

# C Community Development Committee

Meeting date: November 19, 2007

For Metropolitan Council meeting of Dec. 12, 2007

## ADVISORY INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	November 14, 2007
<b>Subject:</b>	Livable Communities Demonstration Account (LCDA) Funding Recommendations
<b>District(s), Member(s):</b>	All
<b>Policy/Legal Reference:</b>	Livable Communities Act, Minnesota Statutes 473.75
<b>Staff Prepared/Presented:</b>	Jan Gustafson, Manager, Livable Communities Program Joanne Barron, Planning Analyst Linda Milashius, Senior Planner
<b>Division/Department:</b>	Community Development, Housing & Livable Communities

**Today's Action:** None. This meeting is an opportunity to hear and ask questions about the Livable Communities Advisory Committee (LCAC) recommendations. Ruth Grendahl, Chair of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, will present the committee's recommendations and review the process the committee followed to evaluate the proposals.

### Proposed Action/Motion scheduled for December 3, 2007:

That the Metropolitan Council award grants from the Livable Communities Demonstration Account to the ten projects listed totaling \$5,936,397.

ID #, Applicant City	Project Name	Recommended Amount
A.4. Minneapolis	Longfellow Station	\$500,000
C.3. Rosemount	Stonebridge Core Block East	\$1,587,500
A.8. St. Paul	Dale Street Village	\$1,050,000
A.6. Minneapolis	West Broadway Curve	\$1,325,000
C.2. Forest Lake	Washington County Senior Housing/Headwaters	\$700,000
A.9. St. Paul	Rivoli Street	\$325,000
B.4. Roseville	Har Mar Apartments	\$305,000
Projects are listed in point rank order A – Center Cities, B – Developed Cities, C – Developing Cities		<b>Total \$5,792,500</b>

### Issues

- Whether the Council should award \$5,792,500 from the Livable Communities Demonstration Account (LCDA) for development projects recommended by the Livable Communities Advisory Committee.
- Whether to award, at the suggestion of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, an additional \$143,897 to project A.9, Rivoli Street, St, Paul, thereby fully funding this project's request. This would result in total LCDA dollars awarded of \$5,936,397.

### Overview and Funding

*Background and Funding Criteria.* The Community Development Committee recommended and the Metropolitan Council approved the 2006 LCA Annual Distribution Plan on March 28, 2007. The

approved Distribution Plan included the funding amount of \$8 million for LCDA, the funding criteria and calendar.

No major changes to the criteria were made this year. One change in the application process required applicants to submit a pre-application, to enable staff to provide better feedback to applicants on eligibility and other issues. Applicants commented that this process was helpful.

The criteria retained a change made in 2005 that the Advisory Committee may recommend up to 40 percent of the total LCDA funds in a grant cycle for projects located in Minneapolis and St. Paul (40 percent is the average yearly percentage of total funds awarded to the two cities during the first nine years of the program before this criteria was established). The criteria also state that the Council may award more than 40 percent of the total available funding to projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul, provided that the projects are exemplary demonstrations of the program criteria, and have satisfactorily met the evaluation assessment for readiness.

*Recommendations.* Seven projects are recommended by the advisory committee for funding, totaling \$5,792,500 of the available \$8 million, leaving a balance of \$2,207,500. Five of the seven projects are recommended for full funding. Partial funding for one of the projects, A.6., West Broadway Curve, Minneapolis, was arrived at by selecting line item requests most appropriate to the demonstration represented by the project. A second project, A.9, Rivoli Street, St. Paul, was recommended for partial funding to keep the recommended amount at the required 40 percent of total available dollars that the advisory committee could recommend for Minneapolis and St. Paul projects. However, the advisory committee suggests that the Community Development Committee consider awarding an additional \$143,897 to Rivoli Street, thereby fully funding this project's request, and bringing the total for this project to \$468,897. If this additional amount were recommended by the Community Development Committee, the recommendations would total \$5,936,397, leaving an LCDA balance (of the \$8 million allocated for 2007) of \$2,063,603.

**2007 Livable Communities Demonstration Account  
Development Grant Applications  
Received and Recommended for Funding**

**Total funding Available: \$8 Million**

A – Center Cities

B – Developed Cities    C – Developing Cities

	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Funding Request</b>	<b>Recommended Funding</b>
A.2	<i>Minneapolis</i>	<i>Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station Redevelopment</i>	\$1,134,200	0
A.3	<i>Minneapolis</i>	<i>Jackson Street NE Artist Affordable Housing</i>	\$1,272,680	0
<b>A.4</b>	<b>Minneapolis</b>	<b>Longfellow Station</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>
A.5	Minneapolis	SEMI-University Research Park / East Granary Road	\$971,000	0
<b>A.6</b>	<b>Minneapolis</b>	<b>West Broadway Curve</b>	<b>\$1,845,000</b>	<b>\$1,325,000</b>
A.7	St. Paul Port Authority	Arlington Jackson West	\$1,850,000	0
<b>A.8</b>	<b>St. Paul</b>	<b>Dale Street Village</b>	<b>\$1,050,000</b>	<b>\$1,050,000</b>
<b>A.9</b>	<b>St. Paul</b>	<b>Rivoli Street</b>	<b>\$468,897</b>	<b>\$325,000*</b>
A.10	St. Paul	Stryker Project	\$375,000	0
<b>B.1</b>	<b>Hopkins</b>	<b>Blake Corridor Improvement Project</b>	<b>\$2,995,000</b>	<b>0</b>
B.2	New Brighton	Northwest Quadrant	\$400,000	0
B.3	New Hope	Bass Lake Road Apartments Redevelopment	\$1,500,000	0
<b>B.4</b>	<b>Roseville</b>	<b>Har Mar Apartments</b>	<b>\$305,000</b>	<b>\$305,000</b>
C.1	Centerville	Phase I Downtown Redevelopment	\$1,466,000	0
<b>C.2</b>	<b>Forest Lake</b>	<b>Washington County Senior Housing /Headwaters</b>	<b>\$700,000</b>	<b>\$700,000</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>Rosemount</b>	<b>Stonebridge Core Block East</b>	<b>\$1,587,500</b>	<b>\$1,587,500</b>
Total			\$18,420,277	

\* The Livable Communities Advisory Committee suggests that the Council award an additional \$143,897 to fully fund this project.

- Proposals listed in **bold type** are recommended for full or partial funding, as indicated.
- Proposals in *italic type* met the 30 point threshold to be considered for funding, but were not recommended by the Advisory Committee because the amount recommended would have exceeded the 40 percent of available funding the LCAC could recommend for projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul.
- Proposals in regular type did not meet the 30 point threshold in the evaluation conducted by the Livable Communities Advisory Committee.
- Proposals in shaded type did not meet the 20 point threshold in the Step 1 Evaluation conducted by a staff team.

## **Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2007 Application and Review Process**

**Application Process:** Staff held two workshops for applicants on April 25 and 26 to explain the program, application form, evaluation process, and answer questions. A two-page pre-application was required to be submitted by June 11. Twenty-four pre-applications were received. Staff provided comments during the week of June 18 on eligibility of items for which funding was requested, comments in some cases that a proposal was not well targeted to the program and therefore unlikely to be competitive, and advice in cases where required information was missing from the project description or not in the required format. As a result of the staff comments or due to internal city decisions, eight pre-applications were not submitted as full applications. Applicants submitted 16 proposals by the application deadline of July 16 requesting eligible items totaling \$18,420,277.

**Eligibility Review:** Staff reviewed applications for completeness, eligibility of the proposal, eligibility of items requested, and whether the resolution of support contained all of the required language. Staff reviewed the circumstances of the use of eminent domain in the Stonebridge Court, Rosemount, project, and determined, in consultation with staff's legal counsel, that the use of eminent domain in this project is consistent with Council policy and state law.

**Step One Evaluation Process:** A staff team evaluated the 16 proposals according to seven criteria outlined in the LCDA program criteria—use land efficiently (0-8 points), link land uses with transit (0-8 points), connect housing and centers of employment and other uses (0-8 points), provide a range of housing (0-8 points), conserve and protect natural resources (0-8 points), and include processes and tools to ensure successful outcomes (0-10 points). Seven staff members evaluated proposals in their area of expertise according to specific measurable factors for each criteria. Each project could receive up to 50 points. The Step One evaluation covered the elements of the project that will be completed or substantially completed by the end of 2009, the two-year term of the grant contract. As a result of the Step One evaluation, 15 proposals advanced to the Step Two Evaluation and one did not, having scored less than 20 points.

**Step Two Evaluation Process:** The Livable Communities Advisory Committee conducted the Step Two evaluation over the course of six meetings from September 6 to November 1. Based on an initial evaluation of the 15 proposals, the LCAC selected 11 proposals for further funding consideration. The LCAC conducted a question-and-answer dialogue with representatives of the 11 proposals to get clarification or more detail on projects, and to ask why projects could not proceed or what could not be accomplished but for LCDA dollars at this time. Following committee discussion on each project at a later meeting, the committee scored each proposal against the selection criteria. The Step One evaluation points were brought to the advisory committee after it had completed its scoring evaluation process.

**Step Two Scoring:** The Advisory Committee scored proposals on two major evaluation criteria for which proposals could receive up to 50 points: 1) the extent to which the project shows innovative elements, and demonstrates, or shows potential to demonstrate, new development concepts for the community it is located in and/or for the region, and maximizes the potential of its location (0-30 points); and 2) the extent to which the element for which funding is requested will be a catalyst to implement the project (0-20 points). The committee selected 30 points as the threshold for further funding consideration. Nine projects scored above the 30 point threshold to be considered for funding, two below. The LCDA criteria, in addition to establishing the 30 point threshold, state that if a project scores below the 30 point threshold, the advisory committee may advance the project to the next evaluation step and make it eligible to be considered funding by a two-thirds vote of the committee. A motion was made to move B.2, Northwest Quadrant, New Brighton, into the group of projects to be considered for funding. The motion failed.

**Step Three – Readiness Assessment:** The Committee agreed that all nine projects that had scored at or above the 30 point scoring threshold are ready to be implemented.

**Checklist to Determine if Funding Request Substantially Demonstrates That Proposed Project is Feasible Only With LCDA Grant:** This checklist contains eight questions the Committee is required to answer “yes” or “no.” The Committee answered “yes” to all of the questions, for all ten projects. (Checklist is a separate attachment; forms signed by LCAC Chair Ruth Grendahl for each project are on file).

**Summaries of Projects Recommended for Funding  
With Funding Details**

**and**

**Summaries of Projects Not Recommended for Funding  
With Scoring Results**  
(listed in alphabetical order by city)

**Applicant: Minneapolis**

**Recommended Funding Amount: \$500,000**

**Project Name: Longfellow Station**

Site bounded by 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Hiawatha, 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Dight Avenue

**Project Description:**

The Longfellow Station project is a high-density multi-use transit oriented development located in immediate proximity to the 38<sup>th</sup> St. transit station of the Hiawatha LRT line. When completed the project will include 185-215 new housing units, 35,000 to 50,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, and approximately 430 structured, below-grade, and surface parking spaces. The project will include an innovative, comprehensive, integrated stormwater management system. The rental housing will include 185-215 units (approximately 119 affordable). The commercial space may include a grocery store as well other neighborhood commercial uses at ground level immediately adjacent to the housing structures. Commercial space users and housing residents will be able to park in the structured and below grade parking spaces. The estimated total development costs for the project are approximately \$50 million. The project developers have site control, have in place a complete development team, and are working with the neighborhood and city staff on land use and zoning approvals.

**Advisory Committee Comments on Demonstration, Innovation, Catalyst Elements of this Project:**

This project demonstrates good development strategies to deal with a difficult and challenging site along a transit corridor. The funded element is a fully integrated stormwater system that is a stormwater management model.

**Funding Requested/Funding Recommended:**

**Total Requested: \$500,000**

**Total Recommended: \$500,000**

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds
\$500,000	\$500,000	Construct new comprehensive stormwater management system.

**Previous LCDA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:**

Year	Amount	Purpose	Status
2006	\$934,523	Removal of grain elevators and underutilized buildings	No payments requested.

**Development Timeline:**

Task	Start Date	End Date
Construct components of stormwater management system	June 2008	October 2008

**Applicant: Rosemount**

**Recommended Funding Amount: \$1,587,500**

**Project Name: Stonebridge Core Block East**

Site bounded by Highway 3, Burnley Avenue, 146<sup>th</sup> Street and Lower 147<sup>th</sup> Street

---

**Project Description:**

The City of Rosemount has partnered with Stonebridge Development & Acquisition LLC to create a mixed-use project at the center of Rosemount’s downtown. The project at a site designated as “Core Block East” includes 103 apartment units above street level, of which 20 percent will be affordable. On the first level will be 12,000-square feet of commercial space for either retail or office users. The building reaches three stories along TH 3/South Robert Trail and rises to four stories on the north and east sides, away from TH 3. Residents of the development will be served by underground parking, and surface and on-street parking will be added for visitors, employees, and commercial patrons. The project will provide a more pedestrian-friendly circulation system through the use of sidewalks, appropriate lighting, and modification of the curblin of existing local roads. The land use and building massing are consistent with the *Development Framework for Downtown Rosemount* that was created through a citizen-driven process and adopted by the Rosemount Port Authority and the City Council. The building’s design and architecture are consistent with design guidelines developed by the citizen task force on downtown. The concept indicates installation of rain gardens that will assist in infiltration and water quality. Alternative stormwater solutions will be employed in recognition of the fact that Rosemount’s historic downtown is compact and ponding space limited. Other open spaces, both private and public, and the site’s formal landscaping will improve the property compared to the existing condition. The City is working with the developer to include more efficient mechanical systems and potential reuse of stormwater. The project as a whole, given its more compact footprint, is consistent with the goals of greening by using less property for a truly mixed use project. Overall, the development of a compact, mixed use, multi-story project with minimal setbacks, street orientation and sustainable development concepts is consistent with the goals of the City Council, community and adopted *Framework*.

**Advisory Committee Comments on Demonstration, Innovation, Catalyst Elements of this Project:**

The project demonstrates a good mix of uses and appropriate density for this downtown site, helping to transition from an agricultural to a more urban area. The land acquisition is a key catalyst to the city’s ongoing efforts to redevelop its downtown, and all of the requested elements are integral to catalyzing the development.

**Funding Requested/Funding Recommended:**

**Total Requested: \$1,587,500**

**Total Recommended: \$1,587,500**

<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Recommended</b>	<b>Use of Funds</b>
\$325,000	\$325,000	Land acquisition – two parcels
\$400,000	\$400,000	Street realignment and reconstruction of 146 <sup>th</sup> Street and Burma – realign curbing and install new curb cuts
\$25,000	\$25,000	Installation of sidewalks on south side of 146 <sup>th</sup> Street and west of Burma Avenue
\$250,000	\$250,000	Street lighting, benches, permanent bike racks
\$250,000	\$250,000	Regional pond expansion
\$337,500	\$337,500	Construct underground stormwater retention/infiltration system



**Previous LCDA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:                   None.**

**Development Timeline:**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
Land acquisition – 2 parcels	January 2008	February 2008
Street realignment and reconstruction of 146 <sup>th</sup> Street and Burma – realign curbing and install new curb cuts	May 2008	June 2008
Installation of sidewalks on south side of 146 <sup>th</sup> Street and west of Burma Avenue	September 2008	September 2008
Street lighting, benches, permanent bike racks	September 2008	September 2008
Regional pond expansion	May 2008	June 2008
Construct underground stormwater retention/infiltration system	June 2008	June 2008

**Applicant: St. Paul**

**Recommended Funding Amount: \$1,050,000**

**Project Name: Dale Street Village**

Northeast corner of the intersection of University Avenue and Dale Street

**Project Description:**

The City of St. Paul proposes redevelopment of the northeast corner of the University & Dale intersection to reflect positively on the community and increase vitality at the intersection. A four-story development will feature underground parking, approximately 20,800 square feet of commercial space on the first floor and 46 units of affordable housing on the second, third and fourth floors. The housing will be targeted towards active seniors. The commercial component of the project will feature an anchor tenant, currently envisioned as a Walgreen’s drug store, which will provide stable employment opportunities, goods and services. The building will also feature over 5,000 square feet of commercial space that will provide entrepreneurial opportunities for emerging local entrepreneurs and employment opportunities and community gathering places for local residents. The project will be developed by NEDU, LLC, a collaboration that includes Model Cities, Greater Frogtown Community Development Corporation, Neighborhood Development Center, and Aurora Saint Anthony Community Development. The Neighborhood Development Center and Model Cities will drive the commercial component of the project. Dale Street Village will implement the *University-Dale Transit Oriented Development(TOD) Study*, which was adopted by the City Council in May of 2004, in anticipation of the development of light-rail in the Central Corridor. The redevelopment of University and Dale is the first time a TOD plan will be implemented.

**Advisory Committee Comments on Demonstration, Innovation, Catalyst Elements of this Project:**

The project offers more intensive development appropriate to a transit corridor, compared to the existing conditions. It will create a new street frontage with innovative setback of the housing.

