

2025 Transportation & General Government Committee Members

Name	Title	Organization
Kristin Asher	Public Works Director	Richfield
Josh Berg	Councilmember	Elko New Market
Kissy Coakley	Councilmember	Minnetonka
Marc Culver	City Engineer	Brooklyn Park
Inderia Falana	Government Relations Representative	Minneapolis
Clancy Ferris	Legislative and Grants Analyst	St. Louis Park
**Anne Finn	IGR Director	League of MN Cities
Tom Fischer	Mayor	Little Canada
Tom Fletcher	Mayor	Greenwood
Gary Hansen	Councilmember	Eagan
Sean Hayford Oleary	Councilmember	Richfield
Debra Heiser	Engineering Director	St. Louis Park
Clint Hooppaw	Mayor	Apple Valley
Taylor Hubbard	Mayor	Chaska
Steven Huser	Government Relations Representative	Minneapolis
**Craig Johnson	IGR Representative	League of MN Cities
**Beth Johnston	IGR Representative	League of MN Cities
Dan Kealey	Councilmember	Burnsville
**Tori Kee	IGR Representative/Attorney	League of MN Cities
Brad Larson	City Administrator	Savage
Brady Lee	Public Works Director	Victoria
**Daniel Lightfoot	IGR Representative	League of MN Cities
Brent Mareck	City Manager	Carver
Amáda Márquez Simula	Mayor	Columbia Heights
Justin Miller	City Administrator	Lakeville
Kari Niedfeldt- Thomas	Mayor	New Brighton
*Heidi Nelson	City Administrator	Maple Grove
Loren Olson	Senior Government Relations Representative	Minneapolis
**Hannah Pallmeyer	Government Affairs Liaison	Metropolitan Council
Christian Pederson	Councilmember	Victoria
Eric Petersen	IGR Associate	St. Paul
Chelsea Petersen	Assistant City Administrator	Shakopee
Nick Peterson	City Engineer	St. Paul
Mark Ray	Public Works Director	Burnsville
Tim Sandvik	City Manager	Robbinsdale
Jay Stroebe	City Manager	Brooklyn Park

Michael Thompson	Public Works Director	Plymouth
Kate Thunstrom	City Administrator	St. Francis
Katie Topinka	IGR Director	Minneapolis
Patrick Trudgeon	City Manager	Roseville
**Owen Wirth	IGR Representative	League of MN Cities
Jeff Weisensel	Mayor	Rosemount
Wally Wysopal	City Manager	Fridley
Nyle Zikmund	City Administrator	Mounds View

*Committee Chair

**Guest/Non-City Official

August 18, 2025

TO: Transportation & General Government Policy Committee Members
FROM: Heidi Nelson, City Administrator, City of Maple Grove
SUBJECT: Meeting Notice and Agenda

Monday, August 25, 2025
9:00 am – 11:30 am
Virtual Meeting: Zoom
Join Zoom Meeting

♦ Thank you for agreeing to be a policy committee member!

Attached are the materials for the second Transportation & General Government Policy Committee meeting. Please take the time to review the policies and come with your ideas and suggestions.

AGENDA

1. Call to order. (Heidi Nelson, Chair)
2. Approval of minutes for the July 28, 2025 meeting.
3. Presentations: ***Metro Transit, Lesley Kandaras, General Manager, and Luther Wynder, Chief Executive Officer of Minnesota Valley Transit Authority.***
4. Review policy Committee Memo (Mike Lund, Metro Cities Staff)
5. Discussion of policies and suggested modifications.
 - a. Policies with no recommended changes.
 - b. General Government policies with suggested changes.
 - c. Transportation policies with suggested changes.
6. Discuss additional suggestions for policies, and issues for future consideration.
7. Other business.
8. Adjourn. (11:30 a.m.)

Future Committee Meetings:
Monday, September 22, 2025

Transportation and General Government Committee

Minutes for Meeting of July 28, 2025

Present: Heidi Nelson, Christian Pederson, Clint Hooppaw, Tom Fletcher, Wally Wysopal, Brent Mareck, Gary Hansen, Tom Fischer, Emily Dunsworth, Jay Stroebel, Steve Hauser, Clancy Ferris, Eric Petersen, Sean Hayford Oleary, Debra Heiser, Marc Culver, Tori Kee, Kate Thunstrom, Amada Marquez Simula, Inderia Falana, Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas, Kissy Coakley, Josh Berg, Joe Powers, Dan Kealey, Brady Lee, Taylor Hubbard, Jeff Weisensel, Katie Topinka, Brad Larson, Loren Olson, Tim Sandvik, Phone # 612-298-9052, Hannah Pallmeyer, Patricia Nauman, Mike Lund, Ania McDonnell, Jennifer Dorn.

Chair Nelson called the meeting to order at: 9:03 am. Members made introductions.

Ms. Nauman reviewed the policy committee process and general protocols. Mr. Lund provided an overview of 2025 session activity related to the committee's jurisdiction.

Chair Nelson moved to review of transportation policies and Mr. Lund provided a review of the policies. Ms. McDonnell provided updates on two policies under General Government.

Mr. Mareck raised a question on the newspaper law change and asked for confirmation about the specifics of the change. Mr. Lund added that we do not have a policy on the issue specifically, but staff is happy to work with members on language if a policy is desired. Mr. Larson said he would like to see more statutory flexibility. Mr. Fischer asked, regarding the open meeting law change, whether municipalities have the ability to restrict this on their own. Ms. Kee stated that this is a permissible statute so municipalities could set their own standard.

Chair Nelson asked members whether they had any proposed policy suggestions. Mr. Culver noted state aids, and cost participation. Mr. Powers stated he would like discussion also on cost participation as well as design build contracts. He also noted the noise wall process MnDOT uses and the multifamily property owners with respect to voting. Mr. Fletcher stated that reinforcement on EMS and also that he may have some questions and suggestions on the building code policy. Mr. Hansen added TP-2 and TP-3. TP-2 bus transit and recognizing the increasing number of services provided, and also micro transit. Mr. Stroebel added he would like more discussion and conversation on congregate care facilities. Chair Nelson added it would be good to hear from MDH and DHS. Mr. Larson noted he would like discussion on GG-17.

Mr. Larson noted having the ability to require franchises is also important to provide some level of control on where and how broadband is being distributed and installed throughout our communities. Mr. Wysopal added that the unraveling of the NorthStar rail and that there was no input from cities. Mr. Fischer added GG-1 and how developers are painting us with a broad stroke and asked about messaging on the issue. Ms. Nauman stated that continued communication by cities and elected officials remains key to this work. Mr. Huser added cannabis aid, and support for restoring it as well as TP-3 and equitable funding and what metrics are we using.

Ms. Falana noted group homes as a concern, as well as GG-11 and the need for more funding. Mr. Petersen added TP-3 transit financing, TP-4 regarding street impact fees, and support on GG-3 with restricting weapons on government property, making changes to the POST board with recruitment of officers, GG2-2 and creating a database, GG-26, and tailoring aid to the number of sales not businesses. Mr. Hooppaw noted concerns about residential group homes, franchise authority, PFAS and radium. He also noted on local control and zoning, the importance of continuing to communicate and share community issues and work. Ms. Hubbard added she would like to discuss micro transit, and GG-10. Mr. Petersen added GG-11 and hearing from the MPCA on this and storage issue.

Chair Nelson asked about requests for speakers. Mr. Fletcher suggested annual Metro Transit and Suburban providers update and how the new lines versus old lines are going. Mr. Petersen added Potential Speakers: MPCA, OCM, Post Board/DPS, and MnDOT/Metro Transit. Chair Nelson added DHS, MDH, as well as the cities of Brooklyn Park and Crystal present on residential facilities

Chair Nelson adjourned the meeting at 11:05 am.

August 18, 2025

To: Metro Cities Transportation and General Government Policy Committee
From: Mike Lund, Government Relations Specialist
Re: August 25th Policy Committee Memo

Enclosed are materials for the second meeting of the Transportation and General Government Policy Committee on **Monday, August 25th at 9:00 AM**. The committee will begin with presentations from Lesley Kandaras, General Manager at Metro Transit and Luther Wynder, Chief Executive Officer at Minnesota Valley Transit Authority.

Below are policies with suggested draft language for the committee to consider. Also noted are policies without proposed changes at this time that may be considered for approval if committee members so choose.

FY 2025 distribution amounts for both the Larger Cities and Small Cities assistance accounts have been included in the packet. These funds come through the Transportation Advancement Account (TAA) established in 2023.

General Government (Policies <u>without</u> recommended changes at this time.)	
GG-1	Mandates, Zoning & Local Authority
GG-2	City Enterprise Activities
GG-3	Weapons on City Property
GG-4	911 Telephone Tax
GG-5	800 MHz Radio System
GG-7	Administrative Fines
GG-8	Residential Programs
GG-9	Annexation
GG-10	Statewide Funding Sources for Local Issues with Regional Impact
GG-12	Pollinator Habitat Resources
GG-13	Regulation of Harmful Substances and Products
GG-14	Water Supply
GG-15	Private Well Drilling Restriction Authority
GG-16	Organized Waste Collection
GG-17	Utility Franchise Fees, Accountability and Cost Transparency
GG-18	Election Administration
GG-19	Regulation of Massage Therapists
GG-20	Peace Officer Arbitration Reform
GG-24	Race Equity
GG-27	Street Racing and Carjacking

General Government (Policies with suggested changes.)	
GG-6	Building Codes: <i>Language suggested by city of Greenwood.</i>
GG-11	Urban Forest Management Funding: <i>Hold for Meeting 3.</i>
GG-21	Public Safety Training and Resources: <i>Hold for Meeting 3.</i>
GG-22	Copper and Other Metal Theft: <i>Hold for Meeting 3.</i>
GG-23	Emergency Medical Services: <i>Staff suggested changes.</i>
GG-25	Open Meeting Law: <i>Staff suggests deleting this policy.</i>
GG-26	Adult-Use Cannabis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Staff suggested changes.</i> • <i>Hold adoption for Meeting 3.</i>

Transportation (Policies without recommended changes at this time.)	
TP-4	Street Improvement Districts
TP-5	Highway and Bridge Turn Backs & Funding
TP-6	“3C” Transportation Planning Process: Elected Officials’ Role
TP-7	Electronic Imaging for Enforcement of Traffic Laws
TP-8	Transportation Network Companies and Alternative Transportation Modes
TP-10	Funding for Non-Municipal State Aid (MSAS) City Streets.
TP-11	County State Aid Highway (CSAH) Distribution Formula
TP-13	Plat Authority
TP-14	MnDOT Maintenance Budget
TP-15	Transit Taxing District

Transportation (Policies with suggested changes.)	
TP-1	Road and Bridge Funding: <i>Staff suggested change.</i>
TP-2	Regional Transit System: <i>Language suggested by city of Eagan.</i>
TP-3	Transit Financing: <i>Language suggested by city of Eagan.</i>
TP-9	Airport Noise Mitigation: <i>Language suggested by city of Richfield.</i>
TP-12	Municipal Input/Consent for Trunk Highways and County Roads: <i>Language suggested by city of Richfield.</i>
TP-16	Complete Streets: <i>Language suggested by city of Richfield.</i>

We look forward to seeing you on the 25th.

GG-1 MANDATES, ZONING & LOCAL AUTHORITY

To serve their local residents and communities, city officials must have sufficient local control and decision-making authority. Metro Cities supports local decision-making authority and opposes statutory changes that erode local authority and decision making.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1, provide cities authority to regulate and set local ordinances for zoning. Metro Cities supports existing state laws that provide for this authority.

Metro Cities supports statutory changes that give local officials greater authority to approve or deny variances to allow flexibility in responding to the needs of the community. Metro Cities also supports the removal of statutory barriers to uniform zoning ordinance amendment processes for all cities, regardless of city size classification.

Metro Cities opposes the imposition of legislative mandates that increase local costs without a corresponding state appropriation or funding mechanism. Unfunded mandates potentially increase property taxes and impede cities' ability to fund traditional service needs.

To allow for greater collaboration and flexibility in providing local services, Metro Cities encourages the removal of barriers to coordination between cities and other units of government or entities.

GG-2 CITY ENTERPRISE ACTIVITIES

Creation of an enterprise operation allows a city to provide a desired service while maintaining financial and management control. The state should refrain from infringing on this ability to provide and manage services for the benefit of a local community and residents.

Metro Cities supports cities having authority to establish city enterprise operations in response to community needs, local preferences, or state mandates, or that help ensure residents' quality of life.

GG-3 WEAPONS ON CITY PROPERTY

Cities should be allowed to prohibit handguns and other weapons in city-owned buildings, facilities, and parks and to determine whether to allow permit-holders to bring guns into municipal buildings, liquor stores, city council chambers and city sponsored youth activities. It is not Metro Cities' intention for cities to have the authority to prohibit legal weapons in parking lots, on city streets, city sidewalks or on locally approved hunting land.

32

33 Metro Cities supports local control to prohibit or restrict the possession of dangerous weapons,
34 ammunition, or explosives on local government-owned or leased buildings and land.

35

36 **GG-4 911 TELEPHONE TAX**

37 Public safety answering points (PSAPs) must be able to continue to rely on state 911 revenues to
38 pay for upgrades and modifications to local 911 systems, maintenance and operational support,
39 and dispatcher training.

40 Metro Cities supports state funding for technology and training necessary to provide the
41 number and location of wireless and voice over internet protocol (VoIP) calls to 911 on
42 computer screens and transmit that data to police, fire and first responders.

43

44 **GG-5 800 MHZ RADIO SYSTEM**

45 Metro Cities urges the Legislature to provide cities with the financial means to obtain required
46 infrastructure and subscriber equipment (portable and mobile radios) as well as funding for
47 operating costs, since the prime purpose of this system is to allow public safety agencies and
48 other units of government the ability to communicate effectively.

