated outline. That email has not been reproduced
- for inclusion with this report, but it remains part of the public record.

REQUESTED DISCUSSION

- Discuss the final chapters of the draft subdivision code update, as amended based on the
- Planning Commission's guidance regarding these same sections. Council's input on the draft
- will be incorporated into the final draft reviewed by the Planning Commission at the June 7,
- 140 2017, public hearing.

Exhibits: A: 3/20/2017 City Council

minutes

B: 5/3/2017 Planning Commission

draft minutes

C: Chapters 1103 & 1104 of the draft

Subdivision Code update

D: Comments from Parks & Recreation

Director

E: Park Dedication Statute language

Prepared by: Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd

651-792-7073

bryan.lloyd@cityofroseville.com

Blog

d. Discuss the Annotated Outline Illustrating Present Structure of the Subdivision Code and How a Rewritten Code Might Differ; Provide Input to Guide the Drafted of an Updated Ordinance (PROJ-0042)

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd introduced Mike Lamb, consultant with Kimley-

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd introduced Mike Lamb, consultant with Kimley-Horn, undertaking the rewrite of the city's subdivision code as detailed in the staff report and related attachments.

<u>Title 11 (Exhibit A), Subdivisions and his Memorandum dated February 23, 2017 (Exhibit B)</u>

Mr. Lamb provided an overview of the five major topics needing review: language in code (definitions) and their consistency with other city code; minor subdivision process as discussed by the Planning Commission and of interest to the City Council; Park Dedication mechanism and how to address that moving forward; Design Standards and any revisions of those standards embedded in code; and those areas for reliance on the Public Works Design Standards Manual currently in process.

In the City Council's review of Attachment A, Mr. Lamb clarified that the first column represented current code and right hand column provided suggestions from his office and staff. Mr. Lamb further clarified that those are just suggestions, and not recommendations, but simply based on experience and requiring City Council feedback. Mr. Lamb also referenced excerpts provided from the subdivision ordinances in the metropolitan area and language from those that might make sense for Roseville as the basis for edits. Mr. Lamb further referenced some case studies provided form other metropolitan communities and other first-ring suburbs from out-of-state and staff conversations with those cities as well. Mr. Lamb concluded by stating the intent for this to be an outline review only to help staff and his firm determine the proper direction to pursue from the City Council's perspective.

Exhibit A – Title 11

Page 1

In terms of definitions, Mayor Roe suggested the fewer the better in this portion of code; whether by referencing the Public Works Design Standards Manual or through existing code (e.g. street or design standard components) where those definitions would come out.

Mayor Roe also suggested a general reference to other city documents (e.g. 2008 Pathway Master Plan) rather than specifically referencing them in the subdivision code; with agreement by Councilmember Willmus.

Pages 2 & 3

Along with Mayor Roe, Councilmembers McGehee, Willmus and Laliberte were in agreement that they did not want to consider an administrative review process; continuing that approval process through the Planning Commission and City Council or just the City Council as per current practice.

Page 4

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Lloyd confirmed that any and all application forms and instructions would be revised based on new processes or checklists.

Specific to minor lot splits and associated checklists for one lot splitting into two, Ms. Collins advised that currently if everything on the checklist was addressed, they were approved administratively.

Councilmember McGehee stated her intent that everything, including those minor lot splits, be put back on the table, opining that the checklist should be presented to the City Council in agenda packets indicating any or all items checked off, especially related to drainage, sewer and tree preservation.

Even with minor subdivisions, Councilmember Willmus noted one area of struggle was an informal sketch provided (e.g. on the back of a napkin) versus a more detailed and formal application and information process, showing established locations for lot lines, drainage easements, and any other work that would be done on the front end before being brought to the City Council for approval.

As suggested by City Manager Trudgeon, and confirmed by Councilmember Willmus, this would include a survey.

As decision makers, Councilmember Willmus noted that the additional information could have a significant impact on a decision one way or another based on that level of detail provided; and opined that a survey shouldn't create an excessive burden for a property owner looking to divide their lot; and he preferred having that detail available. Councilmember Willmus stated that from his perspective, that detail did not include being advised that the watershed district had yet to sign off, especially if and when those properties may involve part of a larger drainage system or issue within the community. With not receiving that information upfront, Councilmember Willmus noted that it left out part of the picture, and stated his interest in having that broader picture from materials presented to the City Council, whether or not it created a financial burden on a property owner.

Ms. Collins sought clarification on the current process used for minor subdivisions and plats, asking if the City Council was okay with that as long as additional information was provided upfront.

Mayor Roe agreed, referencing recent examples of plats coming before the City Council.

Without objection, and confirmed by Mr. Lamb, the City Council did not support any administrative process for minor subdivisions; with an up-to-date checklist included at the Planning Commission and/or City Council levels.

With confirmation by staff, Mayor Roe clarified that open house language would parallel that approved in other sections of code.

Councilmember Willmus addressed plat requirements for lots on existing streets and requiring municipal services, and whether some accommodation was needed for private drives built to city street specifications but privately maintained.

Mr. Lloyd advised that there was nothing in the subdivision code; and noted that delved into the area of uncertainty as to whether a subdivision created a flag lot to access properties behind one street or a private street with public streets minus a right-of-way; seeking City Council direction on that point.

Councilmember Willmus stated that he didn't want to revert to flag lots, but recognized situations where larger lots are subdivided and become smaller, this may be a tool that could help accommodate it and create less expense for surrounding property owners and the broader community as well. Councilmember Willmus opined that the city had it within its purview and public works specifications for those situations.

Mayor Roe stated that he wasn't against private driveway as a solution.

Councilmember Willmus noted that there was no language so specific that it would exclude private drives by calling it a street.

Mayor Roe noted that platting wasn't required for a minor subdivision if other requirements were met, with the current process not requiring plats for minor subdivisions.

City Manager Trudgeon noted that it involved a process for document and layout approval, but was not a formal plat.

Regarding item 4, Mayor Roe noted it stated that it seemed obvious from language providing that a divisional lot didn't require minimum standards.

Mr. Lamb clarified that the excerpt from the City of St. Paul could be edited accordingly for further consideration by the City Council. Mr. Lamb noted the need for placing the burden on public works when changing slopes to address any water/sewer issues, or frozen pipes or water being pumped up hill creating low water pressure.

Mayor Roe noted the need to ensure the close attention of the Public Works staff on those specific issues.

Page 5

Mr. Lamb noted some design standards that would be unique to code.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Lamb confirmed the need to address them in the subdivision code versus in general city code (e.g. block sizes).

Page 6

Page 3 of 7

Mayor Roe clarified that lot sizes were addressed in the city's zoning code, not its subdivision code.

Page 6 (Park Dedication)

Mr. Lamb clarified some of this section, noting that references to more formal plans and policies the city had adopted specifically or as part of comprehensive plan updates superceded the subdivision code language developed in 1980. Mr. Lamb noted that he had found only three occasions since that inception of land dedication for park or open space, with the remainder of the situations resulting in cash in lieu of land.

Mr. Lamb suggested consideration of a way that the subdivision code could help support larger connectivity of the city itself (e.g. connecting trails or sidewalks) in a broader nature than by simply setting a process and approach for cash applied to a park or requiring additional recreation maintenance. Mr. Lamb noted that the idea was to consider that larger picture and use the subdivision as a tool to achieve that larger connectivity.

Mayor Roe suggested the intent may be to expand the definition of land contribution that could be beyond a specific plot of land, but involve trail connections.

Mr. Lamb agreed that was the intent, and used several examples in Roseville (e.g. McCarron's Lake area or Old National Guard Armory parcel) as examples of larger tracts of land that could be subdivided, and possibly include another street with a possible trail to connect with the existing system.

Councilmember Willmus questioned if that didn't lead to situations with additional land being donated to areas of the city that already have built-out park and trail infrastructure, limiting the ability to capture dollars to use them in areas of the city without as many amenities available.

While each would be considered on a case by case basis, Mr. Lamb advised that the focus using existing policies, would be to determine how this code as one of many city tools, could be used to improve connectivity throughout the community. Mr. Lamb noted that the comprehensive plan now separated the city into sixteen districts, some of which had no park, and others having limited park space (e.g. Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area). Mr. Lamb noted the need for more sidewalks and amenities to provide synergy in connecting around lakes and development parcels. While agreeing that it differed by location, Mr. Lamb suggested a guiding master plan or park/trail document to help the city code reach its purpose.

Councilmember Willmus spoke against such guiding documents; opining that there were areas in the community without that infrastructure, but could allow them to acquire property on the other side of town.

Mayor Roe noted that the dollars could still be part of this; with Mr. Lamb concurring that it was intended as one other option.

Councilmember Willmus stated that he didn't want to mandate steering each application to the Parks & Recreation Commission for a recommendation, which he considered being set in place if this was pursued.

Mayor Roe opined that this simply provided more options on the land side of the equation, and clarified that ultimately land decisions lay with the city, noting that the city didn't need to approve any land donations that it didn't want.

Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of having more options available, and therefore including that as a tool in the subdivision ordinance.

Mayor Roe noted that it didn't need to be an either/o situation, but could be a combination. Mayor Roe further clarified that there were limits on how money in the Park Dedication fund could be used that needed to be adhered to in any situation.

Page 8

Mayor Roe agreed with the suggestion to remove any references to city staff salaries and refer to the fee schedule.

Chapter 1104.06

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Lloyd advised that this suggestion was as a result of the recent Ramsey County Survey workshop attended by staff related to appropriate signature lines for plats being recorded and the need to allow for property owner signatures sufficient for those being sold between preliminary and final plat recording.

After further discussion and deliberation, it was determined that the subdivision code reference this requirement, but clarified that it was not responsible for the property owner's recording of documents.

Under advice by City Attorney Gaughan, while the city has the responsibility to make sure properties transfer legally and not trip up transactions, he noted it was an issue for the property owner. City Attorney Gaughan stated support for reference Ramsey County in code to this affect, but not to specifically address it beyond protecting the city to make sure plats are recorded properly.

Page 8 (other)

Councilmember McGehee noted her natural interest in tree preservation that she continued to find amazingly unsuccessful to-date.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee specific to solar orientation, Mr. Lamb referenced some of the ideas provided form other communities, while recognizing that green infrastructure continued to evolve. Mr. Lamb provided some examples from the City of St. Paul toward those efforts (e.g. stormwater park) and how parks and open space continued to change, as well as solar orientation as an owner issue. Mr. Lamb noted the differences for Roseville as a fully-developed

1 community versus a newer community with those thins available to be addressed 2 accordingly (e.g. solar orientation and existing tree canopies). 3 4 Councilmember McGehee stated her interest in green infrastructure and use of 5 stormwater ponding to provide for space versus underground tank installation, 6 creating amenities for parks and open space. 7 8 Mr. Lamb recognized that this subdivision code was a revision and intended as an 9 update, and could not do everything for everybody. However, Mr. Lamb suggest-10 ed that is could be more active in focusing on redevelopment and connectivity, in-11 cluding rethinking stormwater requirements as a public amenity. 12 13 Mayor Roe suggested their consideration under the "other" park dedication side; 14 while being careful not to mix too many things together. 15 16 Discussion ensued on the triggers for tree preservation at this time under current 17 ordinance and related to preliminary plat, but not triggered by the minor subdivi-18 sion process as currently written, but through the trigger of new home construc-19 tion. 20 21 Councilmember McGehee stated her interest in making that tree preservation trig-22 ger part of the minor subdivision process to avoid clear cutting. 23 24 Councilmember Willmus stated that he wasn't interested in having that discussion 25 now and was not prepared to make that change tonight, noting that this had been 26 discussed when adopting the tree preservation ordinance at which time it was de-27 cided by the City Council majority to leave minor subdivisions out of the picture. 28 29 Councilmember Laliberte concurred, advising that she also did not come prepared 30 tonight to consider that issue. 31 32 Mayor Roe suggested additional rationale and a better understanding of that issue 33 when this returns to the City Council in its next draft. 34 35 Mr. Lloyd clarified that with larger plats, street infrastructure and existing house 36 pads often determined tree preservation and placement versus minor subdivisions 37 with one large lot and tree preservation not kicking in until new construction of a 38 new home. 39 40 Ms. Collins noted that while there may be no plans upfront for tree preservation, 41 at the final stage of new home development, the parcel would become subject to 42 it. 43 44 Councilmember Laliberte stated that she still considered that the right way to go, 45 opining that the person initially subdividing the lot may have insufficient infor-46 mation to make a prudent decision.

1	As part of that discussion, Councilmember McGehee noted the need to avoid
2	clear-cut situations developing under some subdivisions, creating neighborhood
3	issues at that point and not providing them with any protection.
4	
5	Mr. Lamb thanked the City Council for their good feedback, advising that he and
6	staff anticipated returning to the April 5, 2017 City Council meeting with the first
7	draft of a new subdivision ordinance.
8	

1	a.	PROJF0042: Request by the City of Roseville to approve a comprehensive
2		technical update to the requirements and procedures for processing
3		subdivision proposals as regulated in City Code Title 11 (Subdivisions)
4		Chair Murphy continued the public hearing for Project File 0042 at approximately
5		6:45 p.m. held over from the April 5, 2017 meeting.
6		
7		Community Development Director Kari Collins introduced Leila Bunge,
8		consultant with Michael Lamb of the Kimley-Horn team to guide tonight's
9		discussion of these proposed revisions. Ms. Collins noted that the first portion of
10		proposed subdivision ordinance, as reviewed by the Planning Commission at their
11		last meeting, would be reviewed by the City Council at their May 8, 2017 meeting.
12		
13		Member Gitzen asked staff to provide a draft preliminary clean copy for further
14		review of the actual proposed code at a later meeting; with concurrence by the
15		remainder of the commission.
16		
17		After the May 8th City Council meeting, Ms. Collins advised that City Council
18		comment would also be incorporated into the next iteration and could be sent out
19		to the commission via email for them to provide their feedback to the City Council
20		for anticipated ordinance enactment at the May 22 nd City Council meeting to meet
21		the deadline of the moratorium expiring May 31, 2017.
22		
23		Mr. Lloyd noted that the City Council's review had been delayed as there was
24		insufficient time on their last meeting schedule; with the new timeframe for review
25		at the May 8 th and 15 th meetings, and enactment at the May 22 nd meeting.
26		
27		Chair Murphy asked when the commission would receive an update from last
28		night's review of the document (e.g. park dedication fees) by the Parks &
29		Recreation Commission.
30		
31		Mr. Lloyd advised that the meeting minutes and comments were still being
32		assembled by Parks & Recreation Department staff today; but he would insert the
33		more obvious items of their review at that point in tonight's discussion.
34		
35		Attachment C Document Review (continued)
36		At the commission's last review of the document on April 5th, the last item
37		covered was Page 23, Section 148 that would serve as the intended starting point
38		for tonight's review. However, Mr. Lloyd initiated tonight's review by
39		summarizing the revisions made at that April meeting seeking confirmation or
40		additional feedback before proceeding to the later sections.
41		
42		In his review of the subdivision code earlier today, Mr. Lloyd advised that he
43		could find no reference to "corner lots" anywhere else in the subdivision code and
44		therefore, may not be needed even though it was referenced as a definition in
45		accordance with the updated zoning code.

Based on tonight's Variance Board discussion, Member Kimble asked if there was 1 2 anywhere else in the subdivision code or other areas of code that addressed corner and reverse corner lots. 3 4 5 Mr. Lloyd advised that it was addressed elsewhere in city code, and had been mentioned in the past when the subdivision code had minimum lot size standards; 6 but as of last year's revisions had been relegated to the zoning code and therefore 7 no longer defined elsewhere. 8 9 Page 3, Section 23 10 Member Bull noted that in this section and throughout the document wording had 11 been changed from "applicant" to owner (sole, part or joint owner). However, if a 12 company owns a parcel and they're located elsewhere in the country, perhaps 13 involving a board of directors of shareholders, Member Bull asked how they could 14 have an agent representative applying on their behalf, opining that this language 15 seemed awkward. 16 17 Mr. Lloyd responded that the City Attorney had advised that the most important 18 element was to make sure the owner was making the application; with common 19 20 practice for a local agent or developer to carry that application forward on their behalf. Mr. Lloyd noted that the city had to allow for that and that it could be 21 22 further clarified in application forms accordingly. 23 Member Bull opined that "owner" seemed to have a lot of references; but stated 24 his preference for a definition of "owner" and "registered agent" or a proper name 25 26 for that role. 27 Member Kimble questioned that suggestion, noting the difference in identifying 28 the ownership of a lot versus someone else processing the application that 29 wouldn't change that ownership; and opined that the proposed language seemed 30 appropriate from her perspective. Member Kimble noted the common practice for 31 a local representative to present and process an application on behalf of an owner; 32 noting that the owner had to be the applicant even if they delegated the processing 33 to someone else. 34 35 Mr. Lloyd suggested that the City Attorney's recommendation probably 36 recognized that very situation. 38 39 Member Gitzen agreed, noting that the definition was of "owner" not "applicant."

37

40 41

42

43

With confirmation by Member Bull, Member Daire asked if Member Bull's intent was to revise wording to define sole or joint owners or designated representatives. Member Bull noted that references used to be for "applicant" and "developer" but now had been changed enmass to "owner."

44 45 46

Page 4, Section 24

Mr. Lloyd noted the change to facility versus right-of-way, with deference to local 1 2 and/or state traffic enforcement as allowed to define non-motorized or nonvehicular traffic (e.g. bicyclists) but without need to specifically define in the 3 4 subdivision code. 5 6 Page 4. Section 29 and Page 7, Section 50 Using the Java request as an example, Member Bull addressed consideration of a 7 preliminary plat as an item rather than a process. As another example in line 50, 8 Member Bull noted that it states "...shall submit a preliminary plat..." noting that 9 you don't submit a process, but instead a packet of documents. Member Bull 10 noted the need for consistency. 11 12 Mr. Lloyd advised that this was described in the Procedures Chapter; and opined 13 that the suggested language provided sufficient context and definition of 14 preliminary plats as a standalone definition that further definition was not needed 15 specific to preliminary plat documents. 16 17 Member Gitzen suggested leaving the old definition in place, separating 18 preliminary plats from plats; with concurrence by Members Kimble and Bull. 19 20 Mr. Lloyd clarified that the rationale was to eliminate preliminary plat by 21

recognizing that it was a preliminary version with the plat serving as the final version.

Member Bull suggested differentiating pre and final versions of the plat.

Member Kimble suggested the commission may be getting too detailed on language specifics.

Page 5, Sections 32, 33 and 34

Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Bunge addressed the definition of "street" to "public way" to incorporate what was involved without defining in this document and encompassing all types of public ways and facilities.

Member Gitzen stated that he was not comfortable with this proposed language; and instead suggested "public passageway, such as...designed for travel by pedestrians or vehicles." Member Gitzen further suggested removing the right-ofway language (Section 33). When thinking of a public or private right-of-way, Member Gitzen opined that most people think of an easement; where in this case it was referring to a physical street, creating confusion when later on in the document rights-of-way area referred to as an easement. suggested changing language accordingly in Section 32 and removing Section 33 in its entirety.

By consensus, Sections 33 and 34 were recommended for removal.

