

**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**  
**390 North Robert Street, St. Paul, MN 55101**  
**Phone (651) 602-1000 TDD (651) 291-0904**

**DATE:** February 26, 2007  
**TO:** Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission (MPOSC)  
**FROM:** Arne Stefferud, Planning Analyst-Parks (651-602-1360)  
**SUBJECT:** **Continued Discussion on 2008-2013 Regional Parks CIP Structure**

**Introduction/Background:**

At its meeting on February 13, 2007 the Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission began discussions on developing the 2008-13 Regional Parks Capital Improvement Program (CIP). **(Attachment 1 is the staff memorandum from the February 13 meeting for reference).**

The Commission began to analyze the existing Parks CIP structure and began to consider a change to that structure that insures each agency receives a percentage share of a Parks CIP appropriation based on the percentage share proposed for that agency in the Parks CIP.

The analysis addressed the following policy issues:

1. How should projects be ranked and appropriations for the Parks CIP distributed?
2. What should be the basis for determining a park agency's share in the Parks CIP?

The proposal being considered would structure the 2008-13 Parks CIP by distributing appropriations for the CIP based on the population of each park agency and spending those funds on park agency-prioritized lists that have been approved by the Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission and the Metropolitan Council

At the February 13 meeting park agency staff stated comments and concerns about the proposal. The park agencies liked the simplicity and transparency of this proposal. Specifically, they liked the idea of allowing park agencies to set their own priorities on projects within their CIP allocation and that every agency would be assured of receiving some funding from the CIP in each CIP appropriation.

However, the primary concern raised by some park agencies (Mpls. Park & Rec. Board, Ramsey County and City of St. Paul) was the potential loss in CIP funding due to the fact that their population share was lower than their previous proposed CIP share. They suggested that visitation characteristics be considered as well as agency population in determining the CIP share for an agency. And, a concern was raised in how grants from the Acquisition Opportunity Fund affected the amount an agency received compared to agencies who did not receive such grants. Finally, a concern was raised about transitioning from the current CIP structure to the proposed changes to the structure.

The agencies requested a meeting with Council staff to discuss these issues. Prior to the staff to staff meeting, the following analysis was prepared by me and distributed to the park agencies.

**Additional analysis on splitting CIP by park agency**

## **Issue 1: Splitting CIP among park agencies**

The premise for this analysis is to respond to issues raised regarding splitting the regional parks CIP by park agency and ideas that were brought up at the Feb. 13 MPOSC meeting.

The proposal to split the CIP based on the agency's population provides an equitable distribution of CIP funds to each agency on a per capita basis. As long as the agency projects are consistent with Metropolitan Council actions to approve master plans and consider reimbursements for projects approved by the Council then they would be eligible for CIP funding. But, suggestions were made to consider total visitation and non-local visitation as factors in splitting the CIP in addition to agency population.

To begin that discussion, I've prepared three tables.

**Table 1: 2005 Park Agency visit and visit origin, population and average repeat visits data** illustrates the 2005 visits to each agency compared to other agencies, and further breaks that into visits by residents of that agency (Local), visits by other persons who reside outside that agency but live in the 7 county region (Regional) and visits by persons who live in Greater Minnesota and from Out of State. This visitor origin calculation is based on visitor origin studies done in 1998-99. Consequently, it should not be considered an accurate measure of visitor origin patterns in 2007, but reflect a general sense of it.

The table also illustrates the population of each agency in 2005. Note that persons who live in Bloomington are not counted in Three Rivers Park District's population to avoid double counting. This also applies to persons who live in St. Paul are not counted in Ramsey County's population and vice versa. The visitor origin data also avoids double counting.

Finally, the table illustrates the average number of repeat visits per year by residents of that park agency based on dividing the 2005 "local" visits with the agency's 2005 population. Note that agencies who have dense populations adjacent to their parks (Mpls., St. Paul and Ramsey County) have the highest repeat visitation average (25.2, 7.6 and 6.7 respectively) which is expected since these parks are readily accessible to nearby residents. Due to this repeat visitation, and the disparity between agencies on repeat visitation, comparing the amount of visits one agency receives compared to other agencies is an inaccurate comparison tool.

A suggestion was made to consider an agency's percent of total visitation and the percentage of visits to that agency's parks by persons who reside outside that agency as a way to create a more accurate comparison among park agencies. To begin analyzing that proposal, I prepared a table that tries to split the CIP among park agencies by considering three factors that were mentioned at the Feb. 13 MPOSC meeting:

- 1) the percent of agency population relative to the region's population,
- 2) the percent of 2005 visits to park agency units relative to total 2005 visits
- 3) the percent of non-local visits to a park agency based on the 1998-99 visitor origin study.

Since there was a suggestion that population should be the primary factor, I weighted these factors as follows:

- 60% weight to percent of agency population relative to the region's population
- 20% weight to percent of 2005 visits to park agency units relative to total 2005 visits
- 20% weight to percent of non-local visits to a park agency based on the 1998-99 visitor origin study

The results of this calculation are shown on **Table 2: Proposal to split CIP based on 60% population, 20% visits and 20% non-local visit percentage of agency.** Unfortunately, you can't compare the percentage of an agency's non-local visits to other agencies unless you compare the agency's non-local visits to the total non-local visits of the entire park system.

To address that problem, I prepared **Table 3: Proposal to split CIP based on 60% population, 20% visits and 20% non-local visits to total non-local visits.** The results are shown under the column entitled "Result CIP share based on weighted population, visits and non-local visits". I then compared that result with the proposed share the agency would receive if population was the only factor and showed that in the column entitled "Comparison of weighted CIP share with per capita share". As the column indicates, the agencies that gain share are Minneapolis, St. Paul and Ramsey County, while other agencies lose share.

## **Issue 2: Acquisition Opportunity Grants**

A concern was raised that grants from the Acquisition Opportunity Fund would provide additional funds to an agency beyond what they would receive from the CIP and therefore some adjustment should be made to an agency's CIP share. The premise for this concern is that LCCMR funds plus Metro Council bonds could potentially provide a grant that could finance 100% of a land acquisition project—similar to the 100% funding of a CIP project.

Since every agency has an equal opportunity to receive an Acquisition Opportunity Grant, and we can't predict what amount an agency will receive in the 2008-09 CIP period, it is impossible to make any adjustment to the agency's CIP share for that two year CIP period. However, I tried to come up with a way to adjust an agency's CIP allocation using an example shown on **Table 4: Analysis regarding Adjusting for Acquisition Opportunity Grants awarded from 2008-09 CIP in 2010-11 CIP.** As the example illustrates, an agency could potentially end up with a negative CIP allocation as shown for Carver County.