49 Metro Cities supports the work of the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (previously the
50 Metropolitan Radio Board) in implementing and maintaining the 800 MHz radio system so long
51 as cities are not forced to modify their current systems or become a part of the 800 MHz Radio
52 System unless they so choose.

53

54 **GG-6 BUILDING CODES**

55 ~~Thousands of new housing units as well as commercial and industrial buildings are constructed~~
56 ~~annually in the metropolitan area. The State Building Code (SBC) sets statewide standards for~~
57 ~~the construction, reconstruction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other structures~~
58 ~~governed by the code. A building code provides many benefits, including uniformity of~~
59 ~~construction standards in the building industry, consistency in code interpretation and~~
60 ~~enforcement, and life safety guidance.~~

61 ~~Metro Cities supports an equitable distribution of fees from the Construction Code Fund, with~~
62 ~~proportional distribution based on the area of enforcement where fees were received. Metro~~

~~Cities further supports efforts by the state, cities, and builders to collectively identify appropriate uses for the fund, including education, analysis of new materials and construction techniques, building code updating, building inspector training, and development of performance standards and identification of construction “best practices.”~~

~~Metro Cities also supports adopting the international energy conservation code to the state building code without amendments. Metro Cities does not support legislative solutions that fail to recognize the interrelationships among builders, state building codes and cities.~~

~~Metro Cities supports efforts to increase awareness of the potential impacts and benefits of requiring sprinklers in new homes and townhouses. Metro Cities supports discussion and the dissemination of information on these impacts via the code adoption process through the Department of Labor and Industry. Metro Cities supports adopting and amending the State Building Code through the rulemaking process and opposes legislative changes to building codes absent unusual or extraordinary circumstances.~~

~~As energy costs continue to rise, more attention must be paid to the poor energy efficiency of much of the existing housing stock as well as commercial and industrial buildings. Homes and other buildings that are energy inefficient are more costly to maintain and create added cost to ownership and occupancy. Making homes and buildings more energy efficient will make them more affordable to operate and will help the state achieve energy demand goals and will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This includes supporting legislation to increase the efficiency of buildings on a pathway toward net zero energy.~~

~~Metro Cities supports state funding and technical support for programs that provide support for property owners for weatherization and energy efficiency improvements, including programs available for local governments.~~

~~While a single set of coordinated codes helps provide consistency in code administration and enforcement, implementation of sustainable building design, construction, and operation does not readily integrate with the existing state building and energy code system. As a result, many cities are interested in adopting stronger local standards for sustainable development and conservation.~~

~~Metro Cities supports authorizing cities to employ stronger local standards for sustainable development and conservation that will help inform the state code development process.~~

~~The state should include an optional sustainable appendix to the State Building Code to allow cities to utilize appropriate parts of guidelines in their communities. Metro Cities also supports the state adopting an advanced energy building standard for buildings within the State Building Code and allowing cities to adopt their own enhanced standards.~~

The State Building Code (SBC) sets statewide standards for the construction, reconstruction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other structures governed by the code. A statewide building code provides many benefits, with safety as a primary consideration, including uniformity of construction standards in the building industry, and consistency in code interpretation and enforcement.

Metro Cities supports adopting and amending the State Building Code through the rulemaking process and opposes legislative modifications absent unusual or extraordinary circumstances.

Metro Cities supports an equitable distribution of fees from the Construction Code Fund and collaborative efforts by the state, cities, and builders to identify appropriate uses for the fund, including education, training, and best practices.

The Department of Labor and Industry should collaborate with local governments, builders, and other stakeholders on modifications to the building codes. Proposed changes to the building codes should primarily focus on preserving and improving safety. Impacts on the cost of development and advancing sustainability should also be considered.

Advanced state energy standards reduce energy burdens and costs for building occupants and lower greenhouse gas emissions. Metro Cities supports state funding for programs that support property owners in making energy efficiency improvements, as well as programs available for local governments.

GG-7 ADMINISTRATIVE FINES

Administrative fines can be used to moderate local costs associated with traditional methods of citation, enforcement, and prosecution. Metro Cities supports the administrative fine authority that allows cities to issue administrative fines for defined local traffic offenses and supports further modifications to enhance functionality of this authority. Metro Cities continues to support cities' authority to use administrative fines for regulatory ordinances such as building codes, zoning codes, health codes, and public safety and nuisance ordinances.

Metro Cities supports the use of city administrative fines, at a minimum, for regulatory matters that are not duplicative of misdemeanor or higher-level state traffic and criminal offenses. Metro Cities also endorses a fair hearing process before a disinterested third party.

GG-8 RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS

Sufficient funding and oversight are needed to ensure that residents living in residential programs have appropriate care and supervision and that neighborhoods are not disproportionately impacted by high concentrations of residential programs. Historically, federal and state laws have discouraged the concentration of residential group homes so as not to promote areas that reinforce institutional quality settings.

Under current law, operators of certain residential programs are not required to notify cities when they intend to purchase single-family housing for this purpose. Cities do not have the authority to regulate the locations of residential programs. Cities have reasonable concerns about high concentrations of these facilities in residential neighborhoods, and additional traffic and service deliveries surrounding these facilities when they are grouped closely together. Municipalities recognize and support the services residential programs provide. However, cities also have an interest in preserving balance between residential programs and other uses in residential neighborhoods.

Providers applying to operate residential programs should be required to notify the city when applying for licensure to be informed of local ordinance requirements as a part of the application process. Licensing agencies should be required to notify the city of properties receiving licensure to be operated as residential programs.

Metro Cities supports changes to Minn. Stat. § 245A.11, subd. 4, to allow for appropriate non-concentration standards for all types of cities to prevent clustering. Metro Cities supports statutory modifications to require licensed agencies and licensed providers that operate residential programs to notify the city of properties being operated as residential programs. Metro Cities also supports the establishment of appropriate non-concentration standards for residential programs, to prevent clustering, and supports enforcement of these rules by the appropriate county agencies.

Metro Cities opposes legislation enacted in 2024 that exempts group homes and assisted living facilities with licensed capacities of six or fewer individuals from local rental licensing regulations. Local communities are best positioned to determine whether residential group homes should be included in a rental housing inspection program. Residents in group homes can be especially vulnerable to experiencing unsafe living conditions. Local inspections ensure that housing meets minimum standards and requirements for safety and livability. In addition to any state oversight, local inspections also ensure that any housing conditions needing attention can be addressed promptly. Metro Cities will continue to monitor the new law and urges the Legislature to consider its repeal.

GG-9 ANNEXATION

Attempts have been made in recent years to reduce tensions between cities and townships in annexations. Metro Cities supports continued legislative efforts to develop recommendations regarding best practices and annexation training for city and township officials to better communicate and plan for potential annexations. Further, Metro Cities supports substantive changes to the state's annexation laws that will lead to better land use planning, energy conservation, greater environmental protection, fairer tax bases, clarification of fee reimbursement and fewer conflicts between townships and cities. Metro Cities also supports technical annexation changes that are agreed to by cities and townships.

GG-10 STATEWIDE FUNDING SOURCES FOR LOCAL ISSUES WITH REGIONAL IMPACT

Many issues including, but not limited to, a metropolitan area groundwater monitoring network, emerald ash borer management, perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS/PFOS), and the cleanup of storm-water retention ponds, come with significant local costs, and have effects that reach beyond municipal boundaries.

Metro Cities supports the availability of statewide funding sources to address local issues that have regional or statewide significance or are caused by state or regional actions. Metro Cities opposes any requirement to enact ordinances more restrictive than state law in exchange for access to these funds.

GG-11 URBAN FOREST MANAGEMENT FUNDING

Urban forests are an essential local infrastructure component. Dutch elm disease, oak wilt disease, drought, storms, and emerald ash borer threaten public investments in trees and controlling these issues can be greatly consequential for city budgets. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, through its Urban and Community Forestry program, and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, through its Shade Tree and Invasive Species program, have regulatory authority to direct tree sanitation and control programs. Although these programs allow for addressing some tree disease, pest, and other problems, funding has been inadequate to meet the need of cities to build capacity for tree programs and respond to catastrophic problems.

Cities share the goal of the state's ReLeaf Program – promoting and funding the inventory, planning, planting, maintenance, and improvement of trees in cities throughout the state. In addition, residents are facing significant costs for the removal, replacement, and treatment of emerald ash borer (EAB). Economic and environmental gains for storm water management,

climate change mitigation, air quality management, tourism, recreation, and other benefits must be protected from tree loss. A lack of timely investment in urban forests costs cities significantly more in the long run.

Metro Cities supports continued funding for state programs to assist cities with building and increasing capacity for urban forest management, meeting the costs of preparing for, and responding to, catastrophic urban forest problems and preventing further loss and increasing canopy coverage. Specifically, direct grants to cities are desperately needed for the identification, removal, replacement, and treatment of trees related to management of emerald ash borer (EAB). Metro Cities supports direct grants and/or aid payments to local governments for reimbursement and retroactive relief to homeowners for treatment or removal, transporting and disposal of wood waste containing ash tree material.

GG-12 POLLINATOR HABITAT RESOURCES

Recent declines in the abundance of pollinator insects, such as bees and butterflies, have been identified by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization as a threat to food security, as these insects are an important method of plant pollination. According to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the main threats facing pollinators are habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation. Pollinators lose food and nesting sites they need to survive when native vegetation is replaced by roadways, manicured lawns, crops, and non-native gardens. This can have added detriment to pollinators that migrate. Research has shown that increasing habitats can create the conditions for these insect populations to recover. Converting traditional grass lawns has been identified as one way to increase pollinator habitat.

The Minnesota Legislature created the Lawns to Legumes program, which provides grants to private homeowners to convert traditional lawns to pollinator friendly landscape. The program also funds demonstration neighborhoods, which are pollinator programs run by local governments and nonprofit organizations. Metro Cities supports state funding to programs such as Lawns to Legumes that create pollinator habitat on both public and private lands.

GG-13 REGULATION OF HARMFUL SUBSTANCES AND PRODUCTS

In metropolitan regions where most cities share boundaries with other cities, local bans of harmful drugs and substances such as synthetic drugs, which have been found to be dangerous, do not eliminate access to these products unless all cities take the same regulatory action.

Metro Cities supports statewide regulation and prohibition of products or substances in circumstances where there is evidence that products present a danger to anyone who uses them, where there is broad local support for a ban and where corresponding regulatory issues have regional or statewide significance.

In addition, the Legislature should provide for the regulation of products that are known to damage water quality, sewer collection, and storm and wastewater treatment systems, not just at the treatment and infrastructure maintenance levels, but at the consumer and manufacturing levels, through accurate labeling of products, public education, and recycling and re-use programs.

GG-14 WATER SUPPLY

Municipal water suppliers are charged with meeting the water supply needs of their communities and work to do so with safe, reliable, and cost-effective systems that are sustainable both for established cities and for all future growth.

The aquifers in the metropolitan area cross municipal boundaries and therefore require a coordinated regional approach to planning for their future availability. Currently, approximately 75% of municipal water supply in the metropolitan area comes from groundwater. With proper management of the resource, the current water supply in the region is adequate; however, Metropolitan Council projections predict localized declines in aquifer availability due to population growth estimates if current usage levels are maintained.

Regulation of water is complex and compartmentalized. Various agencies permit its use, plan for its availability, regulate stormwater, treat wastewater and protect the safety of water. To ensure that water supply remains adequate and sustainable across the region, we must understand how much water can be sustainably drawn from the aquifers and what effect increases in re-use, conservation and recharge can have on the sustainability and availability of both groundwater and surface water. Many of these strategies cross agency jurisdictions and will require improved coordination and cooperation.

Municipal water suppliers have made significant infrastructure investments in their systems based on calculated water availability and DNR permits. Proposals to reduce the reliance on groundwater by switching municipal water systems from groundwater to surface water supplies will come with significant costs that could place excessive burdens on local resources.

The outcomes and benefits of re-balancing the mix of groundwater and surface water use for specific municipalities and the region must be identifiable before any projects are undertaken.

The sustainability of our water supply is an issue of regional and statewide significance and the expense of any necessary projects that benefit the region should not fall on individual cities. Any attempts to address water supply sustainability must also consider all water users, including municipal water suppliers, industry, private wells, agriculture and contamination containment.

The metropolitan region must consider the effects of groundwater use beyond the borders of the metropolitan area on the region's groundwater availability and the cost of treating contaminants in surface water that comes into the metropolitan area for use.

Metro Cities supports the removal of barriers to wastewater and storm water re-use, improved inter-agency coordination, clarifying the appropriate roles of local, regional, and state governments with respect to water, streamlining and consolidating permit approval processes and the availability of statewide resources to plan for and ensure the future sustainability of water supply in the metropolitan area. Metro Cities also encourages the Metropolitan Council, in consultation with municipalities, to find ways to re-use wastewater and to develop other strategies to improve conservation.

Metro Cities supports state funding for costs associated with converting water supply from groundwater to surface water and funds to encourage and promote water conservation as a strategy to improve water sustainability and to improve and protect water quality.

GG-15 PRIVATE WELL DRILLING RESTRICTION AUTHORITY

Cities are authorized to enact ordinances that disallow the placement of private wells within city limits to ensure both water safety and availability for residents and businesses. This authority is important for the appropriate management of local water supply conservation efforts. Municipal water systems are financially dependent upon users to operate and maintain the system. A loss of significant rate payers resulting from unregulated private well drilling would economically destabilize water systems and could lead to contamination of the water supply.

Metro Cities supports current law that authorizes cities to regulate and prohibit the placement of private wells within municipal utility service boundaries and opposes any attempt to remove or alter that authority. Metro Cities supports funding that can be used to cap private wells.

GG-16 ORGANIZED WASTE COLLECTION

Cities over 1,000 in population are required by law to ensure all residents have solid waste collection available to them. A city can meet the statutory requirement by licensing haulers to

operate in an open collection system, authorize city employees to collect waste, or implement organized collection through one or multiple haulers to increase efficiency, reduce truck traffic and control costs to residents.