The advisory committee encourages the City to consider the surface parking on the site as a “placeholder,” to be used for future development that would add housing or other activities at this future LRT station, at a time when less parking is needed due to increased transit availability.

**Funding Requested/Funding Recommended:**

**Total Requested: \$1,050,000**

**Total Recommended: \$1,050,000**

<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Recommended</b>	<b>Use of Funds</b>
\$425,000	\$425,000	Acquire Saigon Restaurant Building
\$215,000	\$215,000	Acquire Lendways Restaurant Building
\$215,000	\$215,000	Acquire Nordic Electronics Building
\$75,000	\$75,000	Demolish police substation, Saigon, Lendways and Nordic buildings
\$120,000	\$120,000	Site grading and soil correction

**Previous LCDA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:**

**None.**

**Development Timeline:**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
Acquire Saigon, Lendways, Nordic buildings	March 2008	March 2008
Demolish police substation, Saigon, Lendways and Nordic buildings	March 2008	April 2008
Site grading and soil correction	March 2008	May 2008

**Applicant: Minneapolis**

**Recommended Funding Amount: \$1,325,000**

**Project Name: West Broadway Curve**

West Broadway Avenue between James and Oliver Avenues North

---

**Project Description:**

The West Broadway Curve project includes: Agape Apartments (1926-2018 W. Broadway) – 50-60 units of mixed-income rental housing with underground parking. Will incorporate pedestrian-friendly streetscape and green space design elements and high quality, attractive exterior façade; West Broadway Curve (1808-1904 W Broadway) – Approximately 24 mixed-income, new construction ownership units with off-street parking will connect Agape and Cottage Park; Western Motors Site (1939-2005 W Broadway) – To complete the West Broadway Curve, the City will purchase a used car lot, for sale on the open market, and redevelop the site to include 24-30 town house-style, ownership units; Cottage Park (2001-2109 James Avenue N) – One of six Northside Home Fund Clusters consisting of market rate, single family homes, rehab and new construction. Project includes pedestrian-friendly streetscape, lighting and green space improvements and traffic calming realignment of existing streets. Project goals are to strengthen and build the housing market in a concentrated geographic area in North Minneapolis, to encourage positive street activity and to increase market demand through increased density and improved socio-economic mix of residents. It builds on the West Broadway Alive! Plan and the Corridor Housing Initiative, and implements a comprehensive, large-scale strategy in compliance with the Minneapolis Plan.

**Advisory Committee Comments on Demonstration, Innovation, Catalyst Elements of this Project:**

The project will implement good design strategies to deal with a challenging site and location. Funding the acquisitions along Broadway and related improvements will act as a catalyst for visible improvements along this corridor.

**Funding Requested/Funding Recommended:**

**Total Requested: \$1,845,000**

**Total Recommended: \$1,325,000**

<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Recommended</b>	<b>Use of Funds</b>
\$40,000	\$40,000	Pedestrian-scale lighting – Agape Apartments
\$135,000	\$135,000	Acquisition of properties at 1926, 2014 and 2018 West Broadway
\$50,000	\$50,000	Widening of public sidewalk at 1926-2018 West Broadway
\$150,000	\$150,000	Site prep and grade correction at 1926-2018 West Broadway
\$380,000	\$380,000	Acquisition of properties at 1820, 1900 and 1914 West Broadway
\$80,000	\$80,000	Demolition of blighted structures at 1900 and 1914 West Broadway
\$420,000	\$420,000	Acquisition of West Motors property at 1939-2005 West Broadway
\$70,000	\$70,000	Demolition of structures at 1939-2005 West Broadway
\$300,000	-0-	Green roof design and construction
\$180,000	-0-	Curb and street realignment to effect traffic calming – Cottage Park
\$40,000	-0-	Pedestrian-scale lighting – Cottage Park

**Previous LCDA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:                   None.**

**Development Timeline:**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
Pedestrian-scale lighting – Agape Apartments	October 2008	November 2008
Acquisition of properties at 1926, 2014 and 2018 West Broadway	February 2008	March 2008
Widening of public sidewalk at 1926-2018 West Broadway	September 2008	October 2008
Site prep and grade correction at 1926-2018 West Broadway	March 2008	May 2008
Acquisition of properties at 1820, 1900 and 1914 West Broadway	January 2008	March 2008
Demolition of blighted structures at 1900 and 1914 West Broadway	April 2008	May 2008
Acquisition of West Motors property at 1939-2005 West Broadway	January 2008	February 2008
Demolition of structures at 1939-2005 West Broadway	April 2008	May 2008

**Applicant: Forest Lake**

**Recommended Funding Amount: \$700,000**

**Project Name: Washington County Senior Housing/Headwaters**

Site is bounded by Forest Road, Highway 61, Fenway Avenue and 202<sup>nd</sup> Street North

**Project Description:**

The proposed project will connect new development with existing and future transportation services, and increase the mix of housing affordability within the proposed Walker Methodist Senior Living Campus, part of the 620 acre mixed use Headwaters Planned Unit Development (PUD) in the City of Forest Lake. The City and the HRA intend to construct a 60 unit affordable senior housing facility within the Walker Campus so that low and moderate-income households have access to existing and proposed local and regional transit, government, senior, and commercial services in a pedestrian environment. The Walker Methodist Senior Campus is planned to include a continuum of senior housing options including a skilled care facility, a market rate independent and assisted living facility (176 units), a senior cooperative (74 units), underground tunnels and a senior community center. Residents of the proposed affordable senior housing building will have access to all of the Walker services. The project will be an important component of the larger Headwaters PUD that has been designed to provide ample pedestrian connections, a mix of uses, and seamless integration with the natural environment. The PUD includes a variety of housing (1,840 units), a mix of office and retail uses, a county service center and library, a transit station, several parks, and a large community recreational facility. Walking paths and trails will give residents access to the nearby county library, transit station, and retail areas.

**Advisory Committee Comments on Demonstration, Innovation, Catalyst Elements of this Project:**

The project is a model of partnership among city government, county government, private and non-profit entities. The development is innovative for the city and its developing location, and the requested site acquisition will be a catalyst for the project.

**Funding Requested/Funding Recommended:**

**Total Requested: \$700,000**

**Total Recommended: \$700,000**

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds
\$700,000	\$700,000	Land acquisition

**Previous LCDA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:**

**None.**

**Development Timeline:**

Task	Start Date	End Date
Land acquisition	2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2008	Fall 2008

**Applicant: St. Paul**

**Recommended Funding Amount: \$468,897**

**Project Name: Rivoli Street**

Site is on Rivoli Street, between Minnehaha and Tedesco Street

**Project Description:**

The Village on Rivoli will include 38 single-family detached dwellings in the Railroad Island neighborhood of St. Paul, located less than one mile from downtown St. Paul, with a vista overlooking downtown and the State Capitol, and within a three-block walking distance of transit. The site is an abandoned brownfield that is currently undergoing remediation through the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency’s Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup Program. The lots will be significantly smaller than standard single-family lots. The homes will average 1500 square feet of above-ground living area, for a two story three-bedroom home, and will share common green spaces and walking paths, creating a compact yet family friendly environment. The Village on Rivoli will incorporate a number of green building features into the project’s site plan as well as in the homes themselves, and has received two green building grant awards. A publicly-owned prairie meadow will be created out of a reclaimed street sweeping dump. The city will reconstruct 950 feet of Rivoli Street south of Minnehaha Avenue, rebuilding the existing part of the street and extending and completing the whole street for future housing use. The intent of this mixed income homeownership project is to increase the number of moderate-income homeowners in the Railroad island neighborhood, one of the oldest and poorest in Saint Paul, while simultaneously providing affordable homeownership opportunities for low and very low- income renters living in the neighborhood who wish to become homeowners.

**Advisory Committee Comments on Demonstration, Innovation, Catalyst Elements of this Project:**

The project demonstrates good integration of open space and stormwater elements with the rest of the development. These are unique design features for an urban site that fit well with the character of the area.

**Funding Requested/Funding Recommended:**

**Total Requested: \$468,897**

**Total Recommended: \$325,000**

<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Recommended</b>	<b>Use of Funds</b>
Stormwater pond construction:		
\$57,000	\$57,000	Curb, gutter, drives, sod, topsoil
\$35,889	\$35,889	Excavation and embankment
\$40,871	\$40,871	Bituminous pavement mixture
\$15,200	\$15,200	6” CL5 Aggregate base
\$40,000	\$40,000	Drainage
\$8,800	\$8,800	Quadrants
\$13,958	\$13,958	Infiltration
\$38,000	\$38,000	Sidewalks
\$38,000	\$38,000	Street lighting
\$47,500	\$47,500	Water main

**Previous LCDA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:                   None.**

**Development Timeline:**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
Stormwater pond construction	Spring 2008	Fall 2008



**Applicant: Roseville**

**Recommended Funding Amount: \$305,000**

**Project Name: Har Mar Apartments**

Southwest corner of Snelling Avenue North and Highway 36

---

**Project Description:**

Har Mar Apartments is an existing 120-unit apartment building complex built in 1965. Situated on a 5.4-acre site, the development contains five buildings of 21 to 26 one-bedroom units per building, the majority having a significant amount of deferred maintenance and in need of major repair. There is also an approximate 25 percent vacancy rate currently at the buildings due to unrentable units. Central Community Housing Trust (CCHT), with the support of the City of Roseville, proposes to rehabilitate the existing property into 103 one and two bedroom apartments. The rehabilitation plans will diversify the unit type to provide increased housing choices for low and moderate-income workers, as well as some market-rate apartments. Affordable rents will be targeted to residents at 30, 50 and 60 percent of area median income. CCHT will also make considerable improvements to the building exteriors, add landscaping and recreation areas, including a tot lot for children. Stormwater improvements proposed at the property will help alleviate stormwater capacity issues that have been occurring in the area during heavy rain events. The site improvements will help make possible a future phase to construct a new building on the site that would include 50 two- and three-bedroom affordable apartments, in a location that is currently surface parking.

**Advisory Committee Comments on Demonstration, Innovation, Catalyst Elements of this Project:**

The project will reinvigorate the design of typical 1960s apartments in a first-ring suburb, and upgrade the stormwater management. The funding is a catalyst for reorganizing and updating the existing development, and acting as a catalyst for a future phase to add more housing on the site.

**Funding Requested/Funding Recommended:**

**Total Requested: \$305,000**

**Total Recommended: \$305,000**

<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Recommended</b>	<b>Use of Funds</b>
\$127,000	\$127,000	Removal of obsolete infrastructures – timber and brick retaining walls, bituminous pavement, concrete curb and pavement, wooden sheds, pool
\$138,000	\$138,000	Stormwater management – rain gardens, soil amendment, storm sewer, inlet structures, native vegetation
\$45,100	\$45,100	Design and engineering for site demo, grading drainage, and stormwater management plan
\$24,000	\$24,000	Site grading for directing water away from buildings

**Previous LCDA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:                      None.**

**Development Timeline:**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
Removal of obsolete infrastructures – timber and brick retaining walls, bituminous pavement, concrete curb and pavement, wooden sheds, pool	June 2008	September 2008
Stormwater management – rain gardens, soil amendment, storm sewer, inlet structures, native vegetation	June 2008	June 2009
Design and engineering for site demo, grading drainage, and stormwater management plan	October 2007	May 2008
Site grading for directing water away from buildings	June 2008	June 2009

**Applicant: Centerville**  
**Project Name: Phase I Downtown Redevelopment**

**Funding Request: \$1,466,000**

---

---

**This proposal scored below the 30 point threshold in the Council-adopted LCDA criteria.**

In phase one, the Beard Group, Inc. is proposing to redevelop downtown Centerville. More precisely, initiated in one year and substantially completed in two years, a 41- unit affordable tax credit apartment project will be constructed on Block 7 (B7); 15,000 square feet of retail and 48 units of senior condominiums will be constructed on Block 8 (B8); 14,880 square feet of retail will be constructed on Block 9 (B9); 28 for-sale townhome units will be constructed on Block 1 (B1-2); and 30 for-sale townhome units will be constructed on Block 2 (B2-2). This phase will result in densifying the area; providing for a mix of affordable housing choices; creating 43 new full-time equivalent jobs; developing a center linked to regional transportation systems (metro transit stops and regional trail system); and creating an effective connection between housing, jobs, retail centers and civic uses.

**Applicant: Hopkins**  
**Project Name: Blake Corridor Improvement Project**

**Funding Request: \$2,995,000**

---

---

**This proposal scored below the 20 point threshold in the Step 1 Evaluation conducted by a staff team.**

Within two years from award, the City of Hopkins will work with the neighborhood and stakeholders to design a public recreational space using crime prevention through design techniques and acquire the necessary parcels to expand the existing Cottageville pocket park. The improvements will allow the neighborhood to safely use the park, allow police officers to monitor park activity, and act as a catalyst for redevelopment. In addition, pedestrian improvements will be added from the existing pedestrian bridge over Minnehaha Creek through the project site. The improvements will encourage investment along the corridor and surrounding the park. The pedestrian improvements will help connect residents of the many apartment buildings in the area to the numerous transit routes that serve the area as well as to the Knollwood shopping center and surrounding employment.

**Applicant: Minneapolis**  
**Project Name: SEMI-University Research Park/East Granary Road**

**Funding Request: \$971,000**

---

---

**This proposal scored below the 30 point threshold in the Council-adopted LCDA criteria.**

Granary Road will be constructed and substantially completed by December 31, 2009 and will provide access to a blighted area now un-served by public infrastructure. This access will make possible the planned redevelopment of the SEMI/URP area as a private sector bioscience research park adjacent to and complimenting the University of Minnesota's research park. Within two years of the grant award, over 40 business projects will be substantially completed consisting mostly of commercial/industrial space and some supportive retail. Two major industrial buildings, each totaling 100,000 square feet, will be completed by the end of 2009, which will be serviced by Granary Road. Currently, only one commercial building exists in the area surrounding the planned road infrastructure. Only one unused grain elevator is slated for demolition making way for Granary Road. A planned Granary Park will provide necessary stormwater management ponds and open green space for people living and working in the SEMI/URP area. Nearly 300 housing units exist in the area consisting of a mix of single- and multi-family rental and

ownership units. An additional 185 residential units will be substantially completed by the end of 2009 in the SEMI/URP area. Granary road will include a pedestrian sidewalk and a bike path/lane. Granary Road will also serve an alternative route during construction of the Central Corridor LRT and offer spectators another option for accessing the future University of Minnesota Gopher Stadium.

**Applicant: Minneapolis**

**Funding Request: \$1,134,200**

**Project Name: Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station Redevelopment**

---

**No funding recommended because 40 percent of funds were recommended for higher-scoring Minneapolis and St. Paul projects.**

Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station is a 3.8 acre redevelopment site that has direct at-grade access to the Franklin LRT station along the LRT pedestrian/bike path. Phase 1 increases and improves access to the Franklin LRT station and remediates industrial pollution to build a 20,000 sq. ft. light industrial/office building with 30 affordable & 10 market rate rental units. Other project elements include: build new pedestrian/bike trail along 22<sup>nd</sup> Street through the Bystrom site to the LRT pedestrian/bike trail; acquire & demolish two buildings to build a new street connecting Minnehaha to Cedar Avenue through the Bystrom site, which is essential for future phases of development and improving safety and traffic flow; complete construction of the LRT pedestrian/bike trail segment between the Midtown Greenway and the Franklin station by installing missing lighting, call boxes and security cameras; design and construct a district-wide integrated storm and gray water recycling system and district power system (heat/geothermal and electrical/photovoltaic), and construct connections from the first phase building.

**Applicant: Minneapolis**

**Funding Request: \$1,272,680**

**Project Name: Jackson Street NE Artists Affordable Housing**

---

**No funding recommended because 40 percent of funds were recommended for higher-scoring Minneapolis and St. Paul projects, or to projects that could be fully funded.**

This urban in-fill project on a major commercial corridor linking first ring suburbs with the core city, will create transit oriented housing ownership density by replacing seriously blighted rental stock with a four story, fully accessible, environmentally sustainable, land trusted, artist live/work condo building replete with a green rooftop public space and a large arts production studio/artist in residence program in the heart of the Minneapolis Arts District, where a recent study has alerted the community to the possibility of artist displacement as a consequence of rising property values. This project offers a very high percentage of affordability, features marketing efforts by affiliation with cultural and disability specific artists groups to insure that we reach underserved populations, and works towards providing high density development in a location guided for this use, but as of now largely unutilized as such. This project will encourage additional multi-family high density housing along the Central Avenue transit corridor. Project includes a 39 unit condominium building, 3200 square foot arts production building, and ten town homes.

**Applicant: New Brighton**  
**Project Name: Northwest Quadrant**

**Funding Request: \$400,000**

---

**This proposal scored below the 30 point threshold in the Council-adopted LCDA criteria.**

The development of 100 acres in Northwest Quadrant will be phased over the next 5-7 years, influenced by the rate of absorption of the housing markets, particularly for condominiums. The City has committed to provide connections between the development area and the surrounding 225-acre Long Lake Regional Park. These provisions are included in contracts with co-developers David Bernard (Rottlund Homes) and Sherman Associates. The Minnesota Commercial rail line on the western edge of the development will continue to function. In order to enhance the connectivity of the project area and minimize the rail line as a barrier, the City plans to construct a pedestrian bridge over the tracks. On the east end, the trail following the bridge will connect to the main east-west boulevard and to planned trails. On the west end of the bridge, the trail will connect with existing trails in Long Lake Regional Park.