43 44 45

22

23 24 25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

1	Page 8, Section 56, 57
2	Mr. Lloyd advised that application instructions were made more consistent with
3	other plat applications.
4	
5	If the intent is to remove archaic language, Member Daire suggested changing
6	"utilized" to "used" or "using;" with Mr. Lloyd suggesting " are alternatives to
7	plat procedures."
8	
9	Chair Murphy asked staff to review April meeting minutes to review if "common
10	wall" had been removed or not; however Member Gitzen noted that the City
11	Council in their review could make the decision whether or not to remove it.
12	
13	Mr. Lloyd concurred, advising that this marked up version had been provided to
14	the City Council for their review and deliberation.
15	
16	Page 9, Section 58
17	As with Section 57, Mr. Lloyd advised that the approval could be by the City
18	Manager as consistent with other zoning applications; with proposed language to
19	strike that involvement in the process and refer to administrative approval by the
20	Community Development Department.
21	
22	In the previous definition, Member Gitzen noted that it asked for a survey for
23	recombinations; with Mr. Lloyd responding that after approval, submission of a
24	survey was required to ensure consistency, while applications only require a sketch
25 26	plan format.
26 27	At the request of Member Citzen, Mr. Havd advised that he had discussed a
27 20	At the request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Lloyd advised that he had discussed a
28 20	timeline with the City Attorney and his suggestion was to provide one even if city
29 30	staff was unable to control it at all times. Mr. Lloyd advised that the City Attorney had pointed out that there are times when it could be enforced, such as by
30 31	withholding a building permit until completion of the process. Mr. Lloyd
32	suggested adding language in, with that timeframe pending, in Sections 57, 58 and
33	60, establishing a timeline for recording a plat.
34	oo, establishing a timeline for recording a plat.
35	As an example, Member Kimble referenced a recent alternate plat project she was
36	involved with in the City of St. Paul and their requirement for recording within
37	two years, with a one year extension possible before having to go through the
38	process again.
39	r
40	Chair Murphy stated that sounded beyond reasonable from his perspective.
41	
42	Mr. Lloyd clarified that a longer timeline makes sense from his perspective if the
43	Planning Commission and City Council were making decisions intended to be in
44	place for perpetuity; and as time changes things there would be occasions that it

would be prudent to have an expiration for approvals.

1	Member Bull stated that he was reluctant to specify anything that might give
2	anyone the idea that that had two years to record a plat.
4	Member Gitzen suggested deferring to the City Attorney for the timeline.
5	
6 7	Chair Murphy suggested, with consensus of the body, a one year timeline for recording ALL plat, or to seek an extension.
8	
9	Page 9-10, Section 59 (Consolidations)
10	Mr. Lloyd suggested language changes for minor plats when discussing their
11	purpose, with draft language talking about subdivisions or a consolidation of lots.
12	As discussed last time, Mr. Lloyd suggested it would be prudent to regulate lot
13	sizes and with consolidations a platting of underlying lot boundaries that they be
14	addressed accordingly.
15	
16	Member Gitzen noted that you couldn't get rid of underlying lot boundaries.
17	
18	Mr. Lloyd provided an example of consolidating adjoining lots for tax purposes,
19	but if a house was built across those adjacent lots it could create future problems.
20	Mr. Lloyd advised that the intent was to take a more explicit approach to regulate
21	development according to platted versus tax parcels to avoid development on top
22	of parcel lot lines, making consolidations no longer a platting alternative.
23	
24	At the request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Paschke confirmed that in some cases, a
25	property owner was required to replat such lots now.
26	
27	For tracts of land that are under common ownership and involving several platted
28	lots with a few tax parcels, Mr. Lloyd advised that there was a need to make sure
29	those parcels area platted in such a away to remove property ownership
30	boundaries. If development doesn't violate those boundaries, Mr. Lloyd advised
31	that an owner hadn't been required to replat them to-date, but in the future would
32	be required to do so; and opined that reconsolidation of platted lots served as a plat
33	even if a simple plat versus a platting alternative.
34	M 11 1 4 14 4 14 14 11 1 1 1 1 C 4 12 11 1 C
35	Mr. Lloyd noted that Item #4 would remain and be further edited based on City
36	Attorney advice, and to eliminate the City Manager involvement as with other areas of the subdivision code.
37	areas of the subdivision code.
38	Pages 11 12 Section 61
39 40	Pages 11-12, Section 61 At the request of Chair Murphy specific to park dedication. (Item P. V. Miner Plats)
40 41	At the request of Chair Murphy specific to park dedication (Item B.V Minor Plats) Mr. Lloyd reviewed proposed language intended to subdivide parcels as noted.
4 i 42	ivii. Lioya reviewea proposea language intended to subdivide parcers as noted.
42 43	As a general question, Member Daire asked if this revised subdivision ordinance
43 44	would prohibit the creation of flag lots.

1 2	Mr. Lloyd responded that he thought so, but they were regulated in a later chapter yet to be discussed by the commission; but as a subdivision standard would
3	specifically be prohibited other than on a case-by-case variance review.
4	Daniel 10 Gardina (0
5	Page 12, Section 62
6	Specific to Item 2.ii, Mr. Lloyd addressed rational to protect time and resources
7	involved with repetitive inquiries. At the request of Member Sparby, Mr. Lloyd
8	clarified that if an application came forward under changed circumstances, it
9	would be seen as a new application process in the regulatory framework and would
10 11	not bar an owner from coming forward with an application.
12	Member Sparby stated that he would prefer putting such a bar in the language for
13	the submission process rather than relying on a one year ban.
14	the submission process rather than relying on a one year ban.
15	Member Bull agreed with Member Sparby, opining that he didn't like thins that
16	limited the ability of citizens to seek relief if there was a process in place to
17	administer and recognize differences in applications.
18	administer and recognize differences in approactions.
19	Chair Murphy stated that he was unsure if he agreed with Member Sparby as long
20	as the Board of Adjustments (City Council) was available for that review, this
21	provision also served to protect the city's staff time and resources with repeat
22	applications. With an appeal process to the Board of Adjustments, Chair Murphy
23	opined that it accomplished the goal and a safety net for citizens to be heard.
24	
25	Member Bull referenced a development proposal that was submitted many
26	different times from 2007 through 2016 substantially the same thing and requiring
27	considerable review time.
28	
29	Member Sparby suggested lowering the submission application to six months
30	rather than one year, noting that the application's composition or staff may change
31	and free an applicant to move forward.
32	
33	Specific to submitting substantially the same application, Members Kimble, Bull
34	and Gitzen, along with Chair Murphy agreed with the one year provision; with
35	Member Sparby deferring to his colleagues.
36	
37	Mr. Lloyd advised that the intent was to avoid serial applications when the
38	ultimate goal is turning one lot into two via this subdivision ordinance; thus staff's
39	recommendation for five years unless submitting the application as a major plat
40	process, but not for minor plats.
41	
42 42	In Section 63, Mr. Lloyd again addressed the time limitation.
43 44	In this section, as well as in Chapter 1102 05 (see 2.24) Marshar City and Section 1102 05 (see 2.24) Marshar
44 45	In this section, as well as in Chapter 1102.05 (page 24), Member Gitzen referenced
45	that necessary data for a final plat (major or minor) and Ramsey County

1 2	requirements; and suggested language as previously noted for a review process at a surveyor's office.
3	
4 5	Mr. Lloyd concurred, noting that would be addressed in the next iteration as it was changed to ordinance formatting rather than this side-by-side comparison; and to
6 7	track changes from a global perspective.
8	Member Gitzen stated that his concern was that an ordinary citizen if not familiar
9 10	with development projects may not be aware of the filing process.
11	As the global process for preliminary plat review and approval proceeds, Mr.
12	Lloyd suggested deletion of Section 120. However, Mr. Lloyd agreed that the
13	expanded context needed to consider the process and filing with Ramsey County
14	and how the applicant could be informed of that process, probably in the
15	application form itself.
16 17	Member Gitzen reiterated the need in the subdivision ordinance to inform
18	applicants of the process beyond just filing the final plat; with Member Kimble
19	suggesting an overview of steps to be followed, including timelines and fees either
	in the application form or subdivision code itself.
20 21	in the application form of subdivision code itself.
22	Mr. Lloyd stated that he envisioned the application materials would describe the
23	process more fully and provide the applicant with a timeline.
24	process more rany and provide the approach with a timeline.
25	Member Gitzen asked that staff refer to that process in this subdivision code so
26	applicants understand the process.
27	approxima una processi.
28	At the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Lloyd confirmed that staff was running a
29	parallel path in developing application forms and once the new ordinance is in
30	place would inform applications of what was needed.
31	1
32	Member Bull asked that staff be consistent in distinguishing the process from the
33	result as it related to the platting process.
34	
35	Page 13, Section 65 (Developer Open House Meeting)
36	Using the recent Minnesota State Fair Interim Use application with many different
37	property owners rather than ownership by the State Fair of those sites, Member
38	Bull noted his concern in using "owner" versus "applicant."
39	
40	Mr. Paschke reiterated the process involved co-applicants and clarified that the
41	process was different for open houses, with applicants moving forward with an
42	open house without requiring the involvement of the property owner. Mr. Paschke
43	noted that this simply intended as the first touch as to whether or not a project was
44	worth moving forward. Also in the case of the State Fair, Mr. Paschke advised
45	that each property owner provided a letter of support for the State Fair as the
46	applicant.

1	
2	In Section 66, Member Kimble alluded to the developer open house, while Section
3	65 still says that the owner shall hold the open house.
4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
5	Mr. Lloyd duly noted that error and advised it would be changed to be made
6	consistent and would restore it to "applicant."
7	Total and the state of the stat
8	With Member Bull noting that the next line stated "owner," and their
9	responsibilities, Member Kimble noted that in some cases, the developer will not
10	close on a property until approvals area received at which time the closing would
11	occur on the land and they would then become the owner.
12	
13	In that circumstance, Member Sparby noted that the applicant needed authority
14	from the owner to move forward with the open house.
15	
16	From a practical standpoint, Mr. Lloyd noted that it would be unwise for an owner
17	to move forward without an agreement in place.
18	
19	In order to ensure that relationship is in place, Member Sparby suggested retaining
20	"applicant" in the new language.
21	
22	Mr. Lloyd advised that the owner would likely be aware of and even involved in
23	the open house process; but from his perspective the distinction was the open
24	house process itself held prior to the city becoming involved in a major way. Mr.
25	Lloyd noted the intent of the open house as a venue for public review of a proposal
26	before an application was made for approvals. If an applicant is seeking
27	approval/denial on a property, Mr. Lloyd opined that it was important for the
28	owner to be explicitly identified.
29	
30	Member Sparby stated that he'd support "owner/applicant."
31	
32	Member Kimble suggested "applicant and/or owner."
33	
34	Page 18, Section 83
35	Again, Member Gitzen asked that the applicant be made aware of the process and
36	timeline.
37	
38	Page 19, Sections 84 and 86
39	Member Kimble noted the distinctions in "hardship" and "practical difficulty,"
40	with Mr. Lloyd explaining that they were intentionally different based on State
41	Statute related to land use and zoning and recent revisions to their language from
42	"hardships" to "practical difficulty." However, Mr. Lloyd advised that State
43	Statutes continue to talk in places about "unusual hardships" making that
44	definition hard to determine in Statute. Mr. Lloyd advised that he had taken this
45	language verbatim from State Statute after his conversation with the City Attorney.

Member Gitzen stated that he didn't think State Statute defined it; and asked staff 1 2 to confirm that the Statute was still in place or if it had been further amended as they had been discussing. Member Gitzen opined that "undue hardship" 3 4 represented a strict definition, but he thought the legislature's intent was to revise it to "practical difficulties" in both cases. Member Gitzen opined it was worth 5 verifying whether or not the standards of each were totally different if not. 6 7 In Section 86, in response to Member Sparby, Mr. Lloyd advised that his 8 understanding was that specific grounds for a variance were no applicable to case 9 law; with Member Sparby suggesting that staff further review whether the four 10 11 factors were considered in case law as factors to consider. 12 Mr. Lloyd clarified that the City Attorney had been supportive of those four 13 factors as viable, specific grounds as long as the city was certain nothing else was 14 being left out of that consideration. 15 16 17 Page 21, Sections 88, 89 and through Section 113 Again, as previously noted, Mr. Lloyd reiterated that the ordinance formatting 18 would provide a sense of how everything fit together globally and with necessary 19 20 data for preliminary plats included in the major plat process, noted that this provision was no longer needed. 21 22 Page 23, Chapter 1102.03, Section 114 (Requirements governing approval of 23 Preliminary plats) 24 While a discussion with city the City Attorney and Public Works staff was 25 26 indicated, from a global perspective, Mr. Lloyd suggested these items made more sense in Chapter 1102.01 related to processing of any subdivision. However, Mr. 27 Lloyd opined that it made sense to retain Section 115 to apply conditions of 28 approval as noted, with further review to edit out any remaining redundancies. 29 30 To make an area completely safe, Member Gitzen suggested changing the wording 31 if it remained to a different standard than "adequate drainage. 32 33 Mr. Lloyd confirmed that he proposed to move that to Chapter 1102.01. 34 35 36 Page 24, Section 120 Mr. Lloyd noted removal as it was discussed in the procedures section for final 37 38 plats. 39 Page 26, Section 134 40 While this may seem like an archaic section, Mr. Lloyd clarified that "streets" are 41 42 not automatically accepted as a public street until staff ensures they meet city standards and requirements. 43

In talking about developer agreements, Member Gitzen asked how or whether this

Page 9 of 17

applied.

44 45

1	
2	Mr. Lloyd opined that this applied more broadly, such as public streets obtained
3	through annexation, but for practical purposes, neither he nor the City Attorney
4	could see any reason to retain it.
5	could see any reason to retain it.
6	With Member Kimble asking if it could occur as private roads became public, Mr.
7	Lloyd agreed that could be addressed in the development agreement; but under
8	those circumstances, it may be prudent to retain it.
9	those eneumstances, it may be prodent to read it.
10	Chapter 1102.06, Page 27, Section 137 and Page 29, Section 147 (Required Land
11	Improvements)
12	Mr. Lloyd noted the intent to remove these sections for inclusion in the Public
13	Works design standard manual without further specificity in the subdivision code.
14	Recess
15	Chair Murphy recessed the meeting at approximately 8:07 p.m. and reconvened at
16	approximately 8:12 p.m.
17	Attachment C Document Review (new)
18	Section 137, Chapter 1102.07 – (Chapter 1102.06 of current code)
19	Page 30, Section 153, Item #7
20	Since there is no definition of "parkways," Member Kimble asked if that was clear
21	to everyone.
22	to everyone.
23	Mr. Lloyd advised that this was an error in tracking changes, and advised that the
23 24	intent was to use "boulevard."
2 4 25	intent was to use boulevard.
26	In Section 155, Mr. Lloyd suggested, as previously suggested by the commission,
27	to allow for rain gardens and natural stormwater features if and when they make
28	design-sense rather than requiring turf grass or sod, as long as they stabilized soils
29	and met Public Works design requirements.
30	and met rubbe works design requirements.
31	Member Daire asked if an abutting property owner on a street was allowed to plant
32	decorative grasses or blooming boulevards.
33	decorative grasses of biodining boulevards.
34	Mr. Lloyd responded that there was no codified position on that, and if and when
35	property owners are interested in these front yard and/or public right-of-way areas,
36	they could work with the Public Works Department to seek their approval of their
37	intended plantings, as this was their domain.
38	intended plantings, as this was then domain.
39	Page 31, Sections 153 (page 30) and 157
	Member Gitzen opined that these sections appeared to be the same and questioned
40	whether both were needed.
41 42	whether both were needed.
	Mr. Lloyd responded that Section 152 was under the actocomy of street
43 44	Mr. Lloyd responded that Section 153 was under the category of street improvements, but offered to talk more with the Public Works Department as to
	<u> </u>
45 46	whether the reference should be "parkway" indicating a grass area between driving
46	lanes (e.g. Wheelock and Lexington Parkways).

1	
2	If so, Member noted the need for a definition for "parkway.
3	
4	In Section 157, discussion ensued about the intent and definition of a "boulevard"
5	as a non-paved part of a right-of-way (except for driveways, pathways or
6	walkways) and therefore was distinct or if it needed to be distinguished or
7	removed.
8	
9	Member Kimble suggested this be given further consideration.
10	
11	In Section 160 related to public utilities, Member Gitzen suggested this section
12	was more applicable to the Public Works Department than the Planning
13	Commission.
14	
15	On the flip side, Chair Murphy noted that this may still include a requirement for
16	public comment at the commission or City Council level even if the Public Works
17	Department served as the presenter based on their technical skills to make a
18	recommendation to the commission.
19	
20	Member Gitzen opined that the Planning Commission wouldn't need to review it
21	with Member Sparby recommended language such as, "suggested after study by
22	the Public Works Department and recommendation by the Planning Commission;'
23	agreeing that study seemed out of the commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Lloyd noted
24	that a public hearing could be held at the City Council meeting, with the
25	consensus of the body being for the Public Works Department to provide a repor
26	to the Planning Commission for recommendation to the City Council.
27	
28	In Section 156, Mr. Lloyd noted the recommended changes were from the Public
29	Works Department for a "licensed" rather than a "registered" professiona
30	engineer.
31	
32	Page 35, Line 161
33	At the request of Chair Murphy, Mr. Lloyd reviewed the rationale for leaving this
34	door open for occupancy with the potential for homes being completed prior to
35	final paving of a street, with possibly only the first lift applied.
36	
37	Page 36, Chapter 1103 (Design Standards)
38	After minimal discussion, the consensus of the body was to remove Chapters
39	1103.01 (Street Plan) and 1103.02 (Streets)and refer to the Public Works design
40	standards manual.
41	
42	Mr. Lloyd noted there were some areas with distinction despite the chapter name
43	of "streets," and the application of physical facilities and rights-of way widths
44	required for functional classifications in residential subdivisions or commercia
45	plats, that may provide relevant information for someone layout out a plat.
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

However, Member Gitzen noted that curvatures, horizontal street lines and other items were design standards.

With further discussion, Mr. Lloyd advised that the Public Works Department had supported moving physical facility requirements into their design standards, but information guiding layout of a plat document they had felt some value in preserving it here. However, Mr. Lloyd advised that he would further consult with them for the next iteration of the code.

Members Gitzen and Kimble noted the preference to have information in only one place to avoid redundancies as well as inconsistencies.

Mr. Lloyd agreed, but noted the need for balancing where that most current information should be located and suggested it may be helpful to have those parameters listed here without going into too much detail.

Member Gitzen suggested having them in one place or the other, but if included in both documents, they needed to match; but stated his preference for references in code to the manual.

Member Kimble suggested the categories could remain in the subdivision code by reference guiding people to the Public Works design manual.

Chair Murphy advised staff to make the City Council aware of their strong recommendation without significant review of Chapters 1102.01 and 1102.02 was for the subdivision code to recognize the categories while referring to the Public Works design manual to avoid duplication or errors.

Page 38, Sections 194 – 197

Mr. Lloyd advised that he needed to revisit street widths with the Public Works staff, but thought it was helpful to leave street widths in the subdivision code.