Metro Cities supports current laws that allow cities to work with existing haulers to achieve the benefits of organized collection or investigate the merits of organized collection without the pressure of a rigid timeline and requirement to pass ‘an intent to organize’ at the beginning of the discussion process. Metro Cities opposes any legislation that would further increase the cost or further complicate the process cities are required to follow to organize waste collection or prohibit cities from implementing, expanding, or using organized waste collection. Metro Cities supports state funding to local governments to increase the availability of material and organic recycling.

GG-17 FRANCHISE FEES, ACCOUNTABILITY AND COST TRANSPARENCY

Minnesota cities are authorized by Minn. Stat. § 216B and Minn. Stat. § 301B.01 to require a public utility (gas or electric) that provides services to the city or occupies the public right-of-way within a city to obtain a franchise. Several metro area cities have entered agreements that require the utility to pay a fee to help offset costs of maintaining the right-of-way.

Cities are also adopting energy policies that use renewable energy resources to light or heat public facilities. Policies and programs have also been instituted in cooperation with the public utility franchisee to increase energy efficiency for all users. Cities contract, at city expense, with public utilities to “underground” wires. State laws also require energy companies to provide more electric energy from renewable sources. The specific amounts vary by type of utility.

Metro Cities supports state policies adopted by legislation or through rules of the Public Utility Commission that provide cities with the authority to include city energy policies and priorities in a franchise or similar agreement with a franchisee.

Metro Cities supports greater accountability and transparency for city paid costs associated with underground utility and similar work performed by electric utilities as part of a local project.

Metro Cities supports legislation authorizing cities to franchise broadband/internet service providers (ISPs) in the public right-of-way and to collect franchise fees from these providers. Broadband Franchising will allow a city to require equal access to the same quality of broadband service throughout a city, to require reasonable build-out and system upgrades of broadband systems, to require uniform pricing and other customer service requirements, as well as other public benefits. Furthermore, Metro Cities supports the use of franchise fees on

broadband or other dedicated funding to support local community television, which has seen declining funding from cable franchise fees and public, educational, and governmental (PEG) access fees as consumers switch to internet-based streaming over traditional cable tv service.

GG-18 ELECTION ADMINISTRATION

Cities play a critical role in managing and ensuring the integrity of elections. Any changes made to election laws should not place undue financial or administrative burdens on local governments. Metro Cities supports reimbursement by the state to local units of government for any costs associated with changes to election laws.

State laws that allow the filling of municipal vacancies by special election on one of four days specified in law, can create logistical and financial challenges for municipalities. Metro Cities supports changes to state laws that allow sufficient flexibility for municipalities in addressing vacancies in municipal offices.

Metro Cities supports laws to increase efficiencies in administering absentee ballots and early voting, to reduce the potential for errors, and to improve absentee balloting and early voting processes.

Metro Cities further supports:

- Statutory changes to allow direct balloting for the duration of the absentee voting period.
- Establishing an earlier deadline for ending in-person absentee voting.
- Authorizing cities to schedule election judges to conduct absentee voting at an earlier date in health care facilities.
- Additional funding and flexibility for cities that administer absentee balloting and early voting.
- Requiring the legislature to conduct a cost-benefit analysis for Minn. Stat. §203B.085, which mandates certain days and hours for early voting, weighing the number of voters served by extended hours on evenings and weekends with the cost to local governments.

GG-19 REGULATION OF MASSAGE THERAPISTS

In the absence of statewide regulation for massage therapy practitioners, many cities have enacted local ordinances that require massage therapists to obtain a local professional license

to assist law enforcement in differentiating between legitimate providers and illegitimate businesses fronting as massage therapy establishments.

Metro Cities supports statewide registration or licensure of massage therapists to aid local law enforcement efforts in this area. Metro Cities supports cities' ability to continue to license massage therapy businesses.

GG-20 PEACE OFFICER ARBITRATION REFORM

Many municipalities in the metropolitan area provide law enforcement services and employ licensed peace officers. To ensure the public's safety and trust, and to strengthen collaboration between citizens and peace officers, cities must have the authority to effectively govern local law enforcement agencies. City officials are ultimately responsible for the safety and protection of the local community.

Metro Cities supports statutory arbitration reforms to allow for the discipline, including removal, of law enforcement officers who have been found to have violated local law enforcement agency policies.

Metro Cities further supports a reasonable standard of review in law enforcement arbitration cases, which would limit the determination of arbitrators to whether the actions of an employer were reasonable and consistent with city and agency policies. Metro Cities further supports using administrative law judges (ALJs) or arbitration to address grievances and discipline related to police misconduct.

GG-21 PUBLIC SAFETY TRAINING AND RESOURCES

Metro Cities acknowledges that the tasks public safety responders have been asked to address are increasingly the result of inadequate social services and programs.

Metro Cities recognizes the need for adequate resources for social service and mental health services and programs to help reduce the need for public safety responders to perform these services. Metro Cities supports allocated ongoing state funding to local governments for public safety purposes such as imbedded social workers, mental health response, training, innovation, and more.

Metro Cities supports tools and incentives such as scholarships and/or reimbursements for local law enforcement agencies to use and help with recruitment and retention barriers.

Metro Cities supports resources for the MN Department of Public Safety to acquire and store with a third-party vendor anti-scale fencing, pedestrian doors, and vehicle gates for local government facilities to improve equitable access to these de-escalation and safety tools.

GG-22 COPPER AND OTHER METAL THEFT

Wire theft from streetlights, other public infrastructure, and private property negatively impacts communities, by reducing public safety for all transportation modes. These thefts also cost cities hundreds of thousands of dollars each year to replace and repair damaged streetlights.

Metro Cities supports efforts to curtail the theft of copper wires from public infrastructure and private property. Metro Cities supports statutory changes that would require appropriate controls on the purchase and sale of scrap copper and other metals. Metro Cities also supports increasing penalties for copper wire and other metal theft.

GG-23 EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

The Office of Emergency Medical Services ~~Emergency Medical Services Regulatory Board (EMSRB)~~ is the state regulatory entity that oversees and issues ambulance licenses and also has authority to designate exclusive emergency medical services (EMS) operating areas, or primary service areas (PSAs), for ambulance providers. Once a provider has been approved to operate in a PSA, the provider is authorized to serve the area for an indefinite period of time. Currently, no other state health licensing board grants providers an exclusive operating area.

~~Health licensing boards play a critical role in setting professional standards and credentialing processes. However, the EMSRB has not imposed operational standards to ensure an area has adequate coverage and service levels such as response time requirements. Nor is there state oversight of ambulance billing rates. The current system does not require ambulance services to disclose the number of ambulances staffed, where an ambulance is responding from or any other important data points that would ensure a community is receiving quality ambulance services. The lack of transparency within Minnesota's ambulance industry compromises accountability by EMS providers.~~

~~In 2024, legislation was passed establishing The Office of Emergency Medical Services, which will replace the EMSRB, effective January 1, 2025. The new office is comprised of three divisions for Medical Services, Ambulance Services, and Emergency Medical Service Providers.~~

~~Additionally, three advisory councils are established to provide input and guidance to the office. Metro Cities supports the local government representation on the Emergency Medical Services~~

Advisory Council. Metro Cities supports regional balance among the membership of the various advisory councils established by the office.

Metro Cities supports allowing local units of government to designate which licensed ambulance service provider(s) serve their community and to determine the appropriate level of service. Metro Cities further supports additional tools, data collection, and local authority that ensure transparency by EMS providers. Metro Cities supports decoupling the professional standards overview role from the service area determination. (*Edits suggested by staff*)

GG-24 RACE EQUITY

In the seven-county metropolitan region, people of color represent 28% of the population, and this percentage is expected to grow to 44% by 2050, according to the current population forecast from the Metropolitan Council. As racial and ethnic diversity increases in the region, people of color continue to experience significant barriers in housing, employment, criminal justice, public infrastructure, health, and education, and disparities are becoming more apparent. Across the metropolitan region, many cities are working to examine local policies and systems, to revise the delivery of public services, and to allocate resources to help advance race equity. All levels of government as well as the nonprofit and business sectors have roles to play in addressing race inequities and must work collaboratively to ensure that services and resources are considered, designed, and implemented in a comprehensive, purposeful, informed, and inclusive way to achieve race equity. Metro Cities supports:

- An examination and revision of state, regional, county and city laws, ordinances, and policies to address racial disparities.
- State resources to assist with comprehensive data collection, disaggregation and sharing to ensure informed policy and funding decisions at all levels of government.
- Funding to assist in the development of tools and resources that advance racially equitable outcomes.
- Activating partnerships among state, regional and local governmental institutions, and other entities to advance race equity.

~~GG-25 OPENMEETING LAW~~

~~Public meetings in the State of Minnesota, including city council meetings and local boards and commissions, must be conducted in accordance with the Open Meeting Law under Minnesota Statute 13D.~~

~~In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, cities successfully pivoted to working remotely while maintaining and even increasing transparency and accessibility.~~

~~Metro Cities supports amending the Open Meeting Law to allow city council members and non-elected city board and/or commission members the ability to participate remotely in up to fifty percent of scheduled meetings each year without making their location open and accessible to the public as otherwise required under Minn. Stat. § 13D.02, subd. 1. Metro Cities also supports amending the Open Meeting Law to remove the three times per year cap for medical and military exceptions. (Deletion of policy suggested by staff)~~

GG-26 ADULT-USE CANNABIS

The Minnesota Legislature legalized adult-use cannabis in 2023. The law establishes the Office of Cannabis Management, which ~~will be~~ is responsible for licensing cannabis businesses and regulating the industry. The law includes a local registration process for cannabis business license holders where local governments are authorized to charge a registration and renewal fee. Responsible local governments are required to conduct compliance checks for age verification and the enforcement of local ordinances at cannabis businesses. Cities are authorized to establish, own, and operate a municipal cannabis store. The law also includes an optional, population-based limit on the number of retail locations in each city or county. It is vital that local governments retain the ability to suspend retail registrations for businesses that pose an immediate threat to public health or safety.

The law permits local units of government to establish reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of cannabis business operations and includes a zoning compliance requirement for businesses where a local jurisdiction certifies that a business' plans are appropriate and in line with local requirements.

~~The law establishes a Local Cannabis Aid Account to provide aid to cities and counties. The account will receive 20% of the of the revenue from the 10% gross receipts tax on cannabis products. Half of the local cannabis aid will go to counties and half will be distributed to cities based on the number of businesses located in each city.~~

Metro Cities opposes any efforts to reduce cities' local control and zoning authority related to cannabis. Metro Cities supports legislation providing cities the ability to prohibit cannabis businesses within their jurisdiction.

Metro Cities expects the Office of Cannabis Management to work closely with cities as this legislation is fully implemented. This includes working with local governments to create model ordinances and providing technical assistance on cannabis-related issues.

Metro Cities supports reestablishing the Local Cannabis Aid Account to provide ongoing funding to cities to assist with costs related to the local implementation of legal adult-use cannabis.

~~Metro Cities supports the ongoing evaluation of costs associated with the legalization of adult-use cannabis. Funding should be made available to cities without cannabis businesses if such studies show that those communities face additional budgetary pressures because of cannabis legalization.~~

~~Metro Cities supports the distribution of tax revenue from adult use cannabis sales to cities based on the number of products sold and not the number of stores located in each municipality. (Edits suggested by staff)~~

GG-27 STREET RACING AND CARJACKING

Street racing and carjacking are issues of concern for cities across the metropolitan region. The highly mobile nature of street racing makes it difficult to prevent or stop. Street racing is strongly associated with other illegal activity and poses significant public safety risks for participants, third-party observers, and the public. The crime of carjacking has serious consequences for individual and community public safety. While data provided by the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA) shows recent decreases in the number of carjacking incidents, more should be done to curb this behavior.

Metro Cities supports state funding to help state and local law enforcement agencies prevent and respond to street racing and carjacking. This could include funding for State Patrol air support and funding for costs, including overtime, associated with targeted law enforcement saturations and Toward Zero Deaths initiatives. Metro Cities also supports state resources to increase the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension's intelligence gathering capabilities and to enhance existing coordination efforts among law enforcement agencies.

Metro Cities supports modifications to state laws to prohibit street racing and activities associated with promoting and undertaking the activity of street racing. Specifically, Metro Cities supports statutory changes that address the activity and associated risks posed by street racing, sliding, and drifting. These could include penalties such as license suspension, minimum impoundment periods, and vehicle forfeiture.

518 Metro Cities supports consumer protection efforts that require motor vehicle manufacturers to
519 offer antitheft protection devices on certain vehicles that have been shown to be especially
520 susceptible to theft.

521 Metro Cities further recognizes the importance and value of diversion programs that emphasize
522 behavior modifications, which can help curb illegal activity and minimize recidivism.

TRANSPORTATION POLICIES AND FUNDING INTRODUCTION

Metro Cities supports a comprehensive transportation system as a vital component in planning for and meeting the physical, social, and economic needs of the state and metropolitan region.

A comprehensive transportation system includes streets and bridges, transit, and multi-modal solutions that work cohesively to best meet state, regional and local transportation needs.

Adequate and stable sources of funding are necessary to ensure the development and maintenance of a high quality, efficient and safe transportation system that meets these needs and that will position the state and region to be economically competitive in the years ahead. Failure to maintain a functional transportation system will have adverse effects on the state's ability to attract and retain businesses and create jobs.

Transportation funding and planning must be a high priority for state, regional and local policymakers so that the transportation system can meet the needs of the state's residents and businesses as well as projected population growth. Funding and planning for regional and statewide systems must be coordinated at the federal, state, regional and local levels to optimally achieve long-term needs and goals.