**Applicant: New Hope**  
**Project Name: Bass Lake Road Apartments Redevelopment**

**Funding Request: \$1,500,000**

---

**This proposal scored below the 30 point threshold in the Council-adopted LCDA criteria.**

The city is negotiating the purchase of the Bass Lake Road Apartments. Relocation of the tenants is scheduled to occur during 2007. Demolition and site preparation is expected to occur in early 2008. Per an interim agreement executed in May 2007, the city is working with Insignia Development on a project concept for the site. The city will require a high density, market rate condominium project rich with amenities to provide a new housing type in the city. The city will enforce design guidelines to ensure a high-quality, innovative project that integrates the golf course and complements the neighborhood. Project planning will occur during 2008, with construction in 2009. The main objectives of the redevelopment of the 3.5 acre Bass Lake Road Apartments site are to: complete redevelopment of the fourth and final site identified by the 2002 Livable Communities Task Force; connect activity along Bass Lake Road between Boone Avenue and Winnetka Avenue; remove poorly constructed and poorly maintained apartments that are unsafe and unsightly and contribute to neighborhood and community problems; facilitate the construction of condominiums with high-quality construction and design and attractive amenities, which would provide a new housing option not currently available in New Hope; improve public infrastructure to remove development barriers and facilitate redevelopment (increase watermain capacity, create a storm water management strategy, bury overhead utilities to improve aesthetics, relocate and increase capacity of sanitary sewer lift station, improve sidewalks and install paths, install a transit shelter, and reconfigure and reconstruct the golf course parking lot); improve the visual appearance of the Bass Lake Road corridor contributing to an improved community image.

**Applicant: St. Paul**  
**Project Name: Stryker Project**

**Funding Request: \$375,000**

---

**This proposal scored below the 30 point threshold in the Council-adopted LCDA criteria.**

The proposed LCDA grant funds will be used for acquisition of 605 Stryker, a quarter acre property that will be assembled with an HRA owned 22,500 square foot vacant land parcel to assemble for a 12 unit town home development. The Neighborhood Development Alliance will develop this site. The housing units will be sold to families with incomes between 80 and 115 percent of median income. Construction of the project will start fall of 2008 and be completed by the fall of 2009. This project will contribute toward the re-densification of an obsolete commercial strip that has vacant and underutilized properties. Medium density residential development proposed for the Stryker site will encourage continued redevelopment of medium density housing along Stryker. Medium density housing development on this transit line will facilitate increased use of transit and link residents with jobs in the neighborhood, West Side Flats business park area and downtown St. Paul. The redevelopment of this project is consistent with the Stryker George Precinct plan which calls for homeownership opportunities on this site. It would be difficult to development and market for-sale homes for the HRA site if the adjacent site is not included as part of the development. The adjacent site has a deteriorated commercial structure that has a deleterious impact on the community. There have been numerous complaints about the negative activities occurring on that property. The proposed redevelopment project is located on an older commercial corridor that is starting to transition to a more residential street. The City has recently made public infrastructure improvements adjacent to this site with new streets, utilities, curb bump-outs, a rain garden, grass and new trees. The Dodd Stryker intersection has been redesigned from a five-way intersection to a four-way intersection. These improvements enhanced the pedestrian connections by improving safety and enhancing connections with transit.

**Applicant: St. Paul Port Authority**  
**Project Name: Arlington Jackson West**

**Funding Request: \$1,850,000**

---

**This proposal scored below the 30 point threshold in the Council-adopted LCDA criteria.**

Arlington Jackson West is a 35 acre contaminated site adjacent to the previous Port Authority development, Arlington Jackson Business Center. Currently the site is barricaded from the neighborhood by large auto salvage yards, outdoor storage, and construction operations with very few jobs. By acquiring, remediating, and preparing the land with the assistance of the LCDA funding, we would encourage building development by high tech manufacturers that provide living wage jobs to the surrounding community, including the public housing to the north. Since 2006 design phases have been completed on the Trillium park site to the south of our project which will connect through our site. Connecting Jobs to Households: We anticipate our site could offer up to 418,000 square feet of buildings and 600 jobs to the neighborhood of McDonough Public Housing (580 units) and other single family homes. Transit: There is currently an east-west bus (#61) and a north-south bus (#68) that stop at the intersection of Arlington & Jackson. Our plan includes a transit shelter and/or other transit amenities on the site to encourage these routes. Parks/Trails: The Arlington Jackson West site is immediately north of the 44-acre Trillium Nature Sanctuary currently being developed by the City of St. Paul, and southeast of Gurney Park. Two trails (Trout Brook and Munger State Park/Gateway) run through the site and will be enhanced and connected as part of this development. Environmentally Sensitive: The Port Authority will use innovative Next Generation storm water management techniques, including rain gardens or other options to reduce runoff and beautify areas surrounding trails on this site. In addition, as a part of our design review process, we encourage high quality building design and green building whenever possible.

## Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2007 Step One Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

A seven member staff evaluation team reviewed and scored eligible proposals, using the criteria, factors and scoring considerations in this table. The Step One evaluation covered the elements of the project that will be completed or substantially completed by the end of 2009.

Evaluation Criteria	Factors Evaluated	Scoring Considerations
<b>Land Use Criteria:</b>		
<b>Use land efficiently</b> <u>0-8 points</u>	<i><b>How well the project achieves:</b></i> Development that intensifies land use (adding buildings or other uses) and increases density to a level that maximizes the potential of the location.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The number of land uses added to the site, and/or the increase of proposed development and uses on the site.</li> <li>- The average densities of the project compared to densities recommended for developments based on their community type or proximity to available or planned transit service levels.</li> </ul>
<b>Link land uses to transportation</b> <u>0-8 points</u> (hold harmless if no transit access—use average score)	<i><b>How well the project achieves:</b></i> Development that is designed in relationship to transit and transportation, providing optimal convenience for pedestrian access to transit, and for relationships of development to the regional transit system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The ways in which land uses are designed to optimize the relationship of the project to transit – buildings oriented to the street, street frontage inviting to pedestrians, parking located behind or to the side of buildings or underground.</li> <li>- The number of elements included in the project that support and connect to transit, as appropriate to the site, including sidewalks, paths/trails, bike racks, transit shelters, pedestrian waiting facilities.</li> <li>- The degree to which street patterns, sidewalks, trails, paths, etc., are designed to provide convenient access for pedestrians, shoppers, and workers to transit—with potential to result in an increase in transit riders.</li> </ul>
<b>Connect housing and centers of employment, education, retail, recreation uses</b> <u>0-8 points</u>	<i><b>How well the project achieves:</b></i> Development that provides a diverse variety of uses (within the project area or when added to adjacent land uses) with improved jobs-housing balance, access to a variety of destinations in a connected development pattern both within the project area and to adjacent neighborhoods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The number of types of uses within the project or the immediate surrounding area (within ¼ mile), including office, retail, services, restaurant, entertainment, government/civic, education, arts/cultural, open space, public space, residential.</li> <li>- The relative proximity and location with regard to ease of movement without impediments among land uses, in order to maximize opportunities to circulate among the various land uses rather than separate them.</li> <li>- The degree to which the project increases or improves the connections between housing and jobs, measured by the number of jobs in proximity to the project that could be reached with easy transit or other transportation access offered by the project.</li> <li>- The degree to which the land uses within the project are connected to existing neighborhoods outside the project area.</li> </ul>

Evaluation Criteria	Factors Evaluated	Scoring Considerations
<p><b>Provide a range of housing densities, types and costs</b>  <b><u>0-8 points</u></b></p>	<p><b><i>How well the project achieves:</i></b>  Development that provides a wide variety of housing types and prices or rents, integrating new housing into existing neighborhoods through redevelopment, infill development, adaptive reuse; or through new development in developing communities – within the project or when added to the housing in adjacent neighborhoods; diversifies housing in the community and helps achieve the city’s housing goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The number of housing types/ tenure — single-family, townhouse, multistory, rental, ownership - within the project.</li> <li>- The mix of housing options (as above) that will be provided when added to the housing in neighborhoods adjacent to the project.</li> <li>- The percentage of units in the project that will be affordable to households earning 50 percent of annual median income.</li> <li>- The percentage of units in the project that will be affordable to households earning 80 percent of annual median income.</li> <li>- The degree to which the project’s housing will diversify housing choices city-wide.</li> <li>- The degree to which the project promotes the city’s housing goals.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources</b>  <b><u>0-8 points</u></b></p>	<p><b><i>How well the project achieves:</i></b>  Development that optimally integrates natural resources, including best management practices for water resources that incorporate water resource management into project design to maximize development potential; and employs natural resources, where feasible and appropriate, as community connections, assets and amenities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The type(s) of conventional stormwater management techniques for rate and/or volume control and pollutant removal, including improved site runoff, local and regional storm water detention, employed within the project.</li> <li>- The type(s) of innovative and low impact development (LID) methods employed in the project to achieve storm water control through the integration of natural hydrologic functions into the project’s overall design, including rain gardens, infiltration swales, pervious pavement, native vegetation, underground stormwater retention/filtration structures, green roofs.</li> <li>- The ways in which the project adds green space, enhances connections to green spaces and other natural areas, and/or uses natural resources and features, where feasible and appropriate, as community assets and amenities.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Role:</b>		
<p><b>Processes and tools to ensure successful outcomes - <u>0-10 points</u></b>  - appropriate and effective regulatory tools;  - partnerships;  - community leadership;  - community participation</p>	<p><b><i>How well the project achieves:</i></b>  Development that incorporates appropriate and effective regulatory tools to implement the project, such as zoning codes, design standards, development standards; strong and effective public-private partnerships; meaningful local role to ensure that the project meets community needs and goals; local vision and leadership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The degree to which necessary, appropriate and effective regulatory and implementation tools are in place, having been developed either for this project or previously — zoning for mixed-use development, zoning for transit-oriented development, zoning overlay districts, traditional neighborhood development overlay zones, design standards, development standards, other.</li> <li>- The participation of funding partners.</li> <li>- The degree to which the project is ready to be implemented, based on tools and processes in place (as above), the level of public participation (meetings, workshops, task forces, other citizen/business/stakeholder involvement) and local support (leadership and support of city officials, city council initiatives or actions, or other).</li> </ul>



## Livable Communities Advisory Committee Project Evaluation Scoresheet 2007

### Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2007

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_ ID \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b> ↓		<b>Development and Land Use Evaluation Categories:</b> Evaluate projects for each evaluation category to arrive at your score for this section. See Section E of the application, "Step Two Evaluation Criteria," for applicant responses in these categories.					
	Development and Land Use Evaluation Score: <b>0-30 points</b>	<b>Does the proposal maximize the potential of the project's site and location?</b> <b>(For each of the five evaluation areas, are the opportunities presented by the site and location fully realized? Are there missed opportunities?)</b>					
<b>Part I: Development and Land Use</b> The extent to which the project shows innovative elements, and demonstrates, or shows potential to demonstrate, new development concepts for the community it is located in and/or for the region.	<b>Total points for this Section</b> _____	1. Use land efficiently to maximize potential of the project location <b>0-5 points</b>	2. Link land uses to transit <b>0-5 points</b>	3. Connect housing and centers of employment, education, retail, recreation. <b>0-5 points</b>	4. Provide a range of housing densities, types and costs. <b>0-5 points</b>	5. Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources <b>0-5 points</b>	6. Partnerships, tools and processes to implement the project. <b>0-5 points</b>
		What areas have you identified as noteworthy innovation or demonstration elements?					
<b>Part II: Catalyst</b> The extent to which the element for which funding is requested will be a catalyst to implement the project of which it is a part.	Catalyst Evaluation Score: <b>0-20 points</b>						
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>(50 possible points)</b>						
<b>Part III: Readiness</b> Are implementation tools (zoning codes, other official controls, design standards, development standards, etc.) in place; does the status of funding commitments ensure construction start for funded elements or further progress by December 2008.	Readiness Evaluation:  To be discussed at the Nov. 1 LCAC meeting for a decision.	Comments, questions					

## Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2007

### Checklist to Determine If Funding Request Substantially Demonstrates That Proposed Project Is Feasible Only With LCDA Grant

**Project Name:**

**Project ID:**

1.	Has the applicant submitted a resolution that includes the required language identifying the need for LCDA funding, such that the project element for which funding is requested could not proceed but for LCDA funding awarded in 2007?	Yes ___	No ___
2.	Has the applicant satisfactorily described why the requested project component(s) will not occur within two years after a grant award unless LCDA funding is made available for this project at this time? (Application Section II A)	Yes ___	No ___
3.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified local sources of funding the applicant has considered to fund the LCDA request? (Application Section II F, question a.)	Yes ___	No ___
4.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified why the identified local sources cannot be used within the next two years to fund the requested project element? (Application Section II F, question a.)	Yes ___	No ___
5.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified non-local sources of funding the applicant has pursued to fund the LCDA request? (Application Section II F, question b.)	Yes ___	No ___
6.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified why the identified non-local sources cannot be used within the next two years to fund the requested project element? (Application Section II F, question b.)	Yes ___	No ___
7.	Has the applicant submitted satisfactory documentation (e.g. letters, other documentation) to substantiate unsuccessful efforts to secure non-local funding? (Application Section II F, question b.)	Yes ___	No ___
8.	Does the Livable Communities Advisory Committee accept the applicants' statement that the requested project component would not be built in the market without public subsidy or grant funds?	Yes ___	No ___

In the judgment of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, this proposal does \_\_\_\_\_ does not \_\_\_\_\_ demonstrate the proposed project is feasible at this time only with an LCDA grant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth Grendahl  
Chair, Livable Communities Advisory Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**2007 CONFLICT OF INTEREST SUMMARY**  
**For**  
**MEMBERS OF THE LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**2007 Livable Communities Demonstration Account Development Grant Applications**

A = Center Cities

B = Developed Communities

C = Developing Communities

	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>NAME</b>
A.2	Minneapolis	Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station Redevelopment	Doug Snyder Peggy Lucas
A.3	Minneapolis	Jackson Street NE Artist Affordable Housing	Doug Snyder
A.4	Minneapolis	Longfellow Station Project	Doug Snyder
A.5	Minneapolis	SEMI-University Research Park/East Granary Road	Lance Neckar Kevin Ringwald Doug Snyder
A.6	Minneapolis	West Broadway Curve	Lance Neckar Doug Snyder
A.7	St. Paul Port Authority	Arlington Jackson West	
A.8	St. Paul	Dale Street Village	
A.9	St. Paul	Rivoli Street Reconstruction	
A.10	St. Paul	Stryker Project	
B.2	New Brighton	Northwest Quadrant	
B.3	New Hope	Bass Lake Road Apartments Redevelopment	
B.4	Roseville	Har Mar Apartments	Kevin Ringwald
C.1	Centerville	Phase I Downtown Redevelopment	Donald Jensen
C.2	Forest Lake	Washington County Senior Housing/Headwaters	
C.3	Rosemount	Stonebridge Core Block East	

# LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT

2007

- Funding Schedule
- Funding Criteria
- Selection Process
- Pre-Application Form
- Application Form

## Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2007 Funding Schedule

2007 Available Funding: \$8\* Million

Date	Activity
March 28	Metropolitan Council <b>adopts program calendar, available funding and funding criteria.</b>
April 9	<b>Post grant schedule, funding criteria and application form</b> on <a href="http://www.metrocouncil.org">www.metrocouncil.org</a> ; send e-mail notifying LCA-participating city contacts that these materials are available.
April 24 and 26 (tentative)	<b>Hold workshops</b> for interested applicants (choice of date and location) (Ed. note: notification of workshop dates will be e-mailed to city contacts on April 3, following Community Development Committee action on the LCA Annual Distribution Plan on April 2).
June 11	<b>Pre-application due</b> – a short pre-application must be submitted for each application that will be submitted on July 16
July 16	<b>Applications due</b> , including local resolution of support – no application can be accepted if a pre-application for the proposal was not received on or before June 11.
Mid-July – August	Staff conducts <b>technical review of proposals and Step 1 evaluation process</b>
August to mid-November	Livable Communities Advisory Committee conducts <b>Step 2 evaluation process and selection process; recommends funding awards.</b>
November 19	<b>Funding recommendations presented</b> to Community Development Committee
December 3	<b>Community Development Committee recommends grant awards</b>
December 12	<b>Metropolitan Council awards grants</b>

\*The LCDA base amount assumes passage of legislation the Council proposed during the 2007 session of the Minnesota Legislature that would authorize a one-time allocation of \$1 million from the Livable Communities Demonstration Account to the Council's local government comprehensive planning grant and loan program. If the legislation does not pass, the amount available for LCDA grants would be increased by \$1 million.

# LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT

## Funding Criteria and Selection Process

Funding Available in 2007: \$8\* Million for Development Grants

(\*See footnote on previous page.)

