

# C Community Development Committee

Meeting date: January 4, 2010

## ADVISORY INFORMATION

<b>Date:</b>	December 30, 2009
<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>	Paul Burns, Manager, Livable Communities Program Joanne Barron, Planning Analyst
<b>Division/Department:</b>	Community Development, Housing & Livable Communities

## Proposed Action

That the Metropolitan Council award seven Livable Communities Demonstration Account (LCDA) grants as follows:

ID, Project Name	Applicant	Eligible Request	Recommendation
A.2 Gateway Lofts *	Minneapolis	\$74,000	\$74,000
A.4 The Penfield	St. Paul	\$610,000	\$610,000
C.3 South Lewis Avenue Redevelopment	Watertown	\$366,318	\$366,318
B.2 Sienna Green Phase II	Roseville	\$202,100	\$202,100
C.1 Presbyterian Homes	Eden Prairie	\$848,300	\$848,300
A.1 Capri Block	Minneapolis	\$869,000	\$869,000
A.3 Harriet Island Boulevard / West Side Flats	St. Paul	\$750,000	\$47,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$3,016,718</b>
A - Center Cities, B - Developed Cities, C - Developing Cities			
Projects are listed in order of evaluation ranking. This recommendation reflects 40% of available LCDA funds going to projects located in Minneapolis and St. Paul, per LCDA guidelines.			
* The applicant has requested to use the grant as a loan to a subrecipient. If the Council approves an action to allow this practice, the grant agreement will include required provisions.			

Further, that the Metropolitan Council award the following additional amounts to the two projects listed below:

ID, Project Name	Applicant	Eligible Request	Recommendation
A.3 Harriet Island Boulevard / West Side Flats	St. Paul	\$750,000	\$703,000  (In addition to the \$47,000 in above recommendation)
A.5 2700 the Avenue	St. Paul	\$800,000	\$280,282
Projects are listed in point rank order		Total Suggested Additional Award	\$983,282

This will result in awards to Minneapolis and St. Paul exceeding the 40% guideline (64.6%) for LCDA funding to the central cities, and will award all the available funds to the highest scoring projects.

## Background

Since the program's inception in 1996, the Council has held an annual competitive grant cycle to accept applications for Livable Communities Demonstration Account funding. LCDA funding supports projects that demonstrate innovative ways of meeting 2030 Regional Framework goals and strategies to achieve connected, efficient land-use patterns in communities throughout the region.

The 13-member Livable Communities Advisory Committee is appointed by the Council and is charged with reviewing LCDA funding proposals and making funding recommendations to the Council, based on guidelines adopted by the Council each year in the LCA Annual Fund Distribution Plan. The staff evaluation process and Livable Communities Advisory committee review process is described in the attached *Summary of Application and Review Process*.

The Community Development Committee recommended and the Metropolitan Council approved the 2009 LCA Annual Fund Distribution Plan on June 24, 2009. The Distribution Plan includes the LCDA guidelines, application and schedule.

The major change to the LCDA guidelines this year is a greater emphasis on readiness of projects to be completed within two years of the grant award. This was accomplished by requiring that, to be eligible, projects must include development components, in addition to the grant-funded activities, that will be completed within 24 months of the grant award date, and by allocating 10 of 50 possible points to readiness of projects in the scoring process conducted by the LCAC.

The LCDA guidelines retained changes approved by the Council in the 2007 LCA Annual Fund Distribution Plan to more deeply integrate applicable state policies into the evaluation process (policies and initiatives of Minnesota Housing, MnDOT, Departments of Commerce and Administration, Human Services, Natural Resources, and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency); give bonus points to projects located within one-half mile of transit stations and stops on transitways and express bus commuter system corridors identified in the 2030 Transitway System; and to incorporate the Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines to

encourage more sustainable development practices in the evaluation of funding proposals. Applicants Housing Performance scores also continue to be factored into the scoring process.

The LCDA guidelines also retained a 2005 change that the LCAC may recommend up to 40 percent of the total LCDA funds available 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 criterion was established). The guidelines 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 guidelines and have scored 7 of 10 readiness points in the LCAC's evaluation. The Council awarded slightly more than 40% of the dollars to projects located in Minneapolis and St. Paul in 2006, 2007 and 2008, at the suggestion of the LCAC. Amounts awarded to projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul have ranged over the four years since the 40% guideline was instituted from 36.4% in 2005 to 41.8% in 2007 and have averaged 39.8%.

### **Summary of Committee Discussion at the December 7, 2009 meeting:**

At the Dec. 7 meeting, Chaired by Tony Pistilli, Dan Marckel, Vice-Chair of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, presented the LCAC's recommendations.

Discussion included whether the Council should award funding higher than the 40% guideline to projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul, as suggested by the Livable Communities Advisory Committee; concern about possibly not awarding all of the available \$4 million in a year when the total available funding has been cut back; and the importance of being confident that if funding is awarded to projects in excess of the 40% guideline, they will be completed within the grant term. Marckel responded to the latter point that the LCAC looking carefully at whether projects were ready to be implemented and completed with the 2-year grant term, and is confident that all of the recommended projects are ready.

Member Wulff asked about the Valley Ridge Redevelopment project in Burnsville which was not recommended for funding. Marckel said the LCAC saw great potential for this project and the future retail development to be a good demonstration, but that the LCAC did not support funding at this time. There was discussion about the project scores for the Burnsville project and the St. Paul projects suggested for funding in excess of 40%, with Member Bowles stating that the scoring should be the first consideration in funding. Staff reported that the Burnsville project scored 29, and the Harriet Island Blvd, St. Paul project scored 37. (See attached table listing scores for all projects).

Bowles asked if consideration is or could be given to funding housing for disabled persons. Pistilli asked if staff could ask the Council's funding partners if there is a demand and need for this type of housing. Guy Peterson responded that staff would attempt to secure this information.

Wulff requested information on the transit funding picture as it may affect future LCA funding for the January 4, 2010 meeting at which CDC action on the LCDA recommendations is scheduled.

### **Rationale**

Seven projects are recommended for funding by the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, totaling \$3,016,818. This amount is 75% of the available \$4 million. Six of the

seven projects are recommended by the LCAC to receive the full amount of their funding requests. Partial funding of \$47,000 (of a \$750,000 request) for one project, A.3, Harriet Island Boulevard / West Side Flats, St. Paul, is recommended to keep the amount at the 40 percent of total available dollars the advisory committee can recommend for Minneapolis and St. Paul projects. The LCAC suggests that the Community Development Committee consider recommending an additional \$703,000 to fully fund this project, which is highly supported by the Committee. The LCAC also suggests that the Community Development Committee consider recommending that the next highest-scoring project, A.5, 2700 the Avenue, St. Paul, receive \$280,000 of its \$800,000 request. Awarding these additional amounts to the two projects, totaling \$983,282, would bring the award amount to the total available amount of \$4 million. If the Community Development Committee were to recommend the additional \$983,282 to the two St. Paul projects, the percentage of available funding going to Minneapolis and St. Paul projects would be 64.6%, and make the average for the five-year 2005 – 2009 period since implementation of the 40% guideline be 42.5%.

The Proposed Action language in this memo would approve the LCAC recommendations and award additional funding to fully fund one St. Paul project and award funding to an additional St. Paul project, both of which would cause the recommendation to exceed the 40% guideline.

## **Funding**

The approved 2009 LCA Annual Fund Distribution Plan included available funding of \$4 million for LCDA demonstration grants.

## **Known Support / Opposition**

Resolutions supporting each of the submitted applications were received from the respective cities and development authorities. There is no known opposition.

The following documents are attached:

- 2009 LCDA table of Recommendations and LCAC Suggested Awards
- Summary of Application and Review Process
- Summaries of Projects Recommended and Not Recommended
- Combined project summaries
- Step One Evaluation Scoring Summary
- Advisory Committee Evaluation Form
- Checklist to Determine Feasibility of Project Only With LCDA Grant
- Conflict of Interest Record for Advisory Committee members
- Application Guide
- Application Form, Eminent Domain Certification, and Resolution
- Summary Notes of Advisory Committee meetings

## 2009 Livable Communities Demonstration Account Recommendations and LCAC Suggested Awards

ID, Project Name	Applicant	LCAC Score	Eligible Request	Recommendation
A.2 Gateway Lofts	Minneapolis	41.3	\$74,000	\$74,000
A.4 The Penfield	St. Paul	40.7	\$610,000	\$610,000
C.3 South Lewis Avenue Redevelopment	Watertown	39.8	\$366,318	\$366,318
B.2 Sienna Green Phase II	Roseville	39.6	\$202,100	\$202,100
C.1 Presbyterian Homes	Eden Prairie	37.9	\$848,300	\$848,300
A.1 Capri Block	Minneapolis	37.7	\$869,000	\$869,000
A.3 Harriet Island Boulevard / West Side Flats	St. Paul	37.5	\$750,000	*\$750,000
A.5 2700 the Avenue	St. Paul	37.3	\$800,000	**\$280,282
				<b>\$4,000,000</b>
Not recommended:				
B.1 Valley Ridge Redevelopment, Burnsville	Dakota County CDA	28.9	\$1,000,000	
C.2 Genz Ryan Redevelopment	Rosemount	23.9	\$270,000	

\*\$703,000 of this amount is above the 40% guideline for funding to projects in St. Paul and Minneapolis.

\*\* This amount is above the 40% guideline for funding to projects in St. Paul and Minneapolis

A - Center Cities, B - Developed Cities, C - Developing Cities

# **Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2009 Summary of Application and Review Process**

## **Application Process**

- Following Council adoption of the LCDA criteria on June 24, 2009, as part of the LCA Annual Fund Distribution Plan, staff posted the funding application packet on [www.metrocouncil.org](http://www.metrocouncil.org).
- Staff held two workshops for applicants on July 8 and 9 to explain the program, application form, and evaluation process, and to answer questions from those interested in submitting an application.
- There was no pre-application step this year (as there was in 2007 and 2008) due to a shortened grant cycle.
- Applicants submitted 14 proposals by the application deadline of August 24.

## **Review for Eligibility and Completeness**

- Staff reviewed applications for eligibility, eligibility of items requested, and completeness.
- Four of the 14 applications were ineligible because they did not include project components, in addition to the grant-funded activities, that would be completed within 2 years of the grant award. The ineligible applications are: Commuter Rail Area Land Acquisition, Anoka; Center Station Site Assembly and Pedestrian Connection, Apple Valley; Downtown Chanhassen Transit Station, Chanhassen; and Central Park, Rosemount.
- Staff followed up with eligible applicants to ensure that all applications and all supporting documents were complete and that items requested were eligible for funding.
- Ten eligible proposals requested eligible items totaling \$5,789,718.

## **Step One Evaluation Process**

- A staff team of seven members, representing LCA, Local Planning Assistance, Transportation Services and Metro Transit evaluated the 10 eligible proposals according to seven criteria in the LCDA program criteria: use land efficiently (0-8 points), link land uses with transit (0-10 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 (0-8 points).
- Each project could receive up to 50 points. To advance to the Step Two evaluation process, projects needed to score a minimum of 20 points.
- Each staff member evaluated proposals in their area of expertise according to specific measurable factors for each criterion.
- The Step One evaluation covered the elements of the project that will be completed or substantially completed by the end of 2011, the two-year term of the grant contract.
- All ten projects scored 20 or more points in the Step One evaluation, and advanced to the Step Two evaluation.

## **Step Two Evaluation Process**

- The Livable Communities Advisory Committee conducted the Step Two evaluation during six meetings held from September 16 to November 19.
- The LCAC conducted a question-and-answer dialogue with representatives of all ten 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 Advisory Committee scored proposals on three 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); 2) the extent to which the element for which funding is requested will be a catalyst to implement the project (0-10 points), and 3) the extent to which the proposed project is ready and able to use an LCDA grant, if awarded, within the 2-year grant term (0-10 points).
- Eight projects scored above the 30 point funding threshold, 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 LCAC may qualify the project as eligible for funding by a vote of the majority of members voting. The LCAC did not make such a motion for either of the two projects that scored below 30 points.

## **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” for each project.
- The Committee answered “yes” to all of the questions for nine of the projects.
- For the tenth project, B.1, Valley Ridge Redevelopment, located in Burnsville and submitted by the Dakota County CDA, the LCAC answered ‘no’ to Question #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?”
- The checklist is attached separately; a master checklist recording the LCAC’s decisions and signed by LCAC Chair Ruth Grendahl is on file.

## **Housing Performance Scoring**

- Following evaluation and scoring of proposals, up to ten additional housing incentives points were 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 10-point scale.
- If a proposal includes or proposes new affordable housing, or if affordable housing is located in the project site/area, a proposal could either improve its ranking by the score applied to it or not be lowered in the rankings.
- No project rankings changed significantly as a result of adding the housing incentives points to the LCAC scores.

**Summaries of Projects Recommended for Funding  
With Funding Details  
(in point rank order)**

**and**

**Summaries of Projects Not Recommended for Funding  
With Scoring Results**



## Project Summary

**Grantee:** City of Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development  
**Project Name:** Gateway Lofts  
**Project Location:** Within the triangle formed by 27th Avenue North, Upton Avenue North and West Broadway Avenue in Minneapolis  
**Council District:** District 7 – Annette Meeks

---

### Project Description – to be completed within two-year grant term:

Gateway Lofts will be a 3-story building with 46 rental apartments, bringing mixed-income workforce housing affordable to entry-level and low-wage workers to the West Broadway corridor in North Minneapolis, near the Robbinsdale border. Forty-one of the units will be affordable at 50% AMI, five will be market rate, and some of the units will provide a live-work option. The site for this project is currently vacant with an abandoned gas station. Underground parking will be provided. The proposed project will be an attractive asset to the community that will increase housing options and density in an area which is currently low-density single family homes, duplexes and four-plexes.

### Grant-Funded Activities:

Demolish the existing structures, site grading and engineering to construct a rain garden to assist with stormwater management.

### Future Development Phases, if applicable:

None.

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

The project is well-designed and integrated into the oddly-shaped, sloping site, and provides good stormwater solutions on a small site. The design and height of the building takes advantage of a location along a transit corridor, while also integrating well with the adjacent neighborhood of single-family homes and duplexes. The Committee also noted that the live-work option is a positive feature. The requested components are catalysts for the project.

### Funding:

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds	
\$74,000	\$74,000	\$54,000	Engineering, site grading and native vegetation for rain gardens
		20,000	Demolition of existing structures

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

**None.**

### Development Timeline:

Task	Start Date	End Date
Site grading to promote proper drainage, excavation and appropriate fill	9/1/2010	9/1/2011
Demolish existing obsolete structures	9/1/2010	9/1/2011
Engineering for rain garden	9/1/2010	9/1/2011
Completion of Gateway Lofts		12/31/2011

# Project Summary

**Grantee:** City of Saint Paul  
**Project Name:** The Penfield  
**Project Location:** The downtown Saint Paul block bounded by 11th Street on the North, Robert Street on the East, 10th Street on the South and Minnesota Street on the West  
**Council District:** District 13 – Richard Aguilar

---

## Project Description:

The Penfield is a mixed-use project that will include 216 market-rate apartments, a 30,000 square foot grocery store, 200 underground parking spaces, and 111 surface parking spaces located in the heart of downtown Saint Paul, one block from the future Central Corridor LRT line. A green roof on the building will be employed for stormwater retention and will dramatically reduce storm runoff volume and peak flow rate. The roof will also conserve energy by moderating temperatures on the roof and surrounding areas, helping to reduce the heat island effect downtown during the hot summer months and improve the energy efficiency of the building. The City will schedule visits and tours of the green roof for educational purposes. Construction of The Penfield will retain and incorporate a portion of the Public Safety Building, which has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

## Grant-Funded Activities:

Design, engineering and installation of a green roof.