TP-1 ROAD AND BRIDGE FUNDING

Under current financing structures that rely primarily on local property taxes and fees as well as cities' share of the Highway User Tax Distribution (HUTD) Fund, road and bridge needs in the metropolitan region continue to be underfunded. Metro Cities supports stable, sufficient, and sustainable statewide transportation funding and expanded local tools to meet the transportation system needs of the region and local municipal systems. Consideration should be given to using new, expanded, and existing resources to meet these needs. Metro Cities supports the use of dedicated taxes and fees to fund transportation infrastructure.

In addition, cities lack adequate tools and resources for the maintenance and improvement of municipal street systems, with resources restricted to property taxes and special assessments. It is imperative that alternative revenue generating authority be granted to municipalities and that state resources be made available for this purpose to aid local communities and relieve the burden on the property tax system.

Metro Cities supports Municipal State Aid Street (MSAS) funding. MSAS provides an important but limited revenue source that assists eligible cities with street infrastructure needs and is limited to twenty percent of a city's street system.

Metro Cities supports state funding to assist cities over-burdened by cost participation responsibilities from improvement projects on state or county highways.

Metro Cities supports flexibility in cost participation policies, especially for those cities with a disproportionate number of state or county highways in and around their local boundaries. The state and counties should have responsibility for the installation, replacement, and ongoing maintenance for infrastructure within their right-of-way including Complete Streets facilities such as trails and sidewalks.

Metro Cities supports state funding for state highway projects, including congestion, bottleneck and safety improvements. ~~Metro Cities supports requiring the Minnesota Advisory Council on Infrastructure (MACI) to include in its annual reporting all road and bridge funding provided by MnDOT and counties. (Edit suggested by staff)~~ This information should include the jurisdiction(s) projects are located in, the source of funding, and any local match required for each investment. Metro Cities also supports state financial assistance, as well as innovations in design and construction, to offset the impacts of regional transportation construction projects on businesses.

Metro Cities opposes statutory changes restricting the use of local funds for transportation projects. Metro Cities opposes restrictions on aesthetic related components of transportation projects, as these components often provide important safety and other benefits to projects.

Metro Cities supports further research into the policy implications for electric and automated vehicles on roadways, transit, and other components of transportation systems. Metro Cities encourages the state to study the impact of electric and automated vehicles on transportation related funding and policies.

TP-2 REGIONAL TRANSIT SYSTEM

The Twin Cities Metropolitan Area needs a multi-modal regional transit system as part of a comprehensive transportation strategy that serves all users, including commuters and the transit dependent. The transit system should be composed of a mix of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, a network of bike and pedestrian trails, bus rapid transit, express and regular route bus service, ride-on-demand microtransit, exclusive transitways, light rail transit, streetcars, and commuter rail corridors designed to connect residential, employment, retail, and entertainment centers. *(Language suggested by city of Eagan)* The system should be regularly monitored and adjusted to ensure that routes of service correspond to current and forecasted changes in the region's transit service needs and priorities. Metro Cities supports strategic expansion of the regional transit system.

67 Current congestion levels and forecasted population growth require a stable, reliable, and
68 growing source of revenue for transit construction and operations so that our metropolitan
69 region can meet its transportation needs to remain economically competitive. Metro Cities
70 supports an effective, efficient, and comprehensive regional transit system as an invaluable
71 component in meeting the multimodal transportation needs of the metropolitan region and to
72 the region's economic vibrancy and quality of life. Metro Cities recognizes that transit service
73 connects residents to jobs, schools, health care, and activity centers.

74 Transit access and service frequency levels should recognize the role of public transit in
75 addressing equity, including but not limited to racial and economic disparities, people with
76 disabilities and the elderly. Metro Cities supports efforts to transition the fleets of transit
77 providers in the metropolitan region to low or zero emission buses and supports using equity
78 and environmental criteria identified in transit providers' zero emission bus transition plans to
79 prioritize the deployment of zero or low-emission buses.

80 Metro Cities opposes statutory changes restricting the use of local funds for planning or
81 construction of transit projects. Restricting local planning and funding limits the ability of cities
82 to participate in transit corridor planning and development. State and regional policymakers
83 must coordinate with local units of government as decisions are made at the state level on
84 transit projects that also involve municipal planning, funding, and policy decisions.

85 In the interest of including all potential options in the pursuit of a regionally balanced transit
86 system, Metro Cities opposes the imposition of legislative moratoriums on the study, planning,
87 design, or construction of specific transit projects.

88 Metro Cities supports a regional governance structure that ensures a measurably reliable and
89 efficient system, recognizes the diverse transit needs of our region and addresses funding needs
90 for all components of the system. These structures must work with and be responsive to the
91 needs of the communities they serve.

92 Metro Cities supports an open and collaborative regional transportation planning process that
93 fully engages all public transit providers as partners in ongoing policy development to achieve
94 desired outcomes, including establishment of transit project criteria that promote fair and
95 equitable selection of projects throughout the region and transparent regional distribution of
96 available funding.

97 Metro Cities recognizes the need for flexibility in transit systems for cities that border the edges
98 of the seven-county metropolitan area to ensure users can get to destinations outside of the
99 seven-county area. Metro Cities encourages the Metropolitan Council to coordinate with collar
100 counties so that riders can get to and from destinations beyond the boundaries of the region.

Metro Cities is opposed to legislative or Metropolitan Council directives that constrain the ability of metropolitan transit providers to provide a full range of transit services, including reverse commute routes, suburb-to-suburb routes, transit hub feeder services or new, experimental services that may show a low rate of operating cost recovery from the fare box.

Metro Cities supports the autonomy of suburban transit providers to conduct operations to meet demonstrated and unique needs in their designated service areas independent from the operations of other regional transit providers. Metro Cities supports the ability of a new window to be established for cities to opt out of Metro Transit to either partner with or join an existing suburban transit provider or to establish their own transit service.

Suburban transit providers are concerned that funding challenges may be used to attempt to justify a repeal of their authorizing legislation and to consolidate transit services into a single regional entity. This would result in reverting to conditions existing nearly 40 years ago when inadequate service caused twelve suburbs to elect not to be part of the traditional transit system.

In the interest of safety and traffic management, Metro Cities supports further study of rail safety issues relating to water quality protections, public safety concerns relating to derailments, traffic implications from longer and more frequent trains and the sensitive balance between rail commerce and the quality-of-life impacts on the communities through which they pass.

TP-3 TRANSIT FINANCING

Shifting demographics in the metropolitan region will mean increased demand for various modes of transit in areas with and without current transit service. MVST revenue projections are unpredictable, and the Legislature has repeatedly reduced general fund support for Metro Transit, which contributes to persistent operating deficits for regional transit providers.

Operating subsidies necessary to support a regional system should come from regional and statewide funding sources and not local taxpayers. Until recently, state and regional resources for transit had diminished, with costs shifting to local taxpayers in the metropolitan area. A system of transit provides significant economic benefits to the state and metropolitan region and must be supported with state and regional revenue sources. In addition, capital costs for the expansion of the regional transit system should be supported through state and regional sources, and not the sole responsibility of local units of government. In 2023, a 0.75% regional sales and use tax in the seven county metropolitan region was established to provide funding for transit operations, maintenance, and capital projects.

Metro Cities supports stable and predictable state and regional revenue sources to fund operating and capital expenses for all regional transit providers and Metro Mobility at a level sufficient to meet the growing operational and capital transit needs of the region and to expand the system to areas that lack sufficient transit service options.

Metro Cities continues to support an advisory role for municipal officials in decisions associated with local transit projects. Metro Cities supports the early engagement of local governments in transit project planning and development including project scoping, cost estimating, funding requests and coordination with overlapping initiatives to achieve successful corridor-based projects.

To promote stable and predictable distribution of Regional Transportation Sales and Use Tax receipts, Metro Cities supports a collaborative process by which the Metropolitan Council includes stakeholders in the creation of policy guiding the distribution of funds.

Metro Cities supports equitable distribution of Regional Transportation Sales and Use Tax receipts based on consideration of ridership, population, and net tax capacity factors at a percentage rate commensurate with Motor Vehicle Sales Tax funding of regional public transit providers. (Language suggested by city of Eagan) Metro Cities supports the creation of a city allocation from the Regional Transportation Sales Tax to aid cities with local transportation infrastructure.

TP-4 STREET IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS

Funding sources for local transportation projects are limited to the use of Municipal State Aid Street Program (MSAS), Transportation Advancement Account (TAA) distributions, property taxes and special assessments. With increasing pressures on city budgets and limited tools and resources, cities are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain aging streets.

Street improvement districts allow cities in developed and developing areas to fund new construction as well as reconstruction and maintenance efforts.

The street improvement district is designed to allow cities, through a fair and objective fee structure, to create a district or districts within the city in which fees are raised on properties in the district and spent within the boundaries of the district.

Metro Cities supports the authority of local units of government to establish street improvement districts. Metro Cities also supports changes to special assessment laws to make assessing state-owned property a more predictable process with uniformity in the payment of assessments across the state.

168

169 **TP-5 HIGHWAY AND BRIDGE TURN BACKS & FUNDING**

170 Cities do not have the financial capacity and in many cities the technical expertise other than
171 through significant property tax increases, to absorb additional roadway or bridge infrastructure
172 responsibilities without new funding sources. The existing municipal turnback fund is not
173 adequate based on contemplated turn backs.

174 Metro Cities supports jurisdictional reassignment or turnback of roads (Minn. Stat. § 161.16,
175 subd. 4) on a phased basis using functional classifications and other appropriate criteria subject
176 to a corresponding mechanism for adequate funding of roadway improvements and continued
177 maintenance.

178 Metro Cities does not support a wholesale turnback of county or state roads or bridges without
179 the consent of the municipality and the total cost, agreed to by the municipality, being
180 reimbursed to the city in a timely manner. The process for establishing state policies to assign a
181 shared cost participation for newly constructed or rebuilt bridges over trunk highways to local
182 officials, must include input by the local municipalities affected, and any assigned shared costs
183 and responsibilities must be agreed to by the municipalities.

184

185 **TP-6 “3C” TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS: ELECTED OFFICIALS’ ROLE**

186 The Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) was developed to meet federal requirements,
187 designating the Metropolitan Council as the organization that is responsible for a continuous,
188 comprehensive, and cooperative (3C) transportation planning process to allocate federal funds
189 among metropolitan area projects. Input by local officials into the planning and prioritization of
190 transportation investments in the region is a vital component of these processes.

191 Metro Cities supports continuation of the TAB with a majority of locally elected municipal
192 officials as members participating in the process.

193

194 **TP-7 ELECTRONIC IMAGING FOR ENFORCEMENT OF TRAFFIC**

195 Enforcement of traffic laws with cameras and other motion imaging technology has been
196 demonstrated to improve driver compliance and safety. Metro Cities supports cities having the
197 authority to use such technology, including photos and videos, to enforce traffic laws.

198

TP-8 TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANIES AND ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION MODES

The introduction of transportation network companies (TNC) such as Lyft and Uber, vehicle sharing and other wheeled transportation modes such as bicycles and scooters, require the need for local officials to determine licensing and inspection requirements for these modes, and to address issues concerning management over public rights-of-way. Cities have the authority to license rideshare companies, inspect vehicles, license drivers, and regulate access to sidewalks and streets. The use of autonomous delivery robots and aerial drones in public rights-of-way is also becoming more prevalent and cities must maintain and enhance the authority necessary to regulate the use of these vehicles to ensure safe use of the public right of way.

Metro Cities supports the authority of local officials to regulate and establish fees on these transportation modes. Emerging and future transportation technologies have potentially significant implications for local public safety and local public service levels, the needs and impacts of which vary by community.

TP-9 AIRPORT NOISE MITIGATION

Communities closest to MSP and reliever airports are significantly impacted by noise, traffic, and other numerous expansion-related issues. Metro Cities supports the broad goal of providing MSP-impacted communities greater representation on the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC). Metro Cities encourages continued communication between MAC commissioners and the cities they represent.

Balancing the needs of the MAC, the business community, and the airport host cities and their residents requires open communication, planning and coordination. Cities must be viewed as partners with the MAC in resolving differences that arise out of airport projects and the development of adjacent parcels. Regular contact between the MAC and cities throughout a project proposal process will enhance communication and problem solving. The MAC should provide full funding for noise mitigation for all structures in communities impacted by flights in and out of MSP.

Metro Cities supports noise abatement programs and expenditures and the work of the Noise Oversight Committee to minimize the impacts of MAC operated facilities on neighboring communities. The MAC should determine the design and geographic reach of these programs only after a thorough public input process that considers the priorities and concerns of impacted cities and their residents. The MAC should provide full funding for noise mitigation for all structures in communities impacted by flights in and out of MSP.

MnDOT's current policy for approval of highway noise walls uses a weighted voting system for residents and property owners adjacent to proposed noise walls. In all cases, a property owner is allocated twice as many votes as a resident that does not own the property. This effectively denies renters any ability to influence the approval of noise walls adjacent to their homes. In the case of higher density housing, a single non-resident property owner can determine the outcome of a noise wall approval for hundreds of residents. If a property owner votes against a noise wall, even if residents overwhelmingly vote for a noise wall, the MnDOT policy results in hundreds of residents being disadvantaged. This is especially concerning considering renters are more likely to be lower income and more diverse. Metro Cities supports a comprehensive assessment of MnDOT's current noise wall voting policy, specifically including an equity analysis of the policy. (Language suggested by city of Richfield)

TP-10 FUNDING FOR NON-MUNICIPAL STATE AID (MSAS) CITY STREETS

Cities under 5,000 in population are not eligible for Municipal State Aid. Cities over 5,000 residents have limited eligibility for dedicated Highway User Tax Distribution Fund dollars, which are capped by the state constitution as being available for up to twenty percent of streets.

Current County State Aid Highway (CSAH) distributions to metropolitan counties are inadequate to provide for the needs of smaller cities in the metropolitan area.