(The Council's **Policy Restricting Metropolitan Council LCA Grants for Projects Using Eminent Domain for Economic Development** applies to all LCDA applications submitted in 2007.)

### LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE

The Livable Communities Demonstration Account was established by the Livable Communities Act [Minnesota Statutes section 473.25-(b)]. The Demonstration Account provides funds to development or redevelopment projects that connect development with transit, intensify land uses, connect housing and employment, provide a mix of housing affordability, and/or provide infrastructure to connect communities and attract investment. As the name of the account suggests, Demonstration Account funds are intended to be used for projects that demonstrate innovative and new ways to achieve and implement these statutory objectives, not merely to fill project funding needs.

### FUNDING GOALS

The legislative objectives are supported by the *2030 Regional Development Framework* policies. LCDA funding will support projects that demonstrate innovative ways of meeting *Framework* goals and strategies to achieve connected, efficient land-use patterns in communities throughout the region.

- Develop land uses in centers linked to the local and regional transportation systems.
- Efficiently connect housing, jobs, retail centers and civic uses.
- Develop a range of housing densities, types and costs.
- Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources by means of development that is sensitive to the environment.

In Developed Communities, the emphasis of these goals will be, consistent with *Framework* direction, on maintaining and improving infrastructure, buildings and land to provide developments that integrate land uses.

Projects in Developing Communities will be focused on accommodating growth by means of connected development patterns for new development, supporting activity centers along corridors that encourage the development of communities where shopping, jobs and a variety of housing choices co-exist by design.

### ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Application is open to cities participating in the Metropolitan Livable Communities Housing Incentives Program, on behalf of proposals in their communities; or to metropolitan-area counties, housing and redevelopment authorities, economic development authorities or port authorities on behalf of projects located in LCA participant communities.

### PROJECT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

1. The proposal involves new development, redevelopment or infill development addressing the program goals.

2. Proposed project is located within the Council-identified developed area, developing area or a rural growth center (urbanized area).
3. The Metropolitan Council has reviewed and accepted the applicant community's comprehensive plan.
4. The community's comprehensive plan amendments for the submitted proposal, if necessary, are completed or under review by the Metropolitan Council.
5. The proposed project helps achieve one or more of the affordable and life cycle housing goals adopted by the applicant city (or the city in which the project is located if the applicant is a county or a development authority) under the Local Housing Incentives program of the Livable Communities Act.
6. A local resolution (from the applicant city, county or development authority) authorizing the application for grant funds, identifying the need for LCDA funding, and prioritizing applications (if a city is submitting more than one application) is received by July 16, 2007.
7. Application is complete.

#### **OTHER ELIGIBILITY REGARDING EMINENT DOMAIN**

No applicant for an LCDA grant shall be eligible for LCDA grant funds if the project for which an LCDA grant is requested requires the exercise of eminent domain authority over private property for the purposes of "economic development." The Council's policy defines "economic development" as "the taking of private property from one private person or entity, without the consent of the owner, and conveying or leasing such property to another private person or entity, for commercial enterprise, or to increase tax revenue, tax base, employment, or general economic health." The Council's definition of "economic development" does *not* apply if eminent domain was used to: acquire property for public ownership or use; acquire polluted or contaminated property that threatens the public or the environment, and remediation or clean up must occur expeditiously; acquire abandoned or blighted properties; remove public nuisances; or clear defective title. Projects that include "leasing property to a private person or entity that occupies an incidental part of public property or a public facility" are also eligible for LCA grant awards. (For the complete policy, see [www.metrocouncil.org/services/livcomm/EminentDomainPolicy.html](http://www.metrocouncil.org/services/livcomm/EminentDomainPolicy.html))

#### **NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS**

No more than five applications may be submitted by a single applicant in any application cycle. Applicants submitting more than one application per cycle (year) must prioritize them according to the applicant's internal priorities, prior to submittal.

#### **ELIGIBLE AND INELIGIBLE USES OF FUNDING**

**Eligible Uses of Funds:** Grant funds may be used for basic public infrastructure and site assembly to support development projects that meet the funding goals. Funded elements must directly contribute to completion of built or finished projects that meet the funding goals. Requests will be evaluated in the context of individual projects.

1. Basic public infrastructure items include and are defined as:
  - a) Local public streets
    - new streets, street realignment, reconstruction of existing street grid, street extensions or connections.
    - street lighting and street signs, when requested in conjunction with one of the eligible items in 1a), or to retrofit an existing street with these elements, as part of a proposal that meets the funding goals.
    - permanent public pedestrian features, including sidewalks and benches, when requested in conjunction with one of the eligible items in 1a), or to retrofit an existing street with these elements as part of a proposal that meets the funding goals.
  - b) Other infrastructure

- public parking structures (above- or underground), or the public portion of parking structures that will be for shared public-private use.
  - extensions or modifications of local public sewer and water lines, telecommunications lines.
  - c) Other public connecting elements
    - Sidewalks and trails connected to transit.
    - Site-integrated transit shelters, permanent bike racks.
    - Bridge construction for vehicle or pedestrian use
  - d) Storm water management improvements
    - new or expanded stormwater ponds, rain gardens, infiltration swales, pervious pavement, underground stormwater retention/infiltration structures, native vegetation for infiltration and erosion control, that are integral to the development.
  - e) Design and engineering for items listed in 1.a) through 1.d)
2. Site assembly for lands to be used for construction of buildings; streets; sidewalks; parks, plazas and other public spaces; trails; that are integral to future development. Eligible items are:
- a) Land acquisition
  - b) Demolition and removal of obsolete structures, pavement, curb and gutter, sewer and water pipes, on sites the city has already acquired or will acquire.
  - c) Site preparation—site grading and soil correction to enable construction.

**Ineligible Uses of Funds:**

1. County road improvements: all items relating to county roads listed in “eligible uses,” Item 1. a).
2. Traffic signals for local and county roads.
3. Private parking structures
4. Surface parking
5. Trees, sod, landscape plantings
6. For parks, plazas and other public areas: lighting; retaining walls, seat walls; sidewalks; paths; furnishings and equipment including but not limited to benches, trash receptacles, bike racks, signs, kiosks; playground equipment; water features; entry features; public art; shelters, gazebos, pergolas, bell towers; recreation buildings, amphitheaters.
7. Site assembly for lands to be used for transit infrastructure or capital investments, e.g. transit stations, station platforms, park-and-ride facilities (unless park-and-ride spaces will be used for shared parking).
8. Building construction
9. Building rehabilitation and improvements, exterior and interior
10. Housing “affordability gap” and “value gap” financing.
11. Pollution cleanup and related expenses
12. Applicant’s administrative overhead
13. Project coordination
14. Activities prior to the date of the grant award
15. Architect, developer, legal and other fees
16. Local permits, licenses or authorization fees
17. Travel expenses
18. Costs associated with preparing grant proposals
19. Operating expenses
20. Prorated lease and salary costs
21. Marketing costs
22. Comprehensive plan preparation costs
23. Costs associated with master plans or redevelopment plans, design workshops, design standards, market studies, zoning and land use implementation tools.



## **AMOUNT OF AWARDS**

No minimum or maximum award levels for projects have been established. The Metropolitan Council reserves the right to award less than the amount requested. The Metropolitan Council reserves the right to award less than the available funding in the grant cycle.

## **DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS**

The Livable Communities Advisory Committee may recommend up to 40 percent of the total funds available in a grant cycle for projects located in Minneapolis and St. Paul. The Metropolitan Council reserves the right to subsequently consider awarding more than 40 percent of the total available funds in the grant cycle to projects located in Minneapolis and St. Paul, provided these conditions are met:

1. The consideration will adhere to the project evaluation and scoring process outlined in these criteria and to the project rankings; and,
2. Minneapolis and St. Paul projects that, if granted funds, would result in a total that exceeds 40 percent of the available funding in the current grant cycle:
  - a) Are exemplary demonstrations of the program criteria, as measured by these projects having scored 30 of 50 points in the Step Two advisory committee evaluation process, and
  - b) Have satisfactorily met the evaluation assessment for readiness, as determined in the advisory committee evaluation.

## **LOCAL RESOLUTION**

A resolution from the applicant city, county or development authority in support of applications(s) submittal must be submitted with the application, no later than July 16, 2007. The resolution must 1) authorize the grant applications(s), 2) identify the need for LCDA funding, such that the project could not occur in the foreseeable future without LCDA funds, 3) prioritize the applications according to the applicant's internal priorities, if an applicant is submitting more than one application; and 4) represent that the Applicant has undertaken reasonable and good faith efforts to procure funding for the project components for which LCDA funding is sought. Applications submitted by counties and development authorities on behalf of projects located in LCA-participating cities must also be supported by a resolution in support of the application from the city in which the project is located, as well as the resolution from the applicant county or development authority.

## **APPLICATION PROCESS**

1. Applicants are strongly encouraged to attend one of the workshops offered the week of April 23. Email notification of workshop dates and locations will be sent to all LCA-participating cities, and workshop information will be posted on the Council's website at [www.metrocouncil.org](http://www.metrocouncil.org).
2. Submit a pre-application for each proposal for which you intend to submit a full application. Send it by email by 4:30 PM on **June 11, 2007**, to [linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us)
3. Submit 20 copies of the application and required attachments by 4:30 PM on **July 16, 2007** to:

Linda Milashius, Metropolitan Council, 390 North Robert Street, St. Paul, MN. 55101

...**AND** send one email copy of the application to [linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us) (no need to include attachments). Staff will send confirmation of application's receipt. The application is available at [www.metrocouncil.org/grants/lcda/demoapp.doc](http://www.metrocouncil.org/grants/lcda/demoapp.doc)

Sample sources and uses pages and a sample resolution of support are provided with the application form.

**Questions?** Please direct questions related to the application and review process to Joanne Barron, LCDA program coordinator ([joanne.barron@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:joanne.barron@metc.state.mn.us), 651.602.1385), or Linda Milashius, LCDA program support ([linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us), 651.602.1541).



## PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS

### Step One Evaluation Criteria -- 50 possible points

A staff evaluation team will review and score eligible proposals using the Step One evaluation criteria and guidelines:

#### A. Land Use Criteria

**The extent to which the proposal will address or shows potential to address the following criteria**, as applicable to the site location, geographic location and the community context. Proposals will be evaluated according to the appropriate developed or developing context of the project itself, not its developed or developing community classification.

1. **Use land efficiently 0-8 points** – How well the project achieves development that intensifies land use (adding buildings or other uses) and increases density to a level that maximizes the potential of the location.
2. **Develop land uses linked to the local and regional transportation systems 0-8 points** – How well the project achieves development that is designed in relationship to transit and transportation, providing optimal convenience for pedestrian access to transit, and for relationships of development to the regional transit system. (if the proposed project has no transit access, the proposal will be “held harmless” by using the average score of four points).
3. **Connect housing and centers of employment, education, retail, recreation uses 0-8 points**  
= How well the project achieves development that provides a diverse variety of uses (within the project area or when added to adjacent land uses) with improved jobs-housing balance, access to a variety of destinations in a connected development pattern both within the project area and to adjacent neighborhoods.
4. **Develop a range of housing densities, types and costs 0-8 points** -- How well the project achieves development that provides a wide variety of housing types and prices or rents, integrating new housing into existing neighborhoods through redevelopment, infill development, adaptive reuse; or through new development in developing communities – within the project or when added to the housing in adjacent neighborhoods; diversifies housing in the community and helps achieve the city’s housing goals.
5. **Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources through development that is sensitive to the environment 0-8 points** – How well the project achieves development that optimally integrates natural resources, including best management practices for water resources that incorporate water resource management into project design to maximize development potential; and employs natural resources, where feasible and appropriate, as community connections, assets and amenities.

#### B. Tools and Processes

**The extent to which the proposal includes tools and processes to ensure successful outcomes, as appropriate to the project**, including appropriate and effective regulatory tools; partnerships among government, private for-profit and nonprofit sectors; community participation, local vision

and leadership. 0-10 points. How well the project achieves development that incorporates appropriate and effective regulatory tools to implement the project, such as zoning codes, design standards, development standards; strong and effective public-private partnerships; meaningful local role to ensure that the project meets community needs and goals; local vision and leadership.

**Applications must score 20 or more points of a possible 50 points on the Step One criteria to advance to the Step two evaluation process.**

The following guidelines will be applied to proposals following evaluation and scoring on the selection criteria, and provided as information for the Step Two selection process.

- Has applicant community responded or is responding to recommendations cited in the Council’s review of the comprehensive plan?
- If a proposal or related project has been previously funded through a Livable Communities Demonstration Account development or opportunity grant, have grant funds been expended or progress made?

**Step Two Evaluation Criteria – 50 possible points**

The Livable Communities Advisory Committee will score proposals according to the evaluation and selection criteria in Step Two. The LCAC’s 13 members represent and have expertise in development as it relates to local government planning, economic or community development; public and private finance; new development and redevelopment; transportation; environment; and site design. (LCAC membership list is available at [www.metrocouncil.org](http://www.metrocouncil.org)).

**A. Innovation and Demonstration**

**The extent to which the project shows innovative elements, and demonstrates or shows potential to demonstrate new development concepts or elements in one or more of the scoring factor areas, for the community it is located in and for the region. 0-30 points –** Scoring is based on consideration of these factors: The extent to which the proposal uses land efficiently to maximize potential of the project location; links land uses to transit where available; connects housing and centers of employment, education, retail, recreation; provides a range of housing densities, types and costs; conserves, protects and enhances natural resources through development that is sensitive to the environment; other innovation not covered in the previous categories, including tools and processes used to develop and implement the project.

**B. How LCDA Funding Is a Catalyst**

**The extent to which the element for which funding is requested will be a catalyst to implement the project of which it is a part. 0-20 points**

Proposals will be evaluated in the context of the site, geographic area and community. This will recognize the unique and diverse characteristics of projects’ location and geographic location in the region.

**To be considered for funding and advance to the Step Three evaluation process, proposals must score 30 or more points of a possible 50 points in the Step Two evaluation, or be supported by a two-thirds vote of the advisory committee. Housing incentive points as described below in “housing performance scoring” will be applied separately.**

**Step Three Selection Criteria — Readiness**

The readiness assessment includes:

- A. The status of implementation tools** – e.g. zoning codes and other official controls, design standards, development standards.
- B. The status of funding commitments to ensure construction start** for funded element(s) or further progress within a year from the date of the grant award (December 2008), and other indicators of readiness.

## **Housing Performance Scoring**

Following evaluation and scoring of proposals, up to ten additional housing incentives points will be assigned to each applicant's score. The housing incentives points are determined by converting a community's housing performance score from a 100-point scale to a ten-point scale. Project rankings may change as a result of adding the housing incentives points. However, the funding recommendations do not necessarily directly correspond to the numerical rankings.

A proposal will be 'held harmless' in the ranking process (the proposal will either improve its ranking or will not be lowered in the rankings) if the proposal includes or proposes new affordable housing, or affordable housing is located within the project site/area.

The definition of affordable housing used is consistent with how the Council has defined affordable ownership and rental housing in negotiating housing goals to implement the Livable Communities Act. Ownership housing is affordable at 80 percent of median income, and rents are affordable at 50 percent of median income.

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT**  
**2007 GRANT PRE-APPLICATION**

**Instructions:**

1. Please complete and **submit this pre-application by June 11, 2007. No application will be accepted without a pre-application submitted by this date.**
2. In addition, **attach a vicinity map** that includes the project site, provided by the Council. Contact Metropolitan Council staff person Greg Pates (651-602-1410 or [greg.pates@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:greg.pates@metc.state.mn.us)) to obtain a vicinity map showing project location, planned land use, transit locations, and adjacent land uses. Applicant is responsible for marking the project site boundaries on this map.

LCDA staff will reply with **comments** on your pre-application **by June 18, 2007**. Staff will comment: 1) on eligibility of items for which funding is requested; 2) if a proposal is not well targeted to the program criteria and therefore unlikely to be competitive in the evaluation process; and 3) may advise, in some cases, that required information is missing from the project description.

<b>Project Name:</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b> city, county or development authority	
<b>Project Location:</b> City:  Street boundaries, address or major intersection:	
<b>Project Contact:</b> Name: Title: Address: City, Zipcode: Phone & Fax: E-mail:	

**A. Funding Proposal**

Describe the element, building, or phase(s) that will go forward to construction within one year, if this funding request is granted, and be completed or substantially completed within two years of the grant award (December 2007). Do not include numbers of housing units or other project elements that apply to development initiated beyond two years of the grant award date—include these details in Sec. I.C, if applicable. Include funding request (dollars) in Sec. I.B.

(Limit 20 lines)

**B. Funding Request and Timeline** *(limit one page, landscape layout)*

List project elements for which you expect to request funding in priority order, e.g. street, structured parking, stormwater pond. Under “Task/Eligible Use,” provide *detail about items for which you are requesting funds and their location, and itemize the request for each item listed.* Do not list large single-item requests without itemizing. FOLLOW THE EXAMPLE FORMAT.