## Future Development Phases, if applicable:

Development of the north half of the block where the grocery store surface parking will be located as an interim use, and a new City Park on the site of the former Pedro Luggage, across the street from The Penfield on the south side of 10<sup>th</sup> St.

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

The uses and benefits of the green roof are extensive and intensive and will result in substantial benefits in reduced stormwater runoff, reduction of the carbon footprint, while becoming a model for urban green roofs. In addition, the building's location takes advantage of and maximizes the potential of its location near transit to reduce trips and vehicle miles traveled. The Committee also cited the historic preservation aspect of the project.

## Funding:

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds
\$610,000	\$610,000	Design, engineering and installation of a 2-level green roof – 8,000 square feet on the lower level and 4,000 square feet on the upper level.

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

**None.**

## Development Timeline:

Task	Start Date	End Date
Design, engineering, and installation of 2-level green roof	2/1/2010	2/1/2011
Completion of The Penfield		12/31/2011

## Project Summary

**Grantee:** City of Watertown  
**Project Name:** South Lewis Avenue Redevelopment  
**Project Location:** Lewis Avenue Southwest from Kiefer Street to Madison Street  
**Council District:** District 4 – Craig Peterson

### Project Description:

In this first phase of the redevelopment of the southern end of Watertown’s downtown, this project will bring housing into the downtown area by constructing a four-story 75,000 square foot mixed-use development, which will include 50 units of senior housing and 5,000 square feet of retail space. Twenty of the new units will be at market rate, 25 at 50-80% AMI, and 5 at or below 50% AMI. The project will be connected to the community and surrounding region by a new road, sidewalks and a regional trail.

### Grant-Funded Activities

Demolish two existing outmoded industrial buildings and associated parking lots and clear debris, construct the water main, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer to service the development, construct a new stormwater treatment pond, and fund design and engineering for the utilities and stormwater management.

### Future Project:

Several future phases are identified in the City’s downtown redevelopment plan, for the development of five properties. Building plans call for 2- to 3-story buildings of market-rate residential and mixed retail/office and office development. Exact phasing has not been identified to allow for flexibility to maximize development potential based on market conditions.

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

This is a good demonstration to reposition this former industrial part of downtown as a place to live. The public access to the river as a framework for redevelopment along the river is smart and adds value. The city has creatively reconfigured the street infrastructure to permit access for the housing development and future development. The street needs to be done first and is a catalyst for completing the first-phase housing development. Requested activities are the catalyst to moving the senior housing forward.

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds	
\$366,318	\$366,318	\$70,000	Demolish existing buildings and clear demolition debris
		\$296,318	Construct water main, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and stormwater treatment pond; design and engineering for utilities and stormwater management

**Previous LCA grants received for this or related projects:**

**None.**

### Development Timeline:

Task	Start Date	End Date
Design and engineering	2/1/2010	6/1/2010
Demolish existing buildings	6/15/2010	10/1/2010
Watermain construction	6/15/2010	10/1/2010
Sanitary sewer construction	6/15/2010	10/1/2010
Storm sewer	6/15/2010	10/1/2010
Stormwater treatment pond	6/15/2010	6/1/2011
Completion of mixed-use development		12/31/2011

## Project Summary

**Grantee:** City of Roseville  
**Project Name:** Sienna Green Phase II  
**Project Location:** Snelling Avenue North and Highway 36  
**Council District:** District 10 – Kris Sanda

### Project Description – Activities to be Completed within 2-Year Grant Term:

Construction will begin in early summer 2010 on Sienna Green Phase II, a new affordable (at or below 50% AMI) multifamily apartment building for approximately 50 workforce families on the site of the 1950s-era Har Mar apartments. It is the second and final phase of the Sienna Green redevelopment. The building will be located on a portion of the former parking lot for the apartments, and will include underground parking, bike racks and a small surface parking area. The first phase, which received a previous LCDA grant and a TBRA grant, involved rehabilitation and site improvements to the existing five-building complex of 120 one-bedroom apartments, converting some units to larger apartments.

### Grant-Funded Activities:

LCDA funds will assist with infiltration swales and rain gardens that connect throughout the project area and retain stormwater onsite. The LCDA award will also allow for the completion of sidewalks along West Snelling Drive to provide pedestrian connections from Sienna Green to the current bus stop on County Road B and Selling Avenue and the future Snelling Avenue BRT line.

### Future Development Phases, if Applicable:

There are no future phases.

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

The project does a good job of continuing with integrating stormwater treatment throughout the site and using many different practices to achieve this outcome. This project demonstrates restructuring an apartment development built in a different era to work for today's needs by adding another building on the site to increase housing options at this location. This transforms the development into a more livable place, and connects housing to jobs.

### Funding:

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds
\$77,500	\$77,500	Design, engineering, grading and construction of stormwater management system
\$124,600	\$124,600	Permanent pedestrian improvements – extension of public sidewalk and street lighting

### Previous LCA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:

A \$305,000 LCDA grant was awarded in 2007 for Sienna Green Phase I for design and engineering for site demolition, grading, and a stormwater management plan; to remove obsolete structures on the site; implement the stormwater management; and for site grading. In October of 2009, this grant was given an administrative extension to 12/31/2010. \$121,500 in TBRA funds were awarded in 2007 for asbestos and lead-based paint abatement. This grant was also extended in October 2009 to 12/31/2010.

### Development Timeline:

Task	Start Date	End Date
Site acquisition	2/1/2010	2/1/2010
Design and engineering	2/1/2010	5/1/2010
Site grading	6/1/2010	7/1/2010
Stormwater system construction	7/1/2010	6/1/2011
Pedestrian improvements – extension of public sidewalk and lighting	3/1/2011	6/1/2011
Completion of Sienna Green Phase II – 50 units of workforce housing		12/31/2011

# Project Summary

**Grantee:** City of Eden Prairie  
**Project Name:** Presbyterian Homes  
**Project Location:** Southwest corner of Prairie Center Drive and Highway 212  
**Council District:** District 3 – Robert McFarlin

## Project Description:

Presbyterian Homes will be a 9-13 story senior building with 372 units of skilled nursing, temporary care and assisted living, with 168 spaces of underground parking. Presbyterian Homes will develop the project, which will be part of a 21-acre planned unit development that already includes retail, restaurant, office and recreation uses. The City will realign Castlemoor Drive, one of the streets the building faces, to allow the construction of a traffic circle and public sidewalks, create a stormwater pond and rainwater garden.

## Grant-Funded Activities:

Design, engineering and realignment of Castlemoor Drive and stormwater improvements, including National Urban Runoff Program (NURP) ponds and rain gardens.

## Future Development Phases, if applicable:

A future phase will include a 4-story senior/retail housing building, an additional 9-13 story building for all ages, 4 retail/restaurant buildings, and a Hennepin County Ambulance Service office and garage. The site will feature underground and surface parking, porous pavers for sidewalks, public plazas and additional rainwater gardens.

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

The project demonstrates reinventing a large auto-oriented intersection to allow pedestrian access to services and to transit. It also demonstrates how senior housing can be located with convenient access to services and destinations, rather than isolated as is typical of many senior buildings. The city granted waivers for density, height, parking and setback; the height and density of the building is a demonstration for a developing community, and it also demonstrates the result of an approach for eliciting public input.

## Funding:

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds	
\$848,300	\$848,300	\$667,250	Realignment of Castlemoor Drive
		39,950	Stormwater management improvements and rain garden
		141,000	Design and engineering for Castlemoor Drive and stormwater

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

## Development Timeline:

Task	Start Date	End Date
Design and engineering for realignment of street and stormwater management improvements	5/1/2010	11/1/2010
Realignment of Castlemoor Drive	5/1/2010	11/1/2010
Stormwater management improvement and rain garden	5/1/2010	11/1/2010
Completion of senior facility		12/31/2011

# Project Summary

**Grantee:** City of Minneapolis Community Planning and Development Agency  
**Project Name:** Capri Block  
**Project Location:** Between Logan Avenue/West Broadway and Penn Avenue/West Broadway in North Minneapolis  
**Council District:** District 7 – Annette Meeks

---

## Project Description - Activities to be Completed within 2-Year Grant Term:

Completion of site assembly to facilitate further development on West Broadway Avenue, aligned with the goals and vision articulated in the West Broadway Alive! Plan. Activities include expansion of the Capri Theater through the purchase and renovation of additional parcels to include dressing rooms, rehearsal space, a green room, a dance studio and recording studio; redevelopment of the currently vacant Delisi building to include KMOJ radio station, restaurant, coffee shop and adjacent public plaza with new transit shelters.

## Grant-Funded Activities:

Purchase of six properties, including the property at 2029-2033 West Broadway to permit expansion of the Capri Theater; 2101 West Broadway; 2110 23rd Avenue North; 2114 23rd Avenue North, 2300 Penn Avenue North; and 2306 Penn Avenue North.

## Future Development Phases, if applicable:

Phase II will include development of the remainder of the 4.5 acre block on 23<sup>rd</sup> and Penn Avenues North. This is expected to contain a mix of residential and commercial uses, including structured parking for the entire development. Plans are currently under development for restaurant use of 2117 West Broadway.

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

This is a timely opportunity to acquire sites at good prices, given the foreclosure status of several key properties and represents a rare opportunity to catalyze a market-changing large-scale development. Good opportunity to leverage city funds already put into the project and a good city redevelopment plan. The public/private/nonprofit partnership is a replicable demonstration. The Capri Theater and Delisi's redevelopment will serve as good anchors for future development.

## Funding:

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds
\$869000	\$869,000	Land acquisition

## Previous LCA Grants Received For This Or Related Project:

\$47,500 - 2007 TBRA grant to conduct asbestos abatement on the Delisi Building.

## Development Timeline:

Task	Start Date	End Date
Acquire 2029-2033 West Broadway	1/15/2010	6/15/2010
Acquire 2110 23rd Avenue	1/1/2010	8/15/2010
Acquire 2114 23rd Avenue	1/1/2010	6/15/2010
Acquire 2300 Penn Avenue	1/1/2010	8/15/2010
Acquire 2306 Penn Avenue	1/1/2010	4/30/2010
Acquire 2101 West Broadway	1/15/2010	6/15/2010
Development of Delisi Building	9/2010	4/30/2010
Redevelopment of Capri Theatre		12/31/2011

# Project Summary

**Grantee:** City of Saint Paul  
**Project Name:** Harriet Island Boulevard  
**Project Location:** West side riverfront between Wabasha and the railroad, Fillmore Street and the Mississippi River  
**Council District:** District 13 – Richard Aguilar

**Project Description – to be completed within the two-year grant term:**

The City of St. Paul will construct a new road, Harriet Island Boulevard, which will serve the first phase of mixed-use development in the West Side Flats Urban Village along the Mississippi River. Not only does the City's adopted *West Side Flats Master Plan* require that the road be constructed, but it is necessary to provide access to the West Side Flats Apartments, 180-185 rental units and approximately 8,500 square feet of commercial retail space. Located at the Wabasha Street bridgehead, this mixed-use project will be the first of two phases on the site and the first residential building on a site that had been home to industrial uses.

**Grant-Funded Activities:**

Construction of Harriet Island Boulevard, including lighting, sidewalk, and concrete pavers.

**Future Development Phases, if applicable:**

Phase 2 of the project will be a 5-story, 80,000 square foot commercial building immediately south of the Wabasha Street bridgehead. On a broader scale, full build-out of the West Side Flats Urban Village is planned to include up to 1,500 new housing units, 500,000 square feet of commercial space, and will occur over up to 20 years.

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

Harriet Island Boulevard will complete a ring road network and provide a catalyst to permit the West Side Flats plan to proceed. The road helps create a buildable, accessible parcel and permits the developer to work within the framework of a master plan.

**Funding:**

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Use of Funds	
\$750,000	\$750,000*	\$750,000	Street construction, street lighting, sidewalk along west side and concrete pavers, including design and engineering for all items

\* The Livable Communities Advisory Committee recommends \$47,000 be awarded to this project within the guideline that limits the Advisory Committee's recommendations to 40% of available dollars to St. Paul and Minneapolis projects; and suggests that an additional \$703,000 be awarded to fully fund this project.

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

A 2006 LCDA grant for \$750,000 (SG006-164), for Fillmore Street/West Side Flats, to reconstruct a rail crossing, make street improvements, acquire right-of-way, and for design and engineering costs. Work on this project has been completed.

**Development Timeline:**

Task	Start Date	End Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design, engineering, and construction of street</li> <li>• Design, engineering and installation of street lighting</li> <li>• Design, engineering of sidewalk along west side of site</li> <li>• Design, engineering and installation of concrete pavers between the sidewalk and curb</li> </ul>	5/2010	9/ 2010
Completion of West Side Flats Apartments		12/31/2011

## Project Summary

**Grantee:** City of Saint Paul  
**Project Name:** 2700 the Avenue  
**Project Location:** University Avenue and Emerald Avenue in Saint Paul  
**Council District:** District 14 – Kirstin Sersland Beach

**Project Description – to be completed within two-year grant term:**

2700 The Avenue will be a mixed-use office and retail development featuring 72,000 – 90,000 square feet of office space in a four- to 5-story building above a grocery store and other planned retail, to be located at the future Westgate Station for the Central Corridor. The office/retail uses at 2700 the Avenue will complement the surrounding Midway residential neighborhood of over 2,000 condominiums and rental apartments.

**Grant-Funded Activities:**

Replace two city street lighting fixtures and sidewalks on Emerald Street and University Avenue; two permanent bike racks for public use; partially fund a public-use parking structure with a minimum of 270 stalls.

**Future Development Phases, if applicable:**

There are no future phases. However, 2700 the Avenue will be at the center of the planned Westgate Station area for the future Central Corridor, and additional development will occur in the area as the Central Corridor is developed and LRT service is introduced.

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

This project integrates the final phase in an area that has undergone redevelopment and provides a missing office/retail component that creates a mixed-use district. Development will be at a scale appropriate to and taking advantage of its location at a key Central Corridor station location.

**Funding:**

Amount Requested	Amount Recommended*	Use of Funds	
\$800,000	\$280,282	\$109,800	Replace sidewalks on Emerald Street and University Avenue; replace two standard city street lighting fixtures; two permanent bike racks for public use
		\$170,482	Construct public-use parking structure

\*The Livable Communities Advisory Committee suggests that \$280,000 be awarded to partially fund this project. This would result in award totals that exceed the 40% guideline for projects in St. Paul and Minneapolis and use all the available funds.