**Table 1: 2005 Park Agency visit and visit origin, population and average repeat visits data**

Park Agency	Number and percent of visits by visitors who live in the following jurisdictions:					2005 Park Agency Pop. (000's)	Average repeat visits per year by Local Residents
	Total (000's)	Local (000's)	Regional (000's)	Greater MN (000's)	Out of State (000's)		
<b>Anoka County Visitation</b>	2,773.5	1,525.8	1,107.0	79.0	61.7	326.393	4.7
<b>Anoka County visitation percent</b>	100.0%	55.0%	39.9%	2.8%	2.2%	11.6%	
<b>City of Bloomington Visitation</b>	601.7	235.9	337.0	7.2	21.7	84.347	2.8
<b>Bloomington visitation percent</b>	100.0%	39.2%	56.0%	1.2%	3.6%	3.0%	
<b>Carver County Visitation</b>	251.1	105.4	74.7	64.8	6.2	85.204	1.2
<b>Carver visitation percent</b>	100.0%	42.0%	29.8%	25.8%	2.5%	3.0%	
<b>Dakota County Visitation</b>	886.9	629.1	161.6	45.7	50.5	391.558	1.6
<b>Dakota visitation percent</b>	100.0%	70.9%	18.2%	5.2%	5.7%	13.9%	
<b>Minneapolis Park Board Visitation</b>	14,125.6	9,759.1	3,780.4	219.7	366.4	387.711	25.2
<b>Minneapolis visitation percent</b>	100.0%	69.1%	26.8%	1.6%	2.6%	13.8%	
<b>Ramsey County Total Visitation</b>	3,154.3	1,532.4	1,528.1	39.6	54.2	227.873	6.7
<b>Ramsey visitation percent</b>	100.0%	48.6%	48.4%	1.3%	1.7%	8.1%	
<b>City of St. Paul Total Visitation</b>	5,632.1	2,185.7	2,677.4	353.3	415.7	287.385	7.6
<b>St. Paul visitation percent</b>	100.0%	38.8%	47.5%	6.3%	7.4%	10.2%	
<b>Three Rivers Park District Visitation</b>	4,825.0	3,037.1	1,488.1	208.2	91.6	678.854	4.5
<b>Three Rivers PD visitation percent</b>	100.0%	62.9%	30.8%	4.3%	1.9%	24.2%	
<b>Three Rivers/Scott County Visitation</b>	265.0	93.8	143.1	14.0	14.0	115.997	0.8
<b>Three Rivers/Scott visitation percent</b>	100.0%	35.4%	54.0%	5.3%	5.3%	4.1%	
<b>Washington County Visitation</b>	921.8	427.0	396.6	33.1	65.2	224.857	1.9
<b>Washington visitation percent</b>	100.0%	46.3%	43.0%	3.6%	7.1%	8.0%	
<b>Total visitation</b>	<b>33,437.0</b>	<b>19,503.3</b>	<b>11,710.1</b>	<b>1,064.1</b>	<b>1,159.5</b>	<b>2,810.179</b>	<b>6.9</b>
<b>Total visitation by percent</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

**Notes:**

“Local visits” are defined as visits to a park by visitors who reside in that Park Agency’s jurisdiction

“Regional visits” are visits from residents of 7-county metro region who reside outside that Park Agency jurisdiction

Visitor origin data from Metro Council studies done in 1998-99.

“Average Repeat Visits by Local Residents” based on dividing local visits by agency population

**Table 2: Proposal to split CIP based on 60% population, 20% visits and 20% non-local visit percentage of agency**

Park Agency	2005 Park Agency Population and Percent of Total Population	2005 Visits and Percent of Total Visits	2005 Non-local Visits and Percent of Agency Visits	60 percent weighting of population percent	20 percent weighting of Agency Visits Percent	20 percent weighting of Non-Local Agency Visits Percent	Total based on 60% population, 20% agency visits, and 20% non-local visits to agency
	(000's)	(000's)	(000's)				
Anoka County	326.393	2,773.5	1,247.7				
Anoka percent	11.6%	8.3%	45.0%	7.0%	1.7%	9.0%	<b>17.6%</b>
City of Bloomington	84.347	601.7	365.8				
Bloomington percent	3.0%	1.8%	60.8%	1.8%	0.4%	12.2%	<b>14.3%</b>
Carver County	85.204	251.1	145.7				
Carver percent	3.0%	0.8%	58.0%	1.8%	0.2%	11.6%	<b>13.6%</b>
Dakota County	391.558	886.9	257.8				
Dakota percent	13.9%	2.7%	29.1%	8.4%	0.5%	5.8%	<b>14.7%</b>
Minneapolis Park Board	387.711	14,125.6	4,366.5				
Minneapolis visitation percent	13.8%	42.2%	30.9%	8.3%	8.4%	6.2%	<b>22.9%</b>
Ramsey County Total Visitation	227.873	3,154.3	1,621.9				
Ramsey visitation percent	8.1%	9.4%	51.4%	4.9%	1.9%	10.3%	<b>17.0%</b>
City of St. Paul Total Visitation	287.385	5,632.1	3,446.4				
St. Paul visitation percent	10.2%	16.8%	61.2%	6.1%	3.4%	12.2%	<b>21.7%</b>
Three Rivers Park District Visitation	678.854	4,825.0	1,787.9				
Three Rivers PD visitation percent	24.2%	14.4%	37.1%	14.5%	2.9%	7.4%	<b>24.8%</b>
Three Rivers/Scott County Visitation	115.997	265.0	171.2				
Three Rivers/Scott visitation percent	4.1%	0.8%	64.6%	2.5%	0.2%	12.9%	<b>15.6%</b>
Washington County Visitation	224.857	921.8	494.8				
Washington visitation percent	8.0%	2.8%	53.7%	4.8%	0.6%	10.7%	<b>16.1%</b>
Total visitation	2,810.179	33,437.0	13,933.7				
Total visitation by percent	100.0%	100.0%	41.7%	60.0%	20.0%	<b>98.3%</b>	<b>178.3%</b>

**Conclusion:** Non-local visits percentage of each park agency can't be compared with percentages of total visits and percentages of total population. An agency percentage of its Non-Local visits to the Total Non-Local Visits is appropriate. See Table 3.

**Table 3: Proposal to split CIP based on 60% population, 20% visits and 20% non-local visits to total non-local visits**

Park Agency	2005 Park Agency Population and Percent of Total Population	2005 Visits and Percent of Total Visits	2005 Non-Local Visits and Percent of Total Non-Local Visits	60 % Pop. %	20 % Agency Visits %	20 % Non-Local Visits %	Result CIP Share based on Pop., Visits and Non-local Visits	Comparison of weighted CIP share with per capita share
	(000's)	(000's)	(000's)					
<b>Anoka County</b>	326.393	2,773.5	1,247.7					
<b>Anoka percent</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	8.3%	9.0%	7.0%	1.7%	1.8%	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>-1.2%</b>
<b>City of Bloomington</b>	84.347	601.7	365.8					
<b>Bloomington percent</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	1.8%	2.6%	1.8%	0.4%	0.5%	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>
<b>Carver County</b>	85.204	251.1	145.7					
<b>Carver percent</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	0.8%	1.0%	1.8%	0.2%	0.2%	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>
<b>Dakota County</b>	391.558	886.9	257.8					
<b>Dakota percent</b>	<b>13.9%</b>	2.7%	1.9%	8.4%	0.5%	0.4%	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>-4.7%</b>
<b>Minneapolis Park Board</b>	387.711	14,125.6	4,366.5					
<b>Minneapolis visitation percent</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	42.2%	31.4%	8.3%	8.4%	6.3%	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>
<b>Ramsey County Total Visitation</b>	227.873	3,154.3	1,621.9					
<b>Ramsey visitation percent</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	9.4%	11.7%	4.9%	1.9%	2.3%	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>
<b>City of St. Paul Total Visitation</b>	287.385	5,632.1	3,446.4					
<b>St. Paul visitation percent</b>	<b>10.2%</b>	16.8%	24.8%	6.1%	3.4%	5.0%	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>
<b>Three Rivers Park District Visitation</b>	678.854	4,825.0	1,787.9					
<b>Three Rivers PD visitation percent</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	14.4%	12.9%	14.5%	2.9%	2.6%	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>-4.2%</b>
<b>Three Rivers/Scott County Visitation</b>	115.997	265.0	171.2					
<b>Three Rivers/Scott visitation percent</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	0.8%	1.2%	2.5%	0.2%	0.2%	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>-1.2%</b>
<b>Washington County Visitation</b>	224.857	921.8	494.8					
<b>Washington visitation percent</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	2.8%	3.6%	4.8%	0.6%	0.7%	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>-1.9%</b>
<b>Total visitation</b>	2,810.179	33,437.0	13,905.8					
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Table 4: Analysis regarding Adjusting for Acquisition Opportunity Grants awarded from 2008-09 CIP in 2010-11 CIP**