Priority	Project Element	Task/Eligible Use	Itemized \$ Request	Start Date	End Date
<b>EXAMPLE:</b>					
1.	Stormwater pond construction	Excavation and structural reinforcement	\$612,325	1/15/2008	11/15/2008
2.	Demolition of obsolete infrastructure	Demolish jersey barriers, dilapidated concrete structures, and structures built of railroad ties along 36 <sup>th</sup> St. from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 70,000	3/15/2008	5/15/2008
3.	Permanent public pedestrian improvements	Construct sidewalks along both sides of 36 <sup>th</sup> street from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 478,059	5/15/2008	11/15/2008
4.	Permanent public pedestrian improvements	Street lighting, benches, permanent bike racks along 36 <sup>th</sup> St. from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 344,800	5/15/2008	11/15/2008
Priority	Project Element	Task/Eligible Use	Itemized \$ Request	Start Date	End Date
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
<b>Total dollars requested and the start and completion date for the entire project or phase:</b>					



**C. Future Development Phases, if applicable**

Describe future development or phases that will be undertaken beyond two years from the date of the grant award (Dec. 2007). Describe phasing plan and include details of phases, e.g. anticipated number and type of housing units, other proposed project components. If no future phases or development are planned beyond two years, write NONE (Limit 20 lines)

**D. Completed And/Or Existing Adjacent Development**

Describe buildings or development phases already constructed, if applicable, and/or other existing development adjacent to the project area described in Section I.A, page 1, "Funding Proposal." (Limit 20 lines)

# **LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT**

## **2007 GRANT APPLICATION**

### **INSTRUCTIONS:**

Read and follow all instructions carefully and completely. Any applications submitted that do not adhere to the instructions will be returned for revision.

1. Fill out application completely. If a question does not apply, place “NA” in the appropriate box. Do not leave questions blank.
2. Use only font size 11 for responses. Use black font color.
3. Use of bulleted lists is encouraged.
4. Do not attach a coversheet, submittal letter or any graphic images to the front of the application.
5. Application should be bound only with staples, paperclips or binder clips. Do not use spiral binding, or any type of report cover or folder.
6. Application should not exceed 19 pages, unless additional space is needed for complete financial (sources and uses pages) information. Responses to financial information requested on the Sources and Uses pages are the only areas of the application that may exceed the designated space allotment.
7. Be sure all 10 required attachments are included in the application. See page 21 for the list of required attachments and specific instructions.
8. Submit 20 copies of the application form and attachments by 4:30 p.m. on July 16, 2007, to:  
Linda Milashius  
Livable Communities  
Metropolitan Council  
390 Robert Street N.  
St. Paul, MN 55101
9. Submit an electronic copy of the application form (attachments not required) by 4:30 p.m. on July 16, 2007 to [Linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us)

Office Use
------------

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT**  
**2007 GRANT APPLICATION**

See Cover Page for **Instructions** on completing and submitting this application.

<b>Project Name:</b>		
<b>Applicant:</b> city, county or development authority		
<b>Project Location:</b> City:		
Street boundaries, address or major intersection:		
<b>Project Contact:</b> Name:		
Title:		
Address:		
City, Zipcode:		
Phone & Fax:		
E-mail:		
<b>Grantee Information:</b> Contact person	Name:	
	Title:	
	Phone:	
	E-mail:	
Authorized city, county or development authority official(s) for contract signature(s)	Name:	
	Title:	

**Section I.** Information about the Project and project elements for which you are requesting funding.

**I.A. Funding Proposal**

Describe the element, building, or phase(s) that will go forward to construction within one year, if this funding request is granted, and be **completed or substantially completed within two years of the grant award** (Dec. 2007). Do not include numbers of housing units or other project elements that apply to development beyond two years—include these details in Sec. I.H, if applicable. Include funding request (dollars) in Sec. I.B.

(Limit 20 lines)

## I. B. Funding Request and Timeline *(limit one page, landscape layout)*

List requested project elements in priority order, e.g. street, structured parking, stormwater pond. Under “Task/Eligible Use,” provide **as much detail as you can about items for which you are requesting funds and their location, and itemize the request for each item listed. Do not list large single-item requests without itemizing. FOLLOW THE EXAMPLE FORMAT.**

Priority	Project Element	Task/Eligible Use	Itemized \$ Request	Start Date	End Date
	<b>EXAMPLE:</b>				
1.	Stormwater pond construction	Excavation and structural reinforcement	\$612,325	1/15/2008	11/15/2008
2.	Demolition of obsolete infrastructure	Demolish jersey barriers, dilapidated concrete structures, and structures built of railroad ties along 36 <sup>th</sup> St. from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 70,000	3/15/2008	5/15/2008
3.	Permanent public pedestrian improvements	Construct sidewalks along both sides of 36 <sup>th</sup> street from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 478,059	5/15/2008	11/15/2008
4.	Permanent public pedestrian improvements	Street lighting, benches, permanent bike racks along 36 <sup>th</sup> St. from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 344,800	5/15/2008	11/15/2008
Priority	Project Element	Task/Eligible Use	Itemized \$ Request	Start Date	End Date
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
<b>Total dollars requested and the start and completion date for the entire project or phase:</b>					



**I.E. Type and Tenure of Housing:** List the number of housing units by type and tenure (owner/renter) currently within and/or planned for the funding proposal area (Sec. I.A, page 1).

	Total # of Units	# Units Owner	# Units Rental	Distinguishing Features: (e.g. number of stories, building design)
<b>Existing Housing:</b>				
Single-family				
Townhouse				
Apartments or Condominiums				
Duplexes				
Other (list):				
<b>Planned Housing:</b>				
Single-family				
Townhouse				
Apartments or Condominiums				
Duplexes				
Other (list):				

**I.F. Streets**

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Will new streets be constructed? If yes, describe:
		Will new street realignments and connections be constructed? If yes, describe:

**I.G Pedestrian Infrastructure**

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Will new pedestrian infrastructure be added? If yes, mark type and describe:
___ Sidewalks:		
___ Bike paths:		
___ Trails:		
Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Will existing pedestrian infrastructure be improved? If yes, mark type and describe:
___ Sidewalks:		
___ Bike paths:		
___ Trails:		

**I.H. Future Development Phases, if applicable**

Describe future development or phases that will be undertaken beyond two years from the date of the grant award (Dec. 2007). Describe phasing plan and include details of phases, e.g. anticipated number and type of housing units, other proposed project components. If no future phases or development are planned beyond two years, write NONE (Limit 20 lines)

**I.I. Completed And/Or Existing Adjacent Development**

Describe buildings or development phases already constructed, if applicable, and/or other existing development adjacent to the project area described in Section I.A on page 1, "Funding Proposal." (Limit 20 lines)

## Section II. Financial Information

### II.A. Available Resources Assessment

State why this project element(s) will not occur within two years after this grant cycle unless LCDA funding is made available for this project at this time.

(Limit 15 lines)

--	--

### II.B. Cost Estimates: How have costs been determined? Mark (X) as many as appropriate.

(For checked boxes, list which project element(s)).

	Bidding
	Contracting estimates
	Developer estimates
	City estimates
	Other (list):

### II.C. Local Tax Impact of the Project

1.

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Is the applicant planning to use TIF for this project? (If so, be sure to include this in Sources and Uses, II.D and II.E)
		Is the applicant planning to create a TIF district?
		OR, is the project going into a district already generating tax increment?

2.

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Has the applicant completed a TIF analysis of the project?
If so, what is the project increment:		
To what is the increment pledged?		



**II.D. Sources and Uses – For Requested Elements(s) – As described in Sec. I.B, page 2.**

See sample sources and uses page, attached.

Fill out completely, ensuring that the numbers properly total. Incomplete sources and uses may be interpreted as a lack of funding readiness. The Livable Communities Advisory Committee cannot evaluate the financial readiness of a project without complete information.

Sources	\$ Amount	Status	Approval Anticipated by:
<b>TOTAL:</b>			

Uses	\$ Amount	\$ Portion from LCDA Source	\$ Other Public Sources	\$ Other Private Sources
<b>Hard Costs:</b>				
<b>Total Hard Costs:</b>				
<b>Eligible Soft Costs</b> (refer to “Eligible Uses of Funds,” Item 1.a) of the LCDA criteria.				
<b>Total Soft Costs:</b>				
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>				

**II.E. Sources and Uses – For Funding Proposal**, as described in Sec. I.A (page 1), including Requested Element(s) described in Sources and Uses, II.D.

See sample sources and uses page, attached.

Fill out completely, ensuring that the numbers total. Incomplete sources and uses may be interpreted as a lack of funding readiness. The Livable Communities Advisory Committee cannot evaluate the financial readiness of a project without complete information.

Sources	\$ Amount	Status	Approval Anticipated by:
<b>TOTAL:</b>			

Uses	\$ Amount	\$ Portion from LCDA Source	\$ Other Public Sources	\$ Other Private Sources
<b>Hard Costs:</b>				
<b>Total Hard Costs:</b>				
<b>Eligible Soft Costs</b> (refer to “Eligible Uses of Funds,” Item 1.a) of the LCDA criteria.				
<b>Total Soft Costs:</b>				
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>				

## II.F. Other Resource Documentation

Identify other sources the applicant has considered but will not use to fund this LCDA request.

- a) Describe the local funding sources the applicant has considered but will not use to fund the project component for which the applicant is requesting LCDA funds. Include local taxes, use of local bonding authority, other local sources. Identify why these sources cannot be used within the next two years to fund the requested project component.

(Limit 10 lines)

--

- b) Describe non-local sources of funding the applicant has pursued to fund this project component within the next two years. Identify why these sources cannot be used. Provide information (e.g. letters, other documentation) to substantiate unsuccessful efforts to secure such funding.

(Limit 10 lines)

--

## II.G. Other Funding Requests

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has the applicant applied this year for the same funds, in whole or in part, as detailed in this request, from another source(s)?
If yes, state source(s):		

*(Begin new page)*

**Section III.** Information for Evaluating Your Proposal on the Step One Criteria  
(see page 5 of criteria)

**III.A. Land Use Criteria**

Include information in Sections III.A. through III.F for the “Funding Proposal,” as described in Section I.A, page 1. Do not include data and information for any activity or phase(s) beyond two years from the date of the grant award (Dec. 2007).

**1. Use Land Efficiently**

- a) Describe how the proposal will use land more efficiently or increase the intensity of land use on the project site.

Limit 10 lines

- b)

Current overall housing density (net units per acre)	Planned overall housing density (net units per acre)

**2. Develop land uses linked to the local and regional transportation system.**

- a) Describe how project elements are designed to optimize the relationship of the project to transit, (if applicable) through location and orientation of buildings, location of parking, or other project design.

Limit 10 lines

**b)** Describe how, as applicable, existing street patterns, sidewalks, trails, paths provide pedestrian access to transit.

Limit 10 lines

**c)** Describe how, as applicable, new streets or street connections, sidewalks, trails, paths will improve pedestrian access to transit.

Limit 10 lines

**d)** Identify elements included in the project that support or connect to transit, as appropriate to the site.

Mark (X) appropriate box

	Sidewalks (describe):
	Paths/trails (describe):
	Bike racks (describe number, location):
	Transit shelters (describe number, location):
	Pedestrian waiting facilities (describe number, location):
	Other (describe):

**3. Connect housing and centers of employment, education, retail and recreation uses.**

a) Mark (x) the types of uses in the proposed project and within ¼ mile of the project.

Type of Use	Within the proposed project	¼ mile of the project
Office		
Retail		
Services (list type):		
Restaurant		
Entertainment		
Government/civic		
Education		
Arts/cultural		
Open space		
Public space		
Residential		

b) Describe how the project will increase or improve connections between jobs and housing.

Limit 10 lines

c) Employment Proximity and Access

Estimate how many jobs are within ¼ mile?	
How are these jobs reached by bus or car? (describe bus routes, streets, highways and/or freeways traveled)	
Estimate how many jobs are within 1 mile?	
How are these jobs reached by bus or car? (describe bus routes, streets, highways and/or freeways traveled)	

- d) Describe how the project's land uses are arranged or designed to optimize connectivity and access within the project area.

Limit 10 lines

- e) Describe how the project's land uses are arranged or designed to connect to adjacent neighborhoods.

Limit 10 lines

**4. Develop a range of housing densities, types and costs.**

- a) Housing Affordability: List estimated affordability levels for existing and planned housing in the following table: (Area median income - \$78,500)

	<b>Number of Units at or below 50% of Area Median Income</b>	<b>Number of Units at 50-80% of Area Median Income</b>	<b>Number of Units at Market Rate</b>	<b>Current/Proposed Price Ranges of Market Rate Units</b>
Existing housing				
Owner:				
Rental:				
Planned housing				
Owner:				
Rental:				
<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	Mark (X) appropriate box		
<b>Are there mechanisms to ensure long-term affordability? If yes, what type?</b>				
Mark (X) any that apply				
Land trust				
Resale price indexing				
Other (describe):				



- b)** Describe the mix of housing options that will result when the proposed housing (in Section I.E) is added to the housing in adjacent neighborhoods.

Limit 10 lines

--

- c)** Describe how the proposed housing will diversify housing choices city-wide.

Limit 10 lines

--

**5. Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources.**

- a)** What types of **conventional stormwater management** techniques for rate and/or volume control and pollutant removal are employed within the project? Mark (X) all that apply.

Yes	No	
		Improved site runoff – If yes, describe:
		Local storm water detention – If yes, describe:
		Regional storm water detention – If yes, describe:
		Other – If yes, describe:

- b) What type(s) of **innovative and low impact development (LID)** methods are employed in the project to achieve storm water control through the integration of natural hydrologic functions into the project's overall design. Mark (X) all that apply.

Yes	No	
		Rain gardens – If yes, describe:
		Infiltration swales – If yes, describe:
		Pervious pavement – If yes, describe:
		Native vegetation – If yes, describe:
		Underground stormwater retention/filtration structures – If yes, describe:
		Green roofs – If yes, describe:
		Other – If yes, describe:

- c) Describe the ways in which the project: Mark (X) all that apply

Yes	No	
		Adds green space – If yes, describe:
		Enhances connections to existing green spaces and other natural areas, within the project or adjacent to it – If yes, describe:
		Uses natural resources and features, where feasible and appropriate, as community assets and amenities – If yes, describe:

### III.B. Tools and Processes to Ensure Successful Outcomes

- 1. City review/regulatory process:** Describe city review or regulatory processes or procedures used or developed for this project, such as zoning codes, design standards, or development standards.

(limit 6 lines)

- 2. Planning, Implementation and Funding Partnerships:** List and briefly describe the type and nature of partnerships in the project among government, private, for-profit and non-profit sectors.

Name of Partner(s)	Type of Partnership or Role of Partner

- 3. Community’s role:** Describe any public participation processes involving residents, businesspersons and others used to develop the proposal. Describe plans for future community involvement in project implementation.

Limit 10 lines

- 4. City’s role:** How have elected officials, city council initiatives or actions supported the project?

Limit 10 lines

*(begin new page)*

**Section IV.** Information for evaluating your proposal on the Step Two Evaluation Criteria -- see page 6 of criteria.

**Include information in this section for the Funding Proposal, as described in Section I.A. on page 1, AND for any future development described in Section I.H., page 5.**

**IV.A. Innovation and Demonstration**

1. Describe how the funding proposal and future development (if applicable) will make more efficient use of land on the project site to maximize the potential of the project location, in ways that are innovative and replicable elsewhere in the region.

Limit 10 lines

2. Describe how the funding proposal and future development (if applicable) will link land use to the local or regional transportation system in ways that are innovative and replicable elsewhere in the region.

Limit 10 lines

- 3.** Describe how the funding proposal and future development (if applicable) will connect housing and centers of employment, education, retail and recreation uses, in ways that are innovative and replicable elsewhere in the region.

Limit 10 lines

- 4.** Describe how the funding proposal and future development (if applicable) will provide a range of housing densities, types and costs in ways that are innovative and replicable elsewhere in the region.

Limit 10 lines

- 5.** Describe how the funding proposal and future development (if applicable) will conserve, protect and enhance natural resources, through development that is sensitive to the environment, in ways that are innovative and replicable elsewhere in the region.

Limit 10 lines

6. Describe ways the funding proposal and its future phases (if applicable) will be innovative and replicable elsewhere in the region, other than those described in Sec. IV.A.1. through A.5.

Limit 10 lines

7. Describe ways the project has evolved, e.g. how the project may have changed due to public involvement, whether local regulations were modified or created to allow project innovation, collaborations with other regulatory levels resulted in “breaking rules” or creating new rules.

Limit 10 lines

#### **IV.B. How LCDA Funding is a Catalyst**

How will LCDA funding be a catalyst to implement the project?

Limit 20 lines

(Begin new page)

## Section V. Information for Evaluating Your Proposal on the Step Three Selection Criteria – Readiness (see page 6 of criteria)

### V.A. The Status of Implementation Tools

1. **Regulatory Status:** Mark (X) whether the following will be needed, is underway or is completed, or if not applicable, place 'NA' in the box. Briefly provide additional information as noted.