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

2008 LCDA grant - \$250,000 for 2700 the Avenue (SG008-118) for stormwater management.

**Development Timeline:**

Task	Start Date	End Date
Construct public-use parking structure	3/1/2010	3/1/2011
Sidewalk and street lighting replacement	9/1/2010	3/31/2011
Permanent bike racks for public use	9/1/2010	3/31/2011



# Project Summary

**Applicant:** Dakota County Community Development Agency (CDA)  
**Project Name:** Valley Ridge Redevelopment  
**Project Location:** 1921 Burnsville Parkway (near the intersection of Burnsville Parkway and County Road 5), Burnsville  
**Council District:** District 15 – Daniel Wolter

---

## **Project Description - Activities to be Completed within 2-Year Grant Term:**

Redevelopment of a portion of the Valley Ridge Shopping Center, an aging and underutilized 14.3 acre retail strip center located in the city of Burnsville, into a senior housing campus. The Dakota County CDA and Presbyterian Homes will redevelop the site. The development will include 80 units of independent living senior apartments and 60 units of assisted living units, 15-20 of which will have memory care. The two developments will be physically connected with a "town center" of common space and uses.

## **Funding Request:**

\$1,000,000 for acquisition of the property to be redeveloped into senior housing.

## **Future Development Phases, if applicable:**

Future phases of the project will include construction of a scaled-down retail center serving the neighborhood on the eastern portion of the site. The City of Burnsville has identified The Valley Ridge Shopping Center as the best reuse candidate of the centers researched in a study on the reuse potential of shopping centers in the City.

This project is not recommended for funding. The project scored below the funding threshold of 30 points in the Step Two/LCAC scoring.

## **Advisory Committee Comments on this Project:**

The advisory committee believes that the redevelopment of the Valley Ridge Shopping Center has very high potential, and could be a model for other cities facing similar redevelopment challenges regarding outmoded shopping centers within their jurisdictions. However, the committee believes that the current design of the proposed senior housing closes off the ability to create an internal circulation system throughout the entire site, including access to transit, encompassing the future development as well as what is planned for the short-term 2-year period. In response to inquiries about plans for future retail development on the site, a City of Burnsville representative stated that the City does not yet have any specific development guidelines for the future retail site, and that the City is committed to high development standards. The Advisory Committee encourages the City and the CDA to develop integrated development guidelines for the site, and resubmit the application at a future time.

# Project Summary

**Applicant:** City of Rosemount  
**Project Name:** Downtown Redevelopment – Genz Ryan  
**Project Location:** 14745, 14755, 14785 Robert Trail South  
**Council District:** District 16 – Wendy Wulff

---

## **Project Description:**

The City proposes to develop a 12,168 square foot multiple tenant retail building on a site purchased by the Rosemount Port Authority in 2006 as part of its redevelopment efforts for historic Downtown Rosemount. The City has a purchase agreement with a developer who has been having difficulty securing tenants in current economic conditions. The City wants to prepare the site for development to provide incentives to move the project forward and better compete with other sites. The site is across the street from the Waterford Commons project, a mixed-use market rate and affordable rental and commercial project that received an LCDA grant in 2007.

## **Funding Request:**

\$270,000 to demolish three buildings on the site, remove the debris and existing blacktop; and replace an existing obsolete clay sewer line with steel sewer line.

## **Future Development Phases, if applicable:**

A second phase is planned to the south of the first building that would contain 13,400 square feet for service commercial uses.

This project is not recommended for funding. The project scored below the funding threshold of 30 points in the Step Two/LCAC scoring.

## **Advisory Committee Comments on This Project:**

The current plan for the site would replace a one-story development with another one-story development set back from the street with surface parking and pervious surface, missing an opportunity to maximize the potential of the site to include a destination zone with development placed on the corner across the street from new downtown development in a transit and pedestrian environment. The advisory committee believes the site has potential to be better integrated with the new Waterford Commons downtown development.

# Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2009

## 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 are expected to be completed or substantially completed by the end of 2010.

Evaluation Criteria	Factors Evaluated	Scoring Considerations
<b>Land Use Criteria:</b>		
<b>Use land efficiently</b> <b>0-8 points</b>	<b>How well the project achieves:</b> 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> <b>0-10 points</b> <b>(hold harmless if no transit access—use average score)</b>	<b>Location to Transit:</b> Within one-half mile of a transitway in the 2030 Transitway system – Hiawatha LRT, I-35W BRT, Cedar Avenue BRT, I-394 HOT Lane, Northstar Commuter Rail, Central LRT; Southwest, Bottineau, I-35 W North, Central Ave/TH65/BSNF, Rush Line, TH 36/NE, I-94 East, Red Rock (develop as LRT/Busway/BRTCommuter Rail); Central Avenue, Snelling Avenue/Ford Parkway, West Broadway, Nicollet Avenue, Chicago Avenue, East 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, Robert Street, West 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, American Boulevard (potential BRT corridors) or within one-half mile of a local bus route, or within one-half mile of a park-and-ride facility on an express commuter or express bus service. <b>0-3 points</b>  <b>How well the project achieves:</b> 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; is consistent with access management guidelines. <b>0-7 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 0 to 1/10<sup>th</sup> mile from closest bus stop on an urban local, suburban local or local tail of express routes, or park and ride; or from any part of a transitway (not a station) – 3 points</li> <li>- .11 to ¼ mile from closest bus stop on an urban local, suburban local or local tail of express routes, or park and ride; or from any part of a transitway (not a station) – 2 points</li> <li>- .26 to ½ mile from closest bus stop on an urban local, suburban local or local tail of express routes, or park and ride; or from any part of a transitway (not a station) – 1 point</li> <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> <b>0-8 points</b>	<b>How well the project achieves:</b> 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; addresses Minnesota Housing goals; uses an accepted green building system.</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 and promote the city's housing goals.</li> <li>- Does the project promote one or more of Minnesota Housing's goals: provide new affordable housing costing no more than 30% of a household's income, housing for emerging markets, housing for homeless persons or preserve existing affordable housing.</li> </ul> <p>Will the project use an accepted green building system – Minnesota Green Communities, Minnesota Greenstar, or another accepted system.</p>
<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; implementation and use of a local NRI/A to plan the project; 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>- Implementation and use of a local Natural Resources Inventory and Assessment to plan the project.</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>
<p><b>Community Role:</b></p>		
<p><b>Processes and tools to ensure successful outcomes - <u>0-8 points</u></b>  <b>- appropriate and effective regulatory tools;</b>  <b>- partnerships;</b>  <b>- community leadership;</b>  <b>- community participation</b></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  
Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2009**

Evaluation Criteria ↓		<b>Development and Land Use Evaluation Categories:</b> Evaluate projects for each evaluation category to arrive at your score for this section.					
<b>Part I:</b> Development and Land Use Evaluation Score:  0-30 points	<b>The extent to which to 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>  <b><u>0-25 points</u></b>  <b>Total _____</b>	1. Use land efficiently by increasing density and/or intensity of land use. <u>0-4 points</u>  4  3  2  1  0	2. Link land uses to transit  <u>0-4 points</u>  4  3  2  1  0	3. Connect housing and centers of employment, education, retail, recreation. <u>0-4 points</u>  4  3  2  1  0	4. Provide a range of housing densities, types and costs.  <u>0-4 points</u>  4  3  2  1  0	5. Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources  <u>0-4 points</u>  4  3  2  1  0	6. Partnerships, tools and processes to implement the project.  <u>Partnerships – 0-2 points</u>  2 1 0  <u>Tools and Processes - 0-3 points</u>  3 2 1 0
	<b>Does the proposal maximize the potential of the project's site and location – <u>1 point</u></b> <b>Or are there significant missed opportunities? – <u>0</u></b>  <b><u>0-5 points</u></b>  <b>Your Total Part I score _____</b>	1. Use land efficiently by increasing density and/or intensity of land use. <u>0 or 1 point</u>  1  0	2. Link land uses to transit  <u>0 or 1 point</u>  1  0	3. Connect housing and centers of employment, education, retail, recreation. <u>0 or 1 point</u>  1  0	4. Provide a range of housing densities, types and costs.  <u>0 or 1 point</u>  1  0	5. Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources  <u>0 or 1 point</u>  1  0	
Note the areas you have identified as innovation or demonstration elements.							

<p><b>Part II: Catalyst</b></p> <p>The extent to which the element for which funding is requested will be a catalyst to implement the project area of which it is a part.</p>	<p>Catalyst Evaluation Score:</p> <p><b>0-10 points</b></p> <p><b>Your Catalyst Score:</b> _____</p>	<p>For proposals requesting multiple funding elements, rank in order (highest to lowest) the catalyst potential of each element or select the element or elements you believe are the catalyst. This will be discussed at the Nov. 4 meeting.</p>
<p><b>Part III: Readiness</b></p> <p>The extent to which the proposed Project is ready and able to use an LCDA grant, if awarded, within the grant term, and complete the Project components the proposer states will be completed by the end of the 2-year grant term.</p>	<p><b>Readiness Evaluation Score:</b></p> <p><b>0-10 points</b></p> <p><b>Your Readiness Score:</b> _____</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p><b>Add Part I, II and III scores for</b></p> <p><b>Total Score:</b> _____</p> <p><b>50 possible points</b></p>		

**Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2009**

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

**Evaluate and answer yes or no to each of the following eight questions for each of the ten LCDA funding applications:**

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 2009?	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? (see application Section III.B-1)	Yes____	No ____
3.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified local sources of funding the applicant has considered to fund the LCDA request? (see application Section III.B-6-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? (see application Section III.B-6-A)	Yes____	No ____
5.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified non-local sources of funding the applicant has pursued to fund the LCDA request? (see application Section III.B-6-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? (see application Section III.B-6-B)	Yes____	No ____
7.	Has the applicant submitted satisfactory documentation (e.g. letters, other documentation) to substantiate unsuccessful efforts to secure non-local funding? (see application Section III.B-6-B)	Yes____	No ____
8.	Does the Livable Communities Advisory Committee accept the applicants' statement that the requested project component(s) would not be built in the market without public subsidy or grant funds?	Yes____	No ____

In the judgment of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, the following funding proposals **demonstrate** that the proposed project is feasible at this time only with an LCDA grant. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

In the judgment of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, the following funding proposals **do not demonstrate** that the proposed project is feasible at this time only with an LCDA grant.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**2009 CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED by  
MEMBERS OF THE LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**2009 Livable Communities Demonstration Account Development Grant  
Applications**

A = Center Cities

B = Developed Communities

C = Developing Communities

	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Conflict Declared By:</b>
A.1	Minneapolis	Capri Block Site Assembly	Doug Snyder
A.2	Minneapolis	Gateway Lofts	Doug Snyder
A.3	St. Paul	Harriet Island Blvd/West Side Flats	
A.4	St. Paul	The Penfield	
A.5	St. Paul	2700 the Avenue	
B.1	Burnsville	Valley Ridge Redevelopment	
B.2	Roseville	Sienna Green	
C.1	Eden Prairie	Presbyterian Homes	Janet Jeremiah
C.2	Rosemount	Genz-Ryan Redevelopment	
C.3	Watertown	South Lewis Ave Redevelopment	



# Livable Communities Demonstration Account (LCDA) 2009 Grant Application Guide

# Table of Contents

<b>Funding Available and LCDA Calendar .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2009 Available Funding: \$4.0 Million .....	3
LCDA 2009 Calendar.....	3
<b>Funding Criteria and Selection Process.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Background and Purpose .....	3
Eligible Applicants.....	4
Eligible Proposals .....	5
Grant Term .....	5
Number of Applications.....	5
Awards for Projects located in Minneapolis and Saint Paul .....	5
Use of Eminent Domain .....	6
Amount of Awards .....	6
Local Resolution .....	6
<b>Eligible and Ineligible Uses of 2009 Funding.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Eligible Uses of Funds .....	7
Ineligible Uses of Funds:.....	8
<b>Application Process .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Competitive Process .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Livable Communities Advisory Committee.....	10
Partnerships and Coordination .....	10
Evaluation Process .....	11
Step One Evaluation Criteria -- 50 possible points .....	11
Step Two Evaluation Criteria – 50 possible points.....	13
Housing Performance Scoring (0-10 points) .....	14
<b>Reporting Requirements.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Download Forms.....</b>	<b>14</b>

## Funding Available and LCDA Calendar

2009 Available Funding: \$4.0 Million

### LCDA 2009 Calendar

Month	Activity
July 8 & July 9	Hold workshops for interested applicants: July 8, 9-11 am, Golden Valley City hall; July 9, 9-11 am, Vadnais Heights City Hall
August 24	Applications due
September 24	Last date local resolution can be submitted
September	Staff conducts technical review of proposals and Step 1 evaluation process
September to November	Livable Communities Advisory Committee conduct Step 2 evaluation and selection process; recommends funding awards
December 7	Funding recommendations presented to Community Development Committee
December 21	Community Development Committee recommends grant awards
January 13	Metropolitan Council awards grants

## Funding Criteria and Selection Process

### Background and Purpose

The Livable Communities Demonstration Account was established by the Livable Communities Act (LCA), Minnesota Statutes section 473.25(b). The Demonstration Account provides funds to support 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.

LCDA funding helps recipient cities implement their community development objectives and comprehensive plans.

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, and
- 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.

Projects meeting these goals and funded through the LCDA program can help reduce travel by eliminating or shortening vehicle trips, or by encouraging some trips by walking, biking or transit. These results are made possible by increasing the number of land uses located within close proximity, particularly jobs and housing, and can have a significant impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Minnesota Climate Change Advisory Group has stated that 24 percent of emissions in the state of Minnesota are transportation-related. One of three primary ways to reduce CO2 emissions due to transportation is less travel, resulting in lower vehicle miles traveled (the other two ways are cleaner cars and cleaner, low-carbon fuel).

The Metropolitan Council encourages LCDA funding proposals that also reduce energy use through siting, building orientation and innovative design of residential and other buildings.

### **Eligible Applicants**

The following are eligible to apply: statutory or home rule charter cities or towns that are participating in the Metropolitan Livable Communities Housing Incentives Program; metropolitan counties and development authorities (e.g., Housing and Redevelopment Authority, Economic Development Authority or Port Authority).

All LCA-participant communities in good standing are eligible to apply for LCA funding. However, applications awarded a grant for Projects located in communities that have not submitted a decennial comprehensive plan that is complete for review will not be allowed to *receive* any funding until the comprehensive plan is determined to be complete by the Council.

## **Eligible Proposals**

All of the following are required to comprise an eligible proposal:

1. The proposal must involve new development, redevelopment or infill development addressing the program goals. Proposals involving rehabilitation are eligible when the Project has other components that address one or more of the program goals.
2. The proposed Project must be located within the Council-identified developed area, developing area or a rural growth center (urbanized area). Regional park land is ineligible.
3. The proposed Project, including grant-funded activities and the Project elements supported by the grant-funded activities, must be completed within the 24-month grant term.
4. The proposed Project must be consistent or will be made consistent with the local comprehensive plan that has been reviewed by the Council and be consistent with any area, neighborhood, corridor or other local plan adopted by the municipality in which the Project is located.
5. If housing is proposed in the application, 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 county development authority) under the Local Housing Incentives program of the Livable Communities Act.