In reflecting on his experience as a transportation planner with the City of Minneapolis, Member Daire noted the relationship with street width, snow accumulation and placement of mailboxes. As he had shared with Community Development Director Collins earlier for her in turn sharing his comments with the Public Works Department, Member Daire suggested some consideration should be given parking control with vehicle and street access, especially with the advent of more on-street bike lanes and what standards should apply for them. Member Daire noted the correlation with various street widths and types when considering their location to ensure the safety of cyclists. Since this is an area of considerable concern for him, Member Daire suggested city street width standards be raised; including how to deal with three lane streets and turn lanes to keep traffic moving smoothly as well as bike lanes. Therefore, Member Daire advised that his suggestion had been for the Public Works Department to consider more specificity in its design standards.

1	
2	Since this is the way of the future, Member Kimble offered her agreement, noting
3	that it wasn't addressed now (e.g. Ramsey County roadways) and noted a number
4	of items in the current subdivision code that are not yet addressed in Public Works
5	design standards at this point.
6	design standards at this point.
7	In summary, Chair Murphy directed staff to migrate as appropriate.
8	in summary, chair writiphly directed start to hingrate as appropriate.
9	Page 39
10	-
	Member Gitzen suggested these also be included in Public Works design standards.
11	standards.
12	Page 40 Charter 1102 04 (Egganants) Section 200
13	Page 40, Chapter 1103-04 (Easements), Section 209
14	Member Gitzen suggested revised language to read." Easements at least a total of
15	10' wide along the front and side, and corner lot lines as well as centered on rear
16	and side lot lines."
17	
18	At the request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Lloyd advised that he would consult with
19	the Public Works Department whether a statement was still needed about
20	reflection or anchor points.
21	
22	In Section 210, Member Gitzen suggested rewording "drainage easements" to
23	allow stormwater easements on platted land.
24	
25	Page 41, Chapter 1103.05 (Block Standards), Section 213
26	With Roseville being a fully-developed community, Mr. Lloyd advised that the
27	Public Works Department's suggestion was to remove the upper boundary and use
28	the more realistic 900' long block as the upper boundary.
29	
30	In Section 215, Member Gitzen questioned how and what was being designated or
31	what plan was referenced.
32	
33	<u>Page 42, Section 226</u>
34	At the request of Member Daire, Mr. Lloyd noted this was referring to private
35	streets and their physical requirements the same as that of a public street in case
36	they should eventually become public versus private.
37	
38	As discussion ensued, staff was directed to clarify that any references to 20' width
39	for private streets should be corrected to ensure they were a minimum of 24' to
40	accommodate emergency vehicles.
41	
42	Page 43, Section 229
43	Member Gitzen noted that side lot lines were "perpendicular" to front lot lines.
44	1 1
45	Page 43. Section 233

1 As previously noted, flag lots are no longer allowed unless considered on a case-2 by-case basis under a variance.

In Section 235, Member Daire sought clarification of the definition for "major thoroughfares."

Mr. Lloyd noted this was a topic from the Variance Board meeting, and addressing single-family homes versus parking lots and circulation for turnarounds, especially related to county roadways; and current requirements for a turnaround area to avoid backing out directly into the roadway. Mr. Lloyd advised that the definition of "major thoroughfare" is yet to be determined.

At the request of Member Gitzen as to whether or not the comprehensive plan defined types of streets, Mr. Lloyd clarified that as it applied in the past, it was specific to county roadways, but advised that he would continue to work with the Public Works staff to determine the appropriate level tied to functional classifications for definition or description in some other way.

Page 44, Section 237

 Mr. Lloyd advised that shoreland lots were not referenced in Chapter 1017 of the shoreland zoning code.

Page 45, Chapter 1103.07 (Park Dedication), Section 242

Noting reference to "city" at its discretion, Member Sparby asked if this should be defined as the "City Council" instead; with Mr. Lloyd clarifying that ultimately it did mean the City Council upon recommendation by the Parks & Recreation Commission, but ultimately a decision for the City Council. Mr. Lloyd advised that the only reason "city" was used rather than specifying the "City Council," was that other participants were involved in the process.

Member Sparby stated his preference for more specificity to indicate the City Council rather than suggesting city staff made that determination.

Pages 45-46, Section 243

Mr. Lloyd asked that the commission disregard italicized text intended for last night's Parks & Recreation Commission discussion.

At the request of Member Daire, Mr. Lloyd clarified that the trigger involved the net increase in development sites and land area of at least one acre or more. Mr. Lloyd further clarified the current process versus the proposed process for minor plat processes that now would require a public hearing before the City Council took action on a park dedication. With concerns raised by Member Daire on impacts to homeowners attempting to subdivide their property and being subject to a park dedication fee, Mr. Lloyd put the conditions of approval in context in a practical sense of most of those situations falling below the threshold of one acre that would trigger this provision. On the flip side, Mr. Lloyd noted that a minor

1 2	plat process could be used in a large commercial plat if no new infrastructure or rezoning was required, with such a sizable development potential then exempted
3	from park dedication requirements if following Member Daire's logic.
4	Defense in 1 st sint 2 De 1 of December Commission working Chair Manufacture
5	Referencing last night's Parks & Recreation Commission meeting, Chair Murphy
6	asked how the Planning Commission could be aware of the results of their meeting
7	specific to the subdivision code and whether or not the Planning Commission
8 9	agreed with their recommendations short of individual comments to the City Council.
9 10	Council.
11	Ms. Collins advised that staff could provide that feedback to the Planning
12	Commission via email as soon as it became available, at which time if there was
13	anything drastic, individual commissioners could advise staff accordingly. While
14	recognizing the timing conflicts, Ms. Collins noted that the meetings are archived
15	on the city website for optional viewing by the commission as well.
16	on the city website for optional viewing by the commission as well.
17	Noting that meeting minutes were not posted on the website until approved, Chair
18	Murphy expressed interest in getting something similar to meeting minutes from
19	last nights Parks & Recreation Commission meeting for review as soon as possible
20	in order to review them and provide comment to the City Council.
21	ı J
22	Mr. Lloyd advised that he anticipated having a distilled version at a minimum
23	included in the next iteration of the draft subdivision code.
24	
25	Chair Murphy asked that, upon receipt of that information by individual Planning
26	Commissioners, they communicate their feedback directly to Community
27	Development Department for forwarding to or directly to the City Council.
28	
29	In Section 244, Mr. Lloyd briefly summarized the bulk of his conversations with
30	Parks & Recreation staff earlier today related land area or fees in lieu of park
31	dedication. Whatever the results, Mr. Lloyd opined that it was important that the
32	subdivision code still reference land for dedication and advised that it would not be
33	removed in new language, but still tie land dedication with cash dedication as
34	approved in the city's fee schedule annually.
35	
36	In Section 245, Item C, at the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Lloyd advised that
37	State Statute dictated a nexus or connection between what was being required as
38	park land or fee dedications and what it was intended for, previously at 7% and
39	now increased to 10%.
40	D 47 C .: 247
41	Page 47, Section 247
42 42	Should this section survive, Chair Murphy noted an error in still referencing the
43 4.4	HRA rather than the EDA.
44 4 <i>5</i>	Manchan Vinchla animal that it goomed that Describe didn't would be
45	Member Kimble opined that it seemed that Roseville didn't want to encourage

development, especially in the City Council not supporting waiving park

45

46

dedication fees or any permit fees for affordable housing projects that typically 1 have huge funding gaps. 2 3 4 Ms. Collins advised that in 2016, the EDA had adopted a policy, with their determination that the only fee they'd consider waiving would be Sewer Access 5 Charges (SAC) credits, but had stated loud and clear that that waiving any other 6 fees would not be considered under their policy. 7 8 Given that strong agreement by the City Council, Mr. Lloyd advised that the 9 language was being removed from the revised subdivision code. 10 11 12 General Discussion At the request of Chair Murphy, Mr. Lloyd reviewed the next steps and inclusion 13 of Parks & Recreation Commission comments on park dedication and other 14 pertinent areas; reconciling Public Works standards and any potential conflicts on 15 a staff level; City Attorney recommendations; and tonight's comments of the 16 17 Planning Commission in the next iteration into a regular text version of the subdivision code to see how provisions now flow. 18 19 20 Member Daire advised Mr. Lloyd that he found reference to "private streets" on page 13 of Attachment D, Item 10; with Mr. Lloyd advising that he would make 21 sure this was not an oversight in the Public Works design standards. Mr. Lloyd 22 assured Member Daire that a minimum street width of 24' for private streets was 23 considered standard, and was supported by the Fire Marshal too. 24 25 26 Discussion ensued as to whether the Planning Commission was prepared to make a recommendation to the City Council tonight on a revised subdivision code given 27 the tight timeframe; and whether or not to conclude the public hearing tonight. 28 29 Ms. Collins recommended recommendation for approval contingent on further 30 City Attorney review and review by the Public Works Department for 31 redundancies or inconsistencies and additional feedback from the Parks & 32 Recreation Commission. Ms. Collins advised that another option would be to 33 schedule a special Planning Commission meeting to meet the May 31, 2017 34 moratorium deadline. 35 37 Chair Murphy stated that he was not comfortable recommending approval to the 38 39

36

City Council of a document the Planning Commission had yet to see or review in its entirety. Chair Murphy recognized the goal, but questioned if that would create significant problems if that goal wasn't met.

40 41 42

Further discussion ensued related to timing, including receipt of City Council feedback in addition to those others noted.

43 44 45

46

Member Bull opined that the Commission had to have time to perform their role before making a recommendation.

1	
2	Member Daire noted the considerable time spent on this project, expressing his
3	interest in seeing it through.
4	
5	If another session was needed, Ms. Collins asked individual commissioners to
6	submit their comments to staff before the meeting to allow time for a more
7	judicious review by staff.
8	
9	While that usually worked, Member Bull opined that sometimes those individual
10	suggestions were interpreted by staff into text but didn't necessarily reflect what
11	had been recommended.
12	
13	Ms. Collins suggested comment sections from individual commissioners so the
14	suggestions wouldn't be incorporated into text until they received a collective
15	review and consensus.
16	
17	Chair Murphy suggested waiting to discuss this until all written items were
18	available and then project a timeframe from their.
19	
20	Ms. Collins noted that the City Council would want the commission to fee
21	comfortable with their recommendation.
22	
23	Chair Murphy opined that he didn't see the train going off the track if the
24	moratorium was suspended on May 31st before the Planning Commission made
25	their recommendation to the City Council in early June if delayed to their nex
26	regular commission meeting.
27	MOTION
28	
29	Member Daire moved, seconded by Chair Murphy, to continue the public hearing until the next scheduled regular Planning Commission meeting of
30 31	June 5, 2017.
32	June 3, 2017.
33	Ayes: 6
34	Nays: 0
35	Motion carried.
36	monom carried,
37	Chair Murphy thanked Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Bunge for facilitating tonight's
38	discussion.
39	

Title 11 - Subdivisions

173.	CHAPTER 1103: DESIGN STANDARDS	CHAPTER 1103: DESIGN STANDARDS
174.	1103.01: Street Plan	1103.01: Street Roadway Plan
175.	1103.02: Streets	1103.02: Streets Rights-of-Way
176.	1103.021: Minimum Roadway Standards	1103.021: Minimum Roadway Standards
177.	1103.03: Alleys and Pedestrianways	1103.03: Pathways
178.	1103.04: Easements 1103.05: Block Standards	1103.04: Easements
179. 180.	1103.06: Lot Standards	1103.05: Block Standards 1103.06: Lot Standards
181.	1103.07: Park Dedication	1103.07: Park Dedication
101.	1103.07. Faik Dedication	1103.07. Fair Dedication
182.	1103.01: STREET PLAN:	1103.01: STREET ROADWAY PLAN:
	The arrangement, character, extent, width, grade and	New streets and related pathways rights-of-way shall-
	location of all streets shall conform to the	comply to a master street plan that is based on_
	Comprehensive Plan, the approved standard street	conform to the City's Comprehensive Plan and
	sections, and plates of applicable chapters, and shall	Pathways Master Plan to promote a safe, efficient,
	be considered in their relation to existing and planned	sustainable, and connected network for all users and
	streets, to reasonable circulation of traffic, to	modes.
	topographical conditions, to runoff of storm water, to	
	public convenience and safety and in their	
	appropriate relation to the proposed uses of the area	
183.	to be served. (Ord. 216, 7-5-1956)	
	1402.02 CTREETS	1102 02 STREETS RIGHTS OF WAY
	1103.02: STREETS:	1103.02: STREETS RIGHTS-OF-WAY:
		PW Dept to review this section to see if it should
		be moved to the PW Design Standards manual.
		se moved to the FW besign outland with mandain
184.		
154.	A. Right of Way: All rights of way shall conform to	A. Right-of-WayWidth: All-The width of all rights-
	the following minimum dimensions (1995 Code):	<u>rights-of-of-</u> way shall conform to the following
		minimum dimensions corresponding to the
		functional classifications of the roadways therein-
185.		(1995 Code) :
105.	Collector streets 66 feet	Principal Arterial as determined by the
	Concetor streets 00 leet	applicable jurisdiction governing the roadway
186.		approache janearenen governing the routivay

КС	A EXHIBIT C	Minor Arterial as determined by the
		Minor Arterial as determined by the applicable jurisdiction governing the roadway
		applicable jurisdiction governing the roddway
		Collector -streets 66 feet
187.	Local streets 60 feet	Local-streets 60 feet
188.	Marginal access streets 50 feet	Marginal Access access streets 50 feet
	B. Horizontal Street Lines: Where horizontal street	B. Horizontal Street Lines: Where horizontal street
	lines within a block deflect from each other at	right-of-way lines within a block deflect from each
	any one point more than 10° there shall be a	other at any one point more than 10° there shall
	connecting curve. Minimum center line	be a connecting curve. Minimum center line
	horizontal curvatures shall be:	horizontal curvatures shall-be conform to the
		following minimum dimensions corresponding to
		the functional classifications of the roadways
189.		therein:
	Collector streets 300 feet	Principal Arterial as determined by the
		applicable jurisdiction governing the roadway
		Minor Arterial as determined by the
		applicable jurisdiction governing the roadway
190.		Collector-streets 300 feet
	Minor streets 150 feet	Minor streets Local 150 feet
191.	C. Tangents: Tangents at least 50 feet long shall be	Marginal Access feet C. Tangents: Tangents at least 50 feet long shall be
	introduced between reverse curves on collector	introduced between reverse curves on-collector-
	streets.	streets Collector rights-of-way.
192.		
	D. Center Line Gradients: All center line gradients	D. Center Line Gradients: All center line gradients
	shall be at least 0.5% and shall not exceed on:	shall be at least 0.5% and shall not exceed-on the
		following gradients corresponding to the
193.		functional classifications of the roadways therein:
104	Collector streets 4 %	Minor Arterial %
194.	Minor streets 6 %	Collector-streets 4 % Minor streetsLocal 6 %
195.		Marginal Access
	E. Connecting Street Gradients: Different	E. Connecting Street Gradients: Different connecting
	connecting street gradients shall be connected	street gradients shall be connected with vertical
	with vertical parabolic curves. Minimum length,	parabolic curves. Minimum length, in feet, of these
	in feet, of these curves, shall be 15 times the	curves, shall be 15 times the algebraic difference in
	algebraic difference in the percent of grade of	the percent of grade of the two adjacent slopes. For
	the two adjacent slopes. For minor streets, the	minor streets, the minimum length shall be 7 ½ times-
196.	minimum length shall be 7 ½ times the algebraic	
	<u>I</u>	1

IC.	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	KIIIDIL C	
		difference in the percent of grade of the two	the algebraic difference in the percent of grade of the
		adjacent slopes.	two adjacent slopes.
	F.	Minor Streets: Minor streets shall be so aligned	F. Minor Streets: Minor streets shall be so aligned
		that their use by through traffic will be	that their use by through traffic will be discouraged.
197.		discouraged.	
	G.	Street Jogs: Street jogs with center line offsets of	G.E.Street-Jogs: Street Right-of-way jogs with center
		less than 125 feet shall be prohibited.	line offsets of less than 125 feet shall be
198.			prohibited.
	Н.	Intersections: It must be evidenced that all street	H. Intersections: It must be evidenced that all street
		intersections and confluences encourage safe	intersections and confluences encourage safe and
199.		and efficient traffic flow.	efficient traffic flow.
	I.	Alleys: Alleys are not permitted in residential	REMOVED
		areas unless deemed necessary by the City	
200.		Council.	
	J.	Half Streets: Half streets shall be prohibited.	I. Half Streets: Half streets shall be prohibited.
		Wherever a half street is adjacent to a tract to be	Wherever a half street is adjacent to a tract to be
		subdivided, the other half of the street shall be	subdivided, the other half of the street shall be-
		platted within such tract. In cases where the	platted within such tract. In cases where the entire-
		entire right of way has been dedicated to the	right-of-way has been dedicated to the public but the
		public but the property of the owner and	property of the owner and applicantowner is located
		applicantowner is located on one side of such	on one side of such street, the owner and-
		street, the owner and applicantowner shall be	applicantowner shall be required to grade the entire
		required to grade the entire street in accordance	street in accordance with the plans to be approved by
		with the plans to be approved by the Public	the Public Works Department, but the owner and
		Works Director under the provisions of Section	applicantowner shall only be required to deposit-
		1102.07, but the owner and applicantowner shall	payment for one-half of the Public Works Director's
		only be required to deposit payment for one-half	Department's estimated costs of the improvements
		of the Public Works Director's estimated costs of	required under this Title. Building permits shall be-
		the improvements required under this Title.	denied for lots on the side of the street where the
		Building permits shall be denied for lots on the	property is owned by persons who have not entered
		side of the street where the property is owned by	into an agreement with the City for the installation of
		persons who have not entered into an	the improvements required under this Chapter.
		agreement with the City for the installation of	
201.		the improvements required under this Chapter.	
			1