**Assumptions:**

1. Agency per capita doesn't change from 2008-09 CIP to 2010-11 CIP for ease of illustration
2. Assume that \$20 million CIP funds appropriated in 2008-09
3. Assume that \$3 million in Acquisition Opportunity Grants are awarded in 2008-09
4. Assume that Anoka County, Carver County and Dakota County receive \$1 million each of Acquisition Opportunity Grants in 2008-09

Park Agency	2008-09 CIP share based on per capita share	Amount agency received of assumed \$20 million CIP appropriation for 2008-09 (\$000s)	Assumed amount of Acquisition Opportunity Grants agency received in 2008-09 (\$000s)	Assumed Total Amount CIP and Acquisition Opportunity Grants agency got in 2008-09	Percent share of assumed CIP and Acquisition Opportunity Grants awarded in 2008-09	Disparity between per capita share for 2008-09 CIP and what agency received of 2008-09 CIP and Acquisition Opportunity Grants	Assumed 2010-11 CIP share agency would receive under per capita distribution that was the same share as 2008-09	Share for 2010-11 CIP by cutting share to agency that receive more than their share of 2008-09 CIP and Acquisition Funds and increasing share to others
Anoka County	11.6%	\$ 2,323	\$ 1,000	\$ 3,323	14.4%	2.8%	11.6%	8.8%
City of Bloomington	3.0%	\$ 600	\$ -	\$ 600	2.6%	-0.4%	3.0%	3.4%
Carver County	3.0%	\$ 606	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,606	7.0%	4.0%	3.0%	<b>-0.9%</b>
Dakota County	13.9%	\$ 2,787	\$ 1,000	\$ 3,787	16.5%	2.5%	13.9%	11.4%
Minneapolis Park Board	13.8%	\$ 2,759	\$ -	\$ 2,759	12.0%	-1.8%	13.8%	15.6%
Ramsey County	8.1%	\$ 1,622	\$ -	\$ 1,622	7.1%	-1.1%	8.1%	9.2%
City of St. Paul	10.2%	\$ 2,045	\$ -	\$ 2,045	8.9%	-1.3%	10.2%	11.6%
Three Rivers Park District	24.2%	\$ 4,831	\$ -	\$ 4,831	21.0%	-3.2%	24.2%	27.3%
Three Rivers/Scott County	4.1%	\$ 826	\$ -	\$ 826	3.6%	-0.5%	4.1%	4.7%
Washington County	8.0%	\$ 1,600	\$ -	\$ 1,600	7.0%	-1.0%	8.0%	9.0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,000</b>	<b>\$ 23,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Conclusion:** Making an adjustment to an agency's 2010-11 CIP based on the amount it received in total 2009-09 CIP and Acquisition Opportunity Grants could potentially lead to an agency not being able to receive any funds in 2010-11 as shown for Carver County.



## Comments from Greg Mack, Ramsey County (Feb. 22, 2007)

After reviewing the memo and spreadsheets you provided, I would offer the following comments. First, I believe the CIP distribution formula should be relatively simple, transparent, result in some benefit to all agencies and reflect the impacts associated with park use. That said, I have serious concerns about how Ramsey County is treated in a formula based solely on agency population where 56% of our tax-paying population (City of St. Paul) has been omitted from our agency population base. Ramsey County is the implementing agency for nearly 1/3 of the regional park acreage located in the City of St. Paul. Using a formula that includes visitation helps reconcile this discrepancy, provided St. Paul visits are considered non-local visits.

It seems to me that including local visits in the 60/20/20 calculation results in redundant weighting of the agency population. Based on the arguments we historically used for why the State ought to participate in regional park funding, I would suggest a formula that is weighted 60% on agency population and 40% on non-local visits. Attached is a spreadsheet that illustrates this approach (See table below titled **Greg Mack's Proposal: Split CIP based on 60% population and 40% non-local visits to total non-local visits**).

I feel strongly that there should be CIP formula adjustments that reflect acquisition opportunity grants since a substantial portion of historical CIP funding is likely to be earmarked for this purpose. However, to make sure all agencies have a stake in the CIP, I suggest that adjustments be limited to 50% of the agency's CIP share. Applying this to the example you cited on Table 4, Carver County, who received a \$1 million acquisition opportunity grant would still receive 50% of its CIP share (1.5% in this example). The adjusted share formula would have to be modified to reflect this 50% of agency share guarantee.

**Greg Mack's Proposal: Split CIP based on 60% population and 40% non-local visits to total non-local visits**

Park Agency	2005 Park Agency Population and Percent of Total Population	2005 Visits and Percent of Total Visits	2005 Non-Local Visits and Percent of Total Non-Local Visits	60 percent weighting of population percent	0 percent weighting of Agency Visits Percent	40 percent weighting of Non-Local Agency Visits Percent	Result CIP Share based on weighted population, visits and non-local visits	Compare weighted CIP share with per capita share
	(000's)	(000's)	(000's)					
Anoka County	326.393	2,773.5	1,247.7					
Anoka percent	<b>11.6%</b>	8.3%	9.0%	7.0%	0.0%	3.6%	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>-1.1%</b>
City of Bloomington	84.347	601.7	365.8					
Bloomington percent	<b>3.0%</b>	1.8%	2.6%	1.8%	0.0%	1.1%	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>
Carver County	85.204	251.1	145.7					
Carver percent	<b>3.0%</b>	0.8%	1.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.4%	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>-0.8%</b>
Dakota County	391.558	886.9	257.8					
Dakota percent	<b>13.9%</b>	2.7%	1.9%	8.4%	0.0%	0.7%	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>
Minneapolis Park Board	387.711	14,125.6	4,366.5					
Minneapolis percent	<b>13.8%</b>	42.2%	31.4%	8.3%	0.0%	12.6%	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>7.0%</b>
Ramsey County Total Visitation	227.873	3,154.3	1,621.9					
Ramsey Co. percent	<b>8.1%</b>	9.4%	11.7%	4.9%	0.0%	4.7%	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
City of St. Paul Total Visitation	287.385	5,632.1	3,446.4					
St. Paul percent	<b>10.2%</b>	16.8%	24.8%	6.1%	0.0%	9.9%	<b>16.0%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>
Three Rivers Park District Visitation	678.854	4,825.0	1,787.9					
Three Rivers PD percent	<b>24.2%</b>	14.4%	12.9%	14.5%	0.0%	5.1%	<b>19.6%</b>	<b>-4.5%</b>
Three Rivers/Scott County Visitation	115.997	265.0	171.2					
Three Rivers/Scott percent	<b>4.1%</b>	0.8%	1.2%	2.5%	0.0%	0.5%	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>-1.2%</b>
Washington County Visitation	224.857	921.8	494.8					
Washington percent	<b>8.0%</b>	2.8%	3.6%	4.8%	0.0%	1.4%	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>-1.8%</b>
Total visitation	2,810.179	33,437.0	13,905.8					
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

## **Additional comments from Arne Stefferud:**

The non-local visits in the analysis tables 1 through 4 sent out previously split St. Paul residents from the rest of the residents in Ramsey County to avoid double counting local visits versus non-local visits. It also split Bloomington residents from the rest of residents in suburban Hennepin County for Three Rivers Park District. And it separated Minneapolis residents from the suburban residents in Hennepin County and Bloomington.