Will be Needed	Underway	City has Adopted	
			<b>Comprehensive plan amendment.</b> If needed, please describe:
			<b>Environmental Reviews – EAW, EIS, AUAR.</b> If needed, please describe:
			<b>Zoning changes and variances.</b> If needed, please list and include change to/from:

2. **Indicate the status of design or development standards:**

Will be Needed	Underway	City has Adopted	
			Mark (X) appropriate box – if not applicable, place NA in box.
			<b>Design standards.</b> Briefly describe:
			<b>Development standards.</b> Briefly describe:

### V.B. Other Status and Commitments

1.

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Is the development site as represented currently within a designated development district, or an approved development (i.e. PUD)?

2.

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Does the applicant control the site, or sites represented in the proposal?
If no – are steps being taken to gain control? Explain.		

**3. Market and Feasibility Studies:** Indicate the status of market and feasibility studies.

Will be Needed	Underway	City has Completed	Mark (X) appropriate box – if not applicable, place NA in box.
			<b>Market studies</b>
			<b>Feasibility studies</b>
If completed, briefly state the conclusions of the studies: (limit 4 lines)			

**4. Availability of Market Studies**

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Are market studies available for all some or all components of the project?
		If yes, which components (e.g. retail, office, ownership housing, rental housing)?

**5. Developer Status**

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Has a developer been selected for the proposal?
If no, explain status or next steps for selecting a developer and skip to question #7:		
If yes, provide the requested information about the developer(s) and answer question #6:		
Name of Developer(s)		Type of contract or commitment

**6. Site Status**

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Is the developer acquiring the development site from the city?
		If yes, is the site being sold at fair-market value?

**7. Site Plan**

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Is site plan final?
If not final, describe status: (limit 4 lines)		



**8. Architect/Engineer Status**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	Mark (X) appropriate box
		Has an architect/engineer been selected for the project?

**9. Commercial:** If commercial is proposed (in Funding Proposal, as described in Section I.A), provide as much specificity as possible regarding the type of tenants and projected rents.

<b>Type of Tenant</b>	<b>Projected Rents</b>

## Required Attachments

Maps and graphic images are an important part of the evaluation. Ensure that they are readable.

- Use only an 8.5” x 11” or 11” x 17” format
  - If using 11” x 17” format, pages must be folded to an 8.5” x 11” size
- Maps and graphic images must be clearly legible
- Identify north-south-east-west on all images

Attach the following to the application, in the order listed:

1. Aerial photo – provided by the Council. Applicant is responsible for marking the project site boundaries on the photo. Contact Metropolitan Council staff person Greg Pates (651-602-1410 or [greg.pates@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:greg.pates@metc.state.mn.us)) for an aerial photo of the site area.
2. Vicinity map – provided by the Council. Applicant is responsible for marking the project site boundaries on this map. Contact Greg Pates to obtain a vicinity map showing project location, planned land use, transit locations, and adjacent land uses.
3. A site plan showing:
  - adjacent land uses and connections (roads, sidewalks, or other)
  - the location of existing and planned buildings (marked)
  - existing and planned streets
  - transit stops within or adjacent to the development
  - sidewalk and trail routes
  - open space, public spaces
  - proposed phases, if applicable, clearly distinguishing between existing and proposed phases
  - ¼ mile and ½ mile radius.
4. Up to five (5) one-page images of your choice - elevations, section drawings, perspective drawings or illustrations.
5. The applicant’s due diligence financial analysis for the project, if one has been completed. This may be a consultant report, or an internal staff summary or report.
6. Completed Certification of Compliance regarding use of eminent domain (see attachment). ***Must be submitted with application.***
7. Local Resolution of Support (see sample attachment). ***Must be submitted with application.***

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT**  
**CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE**

Regarding Metropolitan Council Policy Restricting LCA Grants  
For Projects Using Eminent Domain for Economic Development

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

The "Applicant" is a statutory or home rule charter city or town that has negotiated affordable and life-cycle housing goals pursuant to the Metropolitan Livable Communities Act and is participating in the Local Housing Incentives Account program, or is a housing and redevelopment authority, economic development authority, or port authority. On January 25, 2006, the Metropolitan Council adopted a "Policy Restricting Metropolitan Council LCA Grants for Projects Using Eminent Domain for Economic Development." The policy applies to LCA grants awarded after January 25, 2006 and private property that was acquired through eminent domain proceedings after January 25, 2006.

Please check one of the following as appropriate for the Project. The Project will not be eligible for LCA grant funding unless the appropriate certifications are made by the Applicant:

**ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT and to the best of my knowledge, I CERTIFY that with regard to the Project for which LCA funding is requested, no eminent domain authority was used after January 25, 2006 to acquire any private property associated with the Project and there are no plans to use eminent domain authority for "economic development" purposes in connection with the Project.**

**Eminent domain authority was used after January 25, 2006 to acquire private property associated with the Project but, ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT and to the best of my knowledge, I CERTIFY that the eminent domain authority was not exercised for "economic development" purposes as defined by the Metropolitan Council's policy because one or more of the following exceptions applies:**

Please check the following exception(s) that applies:

- (a) Private property was acquired for public ownership and public use, such as for a roadway, park, sanitary sewer, hospital, public school, or similar use;
- (b) Private property was acquired to remediate or clean up pollution or contamination that threatens or may threaten public health or safety or the environment;
- (c) Private property acquired through eminent domain will be leased to a private person or entity but the private person or entity only will occupy an incidental part of a public property or public facility, such as a retail establishment on the ground floor of a public building;
- (d) Eminent domain authority was used to acquire abandoned property or acquire "blighted" property as the term "blighted" is defined and used in Minnesota Statutes Chapter 469;
- (e) Private property was acquired to remove a public nuisance; or
- (f) Eminent domain authority was used to clear defective chains of title.

If eminent domain authority was used to acquire private property to remediate or clean up pollution or contamination that threatens or may threaten public health or safety or the environment (see exception (b) above), then ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT, and to the best of my knowledge, I FURTHER CERTIFY that:

- (1) The property owner was/is unable or unwilling to pay for appropriate remediation or clean up; and
- (2) Remediation or clean up must occur expeditiously to eliminate or mitigate the threat to public health or safety or the environment; and
- (3) No Responsible Party has been identified or is financially capable of carrying out the remediation or clean up.

**THIS CERTIFICATION MUST BE  
SIGNED BY THE APPLICANT'S  
AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:**

Name:

---

Title:

---

Signature:

---

**2007 RESOLUTION - SINGLE PROJECT**

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**CITY OF \_\_\_\_\_, MINNESOTA**

**RESOLUTION IDENTIFYING THE NEED FOR  
LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT FUNDING AND  
AUTHORIZING AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS**

**WHEREAS** the City of \_\_\_\_\_ is a participant in the Livable Communities Act's Housing Incentives Program for 2007 as determined by the Metropolitan Council, and is therefore eligible to apply for Livable Communities Demonstration Account funds; and

**WHEREAS** the City has identified a proposed project within the City that meets the Demonstration Account's purposes and criteria and is consistent with and promotes the purposes of the Metropolitan Livable Communities Act and the policies of the Metropolitan Council's adopted metropolitan development guide; and

**WHEREAS** the City has the institutional, managerial and financial capability to ensure adequate project administration; and

**WHEREAS** the City certifies that it will comply with all applicable laws and regulations as stated in the grant agreement; and

**WHEREAS** the City agrees to act as legal sponsor for the project contained in the grant application submitted on \_\_\_\_\_, 2007; and

**WHEREAS** the City acknowledges Livable Communities Demonstration Account grants are intended to fund projects or project components that can serve as models, examples or prototypes for development or redevelopment projects elsewhere in the region, and therefore represents that the proposed project or key components of the proposed project can be replicated in other metropolitan-area communities; and

**WHEREAS** only a limited amount of grant funding is available through the Metropolitan Council's Livable Communities Demonstration Account during each funding cycle and the Metropolitan Council has determined it is appropriate to allocate those scarce grant funds only to eligible projects that would not occur without the availability of Demonstration Account grant funding.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that, after appropriate examination and due consideration, the governing body of the City:

1. Finds that it is in the best interests of the City's development goals and priorities for the proposed project to occur at this particular site and at this particular time.
2. Finds that the project component(s) for which Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding is sought:

- (a) will not occur solely through private or other public investment within the reasonably foreseeable future; and
  - (b) will not occur within two years after a grant award unless Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding is made available for this project at this time.
3. Represents that the City has undertaken reasonable and good faith efforts to procure funding for the project component for which Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding is sought but was not able to find or secure from other sources funding that is necessary for project component completion within two years and states that this representation is based on the following reasons and supporting facts:
4. Authorizes its \_\_\_\_\_ to submit on behalf of the City an application for Metropolitan Council Livable Communities Demonstration Account grant funds for the project component(s) identified in the application, and to execute such agreements as may be necessary to implement the project on behalf of the City.

Adopted this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk

**2007 RESOLUTION - MULTIPLE PROJECTS**

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**CITY OF \_\_\_\_\_, MINNESOTA**

**RESOLUTION IDENTIFYING THE NEED FOR  
LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT FUNDING AND  
AUTHORIZING APPLICATIONS FOR GRANT FUNDS**

**WHEREAS** the City of \_\_\_\_\_ is a participant in the Livable Communities Act's Housing Incentives Program for 2007 as determined by the Metropolitan Council, and is therefore eligible to apply for Livable Communities Demonstration Account funds; and

**WHEREAS** the City has identified proposed projects within the City that meet the Demonstration Account's purposes and criteria and are consistent with and promote the purposes of the Metropolitan Livable Communities Act and the policies of the Metropolitan Council's adopted metropolitan development guide; and

**WHEREAS** the City has the institutional, managerial and financial capability to ensure adequate project administration; and

**WHEREAS** the City certifies that it will comply with all applicable laws and regulations as stated in the grant agreement; and

**WHEREAS** the City agrees to act as legal sponsor for the projects contained in the grant applications submitted on \_\_\_\_\_, 2007;

**WHEREAS** the City acknowledges Livable Communities Demonstration Account grants are intended to fund projects or project components that can serve as models, examples or prototypes for development or redevelopment projects elsewhere in the region, and therefore represents that the proposed projects or key components of the proposed projects can be replicated in other metropolitan-area communities; and

**WHEREAS** only a limited amount of grant funding is available through the Metropolitan Council's Livable Communities Demonstration Account during each funding cycle and the Metropolitan Council has determined it is appropriate to allocate those scarce grant funds only to eligible projects that would not occur without the availability of Demonstration Account grant funding; and

**WHEREAS** cities may submit grant applications for up to five projects during each funding cycle but, using the cities' own internal ranking processes, must rank their projects by priority so the Metropolitan Council may consider those priority rankings as it reviews applications and makes grant awards.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that, after appropriate examination and consideration, the governing body of the City:

Finds that it is in the best interests of the City's development goals and priorities for the proposed projects to occur at these particular sites at this particular time.

1. Finds that the project components for which Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding is sought:
  - (a) will not occur solely through private or other public investment within the reasonably foreseeable future; and
  - (b) will not occur within two years after the grant award unless Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding is made available for these projects at this time.

2. Ranks the project funding applications, according to the City's own internal priorities, in the following order:

Priority Ranking	Project Name	Grant Amount Required
---------------------	--------------	--------------------------

---

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- (5)

3. Represents that the City has undertaken reasonable and good faith efforts to procure funding for the project component for which Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding is sought but was not able to find or secure from other sources funding that is necessary for project component completion within two years and states that this representation is based on the following reasons and supporting facts:

4. Authorizes its \_\_\_\_\_ to submit on behalf of the City applications for Metropolitan Council Livable Communities Demonstration Account grant funds for the project components identified in the applications, and to execute such agreements as may be necessary to implement the projects on behalf of the City.

Adopted this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk



**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**  
390 Robert Street North, St. Paul, MN 55101

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
September 6, 2007

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ruth Grendahl, Gina Bonsignore, Fred Dock, Gary Fields, Glen Hardin, Donald Jensen, Peggy Lucas, Lance Neckar, Kevin Ringwald, Doug Snyder, and Blair Tremere

**Absent:** Dan Marckel

**Others Present:** Staff: Guy Peterson, Jan Gustafson, Joanne Barron, and Linda Milashius

### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ruth Grendahl at 9:08 a.m. She welcomed three new members to the Livable Communities Advisory Committee (LCAC): Peggy Lucas, Lance Neckar and Blair Tremere.

### **Approval of Agenda/Summary Notes**

Chair Grendahl asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Hearing none, she declared that the agenda would stand as printed.

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Grendahl asked committee members and staff to introduce themselves and briefly summarize their background. Chair Grendahl reported that committee member Bob Gorg had realized that his work schedule would not permit him to participate in the committee process and submitted his resignation. Steps have been initiated to fill the vacancy and a new appointment will be announced by Council Chair Peter Bell as soon as possible.

Guy Peterson, Community Development Director, welcomed committee members on behalf of Chair Peter Bell and the Council, expressing the Council's appreciation for the work the advisory committee does.

Committee members were provided with a list of Council staff noting the role of each staff member in the work of the committee.

### **Advisory Committee Charge and Role**

Chair Grendahl explained that the advisory committee reviews and evaluates applications for funding from the Council's Livable Communities Demonstration Account (LCDA). She stressed that the committee serves the Council in an advisory capacity and noted that it is her job to take the committee's recommendations to the Council. The Council has the option to change the committee's recommendations when it awards grant funds. However, Chair Grendahl stated that when she presents the LCAC

recommendations, she also advocates for the LCAC's decisions. Chair Grendahl indicated that the Council has generally awarded funds as the advisory committee has recommended.

She stated that all communication from applicants goes through staff. If Committee members receive calls or materials from applicants, they should refer the applicants or send the materials to staff.

### **LCDA Program Overview and 2007 Changes**

Jan Gustafson, Livable Communities Program manager, stated that there were few changes to the committee's process for this year, but noted that changes to the application and the addition of a requirement that all applicants submit a pre-application for staff's review and comment had proved beneficial for applicants, staff and—ultimately—for the advisory committee because it resulted in fewer applications submitted.

Joanne Barron, Planning Analyst and coordinator for the LCDA program, used slides to provide the committee with an overview of the program, including the program purpose described in the Livable Communities Act that created the program, the program focus, funding goals and evaluation criteria. She reported that the application has been reorganized, hopefully for the better, and that the application includes new questions asking for additional financial information, prepared with the assistance of Gary Fields. There are no changes affecting the committee process this year. Gina Bonsignore reminded members of the debriefing the committee had conducted after last year's process at which time they had recommended changes to the LCDA award process (staff noted that committee recommendations had been implemented; e.g., the inclusion of more detailed financial questions in the grant application). Bonsignore asked if the advisory committee would have a similar opportunity this year. Chair Grendahl stated that Council Chair Peter Bell was in the process of convening an LCDA work group that would include Chair Grendahl and advisory committee member Dan Marckel. That group will be looking at possible changes to the LCDA process and Chair Grendahl indicated that suggestions from advisory committee members could be considered then.

Barron pointed out that Council staff had just completed a technical review of the proposals and were also responsible for determining whether requested items were eligible for funding. LCAC members will focus on assessing what is being demonstrated by proposed projects and the degree of innovation each proposal offers. Some committee members had expressed a desire last year for a more structured scoring and evaluation process, and staff can work with the committee on that.

### **Summary of 2007 LCDA Proposals**

Ms. Barron reviewed the list of proposals the committee will review. There are fifteen proposals, compared to 24 last year, and the lowest number since the first year of the program. The reduced number this year may be due in part to a downturn in market conditions. In addition, six proposals that had submitted a pre-application, a new required step this year, did not submit the full application, due to comments provided by staff or issues within the city. One additional application did not score the minimum points necessary in the Step One evaluation process administered by staff to proceed to the advisory committee evaluation, resulting in fifteen remaining proposals. Grendahl asked if cities were limited to five pre-applications. Barron answered, yes, that is correct. Barron said that four of the fifteen projects in for funding were reviewed by the committee last year – A.4, Longfellow Station, Minneapolis (funded); A.5, SEMI – Granary Road, Minneapolis; B.3, Bass Lake Road Redevelopment, New Hope; and B.4, Har Mar Apartments, Roseville; (none of these three were funded). One additional proposal, A.7, Arlington Jackson, St. Paul, applied for LCDA funding last year but did not advance to the Committee's evaluation. Barron noted that the ID numbers are not in all cases consecutive, due to some projects having dropped out of the process—A.1 and B. 1 have dropped out. Gary Fields asked if the Minneapolis and St. Paul projects are listed in the cities' priority order. Staff answered no, they are

listed in alphabetical order. Grendahl stated that, as in the past, Minneapolis and St Paul's priorities will be shared with the Committee at a later time.

Peggy Lucas asked if the ratio of applications from the suburbs versus the center cities is about the same or different from past years. Barron responded that there have been generally few applications from the edge suburban cities, but overall suburban cities have represented about half of the total compared to those from the center cities. A few years ago the Council established a guideline that set up to 40 percent of the dollars as the amount that should go to projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul, to encourage applications from smaller cities and to let small cities know they can compete for dollars against the larger cities. Blair Tremere commented on the difficult process in the past, when he previously chaired the LCAC, when demand was so much higher than the dollars available; in this circumstance, he said, sometimes readiness of projects can be a tie-breaker. Grendahl said yes, that can be the case. Barron commented that the requests are about twice the available funding at this point in the process this year, compared to three or four times in some prior years.