## **Grant Term**

Grants awarded in 2009 will have a 24-month grant term, with an option for a single extension, not to exceed one year. All extensions must be approved by the full Metropolitan Council.

## **Number of Applications**

No more than five applications may be submitted by a single applicant in any application cycle. The limit of five applications includes those submitted by all entities within the city (city, economic development authority, port authority, etc.) and Projects submitted by counties on behalf of cities. Applicants submitting more than one application per cycle (year) must prioritize them according to the applicant's internal priorities prior to submittal.

## **Awards for Projects located in Minneapolis and Saint Paul**

The Livable Communities Advisory Committee (LCAC) may recommend up to 40 percent of the total funds available in a grant cycle for Projects located in Minneapolis and Saint Paul. The 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 Saint 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 Saint 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 scored a minimum of 7 of 10 readiness points, as determined in the LCAC evaluation.

### **Use of Eminent Domain**

No applicant for an LCA grant shall be eligible for LCA grant funds from the Metropolitan Council if the Project for which an LCA grant is requested requires the exercise of eminent domain authority over private property for purposes of economic development as defined by Council policy. The policy is available online at: <http://www.metrocouncil.org/services/livcomm/EminentDomainPolicy.htm>. The policy states that the prohibition regarding the use of eminent domain does not include "acquiring private property to remediate or clean up pollution or contamination that threatens or may threaten public health or safety or the environment, if the Applicant certifies: (i) the property owner is unable or unwilling to pay for appropriate remediation or clean up; (ii) remediation or clean up must occur expeditiously to eliminate or mitigate the threat to public health or safety or the environment; and (iii) no Responsible Party has been identified or is financially capable or carrying out the remediation or clean up." [A]cquiring abandoned property or acquiring "blighted" property as that term "blighted" is defined and used in Minnesota Statutes chapter 469 also is an exception to the eminent domain policy.

### **Amount of Awards**

No minimum or maximum award levels for Projects have been established, with the exception of distribution limits established for cities by statute. The Metropolitan Council reserves the right to award less than the amount requested and to award less than the available funding in the funding cycle.

### **Local Resolution**

A resolution from the applicant city, county or development authority in support of the applications(s) submitted must be submitted no later than 30 days after the application deadline.

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, including reasons and supporting facts.

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.

## **Eligible and Ineligible Uses of 2009 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 1(a), 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 1(a), or to retrofit an existing street with these elements as part of a proposal that meets the funding goals.

(B) Other infrastructure

- Public-use 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, or 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; or 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 of 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. Interior demolition.



11. Housing "affordability gap" and "value gap" financing.
12. Pollution cleanup and related expenses.
13. Applicant's administrative overhead.
14. Project coordination.
15. Activities prior to the date of the grant award.
16. Architect, developer, legal and other fees.
17. Local permits, licenses or authorization fees.
18. Travel expenses.
19. Costs associated with preparing grant proposals.
20. Operating expenses.
21. Prorated lease and salary costs.
22. Marketing costs.
23. Comprehensive plan preparation costs.
24. Costs associated with master plans or redevelopment plans, design workshops, design standards, market studies, zoning and land use implementation tools.

## **Application Process**

1. Applicants are strongly encouraged to attend one of the workshops offered July 8 and July 9, 2009.
2. Submit 20 copies of the application and required attachments by 4:30 PM on August 24, 2009 to:
3. Linda Milashius  
Metropolitan Council Livable Communities  
390 North Robert Street  
Saint 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) (there is no need to include the attachments in the emailed version). Staff will confirm receipt of the application via email. The application is available at the end of this Application Guide.

**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

Linda Milashius  
LCDA Program Support  
[Linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us)  
651.602.1541

## Competitive Process

### **Livable Communities Advisory Committee**

Applications for Livable Communities Demonstration Account development grants are reviewed by the 13-member LCAC, which makes funding recommendations to the Council. The committee includes members representing six areas of expertise to provide the range of skills and experience necessary for evaluating the complex development and redevelopment Projects for which LCDA funding is requested. Areas of expertise (for which there are two members each) are: local government (planning, economic or community development); development finance (one private finance, one public finance); development (one new development, one redevelopment); transportation; environment; and site design. The LCAC chair, not representing a specific expertise area, is the 13<sup>th</sup> member.

### **Partnerships and Coordination**

The criteria and evaluation process are coordinated with state agency policies and initiatives so that funding consideration is given to Projects that include or demonstrate:

- Strategies to provide a continuum of affordable housing (Minnesota Housing);
- Green Communities Criteria for building affordable housing (Minnesota Housing);
- The potential benefit of major state transportation investments (Minnesota Department of Transportation).
- Access management to maintain a safe flow of traffic while accommodating access needs of adjacent development (Minnesota Department of Transportation);
- The Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines to encourage more sustainable building practices (Administration and Commerce Departments);
- The land use goals of Project 2030, an initiative that identifies the impact of the aging of the baby boom generation and supports life-cycle housing (Department of Human Services);
- That the Natural Resources Inventory and Assessment (NRI/A), a region-wide database and series of maps that records information about land and water resources developed by the Department of Natural Resources and the Metropolitan Council, is implemented locally and used to plan proposals implemented locally and used to plan proposals; and

- Implementation of policies and requirements of the Pollution Control Agency for surface water management.

## Evaluation Process

LCDA applications are evaluated in a two-step process. A staff evaluation team will review and score eligible proposals using the Step One evaluation criteria and guidelines. The LCAC conducts Step Two of the evaluation process.

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

Applications must score 20 or more points to advance to the Step Two evaluation process. A staff evaluation team will review and score eligible proposals using the Step One evaluation criteria and guidelines:

#### 1. 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.

- (A) **Use land efficiently** (0 – 8 points)  
How well the Project will achieve development that intensifies land use (adding buildings or other uses) and increases density to a level that maximizes the potential of the location.
- (B) **Develop land uses linked to the local and regional transportation systems** (0 – 10 points)

0 – 3 points: Location within one-half mile of a transitway in the 2030 Transitway System – Hiawatha LRT, I-35W BRT, Cedar Avenue BRT, I-394 HOT Lane, Northstar Commuter Rail, Central LRT; Southwest, Bottineau, I-35 W North, Central Ave/TH65/BSNF, Rush Line, TH 36/NE, I-94 East, Red Rock (develop as LRT/Busway/BRTCommuter Rail); Central Avenue, Snelling Avenue/Ford Parkway, West Broadway, Nicollet Avenue, Chicago Avenue, East 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Robert Street, West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, American Boulevard (potential BRT corridors); or within one-half mile of a local bus route; or within one-half mile of a park-and-ride facility on an express commuter bus or express bus route.

0 – 7 points: How well the Project will achieve development that is designed in relationship to transit and transportation: by 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); implements access management policies.

**2. Connect housing and centers of employment, education, retail, recreation uses (0 – 8 points)**

How well the Project will achieve development that provides a diverse variety of uses (within the Project area or when added to adjacent land uses) with improved jobs-housing balance and access to a variety of destinations in a connected development pattern, both within the Project area and to adjacent neighborhoods.

**3. Develop a range of housing densities, types and costs (0 – 8 points)**

How well the Project will achieve development that:

- provides life-cycle housing that includes a wide variety of housing types and prices or rents, by 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; helps achieve the city’s affordable housing goals;
- uses Green Communities criteria, Minnesota GreenStar or other accepted green building system; and
- addresses one or more of Minnesota Housing’s goals.

**4. Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources through development that is sensitive to the environment (0 – 8 points)**

How well the Project will achieve development that optimally integrates natural resources, including best management practices that incorporate water resource management into Project design to maximize development potential; implementation and use of a local Natural Resources Inventory and Assessment (NRI/A) to plan the Project; and employs natural resources, where feasible and appropriate, as community connections, assets and amenities.

**5. Tools and Processes (0-8 points)**

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. 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; a meaningful local role to ensure that the Project meets community needs and goals; and local vision and leadership.

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

The LCAC will score proposals according to the evaluation and selection criteria in Step Two. **To be considered for funding, proposals must score 30 or more points of a possible 50 points in the Step Two evaluation**, or be supported by a majority of the advisory committee members voting.

Housing incentive points as described below in “housing performance scoring” will be applied separately.

### **1. Innovation and Demonstration (0-30 points)**

The extent to which the Project demonstrates innovative elements and demonstrates or shows potential to demonstrate new development concepts or elements in one or more of the scoring areas, for the community in which it is located and for the region.

Scoring is based on the extent to which the proposal:

- uses land efficiently to maximize the potential of the Project location;
- links land uses to transportation and transit where available; maximizes major state transportation investments;
- connects housing and centers of employment, education, retail, civic uses and recreation;
- provides a range of housing densities, types and costs;
- conserves, protects and enhances natural resources through development that is sensitive to the environment and incorporates the Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines;
- other innovation not covered in the above categories;
- utilizes tools and processes to develop and implement the Project, including consistency with area, neighborhood, corridor or other plans adopted by the municipality;
- Represents a model, in whole or in part, for the community it is located in and for the region.

### **2. How LCDA Funding is a Catalyst (0-10 points)**

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

### **3. Readiness Assessment (0-10 points)**

**The extent to which the proposed Project is ready** and able to use an LCDA grant, if awarded, within the grant term.

The readiness assessment includes:

- (A) **The status of implementation tools** – e.g., zoning codes and other official controls, design standards, or development standards.
- (B) **The status of funding commitments to ensure construction starts for funded element(s) or further progress within a year from the date of the grant award** (January 2010), and other indicators of readiness.
- (C) **Whether grant funds have been expended for or progress has been made on a prior LCDA development or opportunity grant for the same Project or a related Project.**

### **Housing Performance Scoring (0-10 points)**

Following evaluation and scoring of proposals, up to ten additional housing incentives points will be assigned to each applicant's score 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 if affordable housing is located within the Project site/area. Affordable ownership housing is that which is affordable to households at 80 percent of area median income, and affordable rental housing is that which is affordable at 50 percent of area median income.

### **Reporting Requirements**

LCDA grantees are required to make periodic progress reports. Detail supplied with payment requests comprises the bulk of these progress reports, which are augmented with semi-annual reports. A final progress report is required with the last payment request. When the grant is closed, the grantee's chief financial officer is required to certify to the appropriate expenditure of funds.

### **Download Forms**

[Download the 2009 LCDA Application form \(MS Word\)](#). The application form includes the resolution of support, the eminent domain certification form, and sample "sources and uses" pages.

# **LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT** **2009 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 the application completely. If a question does not apply, place "NA" in the appropriate box. Do not leave questions blank.
2. Use only black font size 11 for responses.
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. The 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. The application should not exceed 20 pages, unless additional space is needed for complete financial information (Sources and Uses pages). 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 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 Monday, August 24, 2009, to:  
Linda Milashius,  
Metropolitan Council Livable Communities  
390 Robert Street N.  
Saint Paul, MN 55101
9. Submit an electronic copy of the application form (attachments not required) by 4:30 p.m. on August 24, 2009 to [Linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Linda.milashius@metc.state.mn.us)

### **IMPORTANT NOTE ON THE GRANT TERM:**

**Should you be awarded an LCDA grant, the grant term is 24 months. Therefore, the application asks you to include information in most of your answers *only* for the components of your project that will be completed within 24 months of the grant award date (January 2010). Beginning with LCDA grants awarded for the 2009 grant cycle, a one-year extension beyond the 24-month grant term is possible, with Metropolitan Council approval, but it will not be granted administratively as in the past.**

# LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DEMONSTRATION ACCOUNT 2009 GRANT 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>Contact for Application:</b> Name and Title: Address: City, Zip Code: 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.A. The Project.** The Project includes activities you are proposing to fund with an LCDA grant *and must also include* project components (residential or commercial buildings, etc.) supported by the funded activities that will be completed within the 24-month grant term (grant term begins at January 2010 grant award date). *Applications that do not include development components that will be completed within the 24 month grant term, in addition to the items(s) proposed to be funded with an LCDA grant, are ineligible.*

**What are you proposing to fund with an LCDA grant?** (e.g. street, land acquisition, public-use structured parking, stormwater activities, etc.). If you are requesting more than one item, list them all *briefly* (add detail in Sec. I.B, page 2).

**Total funding requested: \$**\_\_\_\_\_

### Describe the Project.

The Project includes the activities you propose to fund with an LCDA grant *and* the development components supported by the grant, that will be completed within the 24-month grant term (grant term begins at January 2010 grant award date). You will be asked to include more detail on the development components of the Project in Sections I.E. through I.I. Include data and information about *future* project phases (if applicable) beyond the 24-month grant term in Section I.C. *(Limit 20 lines)*



## I. B. Funding Request and Timeline

List project elements for which you are requesting 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.** (*Limit one page, landscape layout*)

Priority	Project Element	Task/Eligible Use	Itemized \$ Request	Start Date	End Date
<b>EXAMPLE: Delete this shaded EXAMPLE when you complete your application</b>					
1.	Stormwater pond construction	Excavation and structural reinforcement	\$612,325	3/1/2010	11/15/2010
2.	Demolition of obsolete infrastructure	Demolish jersey barriers, concrete and railroad tie structures on 36 <sup>th</sup> St. from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 70,000	3/1/2010	11/15/2010
3.	Permanent public pedestrian improvements	Construct sidewalks on both sides of 36 <sup>th</sup> street from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 478,059	5/15/2010	11/15/2010
4.	Permanent public pedestrian improvements	Street lighting, benches, permanent bike racks along 36 <sup>th</sup> St. from Austin to Davis Streets.	\$ 344,800	5/15/2010	11/15/2010

**NOTE: Before completing this section, consult Section 3, “Eligible and Ineligible Uses of 2009 Funding” in the 2009 LCDA funding criteria**

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.C. Future Development Phases, if applicable**

Describe future development or phases that will be undertaken beyond 24 months from the date of the grant award (Jan. 2010). 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 24 months, write NONE. *(Limit 20 lines)*

**I.D. Adjacent Development, completed prior to this development or in earlier project development phases**

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, “the Project.” *(Limit 20 lines)*

**BEFORE COMPLETING THE REST OF THIS SECTION, NOTE THE FOLLOWING:**

Include information in Section I.E. through I. I. *only* for **the Project** described on page 1, which includes the project components and supporting LCDA-grant-funded activities that will be **completed within the 24-month grant term** (grant term begins in January 2010).

**I.E. Proposed Land Use Changes**

Yes	No	Mark (X) appropriate box	
		Will buildings be demolished? If yes, indicate the number of and type of buildings below:	
		Will new buildings be constructed? If yes, list the percent mix of commercial, residential, public or other uses:	
		Commercial	Public uses
		Residential	Parks / green space
		Other uses - list	

**I.F. Project Mix and Type of Uses**

List the number and types of existing or planned uses for the Project.