Cities need long-term, stable, funding for street improvements and maintenance. In 2023, the Legislature established the Transportation Advancement Account which distributes revenue from the retail delivery fee and the auto parts sales tax to counties, cities, townships, and a food delivery support account. Specifically, this account will distribute 27 percent of the revenue collected to cities under 5,000 in population and 15 percent to cities over 5,000 in population.

Metro Cities supports the distribution of revenue deposited into the Transportation Advancement Account to cities, providing sustainable funding for non-MSAS city streets. Metro Cities supports additional resources and flexible policies to meet local infrastructure needs and increased demands on city streets.

TP-11 COUNTY STATE AID HIGHWAY (CSAH) DISTRIBUTION FORMULA

Significant resource needs remain in the metropolitan area CSAH system. Revenues provided by the Legislature for the CSAH system have resulted in a higher number of projects being completed. However, greater pressure is being placed on municipalities to participate in cost sharing activities, encumbering an already over-burdened local funding system. When the

alternative is not building or maintaining roads, cities bear not only the costs of their local systems but also as much as fifty percent of county road projects.

Metro Cities supports special or additional funding for cities that have burdens of additional cost participation in projects involving county roads.

The CSAH formula passed by the Legislature in 2008 helped to better account for needs in the metropolitan region but additional resources for the region are needed. Metro Cities supports a new CSAH formula more equitably designed to fund the needs of our metropolitan region.

TP-12 MUNICIPAL INPUT/CONSENT FOR TRUNK HIGHWAYS AND COUNTY ROADS

State statutes direct the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) to submit detailed plans, with city cost estimates, at a point one-and-a-half to two years prior to bid letting, at which time public hearings are held for community input. If MnDOT does not concur with requested changes, it may appeal. Currently, that process would take a maximum of three and a half months and the results of the appeals board are binding on both the city and MnDOT.

Metro Cities supports the municipal consent process and opposes changes to weaken municipal consent or adding another level of government to the consent process. Metro Cities opposes changes to current statutes that would allow MnDOT to disregard the appeals board ruling for state trunk highways. Such a change would significantly minimize MnDOT's need to negotiate in good faith with cities for appropriate project access and alignment and would render the public hearing and appeals process meaningless. Metro Cities also opposes the elimination of the county road municipal consent and appeal process for these reasons.

Metro Cities supports limiting the use of design-build contracts to projects with a single owner of the infrastructure being constructed or when there is a compelling reason to utilize that type of contract. MnDOT should be required to justify why an accelerated project is necessary. The decision to use a design-build contract should be made with the input and consent of the jurisdictions impacted by the project. (Language suggested by city of Richfield)

TP-13 PLAT AUTHORITY

Current law grants counties review and comment authority for access and drainage issues for city plats abutting county roads. Metro Cities opposes any statutory change that would grant counties veto power or that would shorten the 120-day review and permit process time.

TP-14 MNDOT MAINTENANCE BUDGET

MnDOT has been inconsistent in meeting its responsibility for maintaining major roads throughout the state and has required, through omission, that cities bear the burden of maintaining major state roads.

MnDOT should be required to meet standards adopted by cities through local ordinances, or reimburse cities for labor, equipment and material used on the state's behalf to improve public safety or meet local standards. Furthermore, if a city performs maintenance, the city should be fully reimbursed.

Metro Cities supports MnDOT taking full responsibility for maintaining state-owned infrastructure and property, including, but not limited to, sound walls and right of way within city limits. Metro Cities supports cooperative agreements between cities and MnDOT, which have proven to be effective in other parts of the state. Metro Cities supports adequate state funding for the maintenance of state rights-of-way.

TP-15 TRANSIT TAXING DISTRICT

The transit taxing district, which funds the capital cost of transit service in the Metropolitan Area through the property tax system, is inequitable. Because the boundaries of the transit taxing district do not correspond with any rational service line nor is being within the boundaries a guarantee to receive service, cities within and outside of the taxing district are contributing unequally to the transit service in the metropolitan area. This inequity should be corrected.

Metro Cities supports a stable revenue source to fund both the capital and operating costs for transit at the Metropolitan Council. However, Metro Cities does not support the expansion of the transit taxing district without a corresponding increase in service and an overall increase in operational funds. To do so would create additional property taxes without a corresponding benefit.

TP-16 COMPLETE STREETS

A complete street may include sidewalks, bike lanes (or wide paved shoulders), special bus lanes, comfortable and accessible public transportation stops, frequent and safe crossing opportunities, median islands, accessible pedestrian signals, curb extensions, narrower travel lanes and more.

A complete street in a rural area will differ from a complete street in a highly urban area, but both are designed to balance safety and convenience for everyone using the road.

Metro Cities supports options in state design guidelines for complete streets that would give cities greater flexibility to:

- Safely accommodate all modes of travel.
- Lower traveling speeds on local streets.
- Address city infrastructure needs.
- Ensure livability in the appropriate context for each city.

Metro Cities opposes state-imposed mandates that would increase street infrastructure improvement costs in locations and instances where providing access for alternative modes including cycling and walking are deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as determined by local jurisdictions.

Municipal State Aid design standards continue to be too restrictive for cities to design and construct complete streets that fit the community's context and address the needs of the community without a variance. Design flexibility should not be denied based on the amount of right-of-way available, it should be at the discretion of the local community's engineer and design team, and it should reflect the needs of the community.

Metro Cities supports efforts to develop new State Aid design standards that focus on providing broad guardrails and greater flexibility for design engineers to use their best judgment on how to meet the needs of a community, limiting the need for variances. (Language suggested by city of Richfield)

Fiscal Year 2025 Transportation Advancement Account

15% Larger Cities Assistance ACTUAL

162.146 LARGER CITIES ASSISTANCE ACCOUNT

Subdivision 1. Larger cities assistance account; appropriation.

(a) A larger cities assistance account is created in the special revenue fund. The account consists of funds under section 174.49, subdivision 3, and as provided by law and any other money donated, allotted, transferred, or otherwise provided to the account.

(b) Money in the account is annually appropriated to the commissioner of transportation for apportionment among all the cities that are eligible to receive municipal state aid under sections [162.09](#) to [162.14](#).

Subd. 2. Allocation formula. The commissioner must apportion funds in the larger cities assistance account as follows:

(1) 50 percent of the funds proportionally based on each city's share of population, as defined in section 477A.011, subdivision 3, compared to the total population of all cities that are eligible to receive municipal state aid under sections 162.09 to 162.14; and

(2) 50 percent of the funds proportionally based on each city's share of money needs, as determined under section 162.13, subdivision 3, compared to the total money needs of all cities that are eligible to receive municipal state aid under sections 162.09 to 162.14.

City	2023 Population Estimates	Population Percentage	Population Allocation \$	2024 Needs	Needs % Percentage	Needs Allocation \$	Total TAA Funds \$
Albert Lea	18,492	0.0044	11,297.00	75,070,158	0.0061	15,613.00	26,910.00
Albertville	8,542	0.0020	5,218.00	21,461,745	0.0017	4,463.00	9,681.00
Alexandria	15,000	0.0036	9,164.00	101,138,239	0.0082	21,034.00	30,198.00
Andover	32,601	0.0077	19,916.00	103,894,901	0.0084	21,608.00	41,524.00
Anoka	18,178	0.0043	11,105.00	52,112,491	0.0042	10,838.00	21,943.00
Apple Valley	56,374	0.0134	34,439.00	129,019,073	0.0104	26,833.00	61,272.00
Arden Hills	9,939	0.0024	6,072.00	18,617,539	0.0015	3,872.00	9,944.00
Austin	26,379	0.0063	16,115.00	94,658,454	0.0077	19,687.00	35,802.00
Baldwin	7,030	0.0017	4,295.00	34,820,095	0.0028	7,242.00	11,537.00
Baxter	8,885	0.0021	5,428.00	55,865,339	0.0045	11,619.00	17,047.00
Becker	5,042	0.0012	3,080.00	20,492,331	0.0017	4,262.00	7,342.00
Belle Plaine	7,456	0.0018	4,555.00	25,607,150	0.0021	5,326.00	9,881.00
Bemidji	15,637	0.0037	9,553.00	62,030,083	0.0050	12,901.00	22,454.00
Big Lake	12,524	0.0030	7,651.00	29,312,985	0.0024	6,096.00	13,747.00
Blaine	73,546	0.0175	44,929.00	171,175,784	0.0139	35,600.00	80,529.00
Bloomington	91,537	0.0218	55,920.00	271,630,179	0.0220	56,492.00	112,412.00
Brainerd	14,670	0.0035	8,962.00	64,082,113	0.0052	13,327.00	22,289.00
Brooklyn Center	33,982	0.0081	20,760.00	72,071,530	0.0058	14,989.00	35,749.00
Brooklyn Park	86,478	0.0206	52,830.00	196,566,729	0.0159	40,881.00	93,711.00
Buffalo	16,611	0.0039	10,148.00	61,759,461	0.0050	12,844.00	22,992.00
Burnsville	65,327	0.0155	39,908.00	157,363,714	0.0127	32,728.00	72,636.00
Byron	6,688	0.0016	4,086.00	23,396,149	0.0019	4,866.00	8,952.00
Cambridge	10,572	0.0025	6,458.00	51,749,091	0.0042	10,762.00	17,220.00
Carver	6,772	0.0016	4,137.00	18,506,549	0.0015	3,849.00	7,986.00
Champlin	24,975	0.0059	15,257.00	60,984,746	0.0049	12,683.00	27,940.00
Chanhassen	25,947	0.0062	15,851.00	78,170,847	0.0063	16,258.00	32,109.00
Chaska	29,739	0.0071	18,168.00	63,806,084	0.0052	13,270.00	31,438.00
Chisago City	5,730	0.0014	3,500.00	20,543,233	0.0017	4,272.00	7,772.00
Chisholm	5,000	0.0012	3,055.00	20,242,219	0.0016	4,210.00	7,265.00
Circle Pines	5,055	0.0012	3,088.00	8,957,228	0.0007	1,863.00	4,951.00
Cloquet	12,667	0.0030	7,738.00	58,584,099	0.0047	12,184.00	19,922.00
Columbia Heights	21,973	0.0052	13,423.00	35,570,645	0.0029	7,398.00	20,821.00
Coon Rapids	63,599	0.0151	38,853.00	156,120,203	0.0126	32,469.00	71,322.00
Corcoran	8,019	0.0019	4,899.00	39,917,374	0.0032	8,302.00	13,201.00
Cottage Grove	42,648	0.0101	26,054.00	118,110,896	0.0096	24,564.00	50,618.00
Credit River	5,655	0.0013	3,455.00	23,958,525	0.0019	4,483.00	8,438.00
Crookston	7,482	0.0018	4,571.00	35,259,305	0.0029	7,333.00	11,904.00
Crystal	23,330	0.0055	14,252.00	45,183,564	0.0037	9,397.00	23,649.00
Dayton	10,086	0.0024	6,162.00	45,746,355	0.0037	9,514.00	15,676.00
Delano	7,155	0.0017	4,371.00	17,142,139	0.0014	3,565.00	7,936.00
Detroit Lakes	10,003	0.0024	6,111.00	73,203,842	0.0059	15,225.00	21,336.00
Duluth	86,788	0.0206	53,019.00	393,766,015	0.0319	81,893.00	134,912.00
Eagan	69,299	0.0165	42,335.00	161,483,537	0.0131	33,584.00	75,919.00
East Bethel	11,992	0.0029	7,326.00	62,301,127	0.0050	12,957.00	20,283.00
East Grand Forks	9,176	0.0022	5,606.00	55,156,016	0.0045	11,471.00	17,077.00
Eden Prairie	64,600	0.0154	39,464.00	174,692,038	0.0141	36,332.00	75,796.00
Edina	54,480	0.0129	33,282.00	148,956,356	0.0121	30,979.00	64,261.00
Elk River	27,232	0.0065	16,636.00	117,140,775	0.0095	24,362.00	40,998.00
Elko New Market	5,200	0.0012	3,177.00	13,492,598	0.0011	2,806.00	5,983.00
Fairmont	10,487	0.0025	6,407.00	59,790,632	0.0048	12,435.00	18,842.00
Falcon Heights	5,640	0.0013	3,445.00	8,417,519	0.0007	1,751.00	5,196.00
Faribault	24,453	0.0058	14,938.00	94,080,436	0.0076	19,566.00	34,504.00
Farmington	23,895	0.0057	14,598.00	45,870,202	0.0037	9,540.00	24,138.00
Fergus Falls	14,144	0.0034	8,641.00	84,244,367	0.0068	17,521.00	26,162.00
Forest Lake	21,502	0.0051	13,136.00	87,830,479	0.0071	18,267.00	31,403.00
Fridley	30,258	0.0072	18,485.00	65,752,910	0.0053	13,675.00	32,160.00
Glencoe	5,744	0.0014	3,509.00	21,794,600	0.0018	4,533.00	8,042.00
Golden Valley	22,552	0.0054	13,777.00	75,861,371	0.0061	15,777.00	29,554.00
Grand Rapids	11,183	0.0027	6,832.00	74,066,599	0.0060	15,404.00	22,236.00
Ham Lake	16,494	0.0039	10,076.00	79,248,668	0.0064	16,482.00	26,558.00