In analyzing the service areas of parks (the geographic space where persons came from that visited that park) most non-local visitors live in nearby cities/counties adjacent to the parks that have non-local visitation. Thus the park's location in relation to its agency's jurisdictional boundary has a significant role in determining the number and percentage of non-local visitors to that park compared to all non-local visitors to the park system. These non-local visits from adjacent cities have a similar redundant weighting of an agency's population.

To address this bias, the non-local visits from persons who live outside the Metro Region and outside the State of MN could be considered. The table below titled, **Proposal to split CIP based on 93% weighted Agency Population and 7% non-Metro, non-MN visitation** illustrates splitting the CIP based on 93% agency population and 7% non-local visits by persons who live outside the Metro Region and outside MN. The weighting of 7% for non-local visits is based on the fact that 7% of all visits were by persons who live outside the Metro Region and outside MN. Thus 93% weighting was given to the agency's population. It is a proposal for consideration along with others.

With regard to the concern that acquisition grants may have been a major historical share of grants, the table titled **METROROPOLITAN REGIONAL PARK SYSTEM—Capital Grants Authorized 1974-2007 (as of Feb. 22,2007)** illustrates all CIP grants, land acquisition opportunity grants, plus line item appropriations for park projects and North Mississippi grants financed with State funds and Metro Council bonds from 1974 to the present. It splits the grants by park agency. The grants are categorized into land acquisition versus development versus line item appropriations. With the exception of \$6 million for Dakota County as a line item appropriation in 2006 for acquiring the Empire Wetlands Regional Park and Wildlife Management Area, all other line item appropriations shown in this table were for rehabilitation/development projects. Thus about 35% of all funds granted were for acquisition and about 65% were for rehabilitation and development.

To look into the future, the 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan estimated that \$193.2 million was needed for land acquisition (25 year total) versus \$242.5 million for rehabilitation/development for a grand total of \$435.7 million. Land acquisition is 44% of that total, and rehabilitation/development is 56% of that total. These estimated costs were provided by park agencies as well as from property tax data of the land in question.

Since 44% of the estimated future capital costs for the entire park system is for land acquisition, it seems reasonable to consider adjusting at most 44% of an agency's CIP share costs based on it receiving an acquisition opportunity grant. Since all agencies have an equal opportunity to receive an acquisition opportunity grant, and those grants have been limited per agency, the benefits an agency derives from receiving an acquisition opportunity grant compared to those that don't is limited.

Agencies have received significant amounts of funds from line item appropriations as shown in the middle attachment below. No adjustment to an agency's CIP share has been proposed --nor is one appropriate to propose--to take into account the line item appropriations an agency receives. Like acquisition opportunity grants, all agencies have a relatively equal chance to receive those additional line item funds.

**Proposal to split CIP based on 93% weighted Agency Population and 7% non-Metro, non-MN visitation**

<b>Park Agency</b>	<b>2005 Park Agency Population and Percent of Total Population</b> (000's)	<b>2005 Visits and Percent of Total Visits</b> (000's)	<b>2005 Non-Local Visits living outside Metro Region and Outside MN</b> (000's)	<b>93 percent weighting of population</b>	<b>7 percent weighting of Non-Local Visits outside Metro Region and Outside MN</b>	<b>CIP Share 93% population and 7% non-local visits outside Metro Region and Outside MN</b>	<b>Compare weighted CIP share with per capita share</b>
Anoka County	326.393	2,773.5	138.7				
Anoka percent	<b>11.6%</b>	8.3%	6.2%	10.80%	0.44%	<b>11.24%</b>	<b>-0.38%</b>
City of Bloomington	84.347	601.7	28.9				
Bloomington percent	<b>3.0%</b>	1.8%	1.3%	2.79%	0.09%	<b>2.88%</b>	<b>-0.12%</b>
Carver County	85.204	251.1	71.1				
Carver percent	<b>3.0%</b>	0.8%	3.2%	2.82%	0.22%	<b>3.04%</b>	<b>0.01%</b>
Dakota County	391.558	886.9	96.7				
Dakota percent	<b>13.9%</b>	2.7%	4.4%	12.96%	0.30%	<b>13.26%</b>	<b>-0.67%</b>
Minneapolis Park Board	387.711	14,125.6	593.3				
Minneapolis percent	<b>13.8%</b>	42.2%	26.7%	12.83%	1.87%	<b>14.70%</b>	<b>0.90%</b>
Ramsey County Visitation	227.873	3,154.3	94.6				
Ramsey percent	<b>8.1%</b>	9.4%	4.3%	7.54%	0.30%	<b>7.84%</b>	<b>-0.27%</b>
City of St. Paul Visitation	287.385	5,632.1	771.6				
St. Paul percent	<b>10.2%</b>	16.8%	34.7%	9.51%	2.43%	<b>11.94%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
Three Rivers Park District Visitation	678.854	4,825.0	299.2				
Three Rivers PD percent	<b>24.2%</b>	14.4%	13.5%	22.47%	0.94%	<b>23.41%</b>	<b>-0.75%</b>
Three Rivers/Scott County Visitation	115.997	265.0	28.1				
Three Rivers/Scott visitation percent	<b>4.1%</b>	0.8%	1.3%	3.84%	0.09%	<b>3.93%</b>	<b>-0.20%</b>
Washington Co. Visitation	224.857	921.8	98.6				
Washington Co. percent	<b>8.0%</b>	2.8%	4.4%	7.44%	0.31%	<b>7.75%</b>	<b>-0.25%</b>
Total visitation	2,810.179	33,437.0	2,220.7				
Total Percent	<b>100.0%</b>	100.0%	100.0%	93.00%	7.00%	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**METROPOLITAN REGIONAL PARK SYSTEM—Capital Grants Authorized 1974-2007 (as of Feb. 22,2007)**

All grants authorized by the Metropolitan Council are listed. This includes regional park CIP grants for acquisition, rehabilitation and development, interest on Council park bonds for the acquisition and development of North Mississippi Regional Park as required by State law, and pass-through appropriations from the Legislature for capital grants that are not part of the Metropolitan Council's regional parks CIP request.

Revenue sources are regional bonds issued by the Metropolitan Council, State bonds, MN Environmental Trust Fund appropriations recommended by the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCMR) and grant fund interest earnings dedicated to North Mississippi Regional Park.

Regional Park Implementing Agency	Total CIP, Acquisition Opportunity, North Mississippi and State Pass-Through Grants	Percent of Total Grants	Regional Park CIP Land Acquisition and Acquisition Opportunity Grants	Percent of CIP Acquisition and Acquisition Opportunity Grants	Regional Park CIP Rehabilitation and Development Grants	Percent of Regional Park CIP Rehabilitation and Development Grants	State Funds passed through the Metro. Council (3)
Anoka County	\$ 30,538,746	7.2%	\$ 9,922,312	6.7%	\$ 19,216,434	8.8%	\$ 1,400,000
City of Bloomington	\$ 7,151,929	1.7%	\$ 2,587,655	1.7%	\$ 4,264,274	2.0%	\$ 300,000
Carver County	\$ 9,800,448	2.3%	\$ 6,922,370	4.6%	\$ 2,878,078	1.3%	\$ -
Dakota County	\$ 32,775,164	7.7%	\$ 14,051,762	9.4%	\$11,623,402	5.3%	\$ 7,100,000
Mpls. Park & Rec. Bd.	\$ 82,864,339	19.5%	\$ 30,485,891	20.4%	\$46,503,448	21.4%	\$ 5,875,000
Ramsey County	\$ 37,259,095	8.8%	\$ 16,511,796	11.1%	\$19,235,299	8.9%	\$ 1,512,000
City of St. Paul	\$ 96,900,109	22.8%	\$ 1,866,855	1.3%	\$55,363,254	25.5%	\$39,670,000
Scott County (1)	\$ 13,647,542	3.2%	\$ 547,333	0.4%	\$ 1,366,123	0.6%	\$ -
Three Rivers Park Dist. (1) (2)	\$ 90,382,811	21.2%	\$ 46,873,055	31.4%	\$ 51,935,947	23.9%	\$ 1,000,000
Washington County	\$ 24,358,896	5.7%	\$ 19,320,871	13.0%	\$ 4,938,025	2.3%	\$ 100,000
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$425,679,079</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 149,089,900</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$217,324,284</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$56,957,000</b>
<b>Percent Total by Category</b>			<b>35.0%</b>		<b>51.1%</b>		<b>13.4%</b>