KC	A EXHIBIT C	
	K. Reserved Strips: Reserved strips controlling	REMOVED
	access to streets are prohibited. (Ord. 216, 7-5-	
202.	1956; amd. 1995 Code) (Ord. 1358, 1-28-2008)	
	1103.021: MINIMUM ROADWAY STANDARDS:	1103.021: MINIMUM ROADWAY STANDARDS:
		PW Dept to review this section to see if it should
		be moved to the PW Design Standards manual.
203.	The following minimum dimensional standards shall	The following minimum dimensional standards shall
	apply to all existing City and private roadways when	apply to all existing City and private roadways when
	newly constructed or reconstructed. All local	newly constructed or reconstructed. All local
	residential streets must be constructed to a width of	residential streets must roadways shall be constructed
	32 feet from the face of curb to face of curb. In cases	per the requirements of the Public Works-Department_
	where this width is impractical, the City Council may	Design Standards Manual. In cases where this width is
	reduce this dimension, as outlined in the City street	impractical, the City Council may reduce this
	width policy. However, for purposes of emergency	dimension, as outlined in the City-street roadway
	vehicle access, no street shall be constructed to a	width policy. However, for purposes of emergency
	width less than 24 feet. In order to preserve the	vehicle access, no-street roadway shall be constructed
	minimum clear width, parking must be restricted	to a width less than 24 feet.
	according to subsection A of this Section.	
		PC recommended including bike lane widths and width for 3 lane roads.
204.		
	A. Signage Requirements: "No parking" signs shall	A. Signage Requirements Parking Prohibition by
	be installed in accordance to the following:	Roadway Width: "No parking" signs shall be
205.		installed in accordance to the following:
	32 feet Parking permitted on both sides of	32 feet Parking permitted on both sides of the
206.	the street (no signs needed).	street roadway (no signs needed).
207.	26-32 feet No parking on one side of the street (signs on one side).	26-32 feet No parking on one side of the <u>street</u> roadway (signs on one side).
	24-26 feet No parking on both sides of the street	24-26 feet No parking on both sides of the street
208.	(signs on both sides).	(signs on both sides). B. Right Of Way Width: For City streets, the
	B. Right-Of-Way Width: For City streets, the right of	
	way shall be in accordance with Section 1103.02	right-of-way shall be in accordance with Section
	of this Chapter. County Roads must comply with	1103.02 of this Chapter. County Roads must comply
	the Ramsey County right-of-way plan. State	with the Ramsey County right of way standards.
	highways must comply with the Minnesota State	State highways must comply with the Minnesota
209.	Highway Department right-of- way plans.	State Highway Department right-of- way standards.
	C.B. Cul-De-Sacs: If there is not a looped road system	C. Cul-De-Sacs: If there is not a looped road system
210.	provided and the street is greater than 200 feet	provided and the street a proposed right-of-way
210.		

	in leng	th, an approved turnaround shall be	is greater than 200 feet in length, an approved
	constru	ucted.	turnaround shall be constructed.
	1.	Length: Cul-de-sacs shall be a maximum	Length: Cul-de-sacs shall be a maximum
		length of 500 feet, measured along the	length of 500 feet, measured along the
		center line from the intersection of	center line from the intersection of origin
211.		origin to the end of right-of-way.	to the end of right-of-way.
	2.	Right-Of-Way: Cul-de-sac right-of-way	2. Right-Of-Way: Cul-de-sac right-of-way
		shall extend at least 10 feet outside of	shall extend at least 10 feet outside of the
212.		the proposed back of curb.	proposed back of curb.
	3.	Standard Design: The standard cul-de-	3-2. Standard Design: The standard cul-de-sac
		sac shall have a terminus of nearly	shall have a terminus of nearly circular
		circular shape with a standard diameter	shape with a standard diameter of 100_
213.		of 100 feet.	<u>120</u> feet.
	4.	Alternatives to the Standard Design: An	4. Alternatives to the Standard Design:
		alternative to the standard design, to	An alternative to the standard design, to
		accommodate unusual conditions, may	accommodate unusual conditions, may be-
		be considered by the Public Works	considered by the Public Works Director
		Director and shall be brought to the City	Department and shall be brought to the City
		Council for approval based on the Public	Council for approval based on the Public-
		Works Director's recommendation.	Works Director's Department's
214.			recommendation.
	5.	Islands: As an option, a landscaped	5. Islands: As an option, a landscaped
		island may be constructed in a cul-de-sac	island may be constructed in a cul-de-sac-
		terminus. A minimum clear distance of	terminus. A minimum clear distance of 24 feet
		24 feet shall be required between the	shall be required between the island and the
		island and the outer curb. No physical	outer curb. No physical barriers which would-
		barriers which would impede the	impede the movement of emergency vehicles-
		movement of emergency vehicles shall	shall be allowed within the island. No parking
		be allowed within the island. No parking	shall be allowed in a cul de sac terminus with
		shall be allowed in a cul-de-sac terminus	a landscaped island unless reviewed and
		with a landscaped island unless	recommended for approval by the Fire
		reviewed and recommended for	Marshal. (Ord. 1358, 1-28-2008)
		approval by the Fire Marshal. (Ord.	
215.		1358, 1-28-2008)	

KC	AL	KNIDIL C		
216.	110	03.03: ALLEYS AND PEDESTRIANWAYS:	110	03.03: PATHWAYS:
	A.	Alleys: Where permitted by the City Council, alley	REN	10VED
		rights of way shall be at least twenty (20) feet		
		wide in residential areas and at least twenty-four		
		(24) feet wide in commercial areas. The City		
		Council may require alleys in commercial areas		
		where adequate off- street loading space is not		
217.		available.		
	B.	Pedestrianways: Pedestrian rights of way shall be	A.	Pathways: Pathway rights of way easements shall
		at least twenty (20) feet wide. (Ord. 216, 7-5-		be at least twenty (20) feet wide. (Ord. 216, 7-5-
218.		1956; amd. 1995 Code)		1956; amd. 1995 Code)
219.	110	03.04: EASEMENTS:	110	03.04: EASEMENTS:
219.	<u> </u>	Easements at least a total of twelve (12) feet	<u> </u>	Easements at least a total of <u>{twelve 10} 10</u> feet
		wide, centered on rear and side yard lot lines,		wide, centered on-rear interior lot lines, and front,
		shall be provided for drainage and utilities where		and side yard lot lines abutting rights-of-way or
		necessary. They shall have continuity of		roadway easements, shall be provided for
		alignment from block to block, and at deflection		drainage and utilities where necessary. They shall
		points easements for pole line anchors shall be		have continuity of alignment from block to $block_{\tau}$
		provided.		and shall be provided at deflection points
				easements for pole line anchors -shall be-
220.				provided.
	B.	Where a subdivision is traversed by a water	B.	Where a subdivision is traversed by a water
		course, drainage way, channel or stream, there		course, drainage way, channel, or stream, there-
		shall be provided a storm water easement or		shall be provided a storm water easement or
		drainage right of way conforming substantially		drainage and utility right of wayeasements shall
		with the lines of such water courses, together		be provided that conformsing
		with such further width or construction or both		substantially with the lines of such water courses,
		as will be adequate for the storm water drainage		together with such further width or construction-
		of the area. (Ord. 216, 7-5-1956)		or both as will beto provide adequate for the
				storm water drainage of for the area. (Ord. 216,
221.				7-5-1956)
441 .	C.	All drainage easements shall be so identified on	C.	All drainage easements shall be so identified on
		the plat and shall be graded and sodded in		the plat-and shall be graded and sodded in-
222.		accordance with Section 1102.06. (1990 Code)		accordance with the Public Works Department.
	1		1	

223.	1103.05: BLOCK STANI	DARDS:	11	03.05: BLOCK STANDARDS:
	A. The maximum length	of blocks shall be one	A.	Blocks over nine hundred (900) feet long shall
	thousand eight hund	red (1,800) feet. Blocks over		require pathway easements at their approximate
	nine hundred (900) f	eet long may require		centers. The use of additional pathway <u>easement</u> s
	pedestrianways at th	eir approximate centers.		connecting to schools, parks, or other destinations
	The use of additional	access ways to schools,		may be required by the City Council.
	parks or other destin	ations may be required by		
224.	the City Council.			
	B. Blocks shall be shape	d so that all blocks fit readily	B.	Blocks shall be shaped so that all blocks fit readily
	into the overall plan	of the subdivision and their		into the overall plan of the subdivision, the
	design must evidence	e consideration of lot		neighborhood, and City, and must consider lot
	planning, traffic flow	and public open space		planning, traffic flow, and public open space areas.
225.	areas.			
	C. Blocks intended for c	ommercial, institutional and	C.	Blocks intended for commercial, institutional, and
	industrial use must b	e designated as such and		industrial use must be designated as such and the-
	the plan must show a	dequate off-street areas to		plan plat must show adequate off-street areas to
	provide for parking, I	oading docks and such other		provide for parking, loading docks, and such other
	facilities that may be	required to accommodate		facilities that may be required to accommodate
226.	motor vehicles.			motor vehicles.
	D. Where a subdivision	borders upon a railroad or	D.	Where a subdivision borders upon a railroad or
	limited access highway	ay right of way, a street may		limited access highway right-of-way, a-street_
	be required approxin	nately parallel to, and at a		Marginal Access right-of-way may be required-
	distance suitable for,	the appropriate use of the		approximately parallel to, and at a distance-
	intervening land as fo	or park purposes in		suitable for, the appropriate landscape
	residential districts o	r for parking, commercial or		treatment/open space in residential districts or for
	industrial purposes in	appropriate districts. Such		parking, commercial or industrial purposes in-
	distances shall be de	termined with due regard		appropriate districts to provide access to abutting
	for the requirements	of approach grades and		properties and appropriate screening of the
	possible features gra	de separations. (Ord. 216, 7-		highway.
227.	5-1956)			
	1103.06: LOT STANDA	SUC.	11	03.06: LOT STANDARDS:
228.		nensions in subdivisions	A.	
	designed for single-fa	mily detached dwelling	de	esigned for single-family detached dwelling
220		e those of the underlying		evelopments shall be those of established in the
229.	•	, 3	<u> </u>	

		zoning district as defined in Title 10 of this Code,	underlying zoning district as defined in Title 10 of this
		or of the intended zoning district if the	Code, or of the intended zoning district if the
		-	
		subdivision is in conjunction with a zoning	subdivision is in conjunction with a zoning change, in
		change, in addition to any requirements herein	addition to any requirements herein defined.
		defined.	
	B.	The minimum dimensions at the rear lot line of	REMOVED
230.		any lot shall be thirty (30) feet.	
	C.	Butt lots shall be platted at least five (5) feet	REMOVED
231.		wider than the average interior lots in the block.	
	D.	Streets.	REMOVED – to be covered in PW Design Standards
232.			<u>Manual</u> Streets
		1. Public Streets: See Section 1103.021.	All streets shall conform to the requirements and
233.			standards of the Public Works Department.
233.		2. Private Streets: Private streets may be	
		allowed by the Council in its discretion	
22.4		provided they meet the following conditions:	
234.		Are not gated or otherwise restrict the flow	
		of traffic;	
235.		Demonstrate a legal mechanism will be in	
		place to fund seasonal and ongoing	
		maintenance; and	
236.		Meet the minimum design standards for	
		_	
		private roadways as set forward in Section	
237.		1103.021. (Ord. 1359, 1-282-2008)	
	E.	The shapes of new lots shall be appropriate for	B-A.Lots For Single-Family Detached Residences: The
		their location and suitable for residential	shapes of new lots shall be appropriate for their
		development. Lots with simple, regular shapes	location and suitable for residential development.
		are considered most appropriate and suitable for	Lots with simple, regular shapes are considered
		residential development because the locations of	most appropriate and suitable for residential
		the boundaries of such lots are easier to	development.
		understand than the boundaries of lots with	
		complex, irregular shapes, and because they	
		ensure greater flexibility in situating and	
238.		designing homes for the new lots.	

	Lots which are appropriate for their	Lots which are appropriate for their
	location and suitable for residential	location and suitable for residential
239.	development often have:	development often have:
233.	i. Side lot lines that are approximately	i. Side lot lines that are approximately
	perpendicular or radial to front the lot	perpendicular or radial to the front
	line(s) of the parcel(s) being	the_lot line(s) of the parcel(s) being
240.	subdivided, or	subdivided, or
	ii. Side lot lines that are approximately	ii. Side lot lines that are approximately
	parallel to the side lot line(s) of the	parallel to the side lot line(s) of the
241.	parcel(s) being subdivided, or	parcel(s) being subdivided, or
	iii. Side lot lines that are both	iii. Side lot lines that are both
	approximately perpendicular or radial	approximately perpendicular or
	to the front lot lines(s) and	radial to the front lot lines(s) and
	approximately parallel to the side lot	approximately parallel to the side lot
	line(s) of the parcel(s) being	line(s) of the parcel(s) being
242.	subdivided.	subdivided.
	2. It is acknowledged, however, that property	2. It is acknowledged; however, that property
	boundaries represent the limits of property	boundaries represent the limits of property
	ownership, and subdivision	ownership, and subdivision applicants often
	applicantowners often cannot change	cannot change those boundaries to make-
	those boundaries to make them more	them more regular if the boundaries that
	regular if the boundaries have complex or	have complex or unusual alignments <u>are</u>
	unusual alignments. Subdivisions of such	not easily changed. Subdivisions of such
	irregularly-shaped parcels may be	irregularly-shaped parcels may be
	considered, but the shapes of proposed	considered, but the shapes of proposed
	new lots might be found to be too	new lots might be found to be too irregular,
	irregular, and consequently, applications	and consequently, applications can be
	can be denied for failing to conform	denied for failing to conform adequately to
	adequately to the purposes for which	the purposes for which simple, regular
	simple, regular parcel shapes are	parcel shapes are considered most
	considered most appropriate and suitable	appropriate and suitable for residential
243.	for residential development.	development.
	3. Flag lots, which abut a street with a	3. Flag lots, which abut a street with a
244.	relatively narrow strip of land (i.e., the	relatively narrow strip of land (i.e., the "flag
	considered, but the shapes of proposed new lots might be found to be too irregular, and consequently, applications can be denied for failing to conform adequately to the purposes for which simple, regular parcel shapes are considered most appropriate and suitable for residential development. 3. Flag lots, which abut a street with a	considered, but the shapes of proposed new lots might be found to be too irregular, and consequently, applications can be denied for failing to conform adequately to the purposes for which simple, regular parcel shapes are considered most appropriate and suitable for residential development. 3. Flag lots, which abut a street with a

	"flag nol	e") that passes beside a		pole") that passes beside a neighboring
		•		
	_	ing parcel and have the bulk of		parcel and have the bulk of land area (i.e.,
		(i.e., the "flag") located behind		the "flag") located behind that neighboring
	_	hboring parcel, are not permitted,		parcel, are not permitted.
		the flag pole does not meet the		
	required	minimum lot width according to		
	the stand	dard measurement procedure.		
	F. Double frontag	e lots shall not be permitted,	C. <u>B.</u> Doub	le frontage lots shall not be permitted,
245.	except:		excer	et <u>Through Lots</u> :
	1. Where lo	ts back upon a thoroughfare, in	1.	Where lots back upon a thoroughfare, in
	which ca	se vehicular and pedestrian access		which case vehicular and pedestrian access-
	between	the lots and the thoroughfare		between the lots and the thoroughfare-
	shall be p	prohibited, and (Ord. 216, 7-5-		shall be prohibited, and (Ord. 216, 7-5-
246.	1956)			1956) ummm
	2. Where to	ppographic or other conditions	2.	Where topographic or other conditions
	render si	ubdividing otherwise		render subdividing otherwise unreasonable.
	unreasor	nable. Such double frontage lots		Such double frontage lots shall have an
	shall hav	e an additional depth of at least		additional depth of at least twenty (20) feet
	twenty (2	20) feet greater than the minimum		greater than the minimum in order to allow
	in order	to allow space for a protective		space for a protective screen planting along
	screen pl	anting along the back lot line and		the back lot line and also in such instances
	also in su	ich instances vehicular and		vehicular and pedestrian access between
	pedestria	an access between lots and the		lots and the thoroughfare shall be
	thorough	fare shall be prohibited. (Ord.		prohibited. (Ord. 245, 5-10-1958)
247.	245, 5-10)-1958)		
247.	G. Lots abutting u	pon a water course, drainage way,	D. C.Lots a	abutting upon a water course, drainage way,
	channel or stre	am shall have an additional depth	chanı	nel or stream shall have an additional depth
	or width as req	uired to assure house sites that	or wi	dth as required to assure house sites that
	meet shoreland	d ordinance requirements and that	meet	shoreland ordinance requirements and that
	are not subject	to flooding.	are n	ot subject to flooding and must conform to
	•	-	the re	equirements outlined in Chapter 1017 of this
242			Code	
248.	H. In the subdivid	ing of any land, due regard shall be		e subdividing of any land, due regard shall be
		atural features such as tree		n for all natural features such as tree
249.	growth, water	courses, historic spots or similar	grow	th, water courses, historic locations or

	conditions which, if preserved, will add	similar conditions and conform to Title 10 of this
	attractiveness and value to the proposed	Code.
	development. (Ord. 216, 7-5-1956; amd. 1995	
	Code)	
	I. Where new principal structures are constructed	F.E. Where new principal structures are constructed
	on lots contiguous to roadways designed as	on lots contiguous to roadways designed as major
	major thoroughfares in the City's Comprehensive	thoroughfares assigned functional classifications
	Plan, driveways servicing such lots shall be	of Minor Arterial or higher in the City's
	designed and constructed so as to provide a	Comprehensive Plan, driveways servicing such
	vehicle turnaround facility within the lot. (Ord.	lots shall be designed and constructed to provide
	993, 2-10-1986)	a vehicle turnaround facility within the lot. (Ord.
250.		993, 2-10-1986)
	J. Where new single-family residential lots are	G.F. Where a new single-family residential lots for
	created on a new street, the driveway cut for the	single-family detached residential development-
	new lot must be placed within the new street.	are created on a new street is platted adjacent to
	(Ord. 1359, 1-28-2008)	a new right-of-way, the driveway cut for the new
		lot-must be placed within the new street shall
		access the new right-of-way. (Ord. 1359, 1-28-
251.		2008)
252.	1103.07: PARK DEDICATION:	1103.07: PARK DEDICATION:
252.	Condition to Approval: As a condition to the approval	
	of any subdivision of land in any zone, including the	and 2c regarding park dedication offers the opportunity
	granting of a variance pursuant to Section 1104.04 of	to improve and create connections to a system of open
	this Title, when a new building site is created in	spaces, parks, and pathways as part of the subdivision
	excess of one acre, by either platting or minor	process. The City, at its discretion, will determine
	subdivision, and including redevelopment and	whether park dedication is required in the form of land,
	approval of planned unit developments, the	cash contribution, or a combination of cash and land.
	subdivision shall be reviewed by the Park and	This decision will be based on existing and proposed
	Recreation Commission. The commission shall	development and on the goals, plans, and policies of
	recommend either a portion of land to be dedicated	the City including, but not limited to, those embodied
	to the public for use as a park as provided by	by the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan,
	Minnesota Statutes 462.358, subdivision (2)(b), or in	Pathways Master Plan, and Comprehensive Plan.
252	lieu thereof, a cash deposit given to the City to be	
253.	1	

	used for park purposes; or a combination of land and		
	cash deposit, all as hereafter set forth.		
	Condition to Approval: As a condition to the approval	Condition to Approval: Park dedication will be	
	of any subdivision of land in any zone, including the	required as a condition to the approval of any	
	granting of a variance pursuant to Section 1104.04 of	subdivision of land resulting in a net increase of	
	this Title, when a new building site is created in	development sites comprising more than one acre of	
	excess of one acre, by either platting or minor	land. The Parks and Recreation Commission shall	
	subdivision, and including redevelopment and	recommend, in accordance with Statute and after	
	approval of planned unit developments, the	consulting the approved plans and policies noted	
	subdivision shall be reviewed by the Park and	herein, either a portion of land to be dedicated to the	
	Recreation Commission. The commission shall	public, or in lieu thereof, a cash deposit given to the	
	recommend either a portion of land to be dedicated	City to be used for park purposes, or a combination of	
	to the public for use as a park as provided by	land and cash deposit. If a tract of land to be divided	
	Minnesota Statutes 462.358, subdivision (2)(b), or in	encompasses all or part of a site designated as a	
	lieu thereof, a cash deposit given to the City to be	planned park, recreational facility, playground, trail,	
	used for park purposes; or a combination of land and	wetland, or open space dedicated for public use in the	
	cash deposit, all as hereafter set forth.	Comprehensive Plan, Pathways Master Plan, Parks and	
		Recreation System Master Plan, or other relevant City	
		plan, the commission may recommend to the City	
		Council that the applicant owner to-dedicate land in	
		the locations and dimensions indicated on said plan or	
		map to fulfil all or part of the park dedication	
254.		requirement.	
	A. Amount to be Dedicated: The portion to be	A. Amount to be Dedicated: The portion of land to	
	dedicated in all residentially zoned areas shall be	be dedicated in all residentially zoned areas shall	
	10% and 5% in all other areas.	be 10% of the area of the subject parcel and 5% in	
		all other areas. Park dedication fees shall be-	
		reviewed and determined annually by City Council	
		resolution and established in the fee schedule in	
255.		Chapter 314 of this Code.	
	B. Utility Dedications Not Qualified: Land dedicated	B. Utility Dedications Not Qualified: Land dedicated	
	for required street right of way or utilities,	for required street-right-of-way or utilities,	
	including drainage, does not qualify as park	including drainage, does not qualify as park	
256.	dedication.	dedication.	