City	2023 Population Estimates	Population Percentage	Population Allocation \$	2024 Needs	Needs % Percentage	Needs Allocation \$	Total TAA Funds \$
Hastings	22,470	0.0053	13,727.00	67,524,451	0.0055	14,043.00	27,770.00
Hermantown	10,555	0.0025	6,448.00	53,693,188	0.0043	11,167.00	17,615.00
Hibbing	16,214	0.0039	9,905.00	127,665,843	0.0103	26,551.00	36,456.00
Hopkins	19,079	0.0045	11,655.00	37,735,252	0.0031	7,848.00	19,503.00
Hugo	17,044	0.0041	10,412.00	56,060,840	0.0045	11,659.00	22,071.00
Hutchinson	14,828	0.0035	9,058.00	63,292,712	0.0051	13,163.00	22,221.00
International Falls	5,802	0.0014	3,544.00	18,651,500	0.0015	3,879.00	7,423.00
Inver Grove Heights	36,219	0.0086	22,126.00	99,405,948	0.0080	20,674.00	42,800.00
Isanti	7,386	0.0018	4,512.00	17,115,368	0.0014	3,560.00	8,072.00
Jordan	7,022	0.0017	4,290.00	19,085,085	0.0015	3,969.00	8,259.00
Kasson	7,140	0.0017	4,362.00	18,121,605	0.0015	3,769.00	8,131.00
La Crescent	5,276	0.0013	3,223.00	13,962,203	0.0011	2,904.00	6,127.00
Lake City	5,518	0.0013	3,371.00	20,437,649	0.0017	4,251.00	7,622.00
Lake Elmo	14,033	0.0033	8,573.00	56,547,612	0.0046	11,760.00	20,333.00
Lakeville	75,217	0.0179	45,950.00	234,778,903	0.0190	48,828.00	94,778.00
Lindstrom	5,000	0.0012	3,055.00	13,728,924	0.0011	2,855.00	5,910.00
Lino Lakes	22,322	0.0053	13,637.00	60,346,185	0.0049	12,550.00	26,187.00
Litchfield	6,624	0.0016	4,047.00	21,768,125	0.0018	4,527.00	8,574.00
Little Canada	10,819	0.0026	6,609.00	30,579,802	0.0025	6,360.00	12,969.00
Little Falls	9,140	0.0022	5,584.00	52,453,409	0.0042	10,909.00	16,493.00
Luverne	5,000	0.0012	3,055.00	13,972,475	0.0011	2,906.00	5,961.00
Mahtomedi	8,206	0.0020	5,013.00	24,245,869	0.0020	5,043.00	10,056.00
Mankato	45,995	0.0109	28,098.00	155,068,766	0.0125	32,250.00	60,348.00
Maple Grove	71,676	0.0170	43,787.00	179,314,870	0.0145	37,293.00	81,080.00
Maplewood	42,088	0.0100	25,712.00	106,575,196	0.0086	22,165.00	47,877.00
Marshall	13,897	0.0033	8,490.00	61,075,011	0.0049	12,702.00	21,192.00
Medina	7,580	0.0018	4,631.00	30,367,960	0.0025	6,316.00	10,947.00
Mendota Heights	11,744	0.0028	7,174.00	43,057,440	0.0035	8,955.00	16,129.00
Minneapolis	433,633	0.1031	264,907.00	851,491,612	0.0689	177,089.00	441,996.00
Minnetonka	54,850	0.0130	33,508.00	150,761,526	0.0122	31,355.00	64,863.00
Minnetrista	8,896	0.0021	5,435.00	30,089,610	0.0024	6,258.00	11,693.00
Montevideo	5,398	0.0013	3,298.00	22,860,270	0.0018	4,754.00	8,052.00
Monticello	14,840	0.0035	9,066.00	47,309,863	0.0038	9,839.00	18,905.00
Moorhead	45,228	0.0108	27,630.00	202,913,565	0.0164	42,201.00	69,831.00
Morris	5,161	0.0012	3,153.00	22,481,048	0.0018	4,675.00	7,828.00
Mound	9,420	0.0022	5,755.00	19,705,803	0.0016	4,098.00	9,853.00
Mounds View	13,249	0.0031	8,094.00	27,222,292	0.0022	5,662.00	13,756.00
New Brighton	24,150	0.0057	14,753.00	38,600,644	0.0031	8,028.00	22,781.00
New Hope	21,986	0.0052	13,431.00	39,647,849	0.0032	8,246.00	21,677.00
New Prague	8,283	0.0020	5,060.00	27,609,400	0.0022	5,742.00	10,802.00
New Ulm	14,120	0.0034	8,626.00	50,968,110	0.0041	10,600.00	19,226.00
North Branch	11,858	0.0028	7,244.00	68,920,819	0.0056	14,334.00	21,578.00
North Mankato	14,329	0.0034	8,754.00	49,732,863	0.0040	10,343.00	19,097.00
North St. Paul	13,015	0.0031	7,951.00	30,464,132	0.0025	6,336.00	14,287.00
Northfield	21,334	0.0051	13,033.00	48,086,811	0.0039	10,001.00	23,034.00
Oak Grove	9,179	0.0022	5,607.00	65,245,511	0.0053	13,569.00	19,176.00
Oakdale	28,303	0.0067	17,290.00	63,605,599	0.0051	13,228.00	30,518.00
Orono	8,383	0.0020	5,121.00	25,802,256	0.0021	5,366.00	10,487.00
Otsego	23,132	0.0055	14,131.00	74,810,304	0.0061	15,559.00	29,690.00
Owatonna	26,647	0.0063	16,279.00	107,098,402	0.0087	22,274.00	38,553.00
Plymouth	81,026	0.0193	49,499.00	242,321,091	0.0196	50,397.00	99,896.00
Princeton	5,388	0.0013	3,292.00	13,038,405	0.0011	2,712.00	6,004.00
Prior Lake	28,915	0.0069	17,664.00	67,349,264	0.0055	14,007.00	31,671.00
Ramsey	28,899	0.0069	17,654.00	92,772,395	0.0075	19,294.00	36,948.00
Red Wing	16,675	0.0040	10,187.00	77,722,982	0.0063	16,164.00	26,351.00
Redwood Falls	5,102	0.0012	3,117.00	27,133,691	0.0022	5,643.00	8,760.00
Richfield	38,678	0.0092	23,628.00	88,295,430	0.0071	18,363.00	41,991.00
Robbinsdale	14,945	0.0036	9,130.00	30,203,028	0.0024	6,281.00	15,411.00
Rochester	122,969	0.0292	75,122.00	465,373,266	0.0377	96,786.00	171,908.00
Rogers	14,934	0.0035	9,123.00	66,579,952	0.0054	13,847.00	22,970.00
Rosemount	26,965	0.0064	16,473.00	87,877,890	0.0071	18,276.00	34,749.00
Roseville	36,254	0.0086	22,148.00	86,939,668	0.0070	18,081.00	40,229.00
Sartell	19,673	0.0047	12,018.00	66,964,047	0.0054	13,927.00	25,945.00
Sauk Rapids	13,862	0.0033	8,468.00	49,333,165	0.0040	10,260.00	18,728.00
Savage	33,159	0.0079	20,257.00	78,498,039	0.0064	16,326.00	36,583.00
Shakopee	46,037	0.0109	28,124.00	134,521,364	0.0109	27,977.00	56,101.00
Shoreview	27,369	0.0065	16,720.00	52,307,828	0.0042	10,879.00	27,599.00
Shorewood	7,958	0.0019	4,862.00	25,545,527	0.0021	5,313.00	10,175.00
South St. Paul	20,759	0.0049	12,682.00	59,211,520	0.0048	12,314.00	24,996.00
Spring Lake Park	7,360	0.0017	4,496.00	16,683,191	0.0014	3,470.00	7,966.00
St. Anthony	9,978	0.0024	6,096.00	19,587,352	0.0016	4,074.00	10,170.00
St. Cloud	71,321	0.0170	43,570.00	246,302,262	0.0199	51,225.00	94,795.00
St. Francis	8,585	0.0020	5,245.00	30,847,103	0.0025	6,415.00	11,660.00
St. Joseph	7,029	0.0017	4,294.00	22,218,170	0.0018	4,621.00	8,915.00
St. Louis Park	50,010	0.0119	30,551.00	120,599,899	0.0098	25,082.00	55,633.00
St. Michael	21,075	0.0050	12,875.00	65,738,808	0.0053	13,672.00	26,547.00
St. Paul	311,527	0.0740	190,312.00	677,275,064	0.0548	140,856.00	331,168.00
St. Paul Park	5,544	0.0013	3,387.00	17,655,305	0.0014	3,672.00	7,059.00

City	2023 Population Estimates	Population Percentage	Population Allocation \$	2024 Needs	Needs % Percentage	Needs Allocation \$	Total TAA Funds \$
St. Peter	12,066	0.0029	7,371.00	43,351,197	0.0035	9,016.00	16,387.00
Stewartville	6,738	0.0016	4,116.00	15,683,622	0.0013	3,262.00	7,378.00
Stillwater	19,426	0.0046	11,867.00	53,543,844	0.0043	11,136.00	23,003.00
Thief River Falls	8,749	0.0021	5,345.00	52,540,362	0.0043	10,927.00	16,272.00
Vadnais Heights	13,025	0.0031	7,957.00	27,660,103	0.0022	5,753.00	13,710.00
Victoria	11,916	0.0028	7,280.00	25,568,260	0.0021	5,318.00	12,598.00
Virginia	8,421	0.0020	5,144.00	45,152,264	0.0037	9,391.00	14,535.00
Waconia	14,056	0.0033	8,587.00	45,969,493	0.0037	9,560.00	18,147.00
Waite Park	8,354	0.0020	5,103.00	25,008,018	0.0020	5,201.00	10,304.00
Waseca	9,267	0.0022	5,661.00	20,775,748	0.0017	4,321.00	9,982.00
West St. Paul	21,472	0.0051	13,117.00	43,409,156	0.0035	9,028.00	22,145.00
White Bear Lake	24,883	0.0059	15,201.00	58,081,229	0.0047	12,079.00	27,280.00
Willmar	21,410	0.0051	13,079.00	91,946,184	0.0074	19,122.00	32,201.00
Winona	25,948	0.0062	15,852.00	78,861,547	0.0064	16,401.00	32,253.00
Woodbury	78,740	0.0187	48,102.00	210,175,603	0.0170	43,710.00	91,812.00
Worthington	13,947	0.0033	8,520.00	34,989,691	0.0028	7,276.00	15,796.00
Wyoming	8,147	0.0019	4,976.00	40,481,393	0.0033	8,418.00	13,394.00
Zimmerman	6,715	0.0016	4,101.00	15,610,621	0.0013	3,247.63	7,348.63
Total	4,207,008	100%	2,570,070.00	12,357,613,952	100%	2,570,070.63	5,140,140.63

[More detail is available in the January 2025 Municipal State Aid Apportionment Data Book](#)

Fiscal Year 2025 Transportation Advancement Account

27% Small Cities Assistance REVISED Actual Distribution

174.49 TRANSPORTATION ADVANCEMENT ACCOUNT.

Subd. 3. Distribution. The commissioner must distribute or transfer the funds in the transportation advancement funds in the transportation advancement account as follows:

(4) 27 percent to the small cities assistance account under section 162.145, subdivision 2

Total Amount Appropriated	\$8,948,469
---------------------------	-------------

Formula Items	Distribution %	Amount
Equal aid	5%	\$447,423
Population	35%	\$3,131,964
City Street Lane Miles	35%	\$3,131,964
CSAH Lane Miles	25%	\$2,237,117
Total	100%	\$8,948,469

City	Disribution %	Total TAA Funds \$
Ada city	0.002180	19,512
Adams city	0.001174	10,509
Adrian city	0.001666	14,908
Afton	0.004846	43,363
Aitkin city	0.002447	21,894
Akeley city	0.000950	8,503
Albany city	0.002830	25,325
Alberta city	0.000670	5,991
Alden city	0.001059	9,480
Aldrich city	0.000597	5,338
Alpha city	0.000700	6,267
Altura city	0.000832	7,446
Alvarado city	0.000894	7,998
Amboy city	0.000977	8,744
Annandale city	0.003421	30,614
Appleton city	0.002233	19,980
Arco city	0.000632	5,655
Argyle city	0.001311	11,727
Arlington city	0.002457	21,987
Ashby city	0.000847	7,576
Askov city	0.000792	7,086
Atwater city	0.001603	14,340
Audubon city	0.001046	9,356
Aurora city	0.001997	17,871
Avoca city	0.000734	6,570
Avon city	0.001893	16,942
Babbitt city	0.001942	17,378
Backus city	0.000955	8,546
Badger city	0.000950	8,497
Bagley city	0.001687	15,098
Balaton city	0.001198	10,721
Barnesville city	0.003168	28,350

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Barnum city	0.000881	7,885
Barrett city	0.000737	6,594
Barry city	0.000589	5,267
Battle Lake city	0.001403	12,558
Baudette city	0.001465	13,106
Bayport	0.003556	31,817
Beardsley city	0.000849	7,594
Beaver Bay city	0.000759	6,792
Beaver Creek city	0.000767	6,860
Bejou city	0.000627	5,607
Belgrade city	0.001294	11,580
Bellechester city	0.000646	5,781
Bellingham city	0.000774	6,927
Beltrami city	0.000756	6,764
Belview city	0.000858	7,679
Bena city	0.000759	6,794
Benson city	0.004102	36,704
Bertha city	0.000937	8,386
Bethel	0.000898	8,039
Big Falls city	0.000938	8,394
Bigelow city	0.000737	6,596
Bigfork city	0.000914	8,182
Bingham Lake city	0.000767	6,860
Birchwood Village	0.001294	11,579
Bird Island city	0.001686	15,086
Biscay city	0.000601	5,374
Biwabik city	0.001696	15,175
Blackduck city	0.001179	10,553
Blomkest city	0.000687	6,145
Blooming Prairie city	0.002159	19,324
Blue Earth city	0.003350	29,979
Bluffton city	0.000874	7,821
Bock city	0.000665	5,947
Borup city	0.000640	5,726
Bovey city	0.001207	10,805
Bowlus city	0.000831	7,440
Boy River city	0.000573	5,126
Boyd city	0.000677	6,059
Braham city	0.002052	18,362
Brandon city	0.000930	8,318
Breckenridge city	0.003402	30,447
Breezy Point city	0.005000	44,742
Brewster city	0.001008	9,017
Bricelyn city	0.000938	8,393
Brook Park city	0.000674	6,033
Brooks city	0.000662	5,928
Brookston city	0.000656	5,868
Brooten city	0.001187	10,623
Browerville city	0.001377	12,322
Browns Valley city	0.001249	11,175
Brownsdale city	0.001090	9,758
Brownsville city	0.001039	9,301
Brownton city	0.001191	10,655