**Footnotes:**

- (1) Scott County grants include \$11,734,086 for acquisition and development in Scott County under a joint powers agreement with the Three Rivers Park District. Those grants are shown in the Scott County "total" but not in the Scott County "acquisition" and "development" columns. The Scott County acquisition and development grants are shown as part of the Three Rivers Park District acquisition and development, but removed from the Three Rivers Park District "total".
- (2) Three Rivers Park District took over Bryant Lake Regional Park and the Anderson Lakes portion of Hyland-Bush-Anderson Lakes Park Reserve from the City of Eden Prairie. Acquisition and development grants to the City of Eden Prairie totaling \$2,307,895 are included in the Three Rivers Park District grant data.
- (3) The State funds passed through the Metro. Council are State appropriations that park agencies requested on their own for projects that were not in the Metro. Council's regional parks capital improvement program. It is not a complete list of all line item appropriations, as some appropriations were granted directly to park agencies and not passed through the Metropolitan Council.

## Additional comments/proposals from park agency staff meeting (Feb. 26, 2007)

After reviewing the material shown above, no consensus could be reached on splitting the Parks CIP among agencies. The Mpls. Park Board, City of St. Paul, and Ramsey County strongly feel that park visitation needs to be considered along with park agency population in splitting the CIP. However, the remaining 7 agencies prefer splitting the CIP based on agency population because it is simple and accommodates growth in the region, wherever that occurs over time. Both groups recognize that the solution lies somewhere in which funding in the CIP for the existing/older parts of the park system should not be reduced to finance the less developed/growing parts of the park system and vice-versa. The proposal of weighting agency population by 93% and weighting visits by persons residing outside the Metro Region and outside MN at 7% was suggested to try to address that issue, but was not unanimously accepted.

There is also recognition that additional funds from line item appropriations beyond the CIP primarily finance large scale projects that benefit more than the requesting park agency. State funding for Como Zoo/Conservatory has been primarily financed with line item appropriations as the Legislature recognizes that many constituents who reside outside the City of St. Paul visit this regional special recreation feature.

Another proposal was to split the proposed 2008-09 CIP and what would be proposed for the 2008-09 Acquisition Opportunity Fund in one package among the park agencies. This would address the concern about adjusting an agency's CIP share relative to what it had received from the Acquisition Opportunity Fund.

This idea led to another suggestion—that the agency cap on grants from the Acquisition Opportunity Fund should be removed. The premise for this proposal is that if the Acquisition Opportunity Fund and the CIP are considered as one package, then an agency should propose acquisitions from the Acquisition Opportunity Fund as part of its total funding request within its share. This idea also has some appeal to the LCCMR as they would prefer to fund known larger parcels that would be financed with LCCMR funds instead of appropriating money to potentially finance partial costs of many parcels. Agencies offered the following amounts that could be required to buy parcels in the next 12 months as the basis for considering removing the agency cap on the Acquisition Opportunity Fund

### Projected Land Acquisition Funding Needs on Parcels that could likely be acquired in 12 months

Park Agency	Acquisition Fund Need	Additional Comments
Anoka County	\$ 0	
Bloomington	\$ 2,600,000	3 inholdings
Carver County	\$ 6,700,000	Priority on one parcel valued at \$4.5 million, with lower priority on parcels valued at \$1.7 million and \$500,000
Dakota County	\$ 4,500,000	One large parcel valued at \$4 million and lower priority on another parcel valued at \$500,000
Minneapolis Park Board	\$ 750,000	
Ramsey County	\$ 350,000	
City of St. Paul	\$ 2,000,000	Expanding existing park or trail
Scott County	\$ 6,000,000	
Three Rivers Park District	\$ 500,000	
Washington County	\$ 4,900,000	Three parcels with values of \$500,000; \$2.2 million and \$2.2 million
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$28,300,000</b>	

This information points to the need for private sector funding for land acquisition as there isn't enough proposed in the CIP and Acquisition Opportunity Fund to finance land acquisition and rehabilitation/development needs.

A final suggestion was that a "regional park dedication fee" be imposed to generate new revenue for regional park capital improvements and/or help acquire land. There was no discussion on how to implement this idea due to lack of time, but

the premise was that new revenue sources, and in this case public policy, needs to be developed to help acquire land and finance park system infrastructure needs.

### **Visitor Origin by Park Agency**

With regard to the issue of visitor origin, the following table based on 1998-99 park visitor origin data has been applied to annual park visit estimates to illustrate a pattern of where people recreate in the regional park system. Since the data was collected in 1998-99, it doesn't reflect the visitor origin pattern now, but can give the Commission insight into this issue as it relates to splitting the 2008-09 parks CIP among park agencies. This table is from the 2004 Visit Estimate Report. It was not published for the 2005 report since the visitor origin data it's based on was becoming out of date.

The table illustrates the number and percent of visits by residents of one park agency to other park agencies. Since visitors may choose among parks offering similar recreation opportunities, choices on where visits occur is based on accessibility of a park or parks to that person's home. For example, if picnicking and trails are offered in Park A located 0.2 miles from one's home versus Park B offering the same amenities 2 miles away, more visits will occur at Park A.

The number of visits by persons from adjacent jurisdictions is similar, but not equal. For example, the number of St. Paul resident visits to Minneapolis regional parks (711,600) compared to Minneapolis resident visits to St. Paul regional parks (673,500) shows the relative inter-jurisdictional visitation more accurately than comparing total visits of one park agency compared to another.