Type of Use	Number of Existing Uses	Square Footage or Acreage	Number of Planned Uses	Square Footage or Acreage	Mark (X) to identify whether planned uses are new construction, rehabilitation or adaptive reuse	
					New	Rehabilitation or Adaptive Reuse
Residential						
Commercial						
Retail						
Restaurant						
Office						
Government/ Civic						
Arts/Cultural						
Entertainment						
Open Space/ Public Space						
Other (list)						

### I.G. 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.H. 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.I. Pedestrian Infrastructure

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

## Section II. Information for Evaluating Your Project on the Step One Criteria and Step Two Criteria, Parts 1 and 2.

Include information in Section II *only* for the Project, described in Section I.A, page 1. Do not include data and information for any activity or phase(s) that will not be completed within the 24-month grant term (grant term begins at January 2010 award date).

II.A. Land Use Criteria		
II.A.1 Use Land Efficiently		
II.A.1-A	Describe how the proposal will use land more efficiently or increase the intensity of land use on the project site, and whether and how it will maximize the potential of the project location. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>	
II.A.1-B	Current overall housing density (net units per acre)	Planned overall housing density (net units per acre)
II.A.2 Develop land uses linked to the local and regional transportation system.		
II.A.2-A		Is the projected located:
Yes	No	
		<p>Within one-half mile of a transitway in the 2030 Transitway System – Hiawatha LRT, I-35W BRT, Cedar Avenue BRT, I-394 HOT Lane, Northstar Commuter Rail, Central LRT; Southwest, Bottineau, I-35 W North, Central Ave/TH65/BSNF, Rush Line, TH 36/NE, I-94 East, Red Rock (develop as LRT/ Bus way / BRT Commuter Rail); Central Avenue, Snelling Avenue/Ford Parkway, West Broadway, Nicollet Avenue, Chicago Avenue, East 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Robert Street, West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, American Boulevard (potential BRT corridors).</p> <p><b>If yes, state corridor:</b></p>
		Within one-half mile of a local bus route? If yes, state the route name(s)/number(s):
		Within one-half mile of a park-and-ride facility on an express commuter bus or express bus route? If yes, state the route name(s)/number(s):

<b>II.A.2-B</b>	Relationship to major Minnesota state transportation investments: Describe how the funding proposal will connect to or enhance major state transportation investments, if applicable, e.g. new interchanges, ramps or major road improvements.
<b>II.A.2-C</b>	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. <i>(Limit 15 lines)</i>
<b>II.A.2-D</b>	Describe how, as applicable, existing and/or new street patterns, sidewalks, trails, paths provide pedestrian access to transit. Describe how residents will have access to transit, if applicable
<b>II.A.2-E</b>	Identify bus routes that serve the Project. Indicate whether they are express or regular route.
<b>II.A.2-F</b>	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):
<b>II.A.2-G</b>	Is the proposal consistent with access management guidelines?
	Yes – explain how:
	No – explain:
	NA – explain:

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

<b>II.A.3-A</b>	Mark (x) the types of uses in the proposed Project and within ¼ mile of the Project.		
	<b>Type of Use</b>	<b>Within the proposed project</b>	<b>¼ mile of the project</b>
	Office		
	Retail		
	Services (list type):		
	Restaurant		
	Entertainment		
	Government/civic		
	Education		
	Arts/cultural		
	Open space		
	Public space		
	Residential		

<b>II.A.3-B</b>	Describe how the Project will increase or improve connections between jobs and housing. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>II.A.3-C</b>	<b>Employment Proximity and Access</b>	
Estimate how many jobs are within ¼ mile of the Project area:		
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 of the Project area:		
How are these jobs reached by bus or car? (describe bus routes, streets, highways and/or freeways traveled)		

<b>II.A.3-D</b>	Describe how land uses within the Project are arranged or designed to optimize connectivity and access within the Project area. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>II.A.3-E</b>	Describe how land uses within the Project are arranged or designed to connect to adjacent neighborhoods. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

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

**II.A.4-A** Housing Affordability: List estimated affordability levels for existing and planned housing in the Project in the table below: (Area median income: \$83,900)

	<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>
<b>Existing housing</b>				
Owner:				
Rental:				
<b>Planned housing</b>				
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>
		Land trust
		Resale price indexing
		Other (describe):



<b>II.A.4-B</b>	Describe the mix of housing options that will result when the proposed housing (if applicable) within the Project is added to the housing in adjacent neighborhoods. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>II.A.4-C</b>	Describe how the proposed housing in the Project, if applicable, will diversify housing choices city-wide. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>II.A.4-D</b>	Check if the Project includes housing that addresses the following strategies of Minnesota Housing. Mark (X) appropriate box
	New affordable housing (housing that costs no more than 30% of a households' monthly income)
	Emerging market homeownership
	Preservation of existing affordable housing
	Housing for the homeless

<b>II.A.4-E</b>	Check if the any of the following green building systems have been or will be used to build housing in the Project. Mark (X) appropriate box
	Minnesota Green Communities
	Minnesota GreenStar
	Other – specify:

<b>II.A.5. Conserve, protect and enhance natural resources.</b>				
<b>II.A.5-A</b>	What types of <b>conventional stormwater management</b> techniques for rate and/or volume control and pollutant removal are employed within the project? Mark (X) all that apply			
	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>II.A.5-B</b>	What type(s) of <b>innovative and low impact development (LID)</b> 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.			
	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:			
<b>II.A.5-C</b>	Natural resources inventory and assessment (NRI/A)			
Has the municipality in which the project will be located prepared a local NRI/A in coordination with the regional NRI/A?		Yes		No
If yes, was the local NRI/A used to plan this project?				
If yes, how has the local NRI/A benefited preservation or integration of natural resources in the project?				

<b>II.A.5-D</b>	Describe the ways in which the project: Mark (X) all that apply
	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:

<b>II.A.5-E</b>	Does the Project’s design implement the Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines? Mark (X) appropriate box
	Yes – explain how:
	No – explain:
	Inapplicable – explain:

<b>II.A.6. Other Innovation</b>	
<b>II.A.6-A</b>	Has the project evolved beyond its initial concept in any of the following ways? Mark as many boxes below that apply.
	The project changed in response to public involvement. If yes, how did it change?
	Local regulations were modified or created to allow project innovation. If yes, describe how:
	Collaborations with other regulatory levels resulted in “breaking rules” or creating new rules. If yes, describe how.

<b>II.A.6-B</b>	In what ways does the Project go beyond standard sustainable design practices? Give specific examples or details. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>II.A.6-C</b>	Describe ways the Project and its future phases (if applicable) will be innovative and replicable in the region, other than those described elsewhere in this application. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

**II.A.7. Tools and Processes to Ensure Successful Outcomes**

<b>II.A.7-A</b>	<b>City review/regulatory process:</b> Describe city review or regulatory processes or procedures used or developed for this project, such as zoning codes, form-based codes, design or development standards. <i>(Limit 6 lines)</i>

<b>II.A.7-B</b>	Is the project within the boundaries of or subject to an area, neighborhood, corridor or other similar plan adopted by the municipality in which it is located? Mark (X) appropriate box	
Yes	No	If yes, state type and name of plan
		If yes, describe how the project implements the plan

<b>II.A.7-C</b>	<b>Planning, Implementation and Funding Partnerships:</b> List and briefly describe the type and nature of partnerships in the project among government, private, for-profit and non-profit sectors.	
	<b>Name of Partner(s)</b>	<b>Type of Partnership or Role of Partner</b>

<b>II.A.7-D</b>	<b>Community's role:</b> Describe any public participation processes involving residents, business representatives and others used to develop the Project, and plans for future community involvement in project implementation. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>II.A.7-E</b>	<b>City's role:</b> How have elected officials, city council initiatives or actions supported the project? <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>II.B. How LCDA Funding will be a Catalyst</b>	
Describe how LCDA funding will be a catalyst to implement the project. <i>(Limit 20 lines)</i>	

**Section III. Readiness. This information will be used to evaluate the Readiness of the Project (Step Two, 3A and 3B)**

(Begin new page)

III.A. The Status of Implementation Tools			
<b>III.A-1</b>	<b>Regulatory Status:</b> 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.		
<b>Will be Needed</b>	<b>Underway</b>	<b>City has Adopted</b>	
			<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:
<b>III.A-2</b> Status of design or development standards			
<b>Will be Needed</b>	<b>Underway</b>	<b>City has Adopted</b>	
			<b>Design standards.</b> Briefly describe:
			<b>Development standards.</b> Briefly describe:
<b>III.A-3a</b> Market and Feasibility Studies: Indicate the status of market and feasibility studies			
<b>Will be Needed</b>	<b>Underway</b>	<b>City has Completed</b>	
			<b>Market studies</b>
			<b>Feasibility studies</b>
			If completed, briefly state the conclusions of the studies: <i>(Limit 4 lines)</i>
<b>III.A-3b</b> Other Status and Commitments			
Yes	No		
		a.	Is the development site as represented currently within a designated development district, or an approved development (e.g. PUD)?
		b.	Does the applicant control the site, or sites represented in the proposal? If no – are steps being taken to gain control? Explain.

<b>III.A-3c</b>	<b>Availability of Market Studies</b>	
Yes	No	
		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)?

<b>III.A-3d</b>	<b>Developer Status</b>	
Yes	No	
		Has a developer been selected for the proposal? If no, explain status or next steps for selecting a developer and skip to question III.A-3g.

<b>III.A-3e</b>	<b>Developer information</b>	
<b>Name of Developer(s)</b>		<b>Type of contract or commitment</b>

<b>III.A-3f</b>	<b>Site Status</b>	
Yes	No	
		Is the developer acquiring the development site from the city?
		If yes, is the site being sold at fair-market value?

<b>III.A-3g</b>	<b>Site Plan</b>	
Yes	No	
		Is site plan final? If not final, describe status: <i>(Limit 4 lines)</i>

<b>III.A-3h</b>	<b>Architect/Engineer Status</b>	
Yes	No	
		Has an architect/engineer been selected for the project?

<b>III.A-3i</b>	<b>Commercial:</b> If commercial is proposed in the Project, provide as much specificity as possible regarding the type of tenants and projected rents.	
<b>Type of Tenant</b>		<b>Projected Rents</b>

### III.B. Financial Information and Status of Funding Commitments

<b>III.B-1</b>	<b>Available Resources Assessment:</b> State why the Project element(s) will not occur within 24 months after the grant award date (January 2010) unless LCDA funding is made available for this Project at this time. <i>(Limit 15 lines)</i>

<b>III.B-2</b>	<b>Cost Estimates:</b> 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):

<b>III.B-3</b>			<b>Local Tax Impact of the Project</b>
	Yes	No	
			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?
			Has the applicant completed a TIF analysis of the project?
			If so, what is the project increment?
			To what is the increment pledged?



**III.B-4. Sources and Uses – For Requested Elements(s) – As described in Sec. I.B, page 2.**

See the “Sample Sources and Uses page” at the end of this application form.

Fill out the following cells completely, ensuring that the numbers properly total. Incomplete Sources and Uses data 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.

<b>Sources</b>	<b>\$ Amount</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Approval Anticipated by: (date)</b>
<b>Total</b>			

<b>Uses - Hard Costs:</b>	<b>\$ Amount</b>	<b>\$ Portion from LCDA Source</b>	<b>\$ Other Public Sources</b>	<b>\$ Other Private Sources</b>
<b>Total Hard Costs</b>				

<b>Eligible Soft Costs (refer to “Eligible Uses of Funds” in the LCDA Criteria)</b>	<b>\$ Amount</b>	<b>\$ Portion from LCDA Source</b>	<b>\$ Other Public Sources</b>	<b>\$ Other Private Sources</b>
<b>Total Eligible Soft Costs</b>				
<b>Overall Total</b>				

**III.B-5. Sources and Uses -- For the Project -- as described in Sec. I., page 1, including Requested Element(s) described in Sources and Uses on the previous page (Item III.B-4.)**

See the “Sample Sources and Uses page” at the end of this application form.

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: (date)
Total			

Uses - Hard Costs:	\$ Amount	\$ Portion from LCDA Source	\$ Other Public Sources	\$ Other Private Sources
<b>Total Hard Costs</b>				

Eligible Soft Costs (refer to “Eligible Uses of Funds” in the LCDA Criteria)	\$ Amount	\$ Portion from LCDA Source	\$ Other Public Sources	\$ Other Private Sources
<b>Total Eligible Soft Costs</b>				
<b>Overall Total</b>				

<b>III.B-6. Other Resource Documentation. Identify other sources the applicant has considered but will not use to fund this LCDA request.</b>	
<b>III.B-6-A</b>	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, and/or other local sources. Identify why these sources cannot be used within the next two years to fund the requested project component. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>III.B-6-B</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. <i>(Limit 10 lines)</i>

<b>III.B-6-C</b>	<b>Other Funding Requests</b>	
Yes	No	
		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):

## 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 map, with Project site boundaries marked – see *Note* below
2. Vicinity map, with Project site boundaries marked – see *Note* below.

*Note:* To prepare the aerial map (1.) and vicinity map (2.), use the **LCA Make-A-Map** site that offers GIS functionality within a standard web browser. To use Make-A-Map, start at <http://gis.metc.state.mn.us/LCA>. The site walks you through the steps to create your maps. For assistance with questions, contact Jessica Deegan of the Metropolitan Council's GIS staff at 651.602.1718 or [maps@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:maps@metc.state.mn.us).

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 or no later than September 24, 2009..***

# 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: \_\_\_\_\_

**2009 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 2009 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 \_\_\_\_\_, 2009; 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:

(List 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 \_\_\_\_\_, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk



**2009 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 2009 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 \_\_\_\_\_, 2009;

**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 Requested
------------------	--------------	------------------------

---

- (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:

(List 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 \_\_\_\_\_, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk

## SAMPLE

### III B.4. Sources and Uses – For Requested Elements(s) –

Sources	\$ Amount	Status	Approval Anticipated by:
CDBG	800,000	Decision pending	December 2009
TIF	900,000	Committed	
Assessments	150,000	Funded	
Private contribution	500,000	Committed	
Developer equity	500,000	Committed	
LCDA Grant	1,500,000	Pending	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$4,350,000</b>		

Uses	\$ Amount	\$ Portion from LCDA Source	\$ Other Public Sources	\$ Other Private Sources
<b>Hard Costs:</b>				
<b>Site assembly:</b>				
Land acquisition	1,000,000	1,000,000		
<b>Public Infrastructure:</b>				
New street construction	2,000,000		1,500,000	500,000
Street lighting and signs	350,000		350,000	
Storm water management improvements	500,000	500,000		
<b>Total Hard Costs:</b>	<b>\$3,850,000</b>			
<b>Soft Costs:</b> refer to "Eligible Uses of Funds" in the LCDA criteria)				
Design costs	500,000			500,000
<b>Total Soft Costs:</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>			
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,350,000</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>	<b>\$1,850,000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>

## SAMPLE

Include these costs if applicable to your project, and others, as applicable.

### III B.5. Sources and Uses for the Project – As described in Section I., page 1, including the activities you propose to fund with an LCDA grant that you included in Sources and Uses, III B.4.

