

Capital Budgeting Task Force (CBTF) Annual Report

Including
2024 Capital Budget and
2024-2028 Capital Improvement
Program Recommendations

presented to the
Hennepin County Board of
Commissioners

October 16, 2023

HENNEPIN COUNTY

MINNESOTA

October 16, 2023

Hennepin County Board of County Commissioners
Hennepin County Government Center
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55487

Honorable Board Members:

It is my pleasure to submit to you the Annual Report of the Capital Budgeting Task Force (CBTF) containing the activities, principles, and recommendations of the CBTF concerning the 2024-2028 Capital Improvement Program for Hennepin County.

The Capital Budgeting Task Force devoted a considerable amount of time to its extensive review of the capital projects requested by county departments. The CBTF endeavored in its deliberations to recommend a property tax level for capital improvements and debt service which is within county guidelines and limits pertaining to county bonding over the 2024-2028 period. In my remarks to the Administration, Libraries and Budget Committee, I will provide some general themes and our concerns with some components of the capital improvement program.

On behalf of the Capital Budgeting Task Force, I would like to thank the County Board for the ongoing support extended to our Task Force. It is a distinct pleasure for the CBTF membership to be of assistance to the County Board in this significant aspect of county government.

Respectfully,



Susan Carlson-Weinberg, Chair
Capital Budgeting Task Force Committee



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Membership(below)
- II. Summary of activities during 2023.....1
- III. Role and Responsibility in the capital budget process 2
- IV. General approach to capital improvements:
 - A. CBTF Principles 4
 - 1. Revenues 4
 - 2. Expenditures..... 8
 - 3. Other Factors..... 11
 - B. Capital Project Evaluation Criteria12
- V. 2024-2028 Capital Improvement Program commentary..... 14

I. Membership

District	Member	Appointed by	Date Appointed	Expires
1	Susan Carlson Weinberg, Chair	Commissioner Jeff Lunde	12/1/01	N/A
2	PeggySue Imihy Bean	Commissioner Irene Fernando	5/16/22	N/A
3	Vacant	Commissioner Marion Greene		N/A
4	Vacant	Commissioner Angela Conley		N/A
5	Jill Joseph	Commissioner Debbie Goettel	5/1/17	N/A
6	Carolyn Jackson	Commissioner Chris LaTondresse	5/16/22	N/A
7	Vacant	Commissioner Kevin Anderson		N/A
At Large	Ying Vu	County Board	3/1/16	12/31/23
At Large	Greg Sticha	County Board	2/22/18	12/31/25
At Large	Heidi Hamilton	County Board	2/22/18	12/31/25
At Large	Nathan Rich	County Board	2/18/20	12/31/23

II. Summary of activities during 2023

Meeting Date:	Agenda and Location
June 12, 2023	Meet at 625 Building: 625 S 4th Ave, Minneapolis Welcome, introductions, CBTF goals and principles 2022 results, 2023 outlook, 2024 operating instructions Project Updates, new 2024 projects Library Strategic Plan Tour: 625 Building
June 26, 2023	Meet at Public Safety Facility: 401 S 4th Ave, Minneapolis Debt Forecast for Dept requested 2024 - 2028 CIP District Court Sheriff's Office Community Corrections and Rehabilitation Tour: Public Safety Facility
July 10, 2023	Meet at HERC Office Building: 499 N 5th St, Minneapolis Transportation Sales Tax Dev Environment & Energy Emergency Management Transportation Facilities Roads & Bridges Tour: Hennepin Energy Recovery Center
July 24, 2023	Meet at South Mpls Regional Srvc Cntr: 2215 E Lake St, Minneapolis Facility Services Housing and Economic Development Medical Center Tours: Hennepin Healthcare East Lake Clinic and South Minneapolis Regional Service Center
August 7, 2023	Meet at Central Library: 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis Information Technology Municipal Building Commission Library Wrap up any outstanding CBTF items before deliberations Tour: Central Library
August 21, 2023	Meet at Government Center: 300 S 6th Street, Minneapolis County Administrator's Proposed Budget / Deliberations
August 28, 2023	Meet at Government Center: 300 S 6th Street, Minneapolis Deliberations / Wrap up

III. Role and responsibility in the capital budget process

The Capital Budgeting Task Force (CBTF) was established by County Board Resolution in 1973. It has the responsibility of reviewing county departments' capital project requests and making recommendations concerning those requests to the County Board of Commissioners. The Task Force, known as the CBTF, consists of eleven citizens who reside in various communities within Hennepin County. Each of the seven county commissioners appoints one member. The remaining four members are appointed by a majority of the commissioners and serve at-large for four-year terms.