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Bruno city	0.000640	5,725
Buckman city	0.000741	6,632
Buffalo Lake city	0.001218	10,899
Buhl city	0.001404	12,563
Burtrum city	0.000711	6,360
Butterfield city	0.001135	10,158
Caledonia city	0.003105	27,789
Callaway city	0.000761	6,806
Calumet city	0.000957	8,562
Campbell city	0.000824	7,370
Canby city	0.002200	19,688
Cannon Falls city	0.004173	37,338
Canton city	0.000835	7,471
Carlos city	0.000902	8,069
Carlton city	0.001272	11,382
Cass Lake city	0.001605	14,366
Cedar Mills city	0.000627	5,610
Center City city	0.001102	9,863
Centerville	0.003361	30,074
Ceylon city	0.000908	8,126
Chandler city	0.000697	6,241
Chatfield city	0.003137	28,075
Chickamaw Beach city	0.000776	6,944
Chokio city	0.001040	9,304
Clara City city	0.001852	16,573
Claremont city	0.000848	7,590
Clarissa city	0.001255	11,230
Clarkfield city	0.001494	13,368
Clarks Grove city	0.000973	8,704
Clear Lake city	0.001236	11,063
Clearbrook city	0.001029	9,209
Clearwater city	0.002212	19,790
Clements city	0.000723	6,467
Cleveland city	0.001066	9,541
Climax city	0.000820	7,338
Clinton city	0.000840	7,515
Clitherall city	0.000717	6,414
Clontarf city	0.000669	5,989
Coates	0.000554	4,953
Cobden city	0.000532	4,763
Cohasset city	0.004355	38,968
Cokato city	0.002751	24,619
Cold Spring city	0.004103	36,715
Coleraine city	0.002742	24,540
Cologne	0.002278	20,388
Columbus	0.005000	44,742
Comfrey city	0.000923	8,256
Comstock city	0.000636	5,695
Conger city	0.000634	5,677
Cook city	0.001056	9,446
Correll city	0.000612	5,472
Cosmos city	0.001109	9,925
Cottonwood city	0.001467	13,131

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Courtland city	0.001242	11,114
Cromwell city	0.001036	9,271
Crosby city	0.002662	23,817
Crosslake city	0.005000	44,742
Currie city	0.000791	7,077
Cuyuna city	0.001033	9,241
Cyrus city	0.000981	8,774
Dakota city	0.000780	6,977
Dalton city	0.000724	6,481
Danube city	0.000958	8,576
Danvers city	0.000643	5,754
Darfur city	0.000659	5,898
Darwin city	0.000940	8,410
Dassel city	0.001783	15,958
Dawson city	0.002200	19,686
De Graff city	0.000665	5,949
Deephaven	0.004182	37,424
Deer Creek city	0.001090	9,754
Deer River city	0.001289	11,534
Deerwood city	0.001182	10,578
Delavan city	0.000714	6,388
Delhi city	0.000575	5,146
Dellwood	0.001875	16,779
Denham city	0.000538	4,813
Dennison city	0.000870	7,788
Dent city	0.000729	6,521
Dexter city	0.000961	8,598
Dilworth city	0.004378	39,172
Dodge Center city	0.002824	25,268
Donaldson city	0.000654	5,850
Donnelly city	0.000871	7,794
Doran city	0.000720	6,442
Dover city	0.001223	10,940
Dovray city	0.000590	5,281
Dumont city	0.000671	6,004
Dundas city	0.002089	18,689
Dundee city	0.000632	5,652
Dunnell city	0.000656	5,870
Eagle Bend city	0.001066	9,542
Eagle Lake city	0.002824	25,271
East Gull Lake city	0.002333	20,879
Easton city	0.000687	6,148
Echo city	0.000734	6,565
Eden Valley city	0.001484	13,283
Edgerton city	0.001597	14,292
Effie city	0.000621	5,554
Eitzen city	0.000792	7,089
Elba city	0.000703	6,291
Elbow Lake city	0.001943	17,389
Elgin city	0.001516	13,562
Elizabeth city	0.000723	6,468
Elkton city	0.000638	5,710
Ellendale city	0.001151	10,301

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Ellsworth city	0.001128	10,093
Elmdale city	0.000723	6,469
Elmore city	0.001166	10,438
Elrosa city	0.000736	6,589
Ely city	0.003477	31,113
Elysian city	0.001266	11,330
Emily city	0.002971	26,587
Emmons city	0.000860	7,696
Empire	0.004478	40,069
Erhard city	0.000653	5,845
Erskine city	0.000941	8,424
Evan city	0.000693	6,204
Evansville city	0.001037	9,284
Eveleth city	0.003189	28,538
Excelsior	0.002304	20,619
Eyota city	0.002262	20,237
Fairfax city	0.001754	15,696
Farwell city	0.000601	5,377
Federal Dam city	0.000965	8,631
Felton city	0.000688	6,156
Fertile city	0.001410	12,617
Fifty Lakes city	0.002235	20,000
Finlayson city	0.000931	8,332
Fisher city	0.000846	7,566
Flensburg city	0.001244	11,128
Floodwood city	0.001092	9,775
Florence city	0.000596	5,334
Foley city	0.002637	23,597
Forada city	0.000732	6,550
Foreston city	0.001241	11,102
Fort Ripley city	0.000826	7,387
Fosston city	0.002021	18,082
Fountain city	0.000798	7,137
Foxhome city	0.000784	7,013
Franklin city	0.001038	9,285
Frazee city	0.001634	14,624
Freeborn city	0.000790	7,073
Freeport city	0.001137	10,177
Frost city	0.000689	6,164
Fulda city	0.001961	17,548
Funkley city	0.000599	5,357
Garfield city	0.000757	6,773
Garrison city	0.000990	8,856
Garvin city	0.000687	6,145
Gary city	0.000753	6,739
Gaylord city	0.002624	23,477
Gem Lake	0.000866	7,753
Geneva city	0.000946	8,461
Genola city	0.000626	5,598
Georgetown city	0.000697	6,240
Ghent city	0.000847	7,581
Gibbon city	0.001307	11,693
Gilbert city	0.002189	19,584

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Gilman city	0.000649	5,811
Glenville city	0.001103	9,874
Glenwood city	0.003450	30,871
Glyndon city	0.001613	14,436
Gonvick city	0.000810	7,245
Good Thunder city	0.001032	9,235
Goodhue city	0.001487	13,310
Goodridge city	0.000691	6,187
Goodview city	0.003907	34,964
Graceville city	0.001131	10,117
Granada city	0.000803	7,183
Grand Marais city	0.001271	11,371
Grand Meadow city	0.001485	13,286
Granite Falls city	0.003184	28,493
Grant	0.005000	44,742
Grasston city	0.000584	5,228
Green Isle city	0.001231	11,012
Greenbush city	0.001199	10,727
Greenfield	0.004714	42,185
Greenwald city	0.000779	6,968
Greenwood	0.001205	10,783
Grey Eagle city	0.000857	7,670
Grove City city	0.001229	10,995
Grygla city	0.000756	6,762
Gully city	0.000656	5,873
Hackensack city	0.000990	8,860
Hadley city	0.000618	5,533
Hallock city	0.001633	14,613
Halma city	0.000575	5,149
Halstad city	0.001103	9,874
Hamburg	0.000955	8,544
Hammond city	0.000640	5,727
Hampton	0.001066	9,540
Hancock city	0.001355	12,123
Hanley Falls city	0.000793	7,093
Hanover city	0.003771	33,742
Hanska city	0.000893	7,989
Harding city	0.000485	4,343
Hardwick city	0.000707	6,325
Harmony city	0.001610	14,408
Harris city	0.002210	19,780
Hartland city	0.000853	7,637
Hatfield city	0.000611	5,467
Hawley city	0.002787	24,935
Hayfield city	0.001766	15,802
Hayward city	0.000772	6,912
Hazel Run city	0.000615	5,499
Hector city	0.001691	15,129
Heidelberg city	0.000604	5,402
Henderson city	0.001476	13,206
Hendricks city	0.001140	10,199
Hendrum city	0.000797	7,132
Henning city	0.001376	12,309

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Henriette city	0.000616	5,508
Herman city	0.001094	9,786
Heron Lake city	0.001187	10,626
Hewitt city	0.000899	8,046
Hill City city	0.001277	11,429
Hillman city	0.000553	4,945
Hills city	0.001178	10,540
Hilltop	0.001144	10,240
Hinckley city	0.002309	20,658
Hitterdal city	0.000744	6,660
Hoffman city	0.001244	11,134
Hokah city	0.001084	9,704
Holdingford city	0.001085	9,708
Holland city	0.000715	6,402
Hollandale city	0.000952	8,523
Holloway city	0.000792	7,091
Holt city	0.000715	6,394
Houston city	0.001487	13,308
Howard Lake city	0.002427	21,719
Hoyt Lakes city	0.002202	19,703
Humboldt city	0.000627	5,608
Ihlen city	0.000541	4,840
Independence	0.005000	44,742
Iona city	0.000741	6,627
Iron Junction city	0.000651	5,825
Ironton city	0.001107	9,907
Isle city	0.001499	13,413
Ivanhoe city	0.001079	9,653
Jackson city	0.003387	30,305
Janesville city	0.002321	20,772
Jasper city	0.001227	10,982
Jeffers city	0.000933	8,352
Jenkins city	0.001270	11,361
Johnson city	0.000649	5,804
Kandiyohi city	0.001043	9,329
Karlstad city	0.001165	10,422
Kasota city	0.001119	10,017
Keewatin city	0.001462	13,085
Kelliher city	0.000863	7,727
Kellogg city	0.001037	9,277
Kennedy city	0.000775	6,938
Kenneth city	0.000605	5,410
Kensington city	0.000759	6,794
Kent city	0.000614	5,490
Kenyon city	0.002216	19,829
Kerkhoven city	0.001377	12,322
Kerrick city	0.000603	5,400
Kettle River city	0.000698	6,242
Kiester city	0.000961	8,602
Kilkenny city	0.000611	5,469
Kimball city	0.001398	12,509
Kinbrae city	0.000629	5,629
Kingston city	0.000679	6,076

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Kinney city	0.000620	5,551
La Prairie city	0.001288	11,528
La Salle city	0.000619	5,537
Lafayette city	0.000876	7,835
Lake Benton city	0.001263	11,303
Lake Bronson city	0.000766	6,858
Lake Crystal city	0.002447	21,895
Lake Henry city	0.000607	5,430
Lake Lillian city	0.000760	6,799
Lake Park city	0.001211	10,837
Lake Saint Croix Beach	0.001721	15,397
Lake Shore city	0.002232	19,970
Lake Wilson city	0.000925	8,274
Lakefield city	0.002223	19,895
Lakeland	0.002272	20,328
Lakeland Shores	0.000892	7,985
Lamberton city	0.001273	11,388
Lancaster city	0.000868	7,771
Landfall	0.001110	9,936
Lanesboro city	0.001353	12,109
Laporte city	0.000661	5,916
Lastrup city	0.000672	6,011
Lauderdale	0.002027	18,142
Le Center city	0.002496	22,332
Le Roy city	0.001441	12,899
Le Sueur city	0.003872	34,645
Lengby city	0.000675	6,040
Leonard city	0.000581	5,202
Leonidas city	0.000538	4,818
Lester Prairie city	0.001928	17,253
Lewiston city	0.001676	14,998
Lewisville city	0.000770	6,893
Lexington	0.002480	22,190
Lilydale	0.001066	9,540
Lismore city	0.000745	6,668
Littlefork city	0.000989	8,849
Long Beach city	0.000937	8,383
Long Lake	0.001906	17,054
Long Prairie city	0.003610	32,305
Longville city	0.000778	6,966
Lonsdale city	0.004522	40,465
Loretto	0.001049	9,387
Louisburg city	0.000589	5,268
Lowry city	0.000807	7,223
Lucan city	0.000752	6,730
Lyle city	0.001113	9,957
Lynd city	0.000947	8,478
Mabel city	0.001177	10,529
Madelia city	0.002418	21,638
Madison city	0.002160	19,326
Madison Lake city	0.001755	15,702
Magnolia city	0.000670	5,995
Mahnomen city	0.001610	14,405

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Manchester city	0.000604	5,408
Manhattan Beach city	0.000521	4,664
Mantorville city	0.001616	14,464
Maple Lake city	0.002307	20,641
Maple Plain	0.002003	17,922
Mapleton city	0.002059	18,423
Mapleview city	0.000679	6,073
Marble city	0.001112	9,954
Marietta city	0.000814	7,285
Marine on Saint Croix	0.001277	11,429
Mayer	0.002589	23,166
Maynard city	0.000917	8,205
Mazeppa city	0.001433	12,819
McGrath city	0.000636	5,690
McGregor city	0.000921	8,239
McIntosh city	0.001105	9,885
McKinley city	0.000721	6,450
Meadowlands city	0.000615	5,506
Medford city	0.001528	13,676
Medicine Lake	0.000829	7,421
Meire Grove city	0.000683	6,114
Melrose city	0.003457	30,939
Menahga city	0.001875	16,778
Mendota	0.000777	6,955
Mentor city	0.000568	5,079
Middle River city	0.000826	7,394
Miesville	0.000587	5,250
Milaca city	0.002910	26,041
Milan city	0.000952	8,515
Millerville city	0.000569	5,089
Millville city	0.000619	5,540
Milroy city	0.000859	7,687
Miltona city	0.000998	8,927
Minneiska city	0.000621	5,561
Minneota city	0.001716	15,359
Minnesota City city	0.000811	7,260
Minnesota Lake city	0.001243	11,121
Minnetonka Beach	0.001073	9,603
Mizpah city	0.000481	4,305
Montgomery city	0.003321	29,716
Montrose city	0.003619	32,385
Moose Lake city	0.002685	24,029
Mora city	0.003940	35,256
Morgan city	0.001258	11,258
Morristown city	0.001264	11,313
Morton city	0.000962	8,606
Motley city	0.001496	13,387
Mountain Iron city	0.003228	28,882
Mountain Lake city	0.002380	21,294
Murdock city	0.000835	7,470
Myrtle city	0.000581	5,197
Nashua city	0.000729	6,523
Nashwauk city	0.001555	13,913