		Mildle C		
	C.	Payment in lieu of dedication in all zones in the	C.	Payment in lieu of dedication: In all zones in the
		city where park dedication is deemed		city where park dedication of land is deemed
		inappropriate by the City, the owner and the City		inappropriate by the City, the owner and the City
		shall agree to have the owner deposit a sum of		shall agree to have the owner deposit a sum of
		money in lieu of a dedication. The sum shall be		money in lieu of a dedication of land as part of
		reviewed and determined annually by the City		the Development Agreement required in Section
		Council by resolution. (Ord. 1061, 6-26-1989)		1102.057 of this Title. Park dedication fees shall
				be reviewed and determined annually by City
				Council resolution and established in the fee
257.				schedule in Chapter 314 of this Code.
	D.	Park Dedication Fees may, in the City Council's	REN	NOVED
		sole discretion, be reduced for affordable		
		housing units as recommended by the Housing		
		and Redevelopment Authority for the City of		
258.		Roseville.		
259.	(Ord	d. 1278, 02/24/03)	(Or	d. 1278, 02/24/03)

Title 11 - Subdivisions

	CHAPTER 1104: ADMINISTRATION AND	CHAPTER 1104: ADMINISTRATION AND
260.	ENFORCEMENT	ENFORCEMENT
261.	1104.01: Inspection at Applicant's Expense	1104.01: Inspection at Applicant's Expense
262.	1104.02: Building Permit	1104.02: Building Permit
263.	1104.03: Occupancy Permit	1104.03: Occupancy Permit
264.	1104.04: Platting Alternatives (Ord. 1395, 9-13-2010)	1104.04: Platting Alternatives (Ord. 1395, 9-13-2010)
265.	1104.05: Variances	1104.05: Variances
266.	1104.06: Record of Plats	1104.06: Record of Plats
	1104.01: INSPECTION AT APPLICANT'S	
267.	EXPENSE:	
207.	All required land improvements to be installed under	REMOVED
	the provisions of this Title shall be inspected during	
	the course of construction by the Public Works	
	Director. Salaries and all costs pursuant to such	
	inspection shall be paid by the owner or applicant in	
	the manner provided in Section 1102.07 of this Title.	
268.	(Ord. 216, 7-5-1956; 1990 Code)	
269.	1104.02: BUILDING PERMIT:	1104.02: BUILDING PERMIT:
203.	No building permit shall be issued for the construction	MOVED TO 1102 – AS PART OF THE DEVELOPER
	of any building, structure or improvement to the land	AGREEMENT
	or any lot within a subdivision as defined herein which	
	has been approved for platting until all requirements	
	of this Title have been complied with fully. (Ord. 216,	
270.	7-5-1956; 1990 Code)	
271.	1104.03: OCCUPANCY PERMIT:	1104.03: OCCUPANCY PERMIT:
	No occupancy permit shall be granted for the use of	MOVED TO 1102 – AS PART OF THE DEVELOPER
	any structure within a subdivision approved for	AGREEMENT
	platting or replatting until required utility facilities	
	have been installed and made ready to service the	
	property and roadways providing access to the subject	
272		
272.	lot or lots have been constructed or are in the course	

	A Exhibit C	
	of construction and are suitable for car traffic. (Ord.	
	216, 7-5-1956; 1990 Code)	
273.	1104.04: PLATTING ALTERNATIVES:	1104.04: PLATTING ALTERNATIVES:
	The following processes may be utilized, within the	MOVED TO 1102.01: PROCEDURE
	parameters set forth therein, as alternatives to the	
	plat procedures established in Chapter 1102 (Ord.	
274.	1395, 9-13-2010):	
	A. Common Wall Duplex Subdivision: A common	MOVED TO 1102.01: PROCEDURE
	wall duplex minor subdivision may be	
	approved by the City Manager upon	
	recommendation of the Community	
	Development Director. The owner shall file	
	with the Community Development Director	
	three copies of a certificate of survey prepared	
	by a registered land surveyor showing the	
	parcel or lot, the proposed division, all	
	building and other structures or pavement	
	locations and a statement that each unit of	
	the duplex has separate utility connections.	
	This type of minor subdivision shall be limited	
	to a common wall duplex minor subdivision of	
	a parcel in an R-2 District or other zoning	
	district which allows duplexes, along a	
	common wall of the structure and common lot	
	line of the principle structure where the	
	structure meets all required setbacks except	
	the common wall property line. Within 60	
	days after approval by the City Manager, the	
	applicant for the common wall duplex minor	
	subdivision shall record the subdivision and	
	the certificate of survey with the Ramsey	
	County Recorder. Failure to record the	
	subdivision within 60 days shall nullify the	
275.	approval of the subdivision.	

B. Recombination: to divide one recorded lot or **MOVED TO 1102.01: PROCEDURE** parcel in order to permit the adding of a parcel of land to an abutting lot and create two buildable parcels, the proposed subdivision, in sketch plan form, shall be submitted to the City Council for approval. No hearing or Planning Commission review is necessary unless the proposal is referred to the commission by the Community Development Director for clarification. The proposed recombination shall not cause any portion of the existing lots or parcels to be in violation of this regulation or the zoning code. Within 30 days after approval by the City Council, the applicant shall supply a certificate of survey to the Community Development Director and City Manager for review and approval. After completion of the review and approval by the Community Development Director and City Manager, the survey shall be recorded by the applicant with the Ramsey County Recorder within 60 days after approval 276. by the City Manager. C. Consolidations: The owner of two or more **MOVED TO 1102.01: PROCEDURE** contiguous parcels or lots of record may, subject to Community Development Director and City Manager approval, consolidate said parcels or lots into one parcel of record by recording the consolidation with Ramsey County Recorder as a certificate of survey showing same, within 60 days of approval. No hearing is necessary unless the proposal is appealed by the applicant to the City Council. 277. The proposed parcels shall not cause any

		portion of the existing lots, parcels, or existing	
		buildings to be in violation of this regulation or	
		the zoning code.	
	D.	Corrections: When a survey or description of a	MOVED TO 1102.01: PROCEDURE
		parcel or lot has been found to be inadequate	
		to describe the actual boundaries, approval of	
		a corrective subdivision may be requested.	
		This type of subdivision creates no new lots or	
		streets. The proposed corrective subdivision,	
		in sketch plan form, along with a letter signed	
		by all affected owners agreeing to the new	
		subdivision, shall be submitted to the City	
		Council for approval. No hearing or Planning	
		Commission review is necessary unless the	
		proposal is referred to the Commission by the	
		Community Development Director for	
		clarification. The proposed parcels shall not	
		cause any portion of the existing lots, parcels,	
		or existing buildings to be in violation of this	
		regulation or the zoning code. A certificate of	
		survey illustrating the corrected boundaries	
		shall be required on all parcels. Within 30 days	
		after approval by the City Council, the	
		applicant shall supply the final survey to the	
		Community Development Director and City	
		Manager for review and approval. After	
		completion of the review and approval by the	
		Community Development Director and City	
		Manager, the survey shall be recorded by the	
		applicant with the Ramsey County Recorder	
		within 60 days. Failure to record the	
		subdivision within 60 days shall nullify the	
278.		approval of the subdivision.	
	E.	Three Parcel Minor Subdivision: When a	MOVED TO 1102.01: PROCEDURE
279.		subdivision creates a total of three or fewer	

parcels, situated in an area where public utilities and street rights of way to serve the proposed parcels already exist in accordance with City codes, and no further utility or street extensions are necessary, and the new parcels meet or exceed the size requirements of the zoning code, the applicant may apply for a minor subdivision approval. The proposed subdivision, in sketch plan form, shall be submitted to the City Council at a public hearing with notice provided to all property owners within 500 feet. The proposed parcels shall not cause any portion of the existing lots, parcels, or existing buildings to be in violation of this regulation or the zoning code. Within 30 days after approval by the City Council, the applicant shall supply the final survey to the Community Development Director for review and approval. A certificate of survey shall be required on all proposed parcels. After completion of the review and approval by the City Manager, the survey shall be recorded by the applicant with the Ramsey County Recorder within 60 days. Failure to record the subdivision within 60 days shall nullify the approval of the subdivision. (Ord. 1171, 9-23-1996) (Ord. 1357, 1-14-2008) (Ord. 1395, 9-13-2010) 1104.05: VARIANCES:

1104.05: VARIANCES: 280.

A. Hardship: Where there is undue hardship in carrying out the strict letter of the provisions of this Code, the City Council shall have the power, in a specific case and after notice and public hearings, to vary any such provision in

MOVED TO 1102 – AFTER PROCEDURE

281.

<u> </u>	A Exhibit C	<u></u>
	harmony with the general purpose and intent	
	thereof and may impose such additional	
	conditions as it considers necessary so that	
	the public health, safety and general welfare	
	may be secured and substantial justice done.	
	B. Procedure For Variances: Any owner of land	MOVED TO 1102 – AFTER PROCEDURE
	may file an application for a variance by	
	paying the fee set forth in section 1015.03 of	
	this title, providing a completed application	
	and supporting documents as set forth in the	
	standard community development	
	department application form, and by	
	providing the city with an abstractor's certified	
	property certificate showing the property	
	owners within three hundred fifty feet (350')	
	of the outer boundaries of the parcel of land	
	on which the variance is requested. The	
	application shall then be heard by the variance	
	board or planning commission upon the same	
	published notice, mailing notice and hearing	
	procedure as set forth in chapter 108 of this	
282.	code. (Ord. 1359, 1-28-2008)	
283.	1104.06: RECORD OF PLATS:	1104.06: RECORD OF PLATS:
	All such plats of subdivisions after the same have been	REMOVED
	submitted and approved as provided in this Title shall	
	be filed and kept by the City Manager among the	
284.	records of the City. (Ord. 216, 7-5-1956)	
		·



TO: Bryan Lloyd, Senior Planner

Kari Collins, Community Development Director

Pat Trudgeon, City Manager

Roseville City Council

FROM: Lonnie Brokke, Director of Parks and Recreation

SUBJECT: Park Dedication Ordinance 1103.07

DATE: May 9, 2017

CC: Parks and Recreation Commission Recommendations

The Parks and Recreation Commission met one time to review and discuss a consultant proposal for revisions to the Subdivision Code 1103.07 - Park Dedication.

The following is a summary of recommendations from their May 2, 2017 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting:

- Keep the Park Dedication Ordinance simple, clear and concise
- Do not use language that creates potential for negotiation
- Limit the opportunity for potential conflicts and competition for funds (funds are limited and unpredictable)
- Limit Park Dedication to land for parkland purposes only, cash or combination (not to expand to trails, pathways,) for use within park boundaries only
- Add back the Land Dedication amount of 5% and 10% (this should be very specific)
- Important that all Park Dedication issues are referred to the Parks and Recreation Commission

Below is a red lined version of their suggestions:

Purpose: Minnesota Statutes 462.358, subdivisions 2b and 2c regarding park dedication offers the opportunity to improve and create connections to a system of open spaces and parks, and pathways as part of the subdivision process. The City, at its discretion, will determine whether park dedication is required in the form of land, cash contribution, or a combination of cash and land. This decision will be based on existing and proposed development and on the goals, plans, and policies of the City including, but not limited to, those embodied by the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan Pathways Master Plan, and the Comprehensive Plan.

Condition to Approval: Park dedication will be required as a condition to the approval of any subdivision of land resulting in a net increase of development sites comprising more than one acre of land. The Parks and Recreation Commission shall recommend, in accordance with Statute and after consulting the approved plans and policies noted herein, either a portion of land to be dedicated to the public for park purposes, or in lieu thereof, a cash deposit given to the City to be used for park purposes, or a combination of land and cash deposit. If a tract of land to be divided encompasses all or part of a site designated as a planned park, recreational facility, playground, trail, wetland, or open space dedicated for public use in the Comprehensive Plan, Pathways Master Plan, Parks and Recreation System Master Plan, or other relevant City plan, the commission may recommend the applicant to dedicate land in the locations and dimensions indicated on said plan or map to fulfil all or part of the park dedication requirement.

Park Dedication Fees: The land portion to be dedicated in all residentially zoned areas shall be 10% and 5% in all other areas. Park dedication fees shall be reviewed and determined annually by City Council resolution and established in the fee schedule in Chapter 314 of this Code.

Utility Dedications Not Qualified: Land dedicated for required street right-of-way or utilities, including drainage, does not qualify as park dedication.

Payment in lieu of dedication: In all zones in the city where park dedication of land is deemed inappropriate by the City, the owner and the City shall agree to have the owner deposit a-the required sum of money at the time of the subdivision to satisfy the Park Dedication requirement in lieu of a dedication of land as part of the Development Agreement required in Section 1102.07 of this Title.

Overall, the Parks and Recreaton Commission supports trail and pathway development and maintenance as a separate and distinct area.

The Parks and Recreation Commission definitely wants to be further involved in and make recommendations to any further renditions.

Subd. 2b. Dedication.

- (a) The regulations may require that a reasonable portion of the buildable land, as defined by municipal ordinance, of any proposed subdivision be dedicated to the public or preserved for public use as streets, roads, sewers, electric, gas, and water facilities, storm water drainage and holding areas or ponds and similar utilities and improvements, parks, recreational facilities as defined in section 471.191, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space. The requirement must be imposed by ordinance or under the procedures established in section 462.353, subdivision 4a.
- (b) If a municipality adopts the ordinance or proceeds under section <u>462.353</u>, subdivision 4a, as required by paragraph (a), the municipality must adopt a capital improvement budget and have a parks and open space plan or have a parks, trails, and open space component in its comprehensive plan subject to the terms and conditions in this paragraph and paragraphs (c) to (i).
- (c) The municipality may choose to accept a cash fee as set by ordinance from the applicant for some or all of the new lots created in the subdivision, based on the average fair market value of the unplatted land for which park fees have not already been paid that is, no later than at the time of final approval or under the city's adopted comprehensive plan, to be served by municipal sanitary sewer and water service or community septic and private well as authorized by state law. For purposes of redevelopment on developed land, the municipality may choose to accept a cash fee based on fair market value of the land no later than the time of final approval. "Fair market value" means the value of the land as determined by the municipality annually based on tax valuation or other relevant data. If the municipality's calculation of valuation is objected to by the applicant, then the value shall be as negotiated between the municipality and the applicant, or based on the market value as determined by the municipality based on an independent appraisal of land in a same or similar land use category.
- (d) In establishing the portion to be dedicated or preserved or the cash fee, the regulations shall give due consideration to the open space, recreational, or common areas and facilities open to the public that the applicant proposes to reserve for the subdivision.
- (e) The municipality must reasonably determine that it will need to acquire that portion of land for the purposes stated in this subdivision as a result of approval of the subdivision.
- (f) Cash payments received must be placed by the municipality in a special fund to be used only for the purposes for which the money was obtained.
- (g) Cash payments received must be used only for the acquisition and development or improvement of parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space based on the approved park systems plan. Cash payments must not be used for ongoing operation or maintenance of parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space.
- (h) The municipality must not deny the approval of a subdivision based solely on an inadequate supply of parks, open spaces, trails, or recreational facilities within the municipality.

(i) Previously subdivided property from which a park dedication has been received, being resubdivided with the same number of lots, is exempt from park dedication requirements. If, as a result of resubdividing the property, the number of lots is increased, then the park dedication or per-lot cash fee must apply only to the net increase of lots.

Subd. 2c. Nexus.

- (a) There must be an essential nexus between the fees or dedication imposed under subdivision 2b and the municipal purpose sought to be achieved by the fee or dedication. The fee or dedication must bear a rough proportionality to the need created by the proposed subdivision or development.
- (b) If a municipality is given written notice of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication before the municipality's final decision on an application, a municipality must not condition the approval of any proposed subdivision or development on an agreement to waive the right to challenge the validity of a fee in lieu of dedication.
- (c) An application may proceed as if the fee had been paid, pending a decision on the appeal of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication, if (1) the person aggrieved by the fee puts the municipality on written notice of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication, (2) prior to the municipality's final decision on the application, the fee in lieu of dedication is deposited in escrow, and (3) the person aggrieved by the fee appeals under section 462.361, within 60 days of the approval of the application. If such an appeal is not filed by the deadline, or if the person aggrieved by the fee does not prevail on the appeal, then the funds paid into escrow must be transferred to the municipality.



Date: 5-15-2017 Item No.: 7.f

Department Approval

City Manager Approval

Para / Truggen

Hai & Callin

Kari Collins, Community Development Director

Item Description: Discuss Proposed Text Amendments to Roseville's City Code,

Chapter 407 Nuisances.

BACKGROUND

2 During the 2016 Neighborhood Enhancement Program inspections, several instances were

3 brought to City Council attention contesting areas within Chapter 407. Per Council request, the

Community Development Department has reviewed the Chapter and has recommended changes

5 for consideration.

6

4

1

- 7 The Code Enforcement Division seeks direction on the proposed text amendments and has
- 8 compiled suggested changes to Roseville's City Code, Chapter 407 Nuisances. The text
- 9 amendments include updates to text language, reordering of sections, adding sections for a
- variance / variance appeal and eliminating duplicative or contradictory language.

11

- 12 Staff previously brought this item forward at the March 27, 2017 Council meeting for discussion.
- 13 Attachments to this RCA include the suggested amendments and revisions from the previous
- 14 discussion as requested by Council.

15 POLICY OBJECTIVE

- 16 Staff periodically updates City Code and Zoning Ordinance language to eliminate duplicate and
- 17 contradictory language.

18 FINANCIAL IMPACTS

19 There are no financial impacts.

20

21 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- 22 Based on the comments provided in this report, staff requests direction in regards to the proposed
- 23 text amendments to Roseville's City Code, Chapter 407.

2425

REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION

- 26 Direct Staff to amend selected text of Roseville's City Code, Chapter 407, as discussed and to
- bring back to Council, amendments to the Ordinance for adoption.