### **Committee Evaluation Process**

The committee discussed a process for the September 20 meeting. Barron noted that with a smaller number of applications than last year, the committee could score projects using a "+ 0 –" scoring, as in the past, and following discussion, select a group of the highest-scoring projects to participate in a Q&A sessions with the committee at a future meeting; or could skip this step and invite all of the projects in for Q&A. Committee members discussed whether to rank the Minneapolis and St. Paul projects, in light of the fact that the Committee can recommend only 40 percent of the funding for Minneapolis and St. Paul projects. Barron said that the committee can, in a separate recommendation, recommend to the Council that additional dollars, beyond the 40 percent, be awarded to Minneapolis and/or St. Paul projects, as was done last year. Bonsignore, Jensen and Ringwald spoke in favor of scoring all of the projects as a "straw poll" early indicator of the committee's level of support for the various projects. Grendahl supported doing the rankings because the scoring deadline is a way for members to do the work of getting familiar with the applications early in the process. The committee decided to do the + 0 – scoring before the next meeting, and decide at the Sept. 20 meeting whether to eliminate projects at that point. Staff will send the evaluation form, an explanation of the scoring system, and a form on which to record scores, to be returned to Linda Milashius by noon on Sept.19.

Dan Marckel has volunteered again this year to map the projects using Google Earth, and provide a virtual tour of projects for the Sept. 20 meeting. Barron asked members to be thinking about questions they have on the projects, either for discussion on Sept. 20 or for the applicants. Grendahl said other questions for the applicants can be added as we go along in the process.

## **Conflict of Interest Procedures**

Chair Grendahl stated that the committee takes conflict of interest procedures very seriously, and that conflicts will be declared at the next meeting if members are ready to do that. Barron referred to the agenda packet item, an excerpt from the bylaws conflict of interest with an additional paragraph covering perceived conflicts, and also referred members to the conflict of interest form members must complete, sign and return to staff if they have conflicts for any project or projects. If members have questions about what constitutes a conflict, staff can refer their questions to the Council's legal counsel for an answer. Barron commented that the LCAC bylaws call for members to declare conflicts orally and in writing, and that is the reason for these procedures. Grendahl added that it has been the practice for members to step back from the table during discussion of projects for which they have a declared conflict.

## **Other Business**

Chair Grendahl said she had a conflict for the meeting scheduled on Thursday, Oct. 4, and asked if committee members could meet on Friday, Oct 5, instead. Members agreed to meet on Friday, Oct 5, beginning at 8:30. This is the meeting for Q&A, and is set to end at 1:30 at present; the time can be adjusted based on the number of applicants attending that meeting. Staff will send a revised calendar.

Grendahl stated that parking will be validated for members if they bring their parking ticket to the Council receptionist on the main floor, who will stamp it. (Parking will be validated for members who park in the US Bank parking center or the 1st National Bank building ramp—both are listed in the information provided in the mailing packet).

Barron said staff will send members a committee roster with contact information, and asked that members send updated or corrected information to staff. Staff does not share this information beyond the committee.

## **Adjourn**

The next LCAC meeting is Thursday, September 20, 2007, 9:00 am – noon, Metropolitan Council, Room LLB. The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**  
390 Robert Street North, St. Paul, MN 55101

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
September 20, 2007

**Committee Members Present:**

Chair Ruth Grendahl, James Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Fred Dock, Gary Fields, Glen Hardin, Donald Jensen, Dan Marckel, Lance Neckar, Kevin Ringwald, Doug Snyder, and Blair Tremere  
Peggy Lucas

**Absent:**

**Others Present:**

Visitors: Kim Lindquist, City of Rosemount; John Meyer, City of Centerville; Maureen Michalski, Central Community Housing Trust; and Nieeta Presley – NEDU Project  
Staff: Guy Peterson, Joanne Barron, Jan Bourgoin and Linda Milashius

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ruth Grendahl at 9:05 a.m. She welcomed new member James Barton. Jim briefly introduced himself and said he looks forward to participating on the committee. Chair Grendahl thanked Jim as well as all committee members for their time commitment.

**Approval of Agenda/Summary Notes**

Chair Grendahl called for the approval of the agenda and summary notes. Hearing no changes, Grendahl stated that the September 20, 2007 agenda and the September 6, 2007 summary notes were approved as written.

**Conflict of Interest**

Committee members were asked by Chair Grendahl to orally declare their conflicts of interest, as required by committee bylaws. Chair Grendahl stated that if there was the possibility of a conflict of interest, it was best to declare it. Conflicts were stated, as recorded in the table on the next page. (The bylaws also state that each committee member must declare conflicts of interest in writing; please bring your Conflict of Interest form to Jan at the next meeting if you have not yet done so). Chair Grendahl asked that if there are any changes to let staff know immediately.

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATUS  
LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2007**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM ON FILE</b>	<b>CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS STATED FOR PROJECTS LISTED (OR NO CONFLICTS WHERE NOTED)</b>
<b>Barton, James</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Bonsignore, Gina</b>	No	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Dock, Fred</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Fields, Gary</b>	No	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Grendahl, Ruth</b>	No	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Hardin, Glen</b>	No	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Jensen, Donald</b>	Yes	C.1 - Centerville, Phase I Downtown Redevelopment
<b>Lucas, Peggy</b>	No	Not present
<b>Marckel, Dan</b>	No	No conflict of interests to declare.
<b>Neckar, Lance</b>	Yes	A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road A.6 – Minneapolis, West Broadway Curve
<b>Ringwald, Kevin</b>	Yes	A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road
<b>Snyder, Douglas</b>	Yes	A.2 - Minneapolis, Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station Redevelopment A.3 – Minneapolis, Jackson Street NE Artist Affordable Housing A.4 – Minneapolis, Longfellow Station Project A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road A.6 – Minneapolis, West Broadway Curve
<b>Tremere, Blair</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare.

## Review of Applications

Chair Grendahl asked that the committee review the project scores committee members had submitted. Linda Milashius distributed the first round overall evaluation scores and a note sheet for each project showing the collective scores for each project -- land use, catalyst, readiness and overall score. Chair Grendahl thanked staff for the new forms this year.

### Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2007 LCAC First Round Overall Evaluation Scores – 9-20-07

	<u>City/Applicant</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>+</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>COI</u>
A.9	St. Paul	Rivoli Street	9	4	0	0
C.3	Rosemount	Stonebridge Core Block East	9	4	0	0
A.4	Minneapolis	Longfellow Station	8	3	1	1
A.8	St. Paul	Dale Street Village	7	5	1	0
A.3	Minneapolis	Jackson Street NE Artists	7	4	1	1
C.2	Forest Lake	Washington Co. Senior Housing	6	5	2	0
B.4	Roseville	Har Mar Apartments	6	4	3	0
A.6	Minneapolis	West Broadway Curve	6	3	2	2
C.1	Centerville	Phase I Downtown Redevelopment	6	3	4	0
B.2	New Brighton	Northwest Quadrant	5	6	2	0
A.2	Minneapolis	Bystrom Brothers	5	4	2	2
A.5	Minneapolis	SEMI-University Research Park	4	3	2	4
A.7	St. Paul Port Authority	Arlington Jackson	4	3	6	0
A.10	St. Paul	Stryker Project	3	5	5	0
B.3	New Hope	Bass Lake Road Apartments	1	6	6	0

#### COI – conflict of interest

#### Key to Scoring:

**Plus (+)** indicates the scorer believes the project is innovative, and demonstrates or shows potential to demonstrate new development concepts or elements for the community it is located in and/or for the region.

**Zero (0)** indicates the scorer feels neutral about whether the project is innovative and demonstrates new development concepts for the community it is located in and for the region; and/or would like to learn more about the project in committee discussion.

**Minus (-)** indicates the scorer believes the project is not innovative or a demonstration of new development concepts for the community it is located in or for the region; or the market has amply demonstrated the development concepts represented by this proposal. The market should support the project in this location without LCDA funding.

The committee discussed the proposals in alphabetical order in their A-B-C groups. Dan Marckel showed Google Earth maps of all of the projects; Chair Grendahl thanked Marckel for preparing this presentation to help everyone relate to the area being discussed. (Marckel indicated he would send the file to Barron for distribution to all committee members to use – it will require members to download Google Earth to their computer). Barron used the document viewer to display land use maps and graphics that were included with the applications. Barron noted that Milashius would record members' comments and questions as each project was discussed. She will prepare and distribute a draft of the questions to committee members for review and then plans to

distribute final questions to the applicants next week to respond to in question and answer periods. Chair Grendahl asked Committee members to send any additional questions to Barron.

Following discussion of all 15 projects, Chair Grendahl asked if the committee would like to consider voting on whether to bring in the lowest-scoring project, B-3, Bass Lake Road Apartments Redevelopment, New Hope, for questions. After discussing the project (notes recorded by Linda Milashius for the record), Tremere made a motion, seconded by Marckel, not to bring this project in for questions, thereby eliminating it from further funding consideration. The motion was approved by committee consensus.

A similar process was followed for three additional lowest-scoring projects, as follows. A.10, Stryker Project, St. Paul – motion by Tremere, second by Neckar, unanimous vote not to bring in for questions. A.7, Arlington-Jackson West, St. Paul Port Authority – motion by Neckar, second by Barton, unanimous vote not to bring in for questions. A.5, SEMI University Research Park, East Granary Road – motion by Tremere, second by Dock, 7 to 2 vote with three abstentions (Neckar, Ringwald, Snyder) not to bring in for questions.

The remaining eleven proposals will be invited to respond to the committee's questions at the next meeting.

Chair Grendahl thanked committee members for reading and analyzing the proposals, taking it seriously and for the good list of questions for those invited back and to also help those interested in returning next year.

Joanne asked that all additional questions be sent to her by next Wednesday, September 26<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Preparation for October 5, 2007 Questions and Answer Meeting**

Barron reviewed the process used last year for the Q&A meeting. Consensus was to use the same process.

- Questions will be sent to applicants in advance of their Q&A to allow them an opportunity to prepare responses.
- Applicants will be invited to bring a one-page (both sides), 8 ½ x 11 project status update about any significant project changes.
- Applicants will be invited to bring a one-page, one-side, 8 ½ x 11 graphic site plan update
- Up to 3 display boards will be acceptable
- Presentations will not be permitted.
- A City representative will be required to be the primary representative for the project, addressing questions that were submitted and others. Developers and consultants or others working with the project may be available for specific questions.

#### **Other Business**

Chair Grendahl invited further questions. No new business was discussed.

#### **Adjourn**

The next LCAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 5, 2007, 8:30 am – noon, Metropolitan Council, Room LLB.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.



**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**  
390 Robert Street North, St. Paul, MN 55101

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**

October 5, 2007

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ruth Grendahl, James Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Fred Dock, Gary Fields, Glen Hardin, Donald Jensen, Peggy Luckas, Dan Marckel, Lance Neckar, Kevin Ringwald, Douglas Snyder, and Blair Tremere

**Committee Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Staff: Guy Peterson, Jan Gustafson, Joanne Barron, Linda Milashius, and Jan Bourgoin

Guests: Dollie Crowther, City of Minneapolis; Lisa Kugler, Project Consultant; Theresa Cunningham, Project Coordinator, City of Minneapolis; Jay Nord - Northeast Development Corporation; Kevin Dockry, City of Minneapolis; Dale Joel, Capital Growth Real Estate; Tiffany Glasper, Senior Coordinator, City of Minneapolis; Pat Lamb, Legacy Development; Joan Trulsen, St Paul Planning & Economic Development; Yang Zhang, St Paul Planning & Economic Development; Kim Lindquist, Community Development Director, City of Rosemount; Jamie Radel, City of Roseville; Kate McGough – AEON; John Meyer, Centerville Finance Director; Doug Borglund, Community Development Director, City of Forest Lake; Barbara Dacy, Washington County HRA; David Black, Asst. Community Development Director, City of New Brighton

**Call to Order**

Chair Ruth Grendahl called the October 5 Livable Communities Advisory Committee (LCAC) meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

**Approve Agenda/Minutes**

Chair Grendahl called for the approval of the agenda and summary notes and, hearing no changes, stated that the October 5, 2007 agenda and the September 20, 2007 summary notes were approved as written.

**Conflict of Interest**

Chair Grendahl invited members to declare any further conflicts of interest prior to the start of the Question and Answer (Q & A) interviews. Peggy Lucas declared a conflict of interest for A.2 – Bystrom Brothers, Minneapolis. Kevin Ringwald declared a conflict of interest for B.4 - Har Mar Apartments. – Roseville, in addition to the conflict he declared at the September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting (A.5 – SEMI-University Research Park.)

Jan Bourgoin distributed forms to those members that had not yet turned in their Conflict of Interest Forms. The updated Conflict of Interest table reflects the conflicts noted today.

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATUS  
LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS  
OCTOBER 5, 2007**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM ON FILE</b>	<b>CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS STATED FOR PROJECTS LISTED (OR NO CONFLICTS WHERE NOTED)</b>
<b>Barton, James</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Bonsignore, Gina</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Dock, Fred</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Fields, Gary</b>	No	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Grendahl, Ruth</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Hardin, Glen</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Jensen, Donald</b>	Yes	C.1 - Centerville, Phase I Downtown Redevelopment
<b>Lucas, Peggy</b>	Yes	A.2 – Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station Redevelopment
<b>Marckel, Dan</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Neckar, Lance</b>	Yes	A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road A.6 – Minneapolis, West Broadway Curve
<b>Ringwald, Kevin</b>	Yes	A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road B.4 – Har Mar Apartments
<b>Snyder, Douglas</b>	Yes	A.2 - Minneapolis, Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station Redevelopment A.3 – Minneapolis, Jackson Street NE Artist Affordable Housing A.4 – Minneapolis, Longfellow Station Project A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road A.6 – Minneapolis, West Broadway Curve
<b>Tremere, Blair</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare

**Question & Answer Period**

Next, Chair Grendahl explained that she would welcome each group of participants, ask them to introduce themselves, and invite each of them to begin by answering the question – But for these funds, what would happen with the project. Written project questions generated by members at the September 20<sup>th</sup> committee meeting were provided by staff to the applicants in advance of today’s meeting, and they were notified that this meeting would be their opportunity to respond orally to those questions. Committee members decided to ask the questions they had submitted and Chair Grendahl would follow-up with any of the questions remaining. Ten minutes will be allowed for questions and answers; five minutes will be allowed between each group of

participants to allow the committee members time to review any handouts and for participants to set up display boards.

The proposals discussed at today's meeting, along with the names representing each project are listed below. Using a laptop computer, Linda Milashius recorded comments, discussion items, follow-up questions and any additional information requested from applicants. A number of applicants submitted updates that were distributed to the Committee.

- A.2 Bystrom Brothers, Minneapolis**  
Representing the Project: Dollie Crowther, City of Minneapolis; Lisa Kugler, Project Consultant
  
- A.3 Jackson Street NE Artists Housing, Minneapolis**  
Representing the Project: Theresa Cunningham, Project Coordinator, City of Minneapolis; Jay Nord, Northeast Development Corporation
  
- A.4 Longfellow Station, Minneapolis**  
Representing the Project: Kevin Dockry, City of Minneapolis; Dale Joel, Project Developer, Capital Growth Real Estate
  
- A.6 West Broadway Curve, Minneapolis**  
Representing the Project : Tiffany Glasper, Senior Coordinator, City of Minneapolis; Pat Lamb – Legacy Development
  
- A.8 Dale Street Village, St. Paul**  
Representing the Project: Joan Trulsen, St Paul Planning & Economic Development
  
- A.9 Rivoli Street Reconstruction, St. Paul**  
Representing the Project: Yang Zhang, St Paul Planning & Economic Development
  
- C.3 Stonebridge Core Block East Project, Rosemount**  
Representing the Project: Kim Lindquist, Community Development Director, City of Rosemount
  
- B.4 Har Mar Apartments, Roseville**  
Representing the Project: Jamie Radel - Economic Development Associate; Kate McGough – AEON, Project Developer
  
- C.1 Phase I Downtown Redevelopment, Centerville**  
Representing the Project: John Meyer, Centerville Finance Director
  
- C.2 Washington County HRA Senior Housing, Forest Lake**  
Representing the Project: Doug Borglund, Community Development Director, City of Forest Lake; Barbara Dacy, Washington County HRA
  
- B.2 Northwest Quadrant, New Brighton**  
Representing the Project: David Black, Asst. Community Development Director, City of New Brighton

## **Other Business**

The purpose of the next meeting is to allow members time to review and discuss what was heard today in preparation for the next step of scoring the projects. Joanne and Linda will follow up with committee members' requests for additional information/questions. Request for information will be sent to cities Monday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, in order to allow them time to return the information prior to next Thursday's meeting.

## **Adjourn**

Chair Ruth Grendahl adjourned the meeting at noon. The next committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 11 from 9:00 a.m. to noon, Metropolitan Council, Room LLB.