The task force meets about 10 times annually concentrated mostly between May and September. Its activities include familiarization with the county's capital assets and reviewing departments' capital project requests to improve, replace or acquire new assets. The final product is a set of recommendations to the County Board regarding an annual capital budget and a five-year capital improvement program. The CBTF's orientation is primarily toward the long-range implications of capital projects. They evaluate the county's capital needs with a goal of maintaining a minimum, but sufficient capital program which does not exceed the amount of revenues which will be available to fund capital projects.

Capital budget instructions are sent to Hennepin County departments in February. The departments' capital project requests are first reviewed by County Administration for content and programmatic value.

The project requests are then submitted to the Capital Budgeting Task Force, which reviews them to arrive at its recommendations to the County Board of Commissioners. After reviewing the CBTF's recommendations, the County Board adopts a capital budget for the ensuing year and a five-year capital program for long-range planning purposes.

This report includes the CBTF membership, activities, and recommendations for the County's five-year capital improvement program, together with the principles that guide the county's capital budget process.

IV. General approach to capital improvements

(as of August 28, 2023)

Since its beginning in 1973, the Capital Budgeting Task Force has established a number of principles and evaluation criteria which have served as a basis for recommendations to the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners concerning capital improvements. These principles and criteria, as updated each year, are presented below:

A. CBTF Principles

Given competing demands for funds, the primary budgetary responsibility of the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners is to establish expenditure priorities to carry out the various program and service responsibilities of Hennepin County. Acting as an advisory committee, the primary responsibility of the Capital Budgeting Task Force is to make recommendations to the County Board regarding priorities for capital improvement projects. As determined by the County Board, the CBTF reviews all capital projects relating to all county departments. Currently, the CBTF does not review the projects overseen and fully funded by other governmental entities [e.g. the Regional Railroad Authority (RRA) or Housing & Redevelopment Authority (HRA)], but does review the projects of Hennepin Healthcare System, Inc. (HHS/Medical Center), although projects that are directly funded through the HHS/Medical Center Operating Budget are not reviewed by the CBTF.

Over the years, it has become apparent to CBTF members that capital improvements as defined and requested by county departments exceed the county's ability to finance them within the time period desired. In addition, the ongoing operating implications of capital projects are often not fully defined or known by departments. As a result, there is a continuing need to establish capital improvement priorities within the context of long-range revenue and expenditure considerations as well as other factors which affect the long-term needs and plans of the county. The following principles have guided the CBTF's review of capital improvements over the years:

1. Revenues

Hennepin County utilizes various types of revenues to finance its capital improvement program: (a) property taxes, (b) bonded indebtedness, (c) dedicated funds, (d) revenues from the sale of real properties, and (e) enterprise fund revenues. The CBTF also has evaluated (f) alternative revenue sources to finance the capital program.

(a) Property Taxes

The Capital Budgeting Task Force considers the property tax to be an important determinant of the scope and size of the county's capital improvement program. Property taxes may be used to finance a project totally or may be used in concert with other revenues. This revenue is programmed for those capital improvements which are not logical candidates for any other revenue source.

Regardless of which projects are funded with property taxes, the amount of property taxes levied or to be levied is considered by the CBTF to be a significant factor influencing the establishment of the capital improvement program. The CBTF believes that the county needs to maintain a minimum level of property tax support to

prudently fund capital projects which are not logical candidates for other financing.

The CBTF has adopted the following specific principles regarding property taxes:

That the property tax levy for capital improvements should be maintained at a relatively consistent level from year to year. If movement of the levy either upward or downward becomes necessary, it should be done gradually.