Agency	2004 Total visits (1,000's)	Number and percent of visits from people who live in the following agency jurisdictions in 2004											TOTAL
		Anoka Co. residents	Bloomington residents	Carver Co. residents	Dakota Co. residents	Minneapolis residents	Suburban Ramsey residents	St Paul residents	Three Rivers (Suburban Hennepin excluding Bloomington) residents	Scott Co. residents	Washington Co. residents	Other MN & Out-of-State residents	
Anoka Co. Visits	2,685.5	1,477.4	-	3.5	61.3	164.4	333.9	95.3	353.0	-	60.4	136.3	2,685.5
Anoka Visits %	100.0%	55.0%	< 0.1%	0.1%	2.3%	6.1%	12.4%	3.5%	13.1%	< 0.1%	2.3%	5.0%	100.0%
City of Bloomington Visits	562.6	9.0	220.5	13.5	46.7	51.2	4.5	9.0	165.4	11.3	4.5	27.1	562.6
Bloomington Visits %	100.0%	1.6%	39.2%	2.4%	8.3%	9.1%	0.8%	1.6%	29.4%	2.0%	0.8%	4.8%	100.0%
Carver Co. Visits	205.0	1.7	-	86.0	2.4	8.7	1.3	-	39.4	7.5	-	57.9	205.0
Carver Visits %	100.0%	0.9%	< 0.1%	42.0%	1.2%	4.2%	0.7%	< 0.1%	19.2%	3.6%	< 0.1%	28.3%	100.0%
Dakota Co. Visits	868.8	13.5	-	-	616.2	40.9	16.7	38.2	34.3	6.3	8.4	94.2	868.8
Dakota Visits %	100.0%	1.5%	< 0.1%	< 0.1%	70.9%	4.7%	1.9%	4.4%	3.9%	0.7%	1.0%	10.8%	100.0%
Minneapolis Park Bd Visits	12,953.3	91.6	-	22.7	393.7	8,949.2	117.4	711.6	2,040.8	27.3	61.6	537.4	12,953.3
Minneapolis Visits %	100.0%	0.7%	< 0.1%	0.2%	3.0%	69.1%	0.9%	5.5%	15.8%	0.2%	0.5%	4.2%	100.0%
Suburban Ramsey Co. Visits	2,759.8	260.0	-	1.6	56.4	96.6	1,340.7	642.8	69.9	-	209.6	35.1	2,759.8
Ramsey Visit %	100.0%	9.4%	< 0.1%	< 0.1%	2.0%	3.5%	48.6%	23.3%	2.5%	< 0.1%	7.6%	3.1%	100.0%
City of St. Paul Visits	5,371.6	129.3	-	7.6	461.2	673.5	585.9	2,084.6	324.3	16.8	355.1	733.4	5,371.6
St. Paul Visit %	100.0%	2.4%	< 0.1%	0.1%	8.6%	12.5%	10.9%	38.8%	6.0%	0.3%	6.6%	13.7%	100.0%
Three Rivers Park Dist. Visits	4,091.6	299.1	217.6	186.0	100.4	289.9	55.3	51.8	2,575.4	41.3	20.5	177.4	4,091.6
Three Rivers Visits %	100.0%	7.3%	5.3%	4.5%	2.5%	7.1%	1.4%	1.3%	62.9%	1.0%	0.5%	6.2%	100.0%
Scott Co. Visits	248.5	6.7	-	-	96.7	2.2	-	-	28.6	88.0	-	26.4	248.5
Scott Co. Visits %	100.0%	2.7%	< 0.1%	< 0.1%	38.9%	0.9%	< 0.1%	< 0.1%	11.5%	35.4%	< 0.1%	10.6%	100.0%
Washington Co. Visits	727.3	15.1	-	2.2	81.7	19.5	54.8	110.9	27.3	1.4	336.9	77.6	727.3
Washington Visits %	100.0%	2.1%	< 0.1%	0.3%	11.2%	2.7%	7.5%	15.2%	3.8%	0.2%	46.3%	10.7%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL VISITS</b>	<b>30,473.9</b>	<b>2,303.4</b>	<b>438.1</b>	<b>323.2</b>	<b>1,916.7</b>	<b>10,296.1</b>	<b>2,510.4</b>	<b>3,744.2</b>	<b>5,658.5</b>	<b>199.7</b>	<b>1,057.0</b>	<b>2,026.6</b>	<b>30,473.9</b>
<b>TOTAL VISITS %</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



# Attachment 1: Material considered at Feb. 13 MPOSC meeting

**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**  
**390 North Robert Street, St. Paul, MN 55101**  
**Phone (651) 602-1000 TDD (651) 291-0904**

**DATE:** January 14, 2007  
**TO:** Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission (MPOSC)  
**FROM:** Arne Stefferud, Planning Analyst-Parks (651-602-1360)  
**SUBJECT:** Discussion on 2008-2013 Regional Parks CIP Structure

## **INTRODUCTION:**

As a follow up from the January 9 meeting regarding the discussion about the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board's request to amend the unfunded 2006-07 Parks capital improvement program (CIP)—which was subsequently withdrawn--the park agencies and Commission discussed the need to consider changing the structure of the Parks CIP for 2008-13. This white paper analyzes the existing Parks CIP structure and a proposes a change to that structure that insures each agency receives a percentage share of a Parks CIP appropriation based on the percentage share proposed for that agency in the Parks CIP.

The analysis addresses the following policy issues:

1. How should projects be ranked and appropriations for the Parks CIP distributed?
2. What should be the basis for determining a park agency's share in the Parks CIP?

The MPOSC would continue to discuss these matters and develop a recommendation to the Council by the end of May 2007 that:

1. Proposes how projects in the 2008-13 Parks CIP are ranked (either by park agencies under a new CIP structure, or by the MPOSC and Metro Council under the current CIP structure, or some other procedure) and how funds appropriated for the 2008-13 Parks CIP will be distributed to the park agencies.
2. Proposes the percentage allocation of funds proposed for each park agency in each biennium of the 2008-13 Parks CIP.
3. Proposes how Acquisition Opportunity Grants will be distributed for eligible acquisition projects and the limit each agency can receive assuming \$2.5 million of LCCMR funds are appropriated in 2007 to match \$1.67 million of existing Council bonds to finance these grants.
4. Proposes how line item appropriations for identical projects in the 2008-13 Parks CIP will affect the distribution of Parks CIP funds to that park agency.
5. Proposes how line item appropriations for specific regional park projects can complement the Parks CIP in recognition that the Governor and Legislature can appropriate State funds beyond what is proposed in the Parks CIP.

## ANALYSIS

### 1. How should projects be ranked and appropriations for the Parks CIP be distributed?

The Parks CIP currently ranks projects within acquisition, rehabilitation and development categories. Projects are then ranked using a series of priority criteria that have been developed over the past 12 years. Park agencies and the Commission have struggled with loop-holes in the ranking criteria, which has led to complaints that the ranking process is biased. Finally, the funds appropriated for the CIP are then split among the acquisition, rehabilitation and development categories in proportion to what was requested for that category. The end result is that some agencies have received significantly more or less funds on a percentage basis compared to what they were proposed to receive for that biennium under this CIP structure.

Following is an example of this disparity of what was proposed for each agency versus what the agency actually received based on the distribution of the \$7 million 2006 State bond appropriation and the \$4.667 million Council bonds granted for 2006-07 Parks CIP projects.

The 2006 State bonds (\$7 million) and matching Metro Council bonds (\$4.667 million) for a total of \$11.667 million were distributed as follows:

- 19.6% (\$2.29 million) for land acquisition projects
- 54.2% (\$6.32 million) for rehabilitation projects
- 26.3% (\$3.07 million) for development projects

Those funds were then granted to projects (funding requests by park agencies) that were ranked by the MPOSC within acquisition, rehabilitation and development categories. Table 1 on the next page compares the amount each agency received in dollars and percentage terms for 2006-07 Parks CIP projects compared to what was proposed for that agency in the 2006-07 Parks CIP. Note the disparity between what the agency received versus what it was proposed to receive.

**Table 1: What Metro Parks Agencies Received for 2006-07 CIP Projects in Dollar and Percentage Terms versus Percentage of CIP Park Agencies Were Proposed to Receive**

<b>Park Agency</b>	<b>Dollars Received for 2006-07 Parks CIP Projects<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent of Dollars Received for 2006-07 Parks CIP</b>	<b>Percent of Dollars Proposed for that Park Agency in 2006-07 Parks CIP</b>	<b>Disparity Between Percent Received vs. Percent Proposed</b>
Anoka County	\$ 957,000	8.2%	9.2%	-1%
Bloomington	\$ 327,000	2.8%	2.2%	+0.6%
Carver County	\$ 285,000	2.4%	2.2%	+0.02%
Dakota County	\$ 1,523,000	13.1%	8.7%	+4.4%
Three Rivers Park Dist. excluding Bloomington	\$ 3,037,000	26.0%	25.5%	+0.5%
Mpls. Park & Rec. Bd. (does not include additional funds appropriated for Lake of the Isles)	\$ 1,731,000	14.8%	19.1%	-4.3%
Ramsey County excluding St. Paul	\$ 580,000	5.0%	8.9%	-3.9%
St. Paul	\$ 2,705,000	23.2%	14.6%	+8.6%
Scott County	\$ -	0.0%	3.4%	-3.4%
Washington County	\$ 522,000	4.5%	6.2%	-1.7%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$11,667,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

The 2006-07 Parks CIP proposed that \$21 million be appropriated in State funds and matched with \$14 million of Council bonds for a total of \$35 million. Since only \$11.667 million was granted, park agencies did not receive on a percentage basis the amount they were proposed to receive in the Parks CIP. Although the unfunded projects in the Parks CIP have rolled over and been ranked ahead of new funding requests in future CIPs, the park agencies would not receive their proposed CIP percentage until an additional \$14 million of State funds were appropriated and matched with \$9.33 million of Council bonds. That may take two or more years to achieve.