Sources	\$ Amount	Status	Approval Anticipated by:
County	2,000,000	Committed	
MHFA	2,000,000	Applied 3-09	October 2009
HOME	1,000,000	Committed	
CDBG	800,000	Decision pending	December 2009
County HRA	500,000	Applied 2-09	October 2009
TIF	900,000	Committed	
Assessments	150,000	Funded	
Private contribution	2,000,000	Committed	
Developer equity	500,000	Committed	
Sales Proceeds	20,000,000	Collected as units close	
LCDA Grant	1,500,000	Pending	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$31,350,000</b>		

Uses	\$ Amount	\$ Portion from LCDA Source	\$ Other Public Sources	\$ Other Private Sources
<b>Hard Costs:</b>				
Land acquisition	1,000,000	1,000,000		
Demolition	800,000		\$800,000	
Building construction	20,000,000			\$20,000,000
Stormwater improvements	500,000	500,000		
Street construction	2,000,000		1,500,000	500,000
Street lighting and signs	350,000		350,000	
Public parking structure	2,000,000		2,000,000	
<b>Total Hard Costs:</b>	<b>\$26,650,000</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>	<b>\$4,650,000</b>	<b>\$20,500,000</b>
<b>Soft Costs:</b> refer to "Eligible Uses of Funds" in the LCDA criteria				
Developer's fee	500,000			500,000
Design costs	500,000			500,000
Engineering costs	800,000		800,000	
Legal	500,000			500,000
Financing Fees	200,000		200,000	
Marketing	1,000,000			1,000,000
Project administration	500,000		500,000	
Appraisal	200,000		200,000	
Inspection fees	500,000		500,000	
<b>Total Soft Costs:</b>	<b>\$4,700,000</b>		<b>\$2,200,000</b>	<b>\$2,500,000</b>
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>\$31,350,000</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>	<b>\$6,850,000</b>	<b>\$23,000,000</b>

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

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
September 16, 2009

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ruth Grendahl, Jim Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Donald Jensen, Janet Jeremiah, Ken Johnson, Peggy Lucas, Dan Marckel, Lance Neckar, Doug Snyder, Blair Tremere, Charleen Zimmer

**Absent:** Glen Hardin

**Others Present:** Staff: Guy Peterson, Beth Reetz, Paul Burns, Joanne Barron, Linda Milashius, Deb Jensen, Jan Bourgoin

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ruth Grendahl at 10:10 a.m.

**Approval of Agenda**

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 welcomed Ken Johnson, a new member to the Advisory Committee. Grendahl noted that three committee members were reappointed this year - Jim Barton, Gina Bonsignore, and Don Jensen. Members introduced themselves, noting their background and experience they bring to the committee's work. Staff introduced themselves.

Chair Grendahl explained 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 that the Council has the option to change the committee's recommendations when it awards grant funds. The Council has generally awarded funds as the advisory committee has recommended.

**2009 LCDA Program Changes**

Guy Peterson, Community Development Division Director, explained the circumstances resulting in \$4 million being available for LCDA grants this year, a much smaller amount than in recent years. The Metropolitan Council asked the legislature for authority to transfer up to 50 percent of the LCDA and Tax Base Revitalization Account (TBRA) monies to help fill a gap in the 2009 regional transit operating budget. The Legislature granted this authority for 2009, 2010, and 2011. Peterson also explained that additional administrative cost saving measures were taken across the full Council, such as trading federal stimulus dollars to be used for some costs.

Peterson said the Council's hope is that the LCDA levy dollars for 2010 will not have to be used for the transit operating deficit, and that full funding will be restored for 2010. The Council pledged to the legislature that there would be no increase to fares, or decrease in transit service.

Peterson reported that there are an unprecedented number of LCA grants not moving forward. He said that \$21 million in grant dollars have not been used, and 40 grants are facing expiration this year having had no draws on their grants. This number includes LCDA, TBRA and Local Housing Incentives Account (LHIA) grants. This year, the Council has pushed to make sure the LCDA grant dollars get used within the two-year grant term. Previous policy allowed for 2-year grant terms with a 1-year administrative extension and an opportunity for grantees to request additional extensions from the Community Development Committee (CDC) and Council. Beginning with the 2009 grant cycle, all grants will be awarded for a 2-year grant term with the opportunity to receive a 1-year extension, but no extensions beyond that. The CDC and full Council will need to approve all requests. The Council wants to make sure the dollars are used within the 2-year grant term, or returned to be re-granted to other applicants.

There was discussion regarding the current market and the status of the grants. Chair Grendahl noted that with fewer requests this year, there is actually a higher percentage of funding available per grant and that the readiness factor will be a bigger issue this year. Jim Barton expressed the hope is that this process will continue putting funds back into the grant pool. Dan Marckel asked whether the Council would consider greater support for transit in granting the funds. Peterson said the LCDA criteria were changed last year to provide greater emphasis on proximity to transit accessibility while ensuring equitable ratings for requests outside the transit service areas.

Paul Burns elaborated that the 1-year extension is no longer an administrative process; the request needs CDC and Council approval. Burns also highlighted the greater emphasis on the readiness issue. There is a requirement that a portion of the project be completed within the grant term, not just the grant-funded activities. He explained that the grant application had been modified this year to make this clearer to the applicants. Future phases can be noted in the application, but applicants need to be realistic about what they can actually accomplish in the two years so the committee's evaluation for readiness can be realistic.

Joanne Barron explained that there are only a few changes to the LCDA program criteria and process this year, mostly related to the readiness issue and the requirement for project elements to be completed within the 2-year grant term. The first change is that applications are ineligible if they do not have a project element or phase that will be completed within the 2-year grant term, in addition to the grant-funded activities. Four applications received this year were ineligible for this reason. She emphasized that some portion of the project needs to be completed within the two-year grant period, and that portion needs to be clearly defined in the project summary. Second, more weight in the scoring system is placed on readiness. Last year the readiness assessment was a separate step, a yes-no evaluation. This year readiness will be evaluated on a scale of 0-10, and it will be a part of the scoring process, not a separate step done following the scoring. Lastly, Barron said the application has been streamlined and shortened by three pages. One question has been added, requested by Markel and Doug Snyder, asking applicants to state how the project goes beyond standard sustainable design.

There was some discussion about whether it made sense, given the grant expectations, that land acquisition is an eligible use of funds. Acquiring property is more difficult to qualify for funds because an acquisition project itself can take 2- 3 years. If the acquisition is needed to get the project going, there also needs to be the commitment to do the next piece of the project within two years.

Deb Jensen said that the project summaries become the performance criteria for the grant contract. Discussion followed about the need to ensure that the project summaries accurately portray the project elements are expected to be completed within the 2-year grant term. Committee members asked if the project summaries were rewritten in the past, and who did that. Barron said she has rewritten the project descriptions only to address length and general editing, and added that more attention to the rewrites is required due to the new grant expectations this year. She also indicated that the packet sent to the Council includes LCAC comments highlighting the important elements of the project identified by the LCAC. Bonsignore asked if committee comments have been included in the project summaries. Barron said they have not been. Jensen added that the comments are incorporated by reference into the grant agreement. These comments could be incorporated into the project summary.

Lance Neckar pointed out that applicant's presentations for the Q&A could be sharpened if they were asked if the project can really be achieved within the two year period. Applicants need to look at their timeframe and determine what can possibly be achieved in the two year grant term.

### **Overview of 2009 LCDA Proposals**

Barron said that 10 eligible applications were received this year, requesting a total of \$5.9 million. An additional 4 applications were received but did not meet the eligibility requirement to have a development component completed within the 2-year grant term. Due to the legislative delay this year, applications were not due until August 24 and there was no pre-application review. As a result of the delayed calendar, the Step One evaluation process conducted by staff is still in process. Applications need to score at least 20 points out of a maximum of 50 in the Step One process to advance to the Committee evaluation process. We will know the results of the Step One evaluation before the next Committee meeting on September 29<sup>th</sup>. She explained that in the case of several applications, geographically-related projects were awarded LCDA grants in recent years, and one project was funded in 2008. This information will be summarized in a table for the Committee's reference.

Barron gave a brief explanation of the summary table that includes project summaries and the itemized funding request for each project. She noted that questionable/ineligible items were marked, and that more information to determine the status of these would be gathered during the evaluation process and through follow-up questions asked of applicants.

### **Committee Evaluation Process**

Grendahl suggested that all 10 applicants be invited for a question-and-answer session with the Committee, and that the committee not do an initial scoring of the projects. The next meeting will focus on questions regarding the projects.

Marckel and Council staff will work together to prepare a Google Earth presentation of the applications received this year, showing the project boundaries, site plans, and locations of geographically-related LCDA projects from recent years. Neckar suggested using "Bing" for low

altitude aerial photography. Blair Tremere requested electronic or CD copies to be used for future reference when reviewing the projects.

Grendahl asked that committee members read all of the applications before the September 29<sup>th</sup> meeting. Barron requested that members think about questions to ask applicants at the Q&A. Questions will be sent to the applicants prior to the Q&A meeting. She also indicated staff will prepare a form to help committee members track questions while reviewing applications.

Gina Bonsignore asked if there was additional information that could be extrapolated from past experiences with various projects that will help evaluate readiness, point toward red flags, or any other issues that come up from past grant experiences. Jim Barton asked for questions to use when looking at readiness, based on experience of reviewing these grants over the years – what are the common threads causing the delays.

Blair Tremere expressed a request for feedback on the Committee's grant decisions – what worked, what didn't, why didn't the project make it, was the money spent, were committee's assumptions correct. Any lessons learned would be very helpful – what type of projects made it, which didn't. Grendahl said that the Committee would like to know that it did its job.

Staff was asked to develop some information for the Committee to use in evaluating project readiness, for the Committee's review at the next meeting. Burns indicated that although project success has been on a project by project basis, staff does have a list of questions used for extension requests and that could be used as a starting place. Staff will prepare something for review at the next meeting.

Neckar said it would be helpful to have a sense of how public/federal processes of lending work. Chair Grendahl explained that the Minnesota Housing funding decisions aren't available until the end of the LCAC evaluation. Bonsignore indicated the tax credit program is the same as last year. Janet Jeremiah suggested asking applicants when they expect to get their funding.

### **Conflict of Interest**

Grendahl discussed the conflict of interest procedures, stating that members may not participate in discussion of projects for which they have declared conflicts, and should step away from the table during such discussions. Barron said that the LCAC committee bylaws call for conflicts of interest to be declared orally and in writing. A conflict of interest form was handed out today. Each member will need to check which projects, if any, for which they have conflict(s), sign, date and return to staff. Barron stated that members will be asked to orally declare any conflicts at future committee meetings.

### **Committee Calendar**

Chair Grendahl briefly discussed the committee calendar and length of meetings. She suggested that the meetings probably do not need to be as long as scheduled.

### **Other Business**

At Chair Grendahl's suggestion, the Committee agreed that Dan Marckel will continue to serve as the Committee's vice-chair. Grendahl complimented Dan on the good job he has done in the past.



Grendahl stated that the Committee's meetings are public meetings and that all communication from applicants, or others on behalf of the applicants, should go through staff. She requested that if members receive materials from applicants, they should forward the materials to staff.

Neckar requested that the committee help keep each other informed on the alignment of HUD, DOT and EPA in the new Sustainable Communities Partnership. He suggested we may want to keep this in mind for future grant criteria. Beth Reetz announced that DOT is sponsoring a webinar on Thursday, September 24, on the Sustainable Communities Partnership.

The next LCAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 29, 2008, 9:00 am – noon, Metropolitan Council, Room LLA.

### **Adjourn**

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**  
**(CORRECTED)**

September 29, 2009

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ruth Grendahl, James Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Don Jensen, Janet Jeremiah, Ken Johnson, Dan Marckel, Lance Neckar, Doug Snyder, Blair Tremere, Charleen Zimmer

**Absent:** Glen Hardin, Peggy Lucas

**Others Present:** Staff: Joanne Barron, Beth Reetz, Paul Burns, Deb Jensen, Paul Hanson, Linda Milashius, Jan Bourgoin

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ruth Grendahl at 9:05 a.m.

**Approve Agenda**

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

**Approve Summary Notes of September 29, 2009 Meeting**

Chair Grendahl asked for approval of the summary notes. Hearing no comment, she declared the minutes were approved as written.

**Staff Report**

Joanne Barron gave a brief summary of the DOT-HUD-EPA Sustainable Communities Partnership webinar held on September 25.

Barron reviewed a list of questions, distributed today, "Evaluating Readiness of LCDA Funding Proposals." Staff prepared the list to respond to the committee's discussion at the Sept 16 meeting on the heightened importance this year of assessing whether proposed projects will be able to complete, within the two-year grant term, the grant-funded activities and the project components the applicant has stated it will complete within the grant term. The list can be used by committee members as a worksheet to determine their individual scores on the 0-10 readiness scale in the project scoring. The committee briefly discussed the lists of readiness questions. Blair Tremere said he liked this approach and suggested it could be revised.

Staff distributed two other summaries in response to discussion and requests at the Sept 16 meeting: a table titled “LCDA Demonstration Account Awards, 2004-2008,” showing the grant status for each, and a packet of “Twin Cities Demonstration Account Projects,” prepared for a mobile workshop conducted by staff at the National Planning Association Conference held in Minneapolis in April 2009. The packet includes descriptions and photos of completed LCDA and other LCA-funded projects.

### Conflict of Interest

Chair Grendahl asked committee members to orally declare their conflicts of interest, as required by committee bylaws. She asked if any member needed clarification on conflict of interest issues. Members stated conflicts of interest as recorded in the table below, or stated they had no conflicts. Members who had not done so at the Sept 16 meeting completed and gave their signed conflict of interest forms to staff.

Committee Member Name	2009 Signed Conflict of Interest Forms Received to Date	2009 Conflicts of Interest Declared at the Sept. 29 meeting
<b>Barton, James</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Bonsignore, Gina</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Grendahl, Ruth</b>	No	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Hardin, Glen</b>	Yes	Absent
<b>Jensen, Donald</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Jeremiah, Janet</b>	Yes	C.1 Presbyterian Homes, Eden Prairie
<b>Johnson, Ken</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Lucas, Peggy</b>	Yes	Absent
<b>Marckel, Dan</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Neckar, Lance</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Snyder, Douglas</b>	Yes	A.1 Capri Block, Minneapolis A.2 Gateway Lofts, Minneapolis
<b>Tremere, Blair</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Zimmer, Charleen</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare

## **Review of Applications**

The committee discussed all 10 funding proposals. Dan Marckel showed Google Earth maps, site plan overlays and Bing maps of all of the projects, and pointed out locational information for each one. (Marckel will send the Google Earth map file to staff for distribution to committee members)

As the projects were discussed, Barron pointed out the proximity of related projects that had previously received LCDA grants for A.1 - Capri Block, Minneapolis; A.3 - Harriet Island Blvd, St. Paul; B.2 – Sienna Green, Roseville; and C.2 – Genz-Ryan, Rosemount. She reviewed information from the table distributed today, “History and Status of Same or Related Projects Previously Awarded LCDA or TBRA Grants.” Linda Milashius recorded members’ comments and questions for applicants on a computer as each project was discussed. She distributed copies of the comments and questions to members at the end of the meeting. Additional questions should be sent to Jan Bourgoin. Staff will send the completed list of comments and questions to members before the next meeting.