28

- 29 Prepared by: Dave Englund, Codes Coordinator
- 30 Attachments: A: Suggested revisions to 407.02.G (Mayor Roe).
- B: Chapter 407 with revisions.
- C: Resident feedback to proposed changes.

5/15/17 - Farm Animal regulations (Roe suggestions to start the conversation):

2 3

1

CURRENT:

4 5 6

- 407.02: NUISANCES AFFECTING HEALTH, SAFETY, COMFORT OR REPOSE:
- 7 The following are hereby declared to be public nuisances affecting health, safety, comfort 8 or repose:
- 9 G. Keeping of Farm Animals: The keeping of cows, horses, sheep, goats or any four
- 10 legged animal commonly known as farm animals, other than those commonly called
- poultry, in any pasture, stable or any enclosure within 300 feet or less of any other lot in 11 any residence district. (Ord. 629, 9-28-70)

12

13 14 15

501.21: RIDING HORSES:

- 16 A. Definition: As used in this Section, "riding horse" means any horse which is used 17 primarily for riding. (Ord. 349, 12-1-1961)
- 18 B. License Required: No person shall keep any riding horse within the City for over 30
- 19 days unless a license for such animal has been first secured.
- 20 C. Condition of License: A license shall be granted to any applicant for a riding horse on
- 21 the following conditions:
- 22 1. Said riding horse shall be used in such a manner so as not to annoy or disturb residents
- 23 of the City.
- 24 2. Said riding horse will be kept in an inconspicuous place and not allowed to run at
- 25 large.
- 26 D. Application for License: The application for a license shall be made to the City
- 27 Manager and granted by the City Council for the license of each particular horse. The
- 28 license shall be suspended or revoked by the City Council upon any breach of the
- 29 conditions of license set forth in this Section. (Ord. 349, 12-1-1961)
- 30 E. Minimum Area and Fencing: No license shall be issued for any riding horse unless the
- 31 horse shall be kept in an adequately fenced pasture of a minimum size of three acres, but
- 32 no more than three horses can be kept in such three acre pasture at any one time. For each
- 33 horse in excess of three, an additional one acre of fenced pasture shall be provided. (Ord.
- 34 734, 9-9-1974)
- 35 F. License Fee: The license fee for each riding horse is as established by the City Fee
- 36 Schedule in Section 314.05. (Ord. 1379A, 11-17-2008)
- 37 G. Term of License: The license granted by the City Council under this Section shall be
- 38 for the life of each horse and need not be renewed annually.
- 39 H. Issuing and Affixing Tags: Upon the granting of a license by the City Council, the
- 40 City Manager shall issue to the licensee a tag indicating that a license has been issued and
- 41 said tag shall be affixed to the riding horse so licensed. (Ord. 349, 12-1-1961)

42 43

44

45

46

47 48

SUGGESTED POSSIBLE CHANGES:

49 50 51

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61 62

63 64

65

66 67

68

69

70

71

- 407.02: NUISANCES AFFECTING HEALTH, SAFETY, COMFORT OR REPOSE:
- The following are hereby declared to be public nuisances affecting health, safety, comfort or repose:
 - G. Keeping of Farm Animals: The keeping of cows, horses, sheep, goats, <u>pigs</u>, <u>poultry</u>, or any <u>four legged</u> animal commonly known as <u>a</u> farm animals, <u>other than those commonly ealled poultry</u>, in any pasture, stable or any enclosure within 300 feet or less of any other lot in any <u>residence</u> district. (Ord. 629, 9-28-70)
 - 1. Exceptions: This prohibition shall not apply to:
 - a. The keeping of up to X chicken hens and Y roosters on Low Density Residential properties to provide eggs for non-commercial purposes, provided that any coops or other related structures meet Accessory Building requirements in Title 10 of this Code;
 - b. The keeping of no more than 2 of what are known as "pygmy" goats or "pot-bellied" pigs, weighing less than 100 pounds each, as pets on Low Density or Medium Density Residential properties;
 - c. The keeping of bees on Low Density Residential properties, provided that any hives or other related structures meet Accessory Building requirements in Title 10 of this Code;
 - d. The use of sheep or goats for turf, plant, or weed control during daylight hours, so long as such animals are not otherwise kept on a premises in violation of this Code;
 - e. Riding Horses licensed under Chapter 501 of this Code.

72 73 74

75

76 77

78

79

80

501.21: RIDING HORSES:

- A. Definition: As used in this Section, "riding horse" means any horse which is used exclusively primarily for riding. (Ord. 349, 12-1-1961) Keeping of horses for any other purpose is not permitted.
- B. License Required: No person shall keep any riding horse within the City for over 30 days unless a license for such animal has been first secured. <u>An unlicensed riding horse</u> shall not be kept in the City for any length of time.
- C. Condition of License: A license shall be granted to any applicant for a riding horse on the following conditions:
- 1. Said riding horse shall be used in such a manner so as not to annoy or disturb residentsof the City.
- 2. Said riding horse will be kept in an inconspicuous place and not allowed to run at large.
- D. Application for License: The application for a license shall be made to the City
- 88 Manager and granted by the City Council for the license of each particular horse. The
- 89 license shall be suspended or revoked by the City Council upon any breach of the
- 90 conditions of license set forth in this Section. (Ord. 349, 12-1-1961)
- 91 E. Minimum Area and Fencing: No license shall be issued for any riding horse unless the
- horse shall be kept in an adequately fenced pasture of a minimum size of three acres, but

- no more than three horses can be kept in such three acre pasture at any one time. For each
- horse in excess of three, an additional one acre of fenced pasture shall be provided. (Ord.
- 95 734, 9-9-1974)
- 96 F. License Fee: The license fee for each riding horse is as established by the City Fee
- 97 Schedule in Section 314.05. (Ord. 1379A, 11-17-2008)
- 98 G. Term of License: The license granted by the City Council under this Section shall be
- 99 for the life of each horse and need not be renewed annually.
- 100 H. Issuing and Affixing Tags: Upon the granting of a license by the City Council, the
- 101 City Manager shall issue to the licensee a tag indicating that a license has been issued and
- said tag shall be affixed to the riding horse so licensed. (Ord. 349, 12-1-1961)

103

104 (or repeal this entire section?)

1 CHAPTER 407 2 NUISANCES

3

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

4 SECTION:

•	SECTIOI.	
5	407.01:	Definitions
6	407.02:	Nuisances Affecting Health, Safety, Public Comfort or Repose
7	407.03:	Nuisances Affecting Peace Public Health and Safety
8	407.04:	Public Nuisance Unlawful Vehicles Constituting a Public Nuisance
9	407.05:	Enforcement Public Nuisance Unlawful
10	407.06:	City Abatement of Public Nuisances Enforcement
11	407.07:	Recovery of Cost City Abatement of Public Nuisances
12	407.08:	Accelerated Abatement Process for Certain Nuisances Recovery of Cos
13	<u>407.09:</u>	Accelerated Abatement Process for Certain Nuisances
14	<u>407.10:</u>	Public Nuisance Variance
15	<u>407.11:</u>	Variance Appeal

16 **407.01: DEFINITIONS:**

- 17 As used in this chapter, the following words and terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section:
- 19 ABANDONED VEHICLE: A motor vehicle that:
 - a. Has been illegally parked on public property for a period of more than 48 hours;
 - b. Has been parked on private property without the consent of the person in control of the property for a period of more than 48 hours;
 - c. Has been voluntarily surrendered by its owner to the city or to a moving contractor hired by the city for its removal.
 - ANIMALS, Domestic: Animals kept within the home as pets such as; fish, dogs, cats, household birds and similar animals.
- 27 ANIMALS, Non-Domestic: Animals, which are kept outside the home for purposes of food or
- pleasure such as; cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, llamas, goats or other similar animals.
- 29 FRONT YARD AREA: All that area between the front property line and a line drawn along the
- front face or faces of the principal structure on the property extended to the side property lines.
- 31 The front side of the property shall be determined as specified in Title 11 of this code.
- 32 GROUNDCOVER: Vegetation and landscaping that covers the ground surface or topsoil and has
- the effect of reducing erosion. (Ord. 1384, 7-13-2009)
- 34 GRAFFITI: Any unauthorized writing, printing, marks, signs, symbols, figures, designs,
- 35 inscriptions or other drawings which are scratched, painted, drawn or otherwise placed on any
- exterior surface of a building wall, fence, sidewalk, curb, dumpster or other such temporary or
- permanent structures on public and private property and which has the effect of defacing the
- 38 property.
- 39 INOPERABLE CONDITION: The A vehicle which has no substantial potential use consistent
- 40 with its usual function, and shall may include a vehicle that:

- 41 a. Has a missing or defective vital component part that is necessary for the normal 42 operation of the vehicle;
 - b. Is stored on blocks, or jacks or other supports.
- 44 JUNK VEHICLE: An inoperable motor vehicle which is; in inoperable condition, partially
- 45 dismantled, which is used for sale of parts, or as a source of repair or replacement parts for other
- 46 vehicles, or which is kept for scrapping, dismantling or salvage of any kind. Uunless such
- 47 vehicle is kept in an enclosed garage. An abandoned vehicle shall also be considered a junk
- 48 vehicle for the purpose of this chapter.
- 49 NATURAL AREAS: Natural, restored, or recreated woodlands, savannahs, prairies, meadows,
- 50 bogs, marshes, and lake shores. (Ord. 1384, 7-13-2009)
- NATURAL LANDSCAPING: Planned landscaping designed to replicate a locally native plant 51
- 52 community by using a mix of plants, shrubs, and trees native to the area. (Ord. 1384, 7-13-2009)
- 53 NUISANCE: Any act, substance, matter emission or thing which creates a dangerous or
- 54 unhealthy condition or which threatens the public peace, health, safety or sanitary condition of
- 55 the city or which is offensive or has a blighting influence on the community and which is found
- 56 upon, in, being discharged or flowing from any street, alley, highway, railroad right of way,
- vehicle, railroad car, waterway, excavation, building, structure, lot, grounds, or other property 57
- 58 located within the city of Roseville. Nuisances shall include, but not be limited to, those
- 59 enumerated below:

43

64

70

- 60 a. Maintain s ing or permit s ting a condition which unreasonably annoys, injures or A. 61 endangers the safety, health, comfort or repose of members of the public; or
- 62 b. Interfer es ing with, obstruct s ing or render s ing dangerous for passage, any public B. road or right of way, street, alley or highway or waters used by the public; or 63
 - c. In any way rendering the public insecure in life or in use of property; or C.
- 65 Đ. d. Is guilty of Aany other act or omission declared by law to be a public nuisance 66 specifically provided.
- D. Anything left or displayed for sale on public or private property without written permission 67 68 by the owner or person in control of the property may be tagged and/or towed at the owner's 69 expense.
 - E. In any way render the public insecure in life or in use of property.
- 71 OCCUPANT: Includes any person living in or in control of any dwelling unit upon property
- 72 wherein a motor vehicle is parked nuisance is determined to be present.
- 73 PEDDLING AND SOLICITING: The practice of going house-to-house, door-to-door, business
- 74 to-business, street-to-street, or any other type of place-to-place, for the purposes of offering for
- 75 sale or obtaining, or attempting to obtain, orders for goods, wares, products, merchandise, other
- 76 personal property or services.
- SERVICE STATION: A business involving the sale of motor fuel and/or the repair of motor 77 78 vehicles.
- 79
- VEHICLE OR VEHICLES: Any "motor vehicle" vehicle as defined in Minnesota Statutes but 80 excluding the following:
- A. Trailers with weight classifications of A and B as provided in Minnesota Statutes 81
- 82 b. Snowmobiles, and ; or
- 83 C. c. "All-terrain vehicles" as defined in Minnesota Statutes.
- 84 VITAL COMPONENT PARTS: Those parts of the motor vehicle that are essential to the
- mechanical functioning of the vehicle, including, but not limited to, the motor, drive train, and 85
- wheels. (Ord. 1162, 7-10-1995) 86

407.02: NUISANCES AFFECTING PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY,

COMFORT OR REPOSE:

- The following are hereby declared to be public nuisances affecting <u>public</u> health, safety, comfort or repose:
- 91 A. Diseased Animals: All diseased animals running at large.
- 92 B. Carcasses: Carcasses of animals not buried or destroyed within 24 hours after death.
- 93 F. A. Backyard Composting: All composting consisting of yard waste and/or kitchen waste 94 which have been left unattended and which cause offensive odors, attract rodents and/or 95 pests or are unsightly, or do not meet the requirements of Section Chapter 409. (Ord. 1092, 96 6-10-91, amended (Ord. 1384, 7-13-2009)
 - J. B. Building Maintenance and Appearance: Buildings, fences, and other structures, which have been so poorly maintained that their physical condition and appearance detract from the surrounding neighborhood. are declared to be public nuisances because they: 1) are unsightly, 2) decrease adjoining landowners' and occupants enjoyment of their property and neighborhood, and 3) adversely affect property values and neighborhood pattern. Any building, fence or other structure not complying with Chapter 906 of this Code or the following:
 - K. Standards: Any building, fence or other structure is a public nuisance if it does not comply with the following requirements:
 - 1. All wires which are strung less than 15 feet above the surface of any public street or alley.
 - 2 1. All exterior doors and shutters shall be hung properly and have an operable mechanism to keep them securely shut or in place.
 - <u>3-2</u>. All cornices, moldings, lintels, bay or dormer windows and similar projections shall be kept in good repair and free from cracks and defects which make them hazardous or unsightly.
 - 4 <u>3</u>. Roof surfaces shall be tight and have no defects which admit water. All roof drainage systems shall be secured and hung properly.
 - 5 <u>4</u>. Chimneys, antennae, air vents and other similar projections shall be structurally sound and in good repair. Such projections shall be secured properly where applicable to an exterior wall or exterior roof.
 - 6 5. All foundations shall be structurally sound and in good repair.
 - C. Debris: An accumulation of tin cans, bottles, trash, uprooted tree stumps, logs, limbs, brush, and other cut vegetative debris, or other debris of any nature or description and the throwing, dumping or depositing of any dead animals, manure, garbage, waste, decaying matter, ground, sand, stones, ashes, rubbish, tin cans or other material of any kind onto public or private property. (Ord. 1337, 5-22-2006)
 - Q. D. Graffiti: Graffiti shall mean any unauthorized writing, printing, marks, signs, symbols, figures, designs, inscriptions or other drawings which are scratched, scrawled, painted, drawn or otherwise placed on any exterior surface of a building, wall, fence, sidewalk, curb, dumpsters or other permanent structures on public or private property and which has the effect of defacing the property. (Ord. 1337, 5-22-2006)
- G. E. Keeping of Farm Animals, Non-Domestic: The keeping of cows, horses, sheep, goats or any four legged animals commonly known as farm animals, other than those commonly called poultry or bees, in any pasture, stable or any enclosure within 300 feet or less of any other lot in any residence district. (Ord. 629, 9-28-70)

- 132 F. Noises: All noises in violation of Chapter 405 of this Code. L. G. Declaration of Nuisance Parking and Storage: The outside parking and or storage on 133 134 residentially-zoned property of vehicles, materials, supplies or equipment not customarily 135 used for residential purposes in violation of the requirements provisions set forth below: is 136 declared to be a public nuisance because it: 1) obstructs views on streets and private 137 property, 2) creates cluttered and otherwise unsightly areas, 3) introduces commercial 138 advertising signs into areas where commercial advertising signs are otherwise prohibited, 4) 139 decreases adjoining landowners and occupants' enjoyment of their property and neighborhood, and 5) otherwise adversely affects property values and neighborhood 140 141 patterns. Service vehicles with a manufacturer's rated capacity of 2,000 pounds or less are exempt from this provision. 142 143 M. Unlawful Parking and Storage: 144 1. Non-Permanent Structures; No person may place, store, or allow the placement 145 or storage of ice fish houses, skateboard ramps, play houses, or other similar nonpermanent structures outside continuously for longer than 24 hours in the 146 147 front-yard area of residentially-zoned property. 2. Storage on Property in Front Yards: No person may place, store or allow the 148 149 placement or storage of the following, for a period longer than 4 days in the front 150 yard or unscreened street facing side yard of a corner lot of any residential zoned 151 area: 152 a. Trailers of any type, unless supporting a boat of 20 foot length or 153 less and completely placed on an improved surface as defined in 154 this Code and stored no closer than five (5) feet of a property line; 155 156 b. Boats or watercraft of any type in excess of 20 foot length; or c. Vehicles of any type in inoperable condition; or 157 158 d. Vehicles of any type that are posted as "for sale"; or 159 160 161 162 163

 - e. Recreational vehicles as defined by State Statute, unless stored completely on an improved surface, as defined in this Code and meeting a five (5) foot setback requirement to a property line and no portion of the vehicle may be stored on or over the Public Right of Way.
 - 3. Storage of Materials: No person may place, store or allow the placement or storage of pipe, lumber, steel, machinery or similar materials including all vehicles, equipment or materials used in connection with a business, outside on residentially-zoned property, except for temporary storage of such materials for use in the construction or remodeling of a structure on the property when a valid City issued building permit exists.
 - 4. Vehicle Parking, General: No person shall cause, undertake, permit or allow the outside parking and storage of vehicles in residentially-zoned property for more than 14 days unless it complies with the following requirements: (Ord. 1288, 8-4-2003)
 - a. Vehicles which are parked or stored outside shall be on an improved surface as defined in this Code.
 - b. All v Vehicles, watercraft and other articles stored outside on property must be owned by a person who is a legal resident

176 residential 177

164

165

166

167

168 169

170

171

172 173

174

178	of that property and continuously maintain current
179	registration and licensure. (Ord. 1466, 04-21-2014)
180	4 <u>5</u> . <u>Large/Commercial Vehicles:</u> No person, owning, driving or in charge of any
181	vehicle with a manufacturers rated capacity of more than one ton, as specified in
182	Minnesota Statutes, may cause or permit that vehicle to be parked outside or stand
183	continuous for more than two hours on a property or public street within a
184	residential zone in the City, with the exception of the following:
185	a. Any motor truck, pickup truck, or similar vehicle being used by a
186	public utility, moving company, or similar company, which is
187	actually being used to service a residence not belonging to or
188	occupied by the operator of the vehicle; or
189	b. Any vehicle which is actually making a pickup or delivery at the
190	location where it is parked. Parking for any period of time beyond
191	the period of time reasonably necessary to provide such excepted
192	service or to make such a pickup or delivery and in excess of the
193	two hour limit shall be unlawful.
194	56. Street Parking, Trailers and Recreational Vehicle: No trailer (of any size),
195	boat supported on a trailer, or recreational vehicle (with dual rear tires or dual rear
196	axle) may be parked on a public street or right-of-way within the City for: 1) more
197	than 4 consecutive days, or, 2) more than 4 total days in any calendar month.
198	a. Parking in one location for over over 2 hours (in a 24 hour period)
199	qualifies as a 'day' for purposes of this section.
200	b. Posting for a public hearing, before City Council, shall be a
201	minimum of 10 days for violations of item #5.
202	N. Exceptions: The prohibitions of this Section shall not apply to the following:
203	1. Any motor truck, pickup truck, or similar vehicle being used by a public utility, moving
204	company, or similar company, which is actually being used to service a residence not
205	belonging to or occupied by the operator of the vehicle.
206	2. Any vehicle which is actually making a pickup or delivery at the location where it is
207	parked. Parking for any period of time beyond the period of time reasonably necessary to
208	make such a pickup or delivery and in excess of the two hour limit shall be unlawful.
209	I.H. Service Stations: Operation of a business service station involving the sale of motor fuel
210	and/or the repair of motor vehicles if conducted in a manner that includes any of the
211	following manner:
212	1. The use of service station premises for the sale, or for display in aid of sale, of
213	any motor vehicle.
214	2. The use of service station premises for storage of damaged or abandoned motor
215	vehicles for in excess of seven days without a directive of the Chief of Police.
216	3. The storing of or the allowing of accumulation of any of the following items
217	on service station the premises in view of adjacent land properties:
218	a. Used oil cans; or
219	b. Discarded auto parts; or
220	c. Discarded tires; or
221	d. Any other items of similar debris nature.
222	4. Operating a service station with premises that does not have its entire area
223	covered by the following: building, concrete or bituminous paving and grass, well