Park agencies have suggested that the MPOSC and Council distribute Park CIP funds in proportion to what was proposed for each park agency in the CIP. Table 2 below illustrates the amount each agency would have received for 2006-07 CIP projects if this distribution scheme had been used. Note that no agency receives more or less than what they were proposed to receive on a percentage basis.

<sup>1</sup> Grant data based on grant agreement files shown in **Appendix A: 2006-07 Metro Regional Parks CIP Data and Other Grants Awarded in 2006**

**Table 2: What Metro Parks Agencies Would Have Received for 2006-07 CIP Projects in Dollar and Percentage Terms If Dollars Were Distributed Based on Percentage of CIP the Park Agencies Were Proposed to Receive**

<b>Park Agency</b>	<b>Dollars Agencies Would Have Received for 2006-07 Parks CIP Projects</b>	<b>Percent of Dollars Agencies Would Have Received for 2006-07 Parks CIP</b>	<b>Percent of Dollars Proposed for that Park Agency in 2006-07 Parks CIP</b>	<b>Disparity Between Percent Received vs. Percent Proposed</b>
Anoka County	\$ 1,073,364	9.2%	9.2%	0.0%
Bloomington	\$ 256,674	2.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Carver County	\$ 256,674	2.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Dakota County	\$ 1,015,029	8.7%	8.7%	0.0%
Three Rivers Park Dist. excluding Bloomington	\$ 2,975,085	25.5%	25.5%	0.0%
Mpls. Park & Rec. Bd. (does not include additional funds appropriated for Lake of the Isles)	\$ 2,228,397	19.1%	19.1%	0.0%
Ramsey County excluding St. Paul	\$ 1,038,363	8.9%	8.9%	0.0%
St. Paul	\$ 1,703,382	14.6%	14.6%	0.0%
Scott County	\$ 396,678	3.4%	3.4%	0.0%
Washington County	\$ 723,354	6.2%	6.2%	0.0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 11,667,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

In order to distribute funds to park agencies based on the percentage proposed for that agency, and be compatible with the CIP enabling law (MS 473.147), grants to each park agency would need to fund ranked projects submitted by each park agency. The MPOSC and Metropolitan Council could accept each agency's prioritized project list as long as projects were consistent with Council approved park and trail master plans, the Council had agreed to fund such projects in the Parks CIP, and the total amount requested by the park agency for its list was the amount the Council had agreed to consider in that biennial CIP.

Distributing Parks CIP funds based on the percentage proposed for that agency and granting those funds to finance agency-prioritized project lists that have been approved by the MPOSC and Metropolitan Council resolves the following problems:

- A. Every agency can be assured of receiving its share of funds appropriated for the CIP. There would be no disparities between what was proposed versus what an agency received. All agencies would be motivated to politically support the CIP since they would be assured of receiving funds from it.
- B. By allowing the agencies to prioritize their projects within their Council established allocation, the highest priority projects for each part of the regional system are funded, or at least partially funded if it's

a very large project that can't be fully funded in one CIP. There is no incentive for park agencies to try to improve the ranking of their projects since all agencies are treated equally.

## **2. What should be the basis for determining a park agency's share in the Parks CIP?**

Currently, the basis for determining a park agency's share (percentage allocation) in the Parks CIP is the result of averaging the allocation using three factors:

- A. How much each agency has received in State and Council bonds relative to the other agencies in the past—including line item appropriations beyond the CIP.
- B. How much each agency received in the most recent distribution of operations and maintenance funds using the formula in MS 473.351.
- C. How much each agency's residential property tax capacity is relative to the other agencies.

Arguments raised by park agencies about the bias of this approach are as follows:

- A. Agencies that received line item State appropriations, North Mississippi RP grants financed with Council interest earnings mandated by State law, and Acquisition Opportunity Grants in addition to the funds they received from the regional parks CIP would continue to get a larger share in the next biennial CIP. Even if these non-CIP grants were not counted, those agencies that received large shares in past CIPs are assured to be allowed to request large shares in future CIPs regardless of changes in growth patterns in the region over time.
- B. Agencies that have mature-developed parks that serve millions of visitors would continue to be allowed to request a larger share in the next biennial CIP while agencies with few parks now and thus low visitation--though they have growing populations and are putting more tax dollars into financing the CIP--continue to be restricted to a small share. These agencies not only need a larger share of the CIP, but their residents are also paying a larger share of taxes that fund the CIP.
- C. Agencies that have a relatively wealthy residential property tax base would continue to get a larger share in the next biennial CIP. Parks funding should not be biased towards any socio-economic class.

The basis for determining the percentage share each park agency should receive in the Parks CIP needs to address these arguments. Determining an agency share in the Parks CIP based on its population addresses those arguments as follows:

- A. The spending per capita of Parks CIP funds is the same for each individual in the region.
- B. As the region grows, the share that is growing relative to other parts of the region will receive more funds, but the per capita spending for each person through the parks CIP remains constant for everyone regardless of where they live. Many other State and Federal grants are distributed based on per capita plans. Consequently there is a solid basis to apply this same practice here. Its democratic characteristics are accountable to the public in ways that the current approach does not as noted above.
- C. This proposal acknowledges the negotiation rights of the Governor and the Legislature in adopting a bonding appropriation, and an LCCMR fund appropriation. If park agencies request additional funds for projects from their legislative delegations because the Parks CIP doesn't propose enough funds for a project, the Legislature and Governor negotiate on whether or not to add additional funds that complement the Regional Parks CIP instead of compete against it. The CIP becomes the base or floor for negotiations in flush fiscal years and the ceiling in lean times. But in both cases, each agency is assured of some funds--at least in proportion to its population--for its CIP projects. Any additional funds added by Legislative/Governor agreement are added because they typically serve a State-wide audience--

such as funds for Como Zoo. Those additional State funds are in effect benefiting the Region and State—not just the park agency. And those additional State funds are not matched with Council bonds.

Table 3 illustrates what each agency was proposed to receive from the 2006-07 Parks CIP, versus what it received on a percentage basis, and all funds the agency received from all sources--the 2006-07 Parks CIP, line item appropriations, North Mississippi grants, and Acquisition Opportunity Grants under the current approach of ranking and distributing funds in the 2006-07 CIP described earlier in this paper. Note that other funding beyond the Parks CIP funding has a significant effect on the percent of all funds an agency received. Scott County received no funds, while the City of St. Paul received 40.9% of all funds granted. Distributing Parks CIP funds on a population basis would reduce this level of funding disparity, and still respect non-CIP funding decisions made by the Governor and Legislature. Those line item appropriations could complement instead of compete against State funding for the Parks CIP.