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Nassau city	0.000638	5,708
Nelson city	0.000704	6,298
Nerstrand city	0.000825	7,379
Nevis city	0.001038	9,289
New Auburn city	0.001037	9,280
New Germany	0.000880	7,872
New London city	0.001569	14,040
New Munich city	0.000822	7,358
New Richland city	0.001497	13,398
New Trier	0.000645	5,771
New York Mills city	0.001713	15,327
Newfolden city	0.000808	7,234
Newport	0.003882	34,738
Nicollet city	0.001485	13,287
Nielsville city	0.000602	5,389
Nimrod city	0.000531	4,756
Nisswa city	0.004484	40,124
Norcross city	0.000646	5,783
North Oaks	0.003249	29,070
Northome city	0.000676	6,050
Northrop city	0.000727	6,503
Norwood Young America	0.003709	33,190
Nowthen	0.005000	44,742
Oak Park Heights	0.004196	37,552
Odessa city	0.000624	5,582
Odin city	0.000640	5,723
Ogema city	0.000673	6,022
Ogilvie city	0.000850	7,610
Okabena city	0.000745	6,667
Oklee city	0.000968	8,659
Olivia city	0.003280	29,354
Onamia city	0.001421	12,718
Ormsby city	0.000667	5,973
Oronoco city	0.002798	25,037
Orr city	0.000719	6,436
Ortonville city	0.002495	22,325
Osakis city	0.001893	16,942
Oslo city	0.000931	8,330
Osseo	0.002628	23,519
Ostrander city	0.000742	6,642
Ottertail city	0.001785	15,969
Palisade city	0.000665	5,950
Park Rapids city	0.004929	44,106
Parkers Prairie city	0.001719	15,382
Paynesville city	0.002776	24,843
Pease city	0.000766	6,854
Pelican Rapids city	0.002886	25,824
Pemberton city	0.000781	6,992
Pennock city	0.000990	8,862
Pequot Lakes city	0.004250	38,030
Perham city	0.003987	35,680
Perley city	0.000733	6,555
Peterson city	0.000732	6,546

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Pierz city	0.001783	15,951
Pillager city	0.001149	10,283
Pine City city	0.003269	29,250
Pine Island city	0.003712	33,220
Pine River city	0.001434	12,834
Pine Springs	0.000984	8,805
Pipestone city	0.003859	34,530
Plainview city	0.003199	28,624
Plato city	0.000842	7,537
Plummer city	0.000728	6,511
Porter city	0.000777	6,956
Preston city	0.001853	16,585
Prinsburg city	0.000984	8,801
Proctor city	0.002798	25,042
Quamba city	0.000663	5,929
Racine city	0.000923	8,255
Randall city	0.001083	9,694
Randolph	0.000920	8,229
Ranier city	0.001208	10,811
Raymond city	0.001119	10,012
Red Lake Falls city	0.002200	19,683
Regal city	0.000574	5,140
Remer city	0.001209	10,816
Renville city	0.001845	16,509
Revere city	0.000649	5,811
Rice city	0.002339	20,931
Rice Lake city	0.003570	31,944
Richmond city	0.001878	16,805
Richville city	0.000675	6,042
Riverton city	0.000743	6,650
Rock Creek city	0.003682	32,945
Rockford city	0.003984	35,654
Rockville city	0.004093	36,622
Rollingstone city	0.001142	10,221
Roosevelt city	0.000722	6,458
Roscoe city	0.000564	5,044
Rose Creek city	0.000832	7,448
Roseau city	0.003048	27,279
Rothsay city	0.001014	9,073
Round Lake city	0.000910	8,140
Royalton city	0.001650	14,761
Rush City city	0.003056	27,349
Rushford city	0.002203	19,711
Rushford Village city	0.002519	22,540
Rushmore city	0.000951	8,506
Russell city	0.000882	7,896
Ruthton city	0.000769	6,884
Rutledge city	0.000834	7,462
Sabin city	0.000952	8,523
Sacred Heart city	0.001149	10,284
Saint Anthony city	0.000622	5,564
Saint Augusta city	0.005000	44,742
Saint Bonifacius	0.002286	20,453

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Saint Charles city	0.004325	38,706
Saint Clair city	0.001023	9,157
Saint Hilaire city	0.000952	8,522
Saint James city	0.004321	38,662
Saint Leo city	0.000566	5,068
Saint Martin city	0.000765	6,847
Saint Marys Point	0.001015	9,085
Saint Rosa city	0.000569	5,092
Saint Stephen city	0.001139	10,195
Saint Vincent city	0.000733	6,563
Sanborn city	0.000924	8,271
Sandstone city	0.002877	25,743
Sargeant city	0.000618	5,531
Sauk Centre city	0.004568	40,873
Scandia	0.005000	44,742
Scanlon city	0.001350	12,081
Seaforth city	0.000680	6,085
Sebeka city	0.001288	11,524
Sedan city	0.000581	5,195
Shafer city	0.001424	12,742
Shelly city	0.000729	6,521
Sherburn city	0.001672	14,958
Shevlin city	0.000713	6,379
Silver Bay city	0.002285	20,448
Silver Lake city	0.001193	10,672
Skyline city	0.000809	7,237
Slayton city	0.002581	23,095
Sleepy Eye city	0.003661	32,764
Sobieski city	0.000983	8,794
Solway city	0.000779	6,968
South Haven city	0.000776	6,942
Spicer city	0.001440	12,885
Spring Grove city	0.001692	15,144
Spring Hill city	0.000535	4,787
Spring Park	0.001519	13,592
Spring Valley city	0.002723	24,369
Springfield city	0.002486	22,246
Squaw Lake city	0.000667	5,967
Stacy city	0.003530	31,587
Staples city	0.003585	32,077
Starbuck city	0.002106	18,845
Steen city	0.000743	6,650
Stephen city	0.001311	11,729
Stewart city	0.001107	9,906
Stockton city	0.001297	11,602
Storden city	0.000769	6,883
Strandquist city	0.000648	5,801
Strathcona city	0.000711	6,366
Sturgeon Lake city	0.001300	11,632
Sunburg city	0.000614	5,498
Sunfish Lake	0.001052	9,414
Swanville city	0.000907	8,112
Taconite city	0.001215	10,872

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Tamarack city	0.000524	4,685
Taopi city	0.000638	5,712
Taunton city	0.000752	6,727
Taylors Falls city	0.001286	11,505
Tenstrike city	0.000891	7,975
Tintah city	0.000648	5,795
Tonka Bay	0.001871	16,745
Tower city	0.001099	9,830
Tracy city	0.002353	21,059
Trail city	0.000696	6,226
Trimont city	0.001303	11,656
Trommald city	0.000776	6,948
Trosky city	0.000629	5,632
Truman city	0.001515	13,559
Turtle River city	0.000624	5,588
Twin Lakes city	0.000672	6,011
Twin Valley city	0.001347	12,054
Two Harbors city	0.003083	27,592
Tyler city	0.001561	13,965
Ulen city	0.001108	9,915
Underwood city	0.001021	9,135
Upsala city	0.000937	8,389
Urbank city	0.000492	4,400
Utica city	0.000779	6,968
Vergas city	0.000892	7,983
Vermillion	0.000833	7,451
Verndale city	0.000939	8,402
Vernon Center city	0.000794	7,105
Vesta city	0.000865	7,739
Viking city	0.000664	5,944
Villard city	0.000803	7,190
Vining city	0.000819	7,327
Wabasha city	0.002801	25,062
Wabasso city	0.001178	10,544
Wadena city	0.004546	40,681
Wahkon city	0.000932	8,336
Waldorf city	0.000752	6,733
Walker city	0.001725	15,432
Walnut Grove city	0.001217	10,892
Walters city	0.000655	5,858
Waltham city	0.000722	6,458
Wanamingo city	0.001652	14,779
Wanda city	0.000721	6,453
Warba city	0.000755	6,760
Warren city	0.002128	19,043
Warroad city	0.002410	21,568
Watertown	0.004279	38,291
Waterville city	0.002244	20,083
Watkins city	0.001385	12,395
Watson city	0.000771	6,900
Waubun city	0.000974	8,720
Waverly city	0.002381	21,302
Wayzata	0.004239	37,937

City	Disribution %	TAA Funds \$
Welcome city	0.001272	11,382
Wells city	0.002623	23,468
Wendell city	0.000696	6,226
West Concord city	0.001200	10,741
West Union city	0.000553	4,949
Westbrook city	0.001304	11,673
Westport city	0.000663	5,937
Whalan city	0.000690	6,175
Wheaton city	0.002033	18,195
Wilder city	0.000732	6,547
Willernie	0.001041	9,312
Williams city	0.000662	5,923
Willow River city	0.001022	9,142
Wilmont city	0.000848	7,589
Wilton city	0.000844	7,553
Windom city	0.004654	41,645
Winger city	0.000722	6,463
Winnebago city	0.002016	18,038
Winsted city	0.002177	19,482
Winthrop city	0.001837	16,441
Winton city	0.000712	6,374
Wolf Lake city	0.000544	4,864
Wolverton city	0.000778	6,960
Wood Lake city	0.000887	7,936
Woodland	0.000993	8,886
Woodstock city	0.000756	6,767
Wrenshall city	0.000816	7,303
Wright city	0.000633	5,665
Wykoff city	0.000963	8,619
Zemple city	0.000670	5,997
Zumbro Falls city	0.000772	6,907
Zumbrota city	0.003982	35,633
TOTAL	1.000000	\$8,948,469

Making the Case for Design-Bid-Build (D-B-B)

It is strongly encouraged that design-build (DB) contracts be limited to projects that have a single owner of the infrastructure being impacted and only if there is a compelling reason to utilize that type of contract. MnDOT should be required to justify why an accelerated project is necessary. Because of the additional burden these project place on local agencies, when a compelling reason is presented, the decision to move to a DB contract should be made by the impacted agencies.

The request is to give preference to the design-bid-build (D-B-B) process because design details matter. A plan set that reflects the signature of all agencies involved brings so much value to a project that it shouldn't be overlooked for any reason, unless it is very compelling and determined by the local agencies to be preferred. All projects should be programed as D-B-B and result in a plan set that will reflect community input, include design details that support stakeholder expectations, and provide assurances that efficient maintenance can be completed for agencies that will be owners of the infrastructure.

The importance of D-B-B is underscored when there are local infrastructure impacts. Just a few examples are offered here from the recent 494 Phase 1 project happening in the Metro District.

- DB results in blatant disregard for the public process and design input. When going through an extensive public engagement process, which is common in developed areas, people are expecting the approved layout to be what is built. With DB contracts those preliminary designs can be essentially tossed into the trash after the public engagement period is completed.

Basically, it becomes the contractual preliminary design document (PDD) despite the many significant unknowns at this stage of design. This is especially prevalent with pedestrian, bike, and utility facilities, where “we can figure that out during final design” is common during the preliminary design phase. Once the PDD is published and added to the contract, the contractor is able to easily decline or fight changes to pedestrian facilities that would typically be discussed during final design of a D-B-B project.

- Design details matter. Details are important for local communities. To be required to come up with a list of requirements for a DB contract is a recipe for failure. You would have to think of every little thing and then MnDOT staff will tell you that you are prescribing too much, and you can't do that with DB. Richfield and Bloomington provided MnDOT a list of must-haves and local standards for the 494 Project 1 and

MnDOT staff neglected to put them into the “Book” document as part of the DB contract.

- Design-Build works best when there is a single owner of the infrastructure being constructed. On 494 (Project 1 and 2 combined) there are facilities being constructed for MnDOT, Hennepin County, Richfield, Bloomington, Edina, Three Rivers Park District, Metro Transit, and the Metropolitan Airports Commission (and maybe more). Once the contract is written, all non-MnDOT entities lose power to dictate how their own facilities are designed and constructed and cannot provide direct instructions to the contractor to ensure these facilities are constructed to agency standards.
- DB provides opportunities for mistakes and costs the public more money or substandard designs. (494 Project 1 examples)
 - A Richfield example: during the contract preparation and preliminary design, MnDOT and their consultants missed a Richfield sanitary sewer that was impacted by the project. This cost Richfield \$500,000 in the first weeks of the 494 Project 1. In cases like this, when mistakes are found, the contractor gets to decide how to handle the issue, even if their solution is a horrible decision for the public and presents an unnecessary future risk. Then, if the local agency doesn't accept the contractor's solution they must pay for “betterment” to do it the right way.
 - Lack of a detailed design led to several situations where adequate right-of-way was **not** acquired, thereby posing project limitations that cannot result in an acceptable design. Again, these impacts were only passed onto the local agency facilities, as the preliminary layout fully vetted the highway needs, but didn't get into enough design detail for the local roadway impacts. In the few instances that ROW limitation impacts could have resulted in sub-standard design of the MnDOT system, those impacts were all pushed onto the local system as sub-standard design solutions the public will now have to pay for and live with into the future.
- The entire process is heavily reliant on consultants, which puts MnDOT at risk if they are not able to apply consistent oversight. The responsibility to ensure that \$377M (494 Project 1) in public money is being spent to their benefit is in the hands of 4 state employees and numerous private employees (MnDOT consultants and the DB contractors team).