224 maintained or other well maintained shrubbery. 225 5 4. Allowing tires to be sold or displayed for sale within view of the 226 adjacent land properties, unless the same are displayed in a rack and only during 227 business hours. (Ord. 499, 8-8-66; amd. 1995 Code) 228 E.I. Smoke and Fumes: Dense smoke, noxious fumes, gas and soot or cinders in unreasonable 229 quantities. (Ord. 207, 11-9-55) 230 J. Vibrations: All unnecessary and annoying vibrations. 231 C. K. Weeds and Vegetation: All noxious weeds are prohibited in all locations. Also, Tall turf 232 grasses, nuisance weeds and rank vegetative growth shall be not maintained at a height of 233 eight inches or less in locations closer than 40 feet to from: 234 1. An occupied principal structure; 235 2. Any property line with an occupied structure on abutting property; and 236 3. A public road pavement edge. 237 This section shall not apply to: 238 1. Natural areas, public open space or park lands, as determined by the city 239 forester or naturalist designated by the city manager. (Ord. 1136, 2-28-1994); 240 Amd. (Ord. 1384, 7-13-2009) 241 2. Yard areas with natural landscaping that follow the City Park Department 242 policy for natural landscaping (Ord. 1384, 7-13-2009) 243 R. L. Yard Cover: The yYard area of a lot shall not be bare soil, shall be covered by a 244 groundcover and shall be maintained as set forward in Section 407.02(CA). (Ord. 1384, 7-245 13-2009) (Ord. 1466, 4-21-2014) H. Peddling and Soliciting: 246 247 1. The practice of going house-to-house, door-to-door, business-to-business, street-to-street, 248 or any other type of place-to-place, for the purposes of offering for sale or obtaining, or 249 attempting to obtain, orders for goods, wares, products, merchandise, other personal 250 property or services if conducted in the following manner: a. Obstructing the free flow of either vehicular or pedestrian traffic on any street, alley, 251 252 sidewalk or other public right-of-way; 253 b. Conducting business in a way as to create a threat to the health, safety and welfare of 254 any individual or the general public; 255 c. Conducting business before 7:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m. 256 d. Making any false or misleading statements about the product or service being offered, 257 including untrue statements of endorsement; 258 e. Remaining on the property of another when requested to leave, or to otherwise conduct 259 business in a manner a reasonable person would find obscene, threatening, intimidating or abusive. 260 261 2. Entering the property of another, unless invited to do so by the property owner or tenant, for the purpose of conducting business as a peddler or solicitor when the property is marked 262 263 with a sign or placard at least 4 inches long and 4 inches wide with print at least 48 point in size stating "No Trespassing" or "No Peddlers or Solicitors," or "Peddlers and Solicitors 264 265 Prohibited" or other comparable statement. Removing, defacing or otherwise tampering 266 with any sign or placard under this section by a person other than the property owner or 267 tenant. 268 (Ord. 1293, 8-11-2003)

O. Vehicles Constituting a Public Nuisance:

- 270 1. Abandoned and Junk Vehicles Create Hazard: Abandoned and junk vehicles are declared 271 to be a public nuisance creating hazard to the health and safety of the public because they 272 invite plundering, create fire hazards, attract vermin, and present physical dangers to the 273 safety and well being of children and other citizens. The accumulation and outside storage of 274 such vehicles is in the nature of rubbish, litter and unsightly debris and is a blight on the 275 landscape and a detriment to the environment. It shall be unlawful for a person to pile, store 276 or keep wrecked, junked or abandoned motor vehicles on private or public property. 277 2. Vehicles Impeding Traffic Flow: Any vehicle, whether occupied or not that is found 278 stopped, standing or parked in violation of any ordinance or State statute; or that is reported 279 stolen; or that is found impeding firefighting, snow removal or plowing or the orderly flow
 - 3. Vehicles Impeding Road and Utility Repair: Any vehicle which is impeding public road or utility repair, construction or maintenance activities after reasonable notice of the improper activities has been given to the vehicle owner or user at least 12 hours in advance, is declared to be a public nuisance.
 - 4. Vehicles Without License Plates: Except where expressly permitted by state law, any vehicle shall be deemed to be junked or abandoned if said vehicle does not have attached thereto a valid and current license plate issued by the proper State agency. (Ord. 1288, 8-4-2003)
 - P. Abatement of Vehicles:

282

283

284

285

286 287

288

289

297

298

299

301

305

306

307

308

309

310

of traffic is declared to be a public nuisance.

290 1. Impounding: Any police officer or other duly authorized person may order any vehicle
291 constituting a public nuisance to be immediately removed and/or impounded. The
292 impounded vehicle shall be surrendered to the duly identified owner by the towing
293 contractor only upon payment of the required impound, towing and storage fees.
294 2. Sale: Notice and sale of any vehicle impounded under this Chapter shall be conducted in
295 accordance with Minnesota Statutes chapter 168B governing the sale of abandoned motor
296 vehicles. (Ord. 1162, 7-10-95)

407.03: NUISANCES AFFECTING <u>PUBLIC HEALTH PEACE</u> AND SAFETY:

- The following are declared to be nuisances affecting public <u>health</u> peace and safety:
 - A. Carcasses: Carcasses of animals not buried or destroyed within 24 hours after death.
- 302 C.B. Dangerous Buildings: All buildings, walls and other structures which have been damaged by
 303 fire, decay or otherwise to an extent exceeding 1/2 their original replacement value or which
 304 are so situated as to endanger the safety of the public, or by order of the Building Official.
 - J.C. Dangers Attractive to Children: All dangerous, unguarded machinery, equipment or other property in any public place or so situated or operated on private property as to attract minor children.
 - D. Diseased Animals: All diseased animals running at large.
 - D.E. Explosives: All explosives, inflammable liquids and other dangerous substances or materials stored or accumulated in any manner or in any amount other than that provided by law.
- F. Holes and Excavations: Any well, hole or similar excavation that is left uncovered,
 unprotected or in such other condition as to constitute a hazard to a person on the premises
 where it is located.
- 314 Q.G.Interference With Radio Or TV: All unnecessary interference and disturbance of radios or

- TV sets caused by defective electrical appliances and equipment or improper operation of any defective electrical appliances and equipment.

 L.H.Interfering With Drainage: Placing entrance culverts or doing any act which may alter or
 - L.H. Interfering With Drainage: Placing entrance culverts or doing any act which may alter or affect the drainage of public streets or alleys or the surface or grade of public streets, alleys or sidewalks without proper permit.
 - H.I. Junk: The outside piling, storing or keeping of old machinery, furniture, household furnishings or appliances or component parts thereof, rusting metal inoperable/unusable equipment, or other debris visible on private or public property. (Ord. 1162, 7-10-1995)
 - B.J. Low Wires, Tree Limbs, Other Vegetation: All wires, tree limbs and other vegetation which are strung less than 15 feet above the surface of any public street or alley located close enough to the surface of a public non-motorized pathway, street or alley as to constitute an impediment to the safe passage of pedestrians, bicyclists or permitted vehicles.
 - K. Material From Air: Throwing, dropping or releasing printed matter, paper or any other material or objects over the City from an airplane, balloon or other aircraft or in such a manner as to cause such material to fall or land in the City.
 - **L.L.** Obstruction of Streets, <u>Crowds</u>: Any use of property abutting on a public street or sidewalk or any use of a public street or sidewalk which causes large crowds of people to gather obstructing traffic and the free use of public streets or sidewalks, <u>except where permitted by the City</u>.
 - M. Peddling and Soliciting:

- 1. Engaging in Peddling or Soliciting, if conducted in the following manner:
 - a. Obstructing the free flow of either vehicular or pedestrian traffic on any street, alley, sidewalk or other public right-of-way; or
 - b. Creating a threat to the health, safety and welfare of any individual or the general public; or
 - c. Doing so before 8:00 a.m. or after 8:00 p.m.; or
 - d. Making any false or misleading statements about the product or service being offered, including untrue statements of endorsement; or
 - e. Remaining on the property of another when requested to leave; or
 - f. Otherwise act in a manner a reasonable person would find obscene, threatening, intimidating or abusive.
- 2. Entering the property of another, unless invited to do so by the property owner or tenant prior to entrance onto the property, for the purpose of conducting business as a peddler or solicitor when the property is marked with a sign or placard meeting the following criteria:
 - a. Sized at least 4 inches long and 4 inches wide; and
 - b. Having print at least 48 point in size or one half inch tall; and
- <u>c. Stating "No Trespassing" or "No Peddlers or Solicitors," or "Peddlers</u> and Solicitors Prohibited" or other comparable statement.
- 3. Removing, defacing or otherwise tampering with any sign or placard displayed in accordance with paragraph 2 above by a person other than the property owner or tenant. (Ord. 1293, 8-11-2003)
- F.N. Radio Aerials: Radio aerials strung or erected in any manner except that provided by law. (Ord. 207, 11-9-55)
- M.O. Repairing Vehicles or Tires in Streets: Making repairs to motor vehicles or tires in public streets or alleys, excepting only emergency repairs when it such repairs will not unduly

impede or interfere with traffic.

- A.P. Snow On Non-motorized Pathways: On all properties with off-the-road, non-motorized pathways, except nontax exempt R-1 or R-2 Low Density Residential properties, ice and snow shall be that is not removed from the non-motorized pathway within 12 hours after snow and ice have ceased to be deposited thereon. (Ord. 925, 5-9-83)
 - E. Noises: All unnecessary noises and annoying vibrations.
 - G.Q. Storage of Wood: The storage of any wood or wood product used or intended to be used as fire wood on residential properties within the City unless wood piles are erected, located and maintained in a safe and orderly fashion:
 - 1. In neat and secure stacks elevated 6 inches off the ground;
 - 2. A maximum height allowed for a wood pile is 6 feet; and
 - 3. Fire wood shall only be stored in a side or rear yard.
 - The City Council may issue permits for the storage of wood in situations where unique circumstances preclude the ability to meet the standards of the Code. (Ord. 522, 1–9–67; amd. 1995 Code)
 - R. Traffic Visibility: Maintaining conditions on any property that violate the requirements of Section 1011.06 of this Code (Visibility Triangles in All Districts).
 - N.S. Trash In Streets: Throwing, placing, depositing or burning leaves, trash, lawn clippings, weeds, grass or other material in the streets, <u>non-motorized pathways</u>, alleys or gutters.
 - O.T. Unauthorized Signs: Erecting, painting or placing of unauthorized traffic signs or advertising signs in streets, alleys or on sidewalks.
 - Q. Storing of Boats, Trailers and Inoperative Motor Vehicles In Front Yards:
 - 1. The storing of the following things for a period longer than 72 hours in the front yard of any residential zoned area:
 - a. Trailers of any kind, unless supporting a boat of 20 feet or less.
 - b. Boats or watercraft of any kind in excess of 20 feet.
 - c. Inoperative motor vehicles of any type.
 - d. Campers and camper buses.
 - 2. For the purpose of this Section, "front yard" means any area between any public street and a line parallel to the public street at the building line. (Ord. 522, 1-9-1967; 1995 Code)

407.04: PUBLIC NUISANCE UNLAWFUL VEHICLES CONSTITUTING A PUBLIC NUISANCE:

- A. Abandoned, Junk and Inoperable Vehicles Create Hazard: Abandoned, junk and inoperable vehicles are declared to be a public nuisance creating hazard to the health and safety of the public because they invite plundering, create fire hazards, attract vermin, and present physical dangers to the safety and well being of children and other citizens. The accumulation and outside storage of such vehicles is in the nature of rubbish, litter and unsightly debris and is a blight on the landscape and a detriment to the environment. It shall be unlawful for a person to pile, store or keep wrecked, junked, inoperable or abandoned vehicles on private or public property.
- B. Vehicles Impeding Traffic Flow: Any vehicle, whether occupied or not that is found stopped, standing or parked in violation of any ordinance or State statute; or that is reported stolen; or that is found impeding firefighting, snow removal or plowing or the orderly flow of traffic is declared to be a public nuisance.
- 405 C. Vehicles Impeding Road and Utility Repair: Any vehicle which is impeding public road or

- 406 utility repair, construction or maintenance activities after reasonable notice of the improper 407 activities has been given to the vehicle owner or user at least 12 hours in advance, is 408 declared to be a public nuisance.
- 409 D. Vehicles Without Current Registration License Plates: Except where expressly permitted by 410 state law, any vehicle or other equipment, which requires registration for operation in the State of Minnesota, shall be deemed to be junked, inoperable or abandoned if said vehicle 411 412 does not have attached thereto a valid registration and current license plate issued by the 413 proper State agency. (Ord. 1288, 8-4-2003)
- E. Abatement of Vehicles: 414
- 415 1. Impounding: Any police officer or other duly authorized person may order any vehicle
- constituting a public nuisance to be immediately removed and/or impounded. The 416
- 417 impounded vehicle shall be surrendered to the duly identified owner only upon payment of 418 the required impound, towing and storage fees.
- 419 2. Sale: Notice and sale of any vehicle impounded under this Chapter shall be conducted in
- 420 accordance with Minnesota Statutes chapter 168B governing the sale of abandoned motor
- 421 vehicles. (Ord. 1162, 7-10-95)

422 **407.05: PUBLIC NUISANCE UNLAWFUL:**

- 423 It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, corporation or association to maintain any public
- 424 "nuisance" as defined in this Chapter and it shall further be unlawful to do any act which act is
- 425 defined as a public "nuisance" in this Chapter. (Ord. 320, 6-9-1961)

426 **407.056**: **ENFORCEMENT**:

- 427 The City Council authorizes the Community Development Director (or designee) to administer
- 428 and enforce this Chapter. The Community Development Director may institute, in the name of
- 429 the City, any appropriate actions or proceedings against a violator as provided by law.
- 430 (Ord.1354, 10-22-2007)

407.067: CITY ABATEMENT OF PUBLIC NUISANCES: 431

- 432 A. Notice: Whenever an officer charged with enforcement determines that a public nuisance is
- 433 being maintained or exists on premises in the City, and determines that the City abatement
- 434 process is appropriate, the officer shall notify, in writing, the owner or occupant of the
- 435 premises of such fact and order that such nuisance be terminated or abated. The notice shall
- 436 specify the steps to be taken to abate the nuisance and the time, not exceeding 30 days,
- 437 within which the nuisance is to be abated. (Ord.1354, 10-22-2007)
- B. Noncompliance: If the notice is not complied with within the time specified, the enforcing 438 439 officer shall immediately report that fact to the City Council. The enforcing officer shall
- 440 also provide notice to the owner or occupant of the premises that the City Council will
- 441 consider the matter and may provide for abating the nuisance by the City. The notice shall
- state the date on which the City Council will consider the matter. Notice by the enforcing 442
- 443 officer shall be given at least ten days before the date stated in the notice when the City
- 444 Council will consider the matter. If notice of the fact that the City Council will consider the
- matter is given by posting, at least 30 days shall elapse between the day of posting and the 445 date of consideration by the City Council. (Ord. 1337, 5-22-2006) 446
- 447 C. Action of City Council: Upon notice from the enforcing officer of noncompliance, the City

- Council may, after notice to the owner or occupant and an opportunity to be heard, provide for abating the nuisance by the City.
- D. Service of Notice: Notices shall may be served by any or all of the following methods:
 - 1. In person; or

452

453

454 455

458

462

480

481

- 2. By certified or registered mail; or
- 3. By posting on site or premises.
- If the premises are not occupied and the owner is unknown, the notice may be served by posting it on the premises.
- The notice shall specify the steps to be taken to abate the nuisance and the time, not exceeding 30 days, within which the nuisance is to be abated.

E. Immediate Threat: If the nuisance poses an immediate threat to the health or safety of the public, the City may abate the nuisance immediately with no hearing. (Ord. 1016, 6-8-1987) (Ord. 1337, 5-22-2006)

407.0<mark>78</mark>: **RECOVERY OF COST**:

- A. Personal Liability: The owner of premises on which a nuisance has been abated by the City shall be personally liable for the cost to the City of the abatement, including administrative costs. As soon as the work has been completed and the cost determined, the City Manager, or other official designated by the City Council, shall prepare a bill for the cost and mail it to the owner. The amount shall be immediately due and payable at the office of the City Manager.
- 469 B. Assessment: If the nuisance is a public health or safety hazard on private property, the 470 accumulation of snow and ice on public sidewalks, the growth of weeds on private property 471 or outside the traveled portion of streets, or unsound or insect infected trees, the city 472 manager shall, on or before September 1 next following abatement of the nuisance, list the 473 total unpaid charges along with all other such charges, as well as other charges for current 474 services to be assessed under Minnesota Statutes section 429.101 against each separate lot or 475 parcel to which the charges are attributable. The City Council may then spread the charges 476 against such property under that statute and other pertinent statutes for certification to the 477 County Auditor and collection along with current taxes the following year, or in annual 478 installments not exceeding 10, as the City Council may determine in each case. (Ord. 1016, 479 6-8-1987)

407.089: ACCELERATED ABATEMENT PROCESS FOR CERTAIN

482 **NUISANCES:**

- A. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 407.06 of this chapter, city officers charged with enforcement of this chapter shall follow the accelerated procedure described below for abating accumulations of snow and ice under subsection 407.03A of this chapter, tall grasses, nuisance weeds and other vegetative growth under subsection 407.02C of this chapter; cut vegetative debris under subsection 407.02D of this chapter; and graffiti under subsection 407.02Q of this chapter. (Ord. 1337, 5-22-2006)
- 1. Notice of Violation: Whenever the officer charged with enforcement determines that a nuisance proscribed under subsection 407.03A or 407.02C of this chapter is being

491	maintained or exists on premises in the city, written notice shall be served in person;
492	or by posting on premises; or by regular or certified first-class mail shall be provided to the
493	property owner or occupant. If the premises are not occupied and the owner is not known,
494	the notice may be served by posting it on the premises. The certified notice shall specify the
495	nuisance to be abated, that the nuisance must be abated within 5 working days, and that if
496	the nuisance is not abated within 5 working days, that the city will have the nuisance abated
497	and the cost of abatement certified against the property for collection with taxes.
498	2. Abatement by City: If the owner or occupant fails to comply with the certified mail notice
499	within 5 days, the city shall provide for abatement of the nuisance. The officer charged with
500	enforcement shall keep records of the cost of abatement and shall provide this information to
501	the city manager for assessment against the property pursuant to section 407.07 of this
502	chapter. (Ord. 1228, 7-12-1999)

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511 512

513

514

515

516

517

530

531

532

407.10: PUBLIC NUISANCE VARIANCE:

- A. A variance request pertaining to an initial notice, prior to consideration by City Council, of nuisances occurring on public or private property as addressed in Section 407.02.G may be filed by a property owner or occupant with the following requirements:
 - 1. Shall be submitted on forms supplied by the City; and
 - 2. Shall include a specific description detailing the reason for the variance request; and
 - 2. Shall be delivered to the Community Development Director within the timeframe given in the initial notice; and
 - 3. Shall be accompanied by the fee set forth in Chapter 314.B; and
 - 4. Submission of evidence including written approval of the otherwise prohibited activity, by 75% of the adjacent property owners within 100 feet of the subject property or prohibited activity.
 - 5. Submission of evidence including written approval of the otherwise prohibited activity, by 100% of the abutting property owners of the subject property or prohibited activity.
- 518 B. Variance requests will be considered, approved or denied by the Community Development
- 519 Director or his/her designee(s). The Community Development Director or his/her designee(s)

520 shall:

- 521 1. Notify the applicant and all property owners, identified under 407.10.A.4,5, within five 522 (5) business days the decision to approve or deny the request and the process available 523 for appeal.
- 524 C. Variance approvals may be granted with or without conditions, including but not limited to a
- 525 time limited duration at the discretion of the City. Violations to any approved public nuisance
- 526 variance shall be grounds for immediate revocation of the variance. Additional nuisance activity
- 527 or violation to City Code may be grounds for the revocation of an approved variance.
- 528 D. Variance denials or revocations may be appealed to City Council by the applicant. If an
- 529 appeal is filed it must:
 - 1. Be submitted on forms supplied by the City; and
 - 2. Be delivered to the City Manager within 10 days of the denial or revocation.