A relatively stable property tax levy for capital improvements will not necessarily result in a stable annual expenditure level for capital improvements. As noted below, the availability of other revenues, many of which are dedicated to specific types or groups of projects, will determine the total expenditure level for the annual capital program. It is because of this fluctuation in non-property tax revenues that the CBTF believes a relatively stable property tax approach is preferable to a stable expenditure approach:

When considering a consistent capital improvement property tax levy, the county should consider the property tax requirements for debt retirement as well as for capital projects.

The property taxes for the county's total capital improvement program should also consider the property taxes required to finance the debt service on general obligation bonds previously issued for capital projects, as well as for those projects in the current program that are proposed to be funded by general obligation bonds. Only in this manner is the total property tax requirement for capital improvements accurately reflected.

The Capital Budgeting Task Force believes that continuing the property tax levy for capital improvements at a minimum, yet relatively stable level, will aid in planning capital improvements in subsequent years. This approach will also help to avoid a natural tendency to ignore the long-range capital needs of the county in order to gain short-term benefits of lower property taxes for one year. Not only is such an approach disruptive to long-range planning, but it is short-sighted in terms of fulfilling the county's obligations to its citizens in the future.

(b) Bonded Indebtedness

The county has authority to issue debt for general capital purposes subject to certain conditions and limitations. The county's capital improvement program must include consideration of many of the same factors that make up the CBTF's principles and evaluation criteria.

The CBTF believes it is important that the county use prudence in the issuance of debt for capital projects. The CBTF believes the county should issue debt in accordance with the following principles:

The county should issue debt only for major capital projects and not try to finance the entire capital program with debt.

- Bonds should not be used to fund operations. A capital project is defined as

a capital outlay typically greater than \$1 million, but may be as small as \$150,000, for the acquisition, construction, or improvement of long-term assets or infrastructure.

- Bonds should not be used to fund any project whose expected life does not exceed the maturity on the bonds.

The county should balance debt issuance; considering intergenerational equity (understanding the extent to which capital projects affect future generations), current and future property tax impacts, bond interest rates and capital needs.

The county should utilize bond financing to align the burden of cost with the beneficiaries of the asset investment.

The county should always reserve sufficient countywide bonding authority remaining after approval of each five-year capital program to always be able to address contingencies and unforeseen additions to the capital program.

The CBTF has consistently recommended that the county's total tax burden for capital (including debt service) be as level as possible. Issuance of bonds allows the county to even out the property tax load while addressing current significant capital needs. However, the task force believes that the county should balance debt issuance with current property taxes to address capital needs in a manner which best serves future property taxpayers as well as current property taxpayers. Debt issuance has future property tax implications which must be factored into the capital financing equation. As discussed above, the CBTF's property tax principles include consideration of increases and decreases in the county debt service requirements in an attempt to level out the property tax for capital improvements.

The county should maintain its debt management planning which includes a strong financial framework and preserves the county's triple A bond rating.

The CBTF is confident the county can accommodate some debt and still retain its high credit rating. However, the task force believes this high credit rating is of such importance that it should be maintained at all costs. Prudent debt management planning developed around the key variables used by the major rating agencies should be utilized by the county to preserve the county's credit rating. The county should maintain an awareness of the total debt of the county as well as that of overlapping and underlying taxing districts.

The county should approve capital improvement plans and issue debt consistent with the following County Board approved guidelines:

- The overall calculated general obligation debt service levy should not exceed 15% of the total annual property tax levy of the County.
- The total amount of outstanding general obligation debt should not exceed \$800 per capita (2009 figure, adjusted for inflation thereafter; 2023 per capita

- amount is \$1,168).
- The total amount of outstanding general obligation debt supported by property tax should not exceed .65% of the Estimated Market Value of the county.

(c) Dedicated Revenues

It is important to note that, of the revenues available for capital improvements, certain types of revenue have a significant impact on the nature and type of capital improvements the county undertakes. A substantial portion of the revenue available for capital improvement projects is dedicated to a specific type of project or group of projects. Of greatest significance in this regard are revenues available for financing county transportation projects including federal, state, transportation sales & use tax and wheelage taxes. The CBTF believes that:

The county should maximize utilization of all revenue sources dedicated for capital improvements including federal, state, transportation sales & use tax and wheelage taxes before programming general revenue sources.