## **Preparation for October 14 Question and Answer Meeting**

Barron announced that the schedule for the Q&A sessions will be sent to the applicants this week. Grendahl suggested allowing 15 minutes for each Q&A session, with 5 minutes between sessions. The meeting is scheduled from 9 am - 12:30 pm, to accommodate sessions for all 10 proposals.

Staff will send the Committee’s questions recorded today to applicants next week, along with any additional questions received from committee members. Applicants will be asked to respond in writing to these questions sent and will be asked to respond orally to two questions: 1) Why would you not be able to complete this project within two years of the grant award (January 2010) without LCDA funding?, and 2) What development components supported by the grant-funded activities will be completed within two years of the grant award (January 2010)? Members may ask any additional questions they have.

## **Other Business**

Committee members suggested that next year the applications be completed electronically. Tremere requested this year’s applications sent to him electronically. Barron asked if any other members wanted to receive the applications electronically. Marckel also requested electronic copies. Grendahl and Tremere thanked staff for the good job in preparing the information distributed today. Grendahl thanked Marckel for the Google/Bing presentation of the projects. No other business.

## **Adjourn**

The next LCAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 14, 2009, 9:00 am – 12:30 pm, Metropolitan Council, Council Chambers. The agenda is questions and answers with applicants.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

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

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
October 14, 2009

- Committee Members Present:** Chair Ruth Grendahl, Jim Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Don Jensen, Ken Johnson, Peggy Lucas, Dan Marckel, Lance Neckar, Doug Snyder, Blair Tremere, Charleen Zimmer
- Committee Members Absent:** Janet Jeremiah
- Others Present:** Staff: Beth Reetz, Paul Burns, Joanne Barron, Linda Milashius, Deb Jensen, Jan Bourgoin
- Guests:  
Mark Kaltsas and Crystal Faust, City of Watertown  
Jamie Radel, City of Roseville; John Rocker, Aeon  
Mark Ulfers, Melissa Taphorn, Dan Rogness and Kari Gill, Dakota County CDA; John Mehrkens, Presbyterian Homes; Jenni Faulkner, City of Burnsville;  
Kelly Hoffman, City of Minneapolis; Amy Geisler, City of Minneapolis;  
Donna Wiemann, City of Minneapolis; Herb Frey, Alliance Housing;  
Martin Schieckel, City of St. Paul; Tanya Bell and Judd Fenlon, Wellington Management;  
Marie Franchett, City of St. Paul, Bob Lux, Alatus, Jesse Symynkywicz and Michael Krych, BKV Group  
Kim Lindquist and Eric Zweber, City of Rosemount;  
Michael Franzen, City of Eden Prairie, John Mehrkens, Presbyterian Homes  
George Sherman, Sherman Associates

**Call to Order**

Chair Ruth Grendahl called the October 14 Livable Communities Advisory Committee (LCAC) meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

**Approve Agenda**

Chair Grendahl called for the approval of the agenda and hearing no changes stated that agenda was approved.

**Approve Minutes**

Chair Grendahl called for any additions or corrections to the summary notes. There were no changes. The summary notes were approved.

Grendahl announced that Committee member Glen Hardin determined he didn't have the time to participate this year and has resigned. The position will remain vacant until next year. Grendahl suggested inviting him to the lunch following the wrap-up meeting to express the Committee's appreciation for his contribution to the work of the Committee.

## Conflict of Interest

Grendahl asked Peggy Lucas to verbally declare any conflicts, since she was absent at the last meeting. The table below reflects that Lucas declared no conflicts.

Committee Member Name	2009 Signed Conflict of Interest Forms Received to Date	2009 Conflicts of Interest Declared at the Sept. 29 meeting
<b>Barton, James</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Bonsignore, Gina</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Grendahl, Ruth</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Jensen, Donald</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Jeremiah, Janet</b>	Yes	C.1 Presbyterian Homes, Eden Prairie
<b>Johnson, Ken</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Lucas, Peggy</b>	Yes	No conflict of interest to declare
<b>Marckel, Dan</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Neckar, Lance</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Snyder, Douglas</b>	Yes	A.1 Capri Block, Minneapolis A.2 Gateway Lofts, Minneapolis
<b>Tremere, Blair</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare
<b>Zimmer, Charleen</b>	Yes	No conflicts of interest to declare

There were a few minutes before the start of the Question and Answer period, so Grendahl asked Joanne Barron to mention the draft list of readiness criteria which had been discussed at previous meetings. Barron asked the committee to think about how the list should be revised for use as a worksheet in the scoring process. She will send the list again and the committee will need to address it at the next meeting in preparation for the project scoring.

## Question & Answer Period

Chair Grendahl explained the process for the Q&A Sessions. Each applicant was allowed 15 minutes to answer questions from the committee. Barron distributed and Committee members reviewed the applicant's responses to the questions from the September 29<sup>th</sup> meeting during the five minutes between each group session. Members were asked to note any additional questions on the green sheets distributed in their packet. Staff collected the sheets and forward questions to the applicants. Applicants will be asked to send their responses to staff prior to the next meeting on Tuesday, October 20<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Grendahl welcomed each group of participants for their Q&A period and ask them to introduce themselves. Grendahl began each session by asking each applicant the following two questions:

- 1) Why would you not be able to complete this project within two years of the grant award (January 2010) without LCDA funding?
- 2) What are the development components supported by the grant-funded activities that will be completed within two years of the grant award?

Grendahl then invited Committee members to ask follow-up questions to the written material provided or to ask other questions. Barron asked questions for some projects to clarify issues relating to eligibility of funded items.

The funding proposals discussed at today's meeting along with the names of persons representing each project are listed below. Using a laptop computer, Linda Milashius recorded answers to the questions. Committee members with conflicts for a particular project stepped away from the table during these discussions.

<b>A.1</b>	<b>Capri Block Site Assembly, Minneapolis</b> Representing the Project: Kelly Hoffman, City of Minneapolis
<b>A.2</b>	<b>Gateway Lofts, Minneapolis</b> Representing the Project: Donna Wiemann, City of Minneapolis; Herb Frey, Alliance Housing
<b>A.3</b>	<b>Harriet Island Blvd/West Side Flats, St. Paul</b> Representing the Project: Marie Franchett, City of St. Paul; George Sherman, Sherman Associates
<b>A.4</b>	<b>The Penfield, St. Paul</b> Representing the Project: Marie Franchett, City of St. Paul; Michael Krych, BKV Group; Bob Lux, Alatus
<b>A.5</b>	<b>2700 the Avenue, St. Paul</b> Representing the Project: Martin Schieckel, City of St. Paul; Judd Fenlon, Wellington Management
<b>B.1</b>	<b>Valley Ridge Redevelopment, Burnsville</b> Representing the Project: Mark Ulfers, Dakota County CDA; Jenni Faulkner, City of Burnsville
<b>B.2</b>	<b>Sienna Green Phase II, Roseville</b> Representing the Project: Jamie Radel, City of Roseville and John Rocker, Aeon
<b>C.1</b>	<b>Presbyterian Homes, Eden Prairie</b> Representing the Project: Michael Franzen, City of Eden Prairie; John Mehrkens, Presbyterian Homes
<b>C.2</b>	<b>Genz-Ryan Downtown Redevelopment, Rosemount</b> Representing the Project: Kim Lindquist and Eric Zweber, City of Rosemount
<b>C.3</b>	<b>South Lewis Avenue Redevelopment, Watertown</b> Representing the Project: Mark Kaltsas and Crystal Faust, City of Watertown

### 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. Barron will send a revised readiness scoring criteria form to members prior to the next meeting for review. Any changes the Committee would like to make to the form can be discussed at the next meeting.

### Adjourn

Grendahl adjourned the meeting at 12:15 pm. The next committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 20<sup>th</sup> from 9:00-11:30 am, at the Metropolitan Council in Room LLB.



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

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
Meeting of October 20, 2009

**Committee Members Present:** Vice Chair Dan Marckel, Jim Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Don Jensen, Ken Johnson, Peggy Lucas, Lance Neckar, Blair Tremere and Charleen Zimmer

**Committee Members Absent:** Ruth Grendahl, Janet Jeremiah and Doug Snyder

**Others Present:** Staff: Beth Reetz, Paul Burns, Joanne Barron, Linda Milashius, and Jan Bourgoin

**Call to Order**

Vice-Chair Dan Marckel called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

**Approve Agenda**

Vice Chair Marckel called for the approval of the agenda; Don Jensen approved the agenda, Jim Barton seconded the motion. The motion passed.

**Approve Summary Notes**

Don Jensen moved to approve the minutes of the October 14, 2009 meeting; Jim Barton seconded the motion. The motion passed.

**Preparation for Scoring LCDA Funding Proposals**

Barron briefly summarized the scoring form included in today's meeting packet, reviewing the three elements: Part 1, Land Use (0 – 30 points); Part 2, Catalyst (0-10 points); Part 3, Readiness (0 – 10 points) for a total of 50 possible points. She reviewed the scoring process and reminded members to score projects and submit scores to Linda Milashius by 4:30 p.m. on Monday, November 2.

Barron explained that the readiness criteria list, also included in the packet, is intended to be used as a worksheet to evaluate and score the 0-10 readiness points, as a tool to ensure the same questions were used in evaluating each project, and to help committee members score the proposals in a consistent manner. She said that some of the questions were originally developed to assist with the grant extension process, and some are taken from the LCDA grant application. The Committee agreed to delete the first column of the draft readiness list that indicates a point range or yes-no answer, leaving a list of questions to assist the committee as a worksheet.

**Discussion of LCDA Funding Proposals**

Vice-chair Marckel explained that the main purpose of this meeting is to allow the committee to discuss all ten funding proposals, focusing on the following questions for each project: 1) Have all the Committee's questions

about the projects been answered? 2) How is the project innovative and what is it demonstrating? 3) Is the funding a catalyst for the project? 4) Does the project meet the readiness questions? Marckel noted that funding proposals must score 30 or more points, of a possible 50 points, to be considered for funding.

Ken Johnson asked for clarification of the Council’s two-year readiness requirement. Paul Burns explained that only projects that include development components that will be completed within two years would be funded. He explained that the application was modified this year to emphasize this requirement.

Tremere asked if all of the applications were complete. Barron responded that all applications are complete and include the required attachments and forms, including a local resolution of support.

Using a laptop computer, 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. Applicant responses to the Q&A follow-up questions were distributed in today’s packet. Additional questions were recorded during the discussion; staff will send them to applicants for responses.

The ten proposals were discussed in the following order:

A. 1	Capri Block Site Assembly	Minneapolis
A. 2	Gateway Lofts	Minneapolis
A. 3	Harriet Island Blvd/West Side Flats	St. Paul
A. 4	The Penfield	St. Paul
A. 5	2700 the Avenue	St. Paul
B. 1	Valley Ridge Redevelopment	Burnsville
B. 2	Sienna Green Phase II	Roseville
C. 1	Presbyterian Homes	Eden Prairie
C. 2	Genz-Ryan Downtown Redevelopment	Rosemount
C. 3	South Lewis Avenue Redevelopment	Watertown

**Other Business**

None

**Adjourn**

The next committee meeting is on Wednesday, November 4<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 am to noon in conference room LLA.

Staff will forward questions from today’s meeting to the applicants, requesting a response by Friday. Applicant responses will be sent to committee members no later than Monday, October 26<sup>th</sup>.

In preparation for the next meeting, the committee will score all ten proposals. Staff will email an evaluation form for each project, and will also send a form for committee members to record scores and return to Milashius by 4:30 pm on Monday, November 2, to allow time to tabulate them for the November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ken Johnson suggested an electronic pdf would be helpful in this process. Milashius will check on that possibility.

Vice-Chair Marckel thanked members for the good discussion and adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

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

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
November 4, 2009

**Committee Members Present:** Ruth Grendahl, James Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Don Jensen, Janet Jeremiah, Peggy Lucas, Dan Marckel, Lance Neckar, Doug Snyder, Blair Tremere and Charleen Zimmer

**Committee Members Absent:** Ken Johnson

**Others Present:** Peter Bell, Council Chair; Staff: Joanne Barron, Guy Peterson, Beth Reetz, Jan Bourgoin, Paul Burns, Linda Milashius

**Call to Order**

Chair Ruth Grendahl called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

**Approve Agenda**

Chair Grendahl called for the approval of today's agenda. Hearing no changes, she stated the agenda was approved as written. Later in the meeting, Don Jensen requested to amend the agenda, adding a discussion of the program criteria, specifically the two year project completion piece.

**Approve Summary Notes**

Dan Marckel moved to approve the summary notes from the October 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. Jim Barton seconded the motion. Janet Jeremiah abstained due to her absence at that meeting. The motion passed.

**Discussion of LCDA Program Criteria and Other Discussion**

Prior to reviewing the evaluation scores, the committee discussed the fact that the LCAC may recommend up to 40 percent of the total funds available in a grant cycle for projects located in Minneapolis and St. Paul. It was noted that the Committee can, however, suggest to the Council's Community Development Committee that additional dollars be awarded to worthy projects. The committee has done this in the past a few times, suggesting additional award amounts of \$100,000 or less to Minneapolis or St. Paul projects. Charleen Zimmer said that the first criterion should be to determine if a project is worthy, and that the committee should respect the 60/40 split if they can, and if not then decide what to do, taking a stepwise approach and ensuring the decisions maintain the credibility of the program. Blair Tremere pointed out that the funds for LCDA grants come primarily from cities beyond the two central cities.

Gina Bonsignore suggested that the committee could suggest to applicants that they make some design improvements to projects, and if they are willing to do this, they could receive funding. But there is no mechanism for this type of process. Marckel suggested that the creativity of projects has diminished, and said he sees the need to figure out how to get better reinvention as projects are developed. Janet Jeremiah said it is hard to be creative in a box, and that we've created a box where some people don't want to go. She suggested

‘opening the box’ to encourage types of innovation that haven’t been thought of and incorporate that into the scoring process. Jeremiah expressed the difficulty of completing the applications with reduced staff. Bonsignore said projects are penalized for doing what is not standard.

Lance Neckar suggested having a discussion with Metro Cities to re-examine the legislation and criteria. Tremere suggested that projects could receive funds for acquisition, then come back for infrastructure funding with a full-blown plan, to phase the plan. There could be a legal hook. Don Jensen said it is unrealistic to think that budgets will stick for two years – ratios can and do change.

**Review Evaluation Scores**

Linda Milashius distributed the scores members had sent to staff this week. The scores are listed in the following table.