**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**  
390 Robert Street North, St. Paul, MN 55101

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
October 11, 2007

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ruth Grendahl, Jim Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Fred Dock, Gary Fields, Glen Hardin, Donald Jensen, Peggy Lucas, Dan Marckel, Lance Neckar, Kevin Ringwald, Douglas Snyder, and Blair Tremere

**Committee Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Staff: Guy Peterson, Jan Gustafson, Joanne Barron, Linda Milashius, and Jan Bourgoin

Guests: Dan Edgerton, Washington County HRA

**Call to Order**

The October 11 Livable Communities Advisory Committee meeting was called to order by Chair Ruth Grendahl at 9:05 a.m.

**Approve Agenda/Minutes**

Chair Grendahl called for the approval of the agenda and summary notes and, upon hearing no changes, stated that the October 11, 2007 agenda and the October 5, 2007 summary notes were approved as written.

**Review Step One Scoring Results**

Joanne Barron provided an overview of the Step One scoring process conducted by staff to assign up to 50 points for each project. Materials in today's packet include a list of the eleven projects under consideration and the score they received in each of six categories, and a total score for each project; and a table listing factors evaluated and scoring considerations for each of the six criteria. Barron explained that the Step One process is a technical evaluation based on specific measurable factors. The evaluation covered only the results expected within two years. The scores and documentation are additional information for the committee consideration in its evaluation; the points will not be added to the committee's points in the Step 2 scoring. Gina Bonsignore asked whether the housing score includes the larger context. Barron explained that it does. Committee discussion covered: how density points are assigned, if a criterion doesn't fit a project perhaps the project should get a default score, whether 'use land efficiently' includes maintaining density, whether rehabilitation should be included in the LCDA program or another program, that the staff land use and tools and processes scores should be decoupled, that increased emphasis on a point system may be at odds with intent to find the best demonstrations. Grendahl indicated both she and Dan Marckel are members of an LCDA Work Group chaired by Council Chair Peter Bell. The committee's concerns discussed today will be brought to the group for discussion. Don Jensen asked if any of the four eliminated projects (based on the members + 0 - scoring) received high scores by the staff evaluations. Barron will follow up to see if there were any discrepancies.

## **Step Two Scoring Process**

Barron reviewed a draft revised scoring form for the committee's use in The Step Two scoring process to assign evaluation points. She explained that the form had been revised to make the process more documentable, and to respond to requests from committee members last year to provide a more structured process for assigning the points. The revised form includes a more calibrated point system with more subpoint categories. Bonsignore said she was concerned that the impact of this scoring revision is unknown. Marckel stated that different scoring systems have been used in the LCDA program, and the results seem to end up the same. Grendahl commented that as long as each member stays consistent with their scoring, it shouldn't skew the numbers. There were no suggested changes to the scoring form.

## **Discussion of 11 LCDA Proposals Under Funding Consideration**

Responses to the follow-up questions from the Oct. 5 meeting were distributed to members today. Although not all of the questions had been answered satisfactorily, it was agreed to move ahead with the information submitted, rather than ask the same questions again. There was discussion about giving suggestions for changes to the project design or components—the committee needs to evaluate the project as it is proposed, but can make suggestions for next year's application on projects not selected this year. Bonsignore pointed out the discussion today was not just to focus around the Q&A, but a full discussion of the projects.

Linda Milashius recorded the committee's comments from today's discussion on the projects. The comments will be distributed to members for their use in the remainder of the evaluation process. A few new questions from members will be asked of representatives for A.2, Jackson St. NE Artists Housing, Minneapolis; C.1, Phase I Downtown Redevelopment, Centerville; C.2, Washington County HRA Senior Housing, Forest Lake. Staff will email their answers next week.

The 11 proposals were discussed in the following order:

- A.2 Bystrom Brothers, Minneapolis
- A.3 Jackson Street NE Artists Housing, Minneapolis
- A.4 Longfellow Station, Minneapolis
- A.6 West Broadway Curve, Minneapolis
- A.8 Dale Street Village, St. Paul
- A.9 Rivoli Street Reconstruction, St. Paul
- C.3 Stonebridge Core Block East Project, Rosemount
- B.2 Northwest Quadrant, New Brighton
- B.4 Har Mar Apartments, Roseville
- C.1 Phase I Downtown Redevelopment, Centerville
- C.2 Washington County HRA Senior Housing, Forest Lake

## **Next Steps/Other Business**

As a next step, the committee will score all 11 proposals on Part I, 'Development and Land Use,' and report these totals to staff. For Part II, 'Catalyst,' members will score the projects requesting one element to be funded. For projects requesting more than one element, members will list the elements in order of their catalyst potential. Milashius will email an evaluation form for each project, and will also send a form to record scores and return to her. Members' scores are due to Milashius by end of the day on Tuesday, October 23<sup>rd</sup>, to allow time to tabulate them for the October 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## Adjourn

Chair Grendahl adjourned the meeting at 11:45 am. The next committee meeting is on Thursday, October 25 from 9:00 a.m. to noon.

The following updated Conflict of Interest table reflects the information received today. Gary Fields submitted his conflict of interest form. All forms have now been received.

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATUS  
LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS  
OCTOBER 11, 2007**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM ON FILE</b>	<b>CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS STATED FOR PROJECTS LISTED (OR NO CONFLICTS WHERE NOTED)</b>
<b>Barton, James</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Bonsignore, Gina</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Dock, Fred</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Fields, Gary</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Grendahl, Ruth</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Hardin, Glen</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Jensen, Donald</b>	Yes	C.1 - Centerville, Phase I Downtown Redevelopment
<b>Lucas, Peggy</b>	Yes	A.2 – Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station Redevelopment
<b>Marckel, Dan</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Neckar, Lance</b>	Yes	A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road A.6 – Minneapolis, West Broadway Curve
<b>Ringwald, Kevin</b>	Yes	A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road B.4 – Har Mar Apartments
<b>Snyder, Douglas</b>	Yes	A.2 - Minneapolis, Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station Redevelopment A.3 – Minneapolis, Jackson Street NE Artist Affordable Housing A.4 – Minneapolis, Longfellow Station Project A.5 – Minneapolis, SEMI-University Research Park – East Granary Road A.6 – Minneapolis, West Broadway Curve
<b>Tremere, Blair</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare

**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**  
390 Robert Street North  
St. Paul, MN 55101

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
November 1, 2007

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ruth Grendahl, Jim Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Gary Fields, Glen Hardin, Donald Jensen, Peggy Lucas, Dan Marckel, Lance Neckar, Douglas Snyder and Blair Tremere.

**Committee Members Absent:** Fred Dock and Kevin Ringwald

**Others Present:** **Staff:** Guy Peterson, Jan Gustafson, Joanne Barron, Linda Milashius, Jan Bourgoin  
**Guests:** Don Edgerton, Washington County HRA; Kim Lindquist, Community Development Director, City of Rosemount; Dave Peterson, Minneapolis Star Tribune

**Call to Order**

The November 1<sup>st</sup> Livable Communities Advisory Committee meeting was called to order by Chair Ruth Grendahl at 9:08 a.m.

**Approve Agenda/Summary Notes**

Chair Grendahl called for the approval of the agenda and summary notes. Upon hearing no changes, she stated that the November 1<sup>st</sup> agenda and the October 25<sup>th</sup> summary notes were approved as written.

**Review Final Evaluation Scores**

Chair Grendahl recapped that as a result of the scoring process reviewed at last week's committee meeting, B.2, Northwest Quadrant, New Brighton and C.1, Phase I Downtown Redevelopment, Centerville, did not meet the threshold score of 30 points to be considered for funding and be considered in the next evaluation step, the readiness assessment. She said that either or both of these proposals could be considered for funding by a two-thirds vote of the committee and asked if there was any interest in opening this item up for discussion. Don Jensen moved to consider the Northwest Quadrant, New Brighton project in the funding-eligible group, and Gina Bonsignore seconded the motion. Discussion followed. There were 6 votes to reinstate the Northwest Quadrant, New Brighton project for funding recommendation, not meeting the required two-thirds vote. The motion failed.

**Checklist to Determine Feasibility of Project Funding Only With LCDA Grant**

Chair Grendahl asked the committee how they would like to proceed to discuss the checklist. The committee agreed that because all of the project requests have been discussed in great detail in previous meetings, the committee was comfortable going through the list of eight questions, considering all projects at one time, and noting if there were any 'no's for any project. The Committee discussed whether, in future, rejection letters from other funders should be required to be submitted. Marckel asked why Minnesota Housing funding did not come through for B.4. Har Mar Apartments, Roseville. Linda Milashius explained that the request was for tax credits and the project did not receive enough points to meet the requirements. Minnesota Housing is helping the city find additional funding sources.

Following discussion for all eight questions, the committee answered 'yes' for all questions on the checklist. Grendahl indicated that she will sign the checklist forms attesting that, at the judgment of the committee, all



proposals demonstrate that the proposed project is feasible at this time only with support of an LCDA grant. The completed “Checklist to Determine if Funding Request Substantially Demonstrates that Proposed Project is Feasible Only With LCDA Grant” follows:

Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2007  
 Checklist to Determine  
 If Funding Request Substantially Demonstrates  
 That Proposed Project Is Feasible Only With LCDA Grant

**Project Name** \_\_\_\_\_ **Project ID#** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Nine Projects:** A.1 – Minneapolis, Long Fellow Station; C.3 – Rosemount, Stonebridge Core Block East Project; A.8 – St. Paul, Dale Street Village; A.6 – Minneapolis, West Broadway Curve; C.2 – Forest Lake, Washington County HRA Senior Housing Development; A.3 – Minneapolis, Jackson Street NE Artists Affordable Housing; A.9 - Rivoli Street Reconstruction; A.2 – Minneapolis, Bystrom Brothers/Franklin Station; B.4 – Roseville, Har Mar Apartments

1.	Has the applicant submitted a resolution that includes the required language identifying the need for LCDA funding, such that the project element for which funding is requested could not proceed but for LCDA funding awarded in 2006?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____	No _____
2.	Has the applicant satisfactorily described why the requested project component(s) will not occur within two years after a grant award unless LCDA funding is made available for this project at this time? (Application Question #4)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____	No _____
3.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified local sources of funding the applicant has considered to fund the LCDA request? (Application Question #5a)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____	No _____
4.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified why the identified local sources cannot be used within the next two years to fund the requested project element? (Application Question #5a)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____	No _____
5.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified non-local sources of funding the applicant has pursued to fund the LCDA request? (Application Question #5b)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____	No _____
6.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified why the identified non-local sources cannot be used within the next two years to fund the requested project element? (Application Question #5b)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____	No _____
7.	Has the applicant submitted satisfactory documentation (e.g. letters, other documentation) to substantiate unsuccessful efforts to secure non-local funding? (Application Question #5b)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____	No _____
8.	Does the Livable Communities Advisory Committee believe the requested project component would not be built in the market without public subsidy or grant funds?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____	No _____

In the judgment of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, this proposal does \_\_\_\_\_ does not \_\_\_\_\_ demonstrate the proposed project is feasible at this time only with support of an LCDA grant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Chair, Livable Communities Advisory Committee

## **Discuss Readiness for Projects Above Scoring Threshold or Moved into the Funding Consideration Group**

The committee discussed the nine qualifying projects, and determined that all of them do meet the readiness requirements for the elements requested and for progress within one year, and should proceed to funding recommendations.

### **Funding Recommendations**

Grendahl reminded the committee that it does not need to recommend that all of the funds be awarded. It's more important that the project meet the requirements for demonstration and innovation. There was concern about the perception the legislature would have if not all the money was spent. Grendahl noted it would send the message that the committee is doing what the legislature asked it to do.

Joanne Barron suggested that the committee look at comments from discussion last week about project elements that are a demonstration, innovation, or catalyst and focus on recommending funding those elements. Other considerations include what funding components or funding level the project needs in order to move forward, and whether a project could move forward if not fully funded. A committee member asked if certain line items could be deleted. Barron responded, yes, they can.

Grendahl reminded the committee that it can recommend up to \$3.2 million for projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul, or 40 percent of the available \$8 million.

Grendahl also reminded committee members that if they had a conflict of interest with one of the projects, they should move away from the table during that discussion.

Discussion proceeded, beginning with the highest-scoring projects. Potential fund allotments were penciled in for each project and revised as the discussion evolved prior to the final funding vote. When the discussion and voting reached the sixth highest scoring project, A.3, Jackson Street Northeast Artists Housing, Minneapolis, requesting \$1,272,680, the remaining amount of the \$3.2 M (40 percent of the total) that could be recommended was \$325,000. Members discussed that this amount would not be enough to help the Jackson Street project proceed – it would only fund about half of the project's first priority item of \$660,000 for land acquisition. On the other hand, the available \$325,000 could significantly help the seventh-ranked project, A.9, Rivoli Street, St. Paul, which requests \$468,897. The committee recommended \$325,000 for this project. The committee also decided to suggest that the Metropolitan Council award an additional \$143,897 to Rivoli Street, in order to fully fund this project. The eight-ranked project, A.2, Bystrom Brothers, Minneapolis, could not be recommended because it would have exceeded the 40 percent that the Committee could recommend. The ninth-ranked project, B.4, Roseville, not falling under the 40 percent guideline, was recommended for full funding of \$305,000.

Seven proposals under consideration (**listed in bold type below**) were recommended for full or partial funding; Proposals listed below in *italic type* met the 30 point threshold to be considered for funding, but were not recommended because the amount requested would have exceeded the 40 percent of available funding the LCAC could recommend for projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul;

Project Name, City	Recommended Amount	Motion	Vote	Abstentions/ Conflict of Interest
<b>A.4 - Longfellow Station, Minneapolis</b>	\$ 500,000 of the \$ 500,000 request	Lucas moved, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Marckel	Carried.	1- Snyder
<b>C.3 - Stonebridge Core Block East, Rosemount</b>	\$ 1,587,500 of the \$ 1,587,500 request	Jensen moved, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Neckar	Carried.	
<b>A.8 - Dale Street Village, St Paul</b>	\$ 1,050,000 of the \$ 1,050,000 request	Fields moved, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Jensen.	Carried.	
<b>A.6 - West Broadway Curve, Minneapolis</b>	\$ 1,325,000 of the \$ 1,845,000 request	Jensen moved, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Lucas not to fund \$300,000 for green roofs; and not to fund \$220,000 for Cottage Park improvements	Carried.	1- Neckar
<b>C.2 - Washington County Senior Housing Headwaters, Forest Lake</b>	\$ 700,000 of the \$ 700,000 request	Tremere moved, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Lucas	Carried.	
<b>A.3 - Jackson Street Artists Housing, Minneapolis</b>	\$ 0 of the \$ 1,272,680 request		Unanimous	
<b>A.9 - Rivoli Street, St Paul</b>	\$ 325,000 of the \$ 468,897 request	Marckel moved, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Barton	Carried.	
<b>A. 2 - Bystrom Brothers, Minneapolis</b>	\$ 0 of the \$ 1,134,200		Unanimous	
<b>B.4 - Har Mar Apartments, Roseville</b>	\$ 305,000 of the \$ 305,000 request		Unanimous	
<b>Total Funding Available</b>	<b>\$8,000,000</b>			
<b>Total Requested</b>	<b>\$8,863,277</b>			
<b>Total Funding Recommended by the Committee</b>	<b>\$5,792,500</b>			
<b>Difference</b>	<b>(\$2,207,500)</b>			
	<b>REQUESTED</b>		<b>RECOMMENDED</b>	
<b>Total A Communities</b>	<b>\$6,270,777</b>	<b>70.8%</b>	<b>\$3,200,000</b>	<b>40.0 %</b>
<b>Total B &amp; C Communities</b>	<b>\$2,592,500</b>	<b>29.2%</b>	<b>\$2,592,500</b>	<b>32.4%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$8,863,277</b>	<b>100 %</b>	<b>\$800,000,000</b>	

## **Evaluation Meeting – Thursday, December 6th**

*It was agreed the wrap-up meeting to debrief about this year's process and/or to make suggestions for next year will be scheduled for Thursday, December 6<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 am in LLB, Robert St., Metropolitan Council. Chair Grendahl suggested that committee members may want to meet for lunch following this meeting and asked the committee to inform staff about their December 6<sup>th</sup> meeting and lunch availability. Staff will follow up with meeting and lunch details.*

## **Other Business**

Chair Grendahl thanked committee members for their dedication and hard work during this process. Dan Marckel commended Grendahl for the direction and leadership provided to the committee. Committee members unanimously agreed and also extended their thanks and appreciation to Chair Grendahl.

Marckel gave a status update on the LCDA Work Group meetings. The work group has met twice. The discussions have been focused on what changes could be made to the program that would encourage more innovation in future projects requesting funding. Barron said that the Work Group will meet one more time before the LCAC wrap up meeting and a progress report will be available at that meeting.

*Barron informed the committee that the committee's funding recommendations will be presented to the Metropolitan Council's Community Development Committee at 4:00 p.m. on November 19, 2007. The Community Development Committee is scheduled to take action on the grant recommendations on December 3, and the Metropolitan Council will act on the Community Development Committee's recommendations on December 12, 2007.*

## **Adjourn**

Chair Grendahl adjourned the meeting at 11:20 am.