407.11: VARIANCE APPEAL:

533	When an appeal is filed, a public meeting regarding the matter shall be held before the City
534	Council, acting as the Board of Adjustments and Appeals, at a regular meeting held within thirty
535	(30) calendar days of the receipt of the appeal. The Board of Adjustments and Appeals may
536	consider any of the evidence that had previously been considered as part of the formal action that
537	is the subject of the appeal. New or additional information from the appealing applicant(s) may
538	be considered by the Board of Adjustments and Appeals at its sole discretion if that information
539	serves to clarify information previously considered by the Community Development Director or
540	his/her designee(s).



Community Development Department

Memo

To: Kari Collins, Community Development Director

From: Dave Englund, Codes Coordinator

Date: 05/11/2017

Re: Resident feedback in regards to proposed nuisance code changes

Kari,

I received 9 emails and approximately 44 phone calls and messages regarding the proposed nuisance code changes. I will redact personal information and attach to the RCA for discussion.

The phone calls and messages I will paraphrase below.

The majority of the calls referenced the hours allowed for peddling and soliciting, this seemed to follow that which I received via email. The overall consensus was to reduce the allowed hours for the activity (most actually wanted it eliminated altogether, but understood it was not a possibility).

Another reoccurring concern for residents was the placement of large recreational vehicles parked in rear or side yards. The requested change allowing the parking of these non-motorized vehicles with a five foot setback (similar to sheds, compost bins and driveways) has the potential for lessening the concerns of residents.

The remainder were equal in opposition and proponents of the keeping of chickens and bees. I received no feedback either for or against the possibility of removing the restriction on pigs and goats.

Dave

David Englund

From:

RV Info

Sent:

Monday, April 03, 2017 4:11 PM

To:

David Englund

Cc:

Pat Trudgeon; Kari Collins

Subject:

FW: Online Form Submittal: General Inquiry Form

FYI

From: noreply@civicplus.com [mailto:noreply@civicplus.com]

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:54 PM To: RV Info <info@cityofroseville.com>

Subject: Online Form Submittal: General Inquiry Form

General Inquiry Form

Please complete this online form and submit.

Contact Information

First Name

Last Name

Field not completed.

Address 1

Field not completed.

Address 2

Roseville

City

MN

State

Zip Code

55113

Home or Cell Phone

Number

Email Address

Email

Select how would you prefer to be contacted

Please share your comment, question or concern (no character limit)

We were pleased to see some clarification regarding the nuisance code. One item that we wondered about is solicitation. Does this also include flyers stuck on peoples doors? When we leave for a vacation we don't feel as though

someone should have to come by and take things off our door. There doesn't seem to be a way to keep the flyers from being placed on our doors (we have two front doors). If the code is being changed we would love to see a "no flyer" addition. Thanks for keeping Roseville a great place to live!

Email not displaying correctly? View it in your browser.

David Englund

From:

Sent: Sunday, April 02, 2017 6:44 PM

To: David Englund

Subject: Chapter 407 of the City Code

Dear Mr. Englund, I have some feedback about the proposed changes to Chapter 407 of the City Code.

- 1. We like the addition of current registration for motor vehicles stored in the yard.
- 2. We could not locate the description of a "driveway" in the online document, but we would like to have this more clearly identified. received a variance to build a large garage, but according to a previous discussion with the city it is OK for him to have his cars in the back yard because they are on a gravel driveway. However this gravel driveway led to the old garage which was demolished. Thus, the "driveway" takes up a large portion of the backyard.
- 3. Can there be a limit to the number of vehicles per yard or acre that can be parked in the yard that cannot fit into the garage?
- 4. Can there be more robust enforcement please?

David Englund

From:

Sent:

Thursday, March 30, 2017 12:00 PM

To:

David Englund

Subject:

Soliciting Hours Roseville

Hi David,

I see that the City of Roseville is going to be making some changes to the code and provided your email for feedback. I am writing to ask for consideration of limiting the soliciting hours until 7 pm. In addition to it being very inconvenient to get a knock on the door after dark, I think it is a safety issue.

Thank you for your time.

David Englund

From:

Sent:

Wednesday, March 29, 2017 3:07 PM

To:

David Englund

Subject:

Updates to Code for nuisance

Why would temporary play houses not be allowed in front yards?

pollinating garden has tall grasses and lots of native plants. I assume this is allowed. I think the phrase "tall grass" is too vague.

Thank you.

David Englund

From:

Sent:

Wednesday, March 29, 2017 1:50 PM

To: Subject: David Englund city code changes

may I ask you to consider changing the time peddlers//solicitors need to stop to be 8pm instead of 9pm? most of summer is darker at 9pm and hard to see who is out there also some of us get up mighty early in the morning for work

thanks

David Englund

From:

Sent:

Wednesday, March 29, 2017 2:07

To:

PM David Englund

Subject:

code change feedback chickens......

Hi David,

I'm writing to add my feedback to code changes. I was happy to see the changes as they are proposed. I do have a concern that I feel is being over looked. It is about chickens, they seem to be exempt. I am not against chickens,

people kept them in their front yard with a weird netting structure over them. chickens were fun to watch, but they stunk, and they also made noise all day and in the early morning hours. I emailed some code person then a couple of years ago and that person told me there really weren't any codes being broken, maybe perhaps the structure they had over it was not allowed.

They keep theirs in the back but each day they let them roam free. Imagine cars driving slamming on their brakes for fear of hitting them. I was told if the chickens go into the street I must call the police when they are in the way of traffic. Otherwise the chickens were fine to roam about.

To me, calling the police on chickens is not something I want to bother them with and yes I have talked to the people, they just wrangle them back to their yard. Other people driving by have also knocked on their door about the chickens. but feel when the city has no guidelines on things such as this, it makes to put up with these things and police things themselves.

Unless you have had to deal with these issues you are not aware of the problem they can become To me this is a city not a farm anymore. Farm animals should not be allowed in a city. These are my concerns. Thank you for taking the time to read them.

David Englund

From:

Sent:

Friday, March 31, 2017 5:33 PM

To:

David Englund

Subject:

Nuisance Ordinance

Mr. Englund,

My initial response is that I'd like to see the solicitation hours (currently from 7 AM to 9 PM) shortened. I think that's too early and too late in the day. I'd actually like it eliminated, but I know that's an unrealistic expectation.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

David Englund

From:

Sent:

Friday, April 21, 2017 3:37 PM

To:

David Englund

Subject:

Feedback on Nuisance code changes

Hello Mr. Engelund,

The Roseville City website asked for resident feedback on the proposed code changes. So here you go:

407.01 Definition of Graffiti

"Any unauthorized..." -> from the definition it is unclear whether unauthorized by the homeowner or another entity. I assume the homeowner?

407.02 Comfort or Repose

C "Tall Grass" -> This would even affect 'little bluestem' when not part of native landscaping.

M.1. Non permanent structures

Why are we telling people they cannot have a skateboard ramp or playhouse in their front yard? Why is this the cities' business?

Date: 5-15-2017 Item No.: 7.g

Department Approval

City Manager Approval

Hai & Callin

Kari Collins, Community Development Director

Item Description: Discuss 407.02.G of City Code Regulating Pigs and Goats

BACKGROUND

During the March 27, 2017 Council discussion of proposed nuisance code amendments, the City Council directed staff to research how other communities regulate pigs and goats.

Staff performed research and found four cities which currently allow for the keeping of pigs and goats. Those cities were Shoreview, Fridley (on one acre and larger parcels), Duluth and St. Paul. Please note the following research findings:

• The City of Shoreview Code Enforcement Officer indicated that Shoreview allows these animals by ordinance, however, no such animals to his knowledge are being kept currently, or have for a number of years.

• The City of St. Paul Animal Control suggested proceeding with caution and that preparation should occur prior to the ordinance change including what specific licensing, enclosure and enforcement requirements would be implemented. Also, it was suggested that the City of Roseville consider how Animal Control would deal with these animals. It was stated that current staff may need additional training in how to deal with these animals and how to transport any strays. St. Paul also suggested that the current contract with a veterinary hospital be researched to identify if these animals can be brought to their location for impound.

• Staff also contacted the Animal Humane Society, as well as, the Animal Board of Health for comments regarding the allowing of pigs and goats in an urban area. The Animal Humane Society raised concerns about these animals being kept in an urban environment. It was the Society's opinion that these animals do not thrive in the urban environment and they were concerned if this would lead to circumstances that would require these animals being brought to their shelters or similar animal rescue shelters.

• Dr. Thompson, State Veterinarian Animal Board of Health, raised similar concerns. Dr. Thompson suggested that Roseville should research the specific vaccination requirements and enclosure requirements these animals need for their safety and the safety of the public. She stated these two groups of animals are very difficult to regulate regarding specific species or weight (as Duluth and Shoreview do). She further stated that the so-called "tea-cup" and potbellied pigs can grow well in excess of two hundred pounds. Also, she stated that goats, of any size, can be extremely destructive to structures, plantings and landscapes.

It is the opinion of staff that removing the restriction on the keeping of pigs and goats may be problematic to enforce due to the following:

- An extraordinary amount of staff time will be required to craft any licensing ordinances specific to these animals.
 - Research related to the required vaccinations and enclosure requirements will need to be compiled well in advance of amending this section of current code.
 - Discussions will need to occur amongst various City Departments regarding oversight and enforcement if these animals are allowed to be kept within the City.
 - Further staff time will need to be allocated to the training of designated staff in the securing and transportation of any stray animals that are located.

Prepared by: Dave Englund, Codes Coordinator

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: May 15, 2017

Item No.: 9.a

Department Approval City Manager Approval

Para / Truger

Item Description: Appoint Youth Commissioner to Human Rights, Inclusion and

Engagement Commission

BACKGROUND

It has been customary for the City Council to appoint non-voting youth representative(s) to serve

3 on various advisory commissions.

5 Elizabeth Hansel has been a youth commissioner on the Human Rights Commission. Similar to

- 6 the appointment of existing Human Rights Commission and Community Engagement
- 7 Commission members to the new Human Rights, Inclusion, and Engagement Commission, Ms.
- 8 Hansel should be appointed to serve on the new commission until the expiration of her term on
- 9 July 31, 2017.

10 FINANCIAL IMPACTS

11 None

15

4

12 REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION

Appoint Ms. Elizabeth Hansel to serve as a youth commissioner on the Human Rights, Inclusion

and Engagement Commission with a term ending July 31, 2017.

Prepared by: Carolyn Curti, Administration Department

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: May 15, 2017

Item No.: 9.b

Department Approval

City Manager Approval

Item Description: Resolution Opposing Small Cell Legislation for the Use of Public Rights-

of-Way

BACKGROUND

10

19

2 Private wireless and cellular service providers are pushing legislation that would allow access to

3 the public right-of-way for the installation of "small cell wireless" equipment and antenna

4 systems. The proposed legislation would also provide access for the small cell industry to locate

their equipment on public agency owned facilities such as light poles and larger sign structures.

6 The bills being considered currently seek to modify Minnesota Statutes Chapters 237.162 and

7 237.163 which pertain to the management of public rights-of-ways. While most organizations

and agencies support allowing the wireless industry access to the public right-of-way, which isn't

9 clear in current statutes, the industry is proposing sweeping language that provides them

additional rights and protections that current private industry users of the right-of-way, such as

gas, electric, cable and telecom providers, do not have today.

Specifically the proposed legislation exempts the small cell industry from all zoning regulations

as well as preempts local decisions that would protect interests of the public and the public

agency that has jurisdiction over the public right-of-way. It also details specific "shot clock"

provisions that regulate the maximum amount of time an agency has to review permits for small

cell installations. Other users of the right-of-way do not have specific language for permit review

times and these types of permits could be quite complicated and take considerable time to review

to ensure the protection of the health, safety and welfare of the public as well as the protection of

the general aesthetic environment at the proposed locations.

20 Another issue of concern relates to collocation fees for the use of publicly owned facilities such

as light poles. Currently, for large antenna systems, the City receives a lease payment for each

antenna. The City generates a significant amount of revenue which is used primarily to offset IT

23 costs for the City. There is concern that the language in this bill which currently restricts fees

beyond actual cost recovery, could set a precedent for the erosion of the lease rates we receive for

25 the use of our water tower and communications towers.

Given these concerns, and at the request of multiple Councilmembers, staff has prepared a

27 resolution opposing the current legislation for Small Cell Wireless installations. Staff is

recommending the City Council consider this resolution and if they agree with the statements

adopt the resolution. Staff with then forward this to our local representatives as well as the

League of Minnesota Cities.

31 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 32 There are no costs for adopting this resolution. If this legislation were to pass, there is the
- possibility that the City could lose out on future lease fees for the use of City owned facilities in
- 34 the public right-of-way.

35 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- 36 Staff recommends Council consider the attached resolution opposing small cell wireless
- legislation for the use of public rights-of-way.

38 REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION

- Motion to adopt a resolution opposing small cell wireless legislation for the use of public rights-of-
- 40 way.

Prepared by: Marc Culver - Public Works Director

Attachments: A: Resolution

B: League of Minnesota Cities Small Cell Wireless Fact Sheet

1 2	EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE
3	CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
4	
5	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
6	
7	Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of
8 9	Roseville, Minnesota was duly held on the 15 th day of May, 2017, at 6:00 p.m.
10	The following members were present: , , , , and Mayor , and the
11	following were absent: .
12	
13	Member introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:
14 15	RESOLUTION No.
16	RESOLUTION NO.
17	RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION REGARDING
18	UNREGULATED ACCESS TO THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR INSTALLATION
19	OF SMALL CELL WIRELESS EQUIPMENT AND ANTENNA SYSTEMS
20	
21	WHEREAS, the City of Roseville has regulations and provisions contained in Chapter 707 of the
22 23	City's City Code detailing the City's permitting of use of the public right-of-way; and
24 25 26 27 28	WHEREAS, legislation was proposed in the Minnesota Legislature that would allow wireless companies to install small cell facility networks in public rights-of-way, subject to mandated statutory regulation that materially differs from the regulation of all other right-of-way users and significantly limits local authority to regulate facility placement issues within the public right-of-way; and
29 30 31 32 33	WHEREAS, granting such access to the public right-of-way by wireless companies is unnecessary, competitively unfair and discriminatory, and may result in new wireless installations in public rights-of-way that compromise public safety and other public interests; and
34	WHEREAS, the City of Roseville currently receives some form of compensation for installations
34 35	or attachments on City owned facilities and the public's right to compensation for use of its
36	assets may be compromised with the passing of the proposed legislation; and
37	
38	WHEREAS, the legislation would supersede existing right-of-way and zoning ordinances and
39	comprehensive plans applicable to new wireless installations in public rights-of-way that the City
40	of Roseville has enacted and planned over the years.
41	
12 13 14 15	NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Roseville Minnesota that the City of Roseville does hereby oppose legislation granting unfair and discriminatory access to the public rights-of-way for the installation of small cell wireless equipment and antenna systems.

46		
47	The motion for the adoption of the foregoing resolution was duly seconded by Member	
48	and upon a vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: , , ,	
49	, and Mayor ,	
50	and the following voted against the same: .	
51		
52	WHEREUPON said resolution was declared duly passed and adopted.	

STATE OF MINNESOTA	
COUNTY OF RAMSEY) SS)
hereby certify that I have ca	duly qualified City Manager of the City of Roseville, Minnesota, do refully compared the attached and foregoing extract of minutes of a Council held on the 15 th day of May, 2017 with the original thereof
WITNESS MY HAND offic	ially as such Manager this 15 th day of May, 2017.
SEAL	
	Detail Total and Cita Manager
	Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager

SMALL CELL WIRELESS: UNREGULATED ACCESS TO PUBLIC ASSETS?

"Cities must balance the need to facilitate these emerging technologies with the needs of the local community."



DID YOU KNOW?

Wireless is an important part of our state's communications infrastructure, but it is a complement, not a substitute for high-speed broadband access in Greater Minnesota cities.

PROBLEM:

Private wireless and cellular service providers are pushing legislation (**HF739/SF561**) that would allow unregulated access to public right-of-way for installation of "small cell wireless" equipment and distributed antenna systems.

- These for-profit companies would be the only unregulated industry allowed unfettered access to this public asset.
- Automatic approval provided by this legislation ties the hands of cities who are responsible for managing these public spaces and considering elements of public health, safety, and aesthetics.
- The legislation limits, and in some cases eliminates, cities' cost recovery options for maintaining the public assets these companies are accessing.
- The legislation would supersede many existing zoning ordinances and comprehensive plans that cities have enacted and planned for over the years.

LEAGUE-SUPPORTED SOLUTION:

 The League supports making wireless providers telecommunication right-of-way (ROW) users with the same rights and privileges of other ROW users.

BACKGROUND:

This small cell technology is being deployed in urban areas to address increased data usage and to eventually deploy a new 5G cellular network.



FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Laura Ziegler

Senior Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Phone: (651) 281-1267 Email: lziegler@lmc.org www.lmc.org/wirelessfacts