

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

DATE: April 30, 2007 **Updated May 2, 2007**

TO: Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission (MPOSC)

FROM: Arne Stefferud, Planning Analyst-Parks (651-602-1360)

SUBJECT: Reconsideration of Park Agency share for 2008-2013 Regional Parks CIP

Introduction/Background:

At its meeting on April 10, the Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission considered six options for splitting the 2008-13 Parks CIP among park agencies. The Commission recommended:

That the Metropolitan Council prepare a 2008-13 regional parks CIP that divides the amount proposed for each regional park agency by weighting the most recent population data for that park agency by 80% and by weighting the percentage of non-local visits that agency hosted from the 1998-99 parks visitor study by 20%.

Metropolitan Council Chair Peter Bell and Regional Administrator Tom Weaver in consultation with Commission Chair Glen Skovholt reviewed the Commission's recommendation on April 30. They looked at various CIP sharing formulas in relation to what agency shares had been proposed for the 2006-07 CIP. They focused on creating a formula that had the least negative impact on all the park agencies as measured by a change in an agency's share in the 2008-13 CIP compared to the share proposed for that agency in the 2006-07 CIP.

Mr. Bell and Mr. Weaver in consultation with Mr. Skovholt proposed that the Commission consider weighting park agency population by 70% and the percentage of non-local visits that agency hosted from the 1998-99 parks visitor study by 30% as the formula for determining a park agency's share of the 2008-13 Parks CIP. This option builds on the discussion and analysis the Commission has conducted over the past three months and meets the goal of a more transparent and understandable CIP. It also was proposed by Mr. Skovholt and discussed by the Commission at the April 10 Commission meeting.

Table 1: Comparison of options for splitting the 2008-13 Parks CIP among park agencies, which follows illustrates the results of this proposal and compares it to the percent proposed for each park agency in the 2006-07 CIP. With the exception of Three Rivers Park District and Scott County, an agency's share increases or is unchanged from what was proposed for that park agency in the 2006-07 Parks CIP. As noted in past analyses, Three Rivers Park District's proposed share was the highest in the 2006-07 CIP so all of the options considered reduced its share. But, the 2006-07 Parks CIP only proposed a share of funds to a park agency. For example Scott County received none of the appropriations for the 2006-07 CIP. This new CIP structure proposes that an agency receive the percentage share of the funds that are appropriated for the CIP.

Because this proposal is a change from what was recommended by the Commission on April 10, staff recommends that the Commission hold a special meeting on May 8 to formally consider it and pass its recommendations on to the Metropolitan Council.

Table 1: Comparison of options for splitting the 2008-13 Parks CIP among park agencies				
Park Agency	2006-07 CIP share proposed for that agency	<u>Option 4 recommended on April 10:</u> 80% Pop., 20% Non-local Visits	New Option 7: 70% Pop., 30% Non-local Visits	Comparison of Option 7 to 2006-07 CIP share proposed for that agency
Anoka County	9.2%	11.1%	10.8%	1.6%
City of Bloomington	2.2%	2.9%	2.9%	0.7%
Carver County	2.2%	2.6%	2.4%	0.2%
Dakota County	8.7%	11.5%	10.3%	1.6%
Minneapolis Park Board	19.1%	17.3%	19.1%	0.0%
Ramsey County	8.9%	8.8%	9.2%	0.3%
City of St. Paul	14.6%	13.1%	14.6%	0.0%
Three Rivers Park District	25.5%	21.9%	20.8%	-4.7%
Three Rivers/Scott County	3.4%	3.5%	3.3%	-0.1%
Washington County	6.2%	7.1%	6.7%	0.5%
Total Percent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

May 2, 2007 Update

The Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission discussed the above memorandum at its meeting on May 1 and scheduled a special meeting to consider it on:

Tuesday, May 8, 5 p.m.

Lower Level Room A, Metropolitan Council, 390 North Robert Street, St. Paul.

The Commission also heard from park agencies at the May 1 meeting who asked that the Commission also take a formal action on a motion that assures an agency receives a percentage share of the Parks CIP appropriation. Following are draft recommendations regarding the agency share of the CIP, requirements of the park agencies to submit a prioritized list of projects for the CIP that must be consistent with Council approved master plans, and granting CIP appropriations

based on the agency share in the CIP for the Council approved prioritized list of projects that agency submitted.

Draft Recommendations

1. That the Metropolitan Council prepare a 2008-13 regional parks CIP that divides the amount proposed for each regional park agency by weighting the most recent population data for that park agency by ___% and by weighting the percentage of non-local visits that agency hosted from the 1998-99 parks visitor study by ___%.
2. That the regional park agencies submit a prioritized list of funding requests for projects for the 2008-13 parks CIP within the amount proposed for that agency as determined by the formula in recommendation 1. Funding requests for projects from each agency's prioritized list must be consistent with Metropolitan Council approved master plans, and in the case of reimbursement requests the Council must have approved consideration of the reimbursement in a former action of the Council. If those funding requests for projects are not consistent with a Council approved master plan or past Council action on a reimbursement, the Council will return the list to the agency for resubmittal of a new list.
3. That appropriations of State funds and matching Metropolitan Council bonds for the 2008-13 parks CIP be granted among the park agencies as determined from the formula in recommendation 1, and that the agencies be required to spend the grants on the Council approved prioritized list of CIP projects. If the CIP funding request is not fully funded the park agency must spend its grant on projects in priority order of the CIP list of projects for that agency.