**Table 3: Comparison of Percentages Proposed for Park Agencies in 2006-07 CIP Versus What Agency Received from CIP, and Percent of all Park Grants Agency Received in 2006**

Park Agency	Percent Proposed for Park Agency in 2006-07 Parks CIP	Percent of Dollars Received for 2006-07 Parks CIP	Percent Agency received of all Park Grants (CIP, Acq. Grants, line item appropriations) in 2006 <sup>2</sup>
Anoka County	9.2%	8.2%	2.8%
Bloomington	2.2%	2.8%	1.8%
Carver County	2.2%	2.4%	0.8%
Dakota County	8.7%	13.1%	21.7%
Three Rivers Park Dist. excluding Bloomington	25.5%	26.0%	8.8%
Mpls. Park & Rec. Bd.	19.1%	14.8%	18.5%
Ramsey County excluding St. Paul	8.9%	5.0%	3.1%
St. Paul	14.6%	23.2%	40.9%
Scott County	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington County	6.2%	4.5%	1.6%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 4 illustrates the population of each park agency in 2005 in number and percentage basis. It is shown to illustrate what the 2008-13 Parks CIP agency percentages could be. Since the population data is updated annually, the 2006 population data could be used in preparing the 2008-13 Parks CIP. That data will be published in April 2007.

**Table 4: Park Agency 2005 Population**

Park Agency	2005 Population	Percent
Anoka County	326,393	11.6%
Bloomington	84,347	3.0%
Carver County	85,204	3.0%
Dakota County	391,558	13.9%
Three Rivers Park Dist. excluding Bloomington	678,854	24.2%
Mpls. Park & Rec. Bd.	387,711	13.8%
Ramsey County excluding St. Paul	227,873	8.1%
St. Paul	287,385	10.2%
Scott County	115,997	4.1%
Washington County	224,857	8.0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,810,179</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>2</sup> Grant data based on grant agreement files shown in **Appendix A: 2006-07 Metro Regional Parks CIP Data and Other Grants Awarded in 2006**

## CONCLUSIONS

Structuring the 2008-13 Parks CIP by distributing appropriations for the CIP based on the population of each park agency and spending those funds on park agency-prioritized lists that have been approved by the Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission and the Metropolitan Council is feasible, justifiable and accountable because:

1. It meets the requirements of applicable statutes governing the regional parks CIP based on a review by Metropolitan Council legal staff.
2. It acknowledges and respects the principles of per capita spending of State and Regional funds applied for other government grant programs. Every citizen is treated the same on a per capita spending basis. As the region grows, the per capita spending from the CIP may go up or down, but each citizen receives the same amount.
3. It allows regional park agencies to set its CIP priorities for projects that the MPOSC and Metropolitan Council has approved. The highest priority CIP project(s) of each park agency receive Parks CIP funding to meet the unique needs of that agency.
4. It respects the roles of the Governor and Legislature in determining capital spending for the State's share of the regional parks CIP, and for appropriating additional State funds for individual projects. If additional funds are needed for a project that can't be fully funded in the Parks CIP, those additional funds complement State funding for the Parks CIP instead of compete against it. Duplicative funding requests for the same project via the Parks CIP and a line item appropriation should end since a park agency is assured of some funding from the Parks CIP and can continue to request additional funds for the project if necessary via a line item appropriation.



### Appendix A: 2006-07 Metro Regional Parks CIP Data and Other Grants Awarded in 2006

Park Agency	2006-07 CIP Agency allocation proposed (%)	Grants received from CIP (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	CIP Agency allocation received (%)	Other Funds passed-through Metro Council to that Agency via line item appropriations- includes North Miss. RP grants (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	Acq. Opportunity Grants Received (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	All Grants to Agency	% All Grants Total
Anoka County	9.2%	SG2006-100	\$ 905,000	8.2%	None	\$ -	None	\$ -		2.8%
		SG2006-131	\$ 52,000							
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 957,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 957,000</b>	
Bloomington	2.2%	SG2006-118	\$ 82,000	2.8%	SG2006-115	\$ 300,000	None	\$ -		1.8%
		SG2006-116	\$ 58,000							
		SG2006-135	\$ 187,000							
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 327,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 300,000</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 627,000</b>	
Carver County	2.2%	SG2006-122	\$ 285,000	2.4%	None	\$ -	None	\$ -		0.8%
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 285,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 285,000</b>	

Park Agency	2006-07 CIP Agency allocation proposed (%)	Grants received from CIP (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	CIP Agency allocation received (%)	Other Funds passed-through Metro Council to that Agency via line item appropriations-includes North Miss. RP grants (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	Acq. Opportunity Grants Received (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	All Grants to Agency	% All Grants Total
Dakota County	8.7%	SG2006-123	\$ 863,000	13.1%	SG2006-138	\$6,000,000	None	\$ -		21.7%
		SG2006-105	\$ 200,000							
		SG2006-130	\$ 460,000							
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 1,523,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$7,523,000</b>	
Three Rivers Park Dist. excluding Bloomington	25.5%	SG2006-128	\$ 100,000	26.0%	None	\$ -	None	\$ -		8.8%
		SG2006-126	\$ 235,000							
		SG2006-125	\$ 225,000							
		SG2006-127	\$ 442,000							
		SG2006-134	\$ 792,000							
		SG2006-104	\$ 206,000							
		SG2006-134	\$ 739,000							
		SG2006-132	\$ 298,000							
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 3,037,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$3,037,000</b>	

Park Agency	2006-07 CIP Agency allocation proposed (%)	Grants received from CIP (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	CIP Agency allocation received (%)	Other Funds passed-through Metro Council to that Agency via line item appropriations-includes North Miss. RP grants (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	Acq. Opportunity Grants Received (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	All Grants to Agency	% All Grants Total
Mpls. Park & Rec. Bd.	19.1%	SG2006-119	\$ 390,000	14.8%	SG2006-145	\$1,800,000	None	\$ -		18.5%
		SG2006-117	\$ 700,000		SG2006-114	\$ 250,000				
		SG2006-129	\$ 641,000		SG2006-113	\$2,500,000				
					SG2006-149	\$ 154,000				
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 1,731,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$4,704,000</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$6,435,000</b>	
Ramsey County excluding St. Paul	8.9%	SG2006-107	\$ 75,000	5.0%	SG2006-112	\$ 321,000	None	\$ -		3.1%
		SG2006-136	\$ 55,000		SG2006-109	\$ 191,000				
		SG2006-133	\$ 450,000							
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 580,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 512,000</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$1,092,000</b>	

Park Agency	2006-07 CIP Agency allocation proposed (%)	Grants received from CIP (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	CIP Agency allocation received (%)	Other Funds passed-through Metro Council to that Agency via line item appropriations-includes North Miss. RP grants (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	Acq. Opportunity Grants Received (Grant No.)	Grant Amount	All Grants to Agency	% All Grants Total
St. Paul	14.6%	SG2006-106	\$ 213,000	23.2%	SG2006-111	\$9,000,000	None	\$ -		40.9%
		SG2006-101	\$ 620,000		SG2006-124	\$2,500,000				
		SG2006-102	\$ 355,000							
		SG2006-103	\$ 1,142,000							
		SG2006-108	\$ 375,000							
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 2,705,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$11,500,000</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$14,205,000</b>	
Scott County	3.4%	None	\$ -	0.0%	None	\$ -	None	\$ -		0.0%
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	
Washington County	6.2%	SG2006-121	\$ 280,000	4.5%	None	\$ -	SG2006-143	\$ 20,953		1.6%
		SG2006-137	\$ 242,000							
		<b>CIP Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 522,000</b>		<b>Line item subtotal</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>Acq. Grants subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 20,953</b>	<b>\$ 542,953</b>	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>CIP Total</b>	<b>\$ 11,667,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>Line Item Total</b>	<b>\$23,016,000</b>	<b>Acq. Grants Total</b>	<b>\$ 20,953</b>	<b>\$34,703,953</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**This Page Blank**