			<b>Part I</b>	<b>Part II</b>	<b>Part III</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>
			<b>Innovation &amp; Demonstration</b>	<b>Catalyst</b>	<b>Readiness</b>	<b>Average Score</b>	<b>Average</b>
			<u>Average Score</u>	<u>Average Score</u>	<u>Average Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rounded</u>
			(0-30 points)	(0-10 points)	(0-10 points)	(Up to 50 pts.)	
A.1	Mpls	Capri Block	22.2	9.1	6.4	37.7	38
A.2	Mpls	Gateway Lofts	25.5	7.8	8.0	41.3	41
A.3	Mpls	Harriet Island Blvd.	21.8	7.7	8.0	37.5	38
A.4	St. Paul	The Penfield	25.5	7.7	7.5	40.7	41
A.5	St. Paul	2700 the Avenue	21.5	7.4	8.4	37.3	37
B.1	Dakota Co CDA/ Burnsville	Valley Ridge Redevelopment	16.1	6.1	6.7	28.9	29
B.2	Roseville	Sienna Green Phase II	24.6	7.0	8.0	39.6	40
C.1	Eden Prairie	Presbyterian Homes	21.4	7.8	8.7	37.9	38
C.2	Rosemount	Genz-Ryan Redevelopment	13.7	5.3	4.8	23.9	24
C.3	Watertown	South Lewis Ave. Redevelopment	23.5	8.7	7.6	39.8	40

**Discuss Projects**

The Committee discussed all of the funding proposals, focusing on innovation and demonstration, catalyst and readiness. Milashius recorded the committee’s comments. The comments will be distributed to members for their use in the remainder of the evaluation process.

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

Copies of the checklist were included in today’s packet. Chair Grendahl asked members to take a look at it in preparation for the next meeting. The committee will make a determination at the next meeting on whether each applicant has satisfactorily addressed the questions in the checklist. This will be the first item on the agenda.

## **Remarks by Peter Bell, Metropolitan Council Chair**

Council Chair Peter Bell thanked committee members for their service and said he appreciates their hard work. He thanked Chair Grendahl and staff for their work. He said he views the LCDA program as a good way to demonstrate the viability of principles that are important for the region to consider. Bell noted that the funds for the LCDA program were limited this year due to the need to balance the transit budget. He said it is looking like limiting the funds will not be necessary next year; the Council is working towards that, but it is not firm.

Grendahl asked Bell for direction. She explained that current program eligibility requirements, including the two year project completion requirement, have created a very limited box for cities to submit worthy applications. Jensen commented that it is harder to fit projects into the program, since applicants can't ask for things that would help project marketability. Marckel commented that creativity means reformulating how development happens. Marckel also said we have not done a good job of sharing the good models we do have. Neckar said that the limitation of funds to public uses and the timeframe requirements do not allow for integrative and creative work across systems – we need discussion of what constitutes creative integration. Bell said he welcomes suggestions to get greater clarity. He also acknowledged there is a level of subjectivity that the committee provides in the evaluation of projects. Chair Bell suggested that the LCAC recommend dollars for projects that are meritorious and it is okay to roll money forward for next year's projects. The 60/40 split for suburban and center cities was also discussed; Bell stated that the 40% goal for funding to center cities could be viewed as a 3-5 year rolling average, rather than a mandate each year. Bell also suggested the need to be more proactive in trying to determine the reason we are not getting good quality applications. He suggested working with the cities to determine why we are not getting the type of applications we are seeking, and how or what can we change to improve the application process. Tremere suggested meeting with Metro Cities early in 2010 about issues related to applying for LCDA funding, why we don't get more qualified applications.

## **Other Business – Wrap-Up Meeting**

Jan Bourgoin will poll members to determine a date for a committee wrap-up meeting in December. There will be a group lunch following the meeting.

## **Adjourn**

The next committee meeting is on Thursday, November 19th from 9:00 am to noon in conference room LLA. The agenda is to make the committee's funding recommendations to the Metropolitan Council.

Chair Grendahl adjourned the meeting at 12 p.m.

**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**  
 390 Robert Street North  
 St. Paul, MN 55101  
**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY NOTES**  
 November 19, 2009

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ruth Grendahl, Jim Barton, Gina Bonsignore, Donald Jensen, Janet Jeremiah, Ken Johnson, Peggy Lucas, Dan Marckel, Douglas Snyder, Blair Tremere

**Committee Members Absent:** Charleen Zimmer

**Others Present:** **Staff:** Beth Reetz, Paul Burns, Joanne Barron, Linda Milashius, Deb Jensen, and Jan Bourgoin  
**Guests:** Marie Franchett and Lucy Thompson, St. Paul PED

**Call to Order**

The November 19th Livable Communities Advisory Committee meeting was called to order by Chair Ruth Grendahl at 9:05 a.m.

**Approve Agenda**

Chair Grendahl called for the approval of the agenda. Don Jensen made a motion to approve the November 19<sup>th</sup> agenda, Jim Barton seconded. Upon hearing no discussion, the agenda was approved as written.

**Approve Summary Notes**

Chair Grendahl called for the approval of the summary notes from the November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. Jim Barton made a motion to approve the summary notes, Don Jensen seconded. Upon hearing no discussion, the summary notes were approved as written.

**Project Scoring**

Staff distributed project scores with the housing performance scores factored in and noted that they did not significantly change the project rankings as ranked in the LCAC scoring.

**2009 Livable Communities Demonstration Account**  
**Livable Communities Advisory Committee**  
**Step 2 and Housing Performance Scores Combined**  
**11/19/2009**

			<b>LCAC Step 2 Scores (Up to 50 pts.)</b>	<b>Housing Performance Score</b>	<b>Total Combined Score</b>
A.2	Minneapolis	Gateway Lofts	41.3	9.8	51.1
A.4	St. Paul	The Penfield	40.7	9.9	50.6
C.3	Watertown	South Lewis Ave. Redevelopment	39.8	7.9	47.7
B.2	Roseville	Sienna Green Phase II	39.6	7.8	47.4
C.1	Eden Prairie	Presbyterian Homes	37.9	7.9	45.8
A.1	Minneapolis	Capri Block	37.7	9.8	47.5
A.3	St. Paul	Harriet Island Blvd.	37.5	9.9	47.4
A.5	St. Paul	2700 the Avenue	37.3	9.9	47.2
B.1	Burnsville	Valley Ridge Redevelopment	28.9	7.9	36.8
C.2	Rosemount	Genz-Ryan Redevelopment	23.9	7.3	31.2

Chair Grendahl explained that as a result of the scoring process completed for the Nov 4 meeting, A.2 - Gateway Lofts, Minneapolis; A.4 – The Penfield, St. Paul; C.3 – South Lewis Ave. Redevelopment, Watertown; B.2 – Sienna Green Phase II, Roseville; C.1 – Presbyterian Homes, Eden Prairie; A.1 – Capri Block, Minneapolis; A.3 – Harriet Island Blvd., St. Paul; and A.5 – 2700 The Avenue all met the funding threshold score of 30 points.

B.1 – Valley Ridge Redevelopment, Burnsville and C.2 – Genz-Ryan Redevelopment, Rosemount did not meet the 30-point threshold score. Grendahl reminded the Committee that the LCDA criteria state that projects scoring below the 30-point funding threshold may be considered for funding if they are supported by a majority vote of the committee. Grendahl asked if there was any interest in considering either of these projects for funding. Don Jensen moved to consider B.1 – Valley Ridge Redevelopment, Burnsville for discussion. Dan Marckel seconded the motion. The motion passed. Following discussion, there was no motion to consider the project for funding. There was no motion to consider C.2 – Genz-Ryan Redevelopment, Rosemount for funding.

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

Chair Grendahl began going through the checklist for each project. There was a suggestion that some of the projects may require additional discussion before completing the checklist. It was agreed that any issues should have been taken care of in the scoring process. The committee agreed that because all of the project requests have been discussed in great detail during 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 of the projects.

During discussions, committee members moved away from the table if they had a conflict of interest with one of the projects.

The committee answered 'yes' for all questions on the checklist for eight of the projects. Grendahl indicated that she will sign the checklist forms attesting that, in the judgment of the committee, eight of the proposals demonstrate that the proposed project is feasible at this time only with support of an LCDA grant. The Committee answered 'no' to Question 4 for B1 – Valley Ridge Redevelopment, Burnsville, stating that the applicant could have further explored the use of local funding sources. Grendahl will sign the checklist accordingly for B.1 – Valley Ridge Redevelopment, Burnsville. The Committee stated that it encourages the applicant to apply again in the future. The "Checklist to Determine if Funding Request Substantially Demonstrates that Proposed Project is Feasible Only With LCDA Grant" follows:

**Livable Communities Demonstration Account 2009**

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

**Evaluate and answer yes or no to each of the following eight questions for each of the ten LCDA funding applications:**

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 2009?	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? (see application Section III.B-1)	Yes ____	No ____
3.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified local sources of funding the applicant has considered to fund the LCDA request? (see application Section III.B-6-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? (see application Section III.B-6-A)	Yes ____	No ____
5.	Has the applicant satisfactorily identified non-local sources of funding the applicant has pursued to fund the LCDA request? (see application Section III.B-6-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? (see application Section III.B-6-B)	Yes ____	No ____
7.	Has the applicant submitted satisfactory documentation (e.g. letters, other documentation) to substantiate unsuccessful efforts to secure non-local funding? (see application Section III.B-6-B)	Yes ____	No ____
8.	Does the Livable Communities Advisory Committee accept the applicants' statement that the requested project component(s) would not be built in the market without public subsidy or grant funds?	Yes ____	No ____

In the judgment of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, the following funding proposals demonstrate that the proposed project is feasible at this time only with an LCDA grant. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

In the judgment of the Livable Communities Advisory Committee, the following funding proposals do **not demonstrate** that the proposed project is feasible at this time only with an LCDA grant.

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



## Funding Recommendations

There was discussion regarding the demonstration merits of the projects.

Discussion proceeded, beginning with the highest-scoring projects. Potential funding amounts were penciled in for each project. Chair Grendahl reminded the committee that it can recommend up to \$1,600,000 million for projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul, or 40 percent of the available \$4,000,000, and that the Committee can suggest to the Metropolitan Council that additional amounts be awarded to Minneapolis and St. Paul projects that meet the scoring and evaluation criteria.

LCAC Funding Recommendations for 2009 LCDA Applications							
Item	Project	City	Evaluation Score	Eligible Request	LCAC Funding Recommended	VOTE	Abstentions/ Conflict of Interest
A.2	Gateway Lofts	Minneapolis	41.3	\$ 74,000	\$ 74,000	9 – yes	Snyder
A.4	The Penfield	St. Paul	40.7	\$610,000	\$610,000	10 – yes	
C.3	South Lewis Ave. Redevelopment	Watertown	39.8	\$366,318	\$366,318	8 – yes 2 – no Carried	
B.2	Sienna Green Phase II	Roseville	39.6	\$202,100	\$202,100	10 – yes	
C.1	Presbyterian Homes	Eden Prairie	37.9	\$848,300	\$848,300	9 – yes	Jeremiah
A.1	Capri Block	Minneapolis	37.7	869,000	\$869,000	8 – yes 1 – no Carried	Snyder
A.3	Harriet Island Blvd.	St. Paul	37.5	\$750,000	\$750,000	10 – yes	
A.5	2700 the Avenue	St. Paul	37.3	\$800,000	\$204,259	8 – yes 2 – no Carried	
B.1	Valley Ridge Redevelopment	Burnsville	28.9	\$1,000,000	\$ -0-		
C.2	Genz-Ryan Redevelopment	Rosemount	23.9	\$270,000	\$ -0-		
			<b>Total</b>	\$5,789,718	\$4,000,000.00		
				<b>Available</b>	\$4,000,000.00		
				<b>Difference</b>	--0--		
	<b>REQUESTED</b>				<b>RECOMMENDED</b>		
	Total A Communities	\$3,103,000	53.6%		\$2,583,282	64.6%	Amount over 40/60 split = \$983,282
	Total B + C Communities	\$2,686,718	46.4%		\$1,416,718	35.4%	
		\$5,789,718	100.0%		\$4,000,000		

40% of total amount available = \$1,600,000  
60% of total amount available = \$2,400,000

The Committee will recommend that \$3,016,718 be awarded to the first seven projects listed. This includes \$47,000 for A.3, Harriet Island Blvd / West Side Flats, St. Paul, to keep the recommendation at 40% of funding to Minneapolis and St. Paul projects. When the recommendations are presented to the Community Development Committee of the Council, the Committee will suggest that an additional \$703,000 be awarded to A.3 - Harriet Island Boulevard, St. Paul, for a total of \$750,000 and an amount of \$280,282 be awarded to A.5 - 2700 the Avenue (\$109,800 for lighting, sidewalks, bike racks and \$170,482 for public parking). This would result in awarding all of the available \$4 million.

**LCAC Funding Recommendations Worksheet for 2009 LCDA Applications**

Item	Project	City	Evaluation Score	Funding Requested	LCAC Funding Recommended	VOTE	Abstentions/Conflict of Interest
A.2	Gateway Lofts	Minneapolis	41.3	\$ 74,000	\$ 74,000	9 – yes	Snyder
A.4	The Penfield	St. Paul	40.7	\$610,000	\$610,000	10 – yes	
	South Lewis Ave. Redevelopment	Watertown				8 – yes 2 – no carried	
C.3	Sienna Green Phase II	Roseville	39.8	\$366,318	\$366,318	carried	
B.2	Presbyterian Homes	Eden Prairie	39.6	\$202,100	\$202,100	10 – yes	Jeremiah
C.1	Capri Block	Minneapolis	37.9	\$848,300	\$848,300	9 – yes 9 – yes 1 – no - carried	
A.1	Harriet Island Blvd.	St. Paul	37.7	869,000	\$869,000	carried	
A.3	2700 the Avenue	St. Paul	37.5	\$750,000	\$750,000	10 – yes 7 – yes 2 – no Carried	Snyder
A.5	Valley Ridge Redevelopment	Burnsville	37.3	\$800,000	\$204,259	Carried	
B.1	Genz-Ryan Redevelopment	Rosemount	28.9	\$1,000,000	\$ -0-		
C.2			23.9	\$270,000	\$-0-		
Total				\$5,789,718	\$4,000,000.00		
				<b>Available</b>	<u>\$4,000,000.00</u>		
				<b>Difference</b>	--0--		

**REQUESTED**

Total A Communities	\$3,103,000	53.6%
Total B + C Communities	\$2,686,718	46.4%
	\$5,789,718	100.0%

**RECOMMENDED**

	\$2,583,282	64.6%
	\$1,416,718	35.4%
	\$4,000,000	

Amount over 40/60 split = \$983,282

40% of total amount available = \$1,600,000  
60% of total amount available = \$2,400,000

### **Evaluation Meeting – Friday, December 18th**

It was agreed the wrap-up meeting to debrief about this year's process and/or to make suggestions for next year is scheduled for Friday, January 18<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 am in LLB, Robert St., Metropolitan Council. Committee members decided to meet for lunch following this meeting at Trattoria da Vinci. Jan will make the reservation and send a meeting notice. Lance Neckar indicated he would not be available for this meeting but will send his recommendations to staff.

### **Other Business**

Chair Grendahl thanked committee members for their dedication and hard work during this process.

Barron informed the committee that the committee's funding recommendations will be presented to the Metropolitan Council's Community Development Committee on December 7, 2009. The Community Development Committee is scheduled to take action on the grant recommendations on January 4th and the Metropolitan Council will act on the Community Development Committee's recommendations on January 13, 2009.

### **Adjourn**

Chair Grendahl adjourned the meeting at 11:05 a.m.