While these dedicated revenues carry with them numerous constraints, the CBTF believes that any prioritization of capital projects within the capital improvement program, must take these constraints into account. Further, the CBTF believes that the use of such revenue sources should be maximized even if, in so doing, projects must be accelerated or delayed to secure such funds. In addition, the CBTF believes that the county should have contingency plans, especially in times of recession, to make use of any additional federal, state, or other funds which may become available as a result of new programs. The CBTF does not believe, however, that new capital projects should be developed merely to take advantage of such funds.

(d) Sale/Lease of Surplus Real Properties

The CBTF believes that the county should exercise proper caution in disposing of valuable properties to ensure that future county needs are considered. The CBTF is also concerned that the county is not forced to sell property at inopportune times merely to balance the current year's operating budget. The CBTF believes that if properties are to be sold or leased, the proceeds from such sales and leases should be dedicated for capital projects because the properties being sold or leased were originally purchased from the county's capital funds:

Generally, revenues derived from the sale or lease of county real properties should be dedicated to the Capital Improvement Program and programmed after receipt by the county.

The CBTF believes that conservative inclusion of property sale revenues as part of the five-year capital program increases the flexibility of the county regarding when the properties are to be sold or leased while supplying a needed non-property tax revenue source to support the capital program.

(e) Enterprise and Internal Fund Revenues

Some county departments generate revenue while providing services and conducting business. Although some front-end financing may be prudent, the CBTF believes that, to the extent feasible and practicable, these enterprises should finance their capital

needs, including initial construction, additions and renovations, with program generated revenue.

The CBTF recommendations included in this Capital Budget and Capital Improvement Program are predicated on the condition that the county's enterprise operations will generate sufficient revenue to finance their own projects to the extent feasible and practicable.

Hennepin Healthcare System (HHS)

As of January 1, 2007, the Hennepin Healthcare System (HHS) corporation board oversees the operations of the medical center. The operating and capital budgets for HHS are reviewed and approved by the County Board. In addition, the debt issued to finance capital improvements for the hospital is issued by Hennepin County. As a result, the Capital Budgeting Task Force reviews the medical center's proposed capital projects that include bonding, and approved projects are included in the county's five-year capital improvement program.

Given the uncertainties in funding streams and other adverse changes in hospital revenues, the CBTF assumes that all bonds issued to finance medical center projects will be general obligation debt of the county, even if that debt is supported by enterprise revenues of the hospital.

(f) Alternative Revenue Sources

In addition to increased authority to issue debt and using the proceeds from the sale of surplus real property, the CBTF believes the county should investigate other non-property tax revenues as they become available. These alternatives may include public/private partnerships, alternative debt instruments in-so-far-as they are prudent, grants and other various donations.

The county should use alternative financing mechanisms only if it can be clearly shown that they are in the best interests of the county.

In summary, the Capital Budgeting Task Force's approach to revenues can be expressed as follows: maximize all non-county revenue sources and utilize whatever revenue sources are available to reduce the property taxes and general obligation debt required for capital projects to a minimum over the long run. Stabilize the property tax levy requirements as much as possible, including the requirements for debt service of county issued bonds. The CBTF believes this approach will provide a minimum but sufficient amount of revenues to finance the county's capital improvement program in the long run.

2. Expenditures

Since it is not feasible to develop a capital improvement program which addresses all project requirements of county departments, the Capital Budgeting Task Force has established evaluation criteria to assist in reviewing capital projects. These criteria are presented in detail in Section B of this report. It should be noted that the criteria as established are not intended to be used as an absolute system to determine a ranking of projects, but rather are used as a guideline to assure that all relevant factors are

considered in the development of any recommendations. In addition to establishment of evaluation criteria, the CBTF has developed the following general principles regarding capital improvement expenditures:

Existing Asset Utilization and Maintenance

The Capital Budgeting Task Force believes that existing county infrastructure should be utilized to the fullest extent possible. For the CBTF, this implies a heavy emphasis on maintaining roads and facilities so that they continue to be serviceable throughout their useful life. **The CBTF cautions the county against reducing maintenance budgets in order to redirect resources to operating programs and services.** Whether the projects are of sufficient magnitude for CBTF involvement or not, the task force believes that maintenance is a high priority and is essential to ensuring full utilization of county assets now and in the future:

The county should maximize utilization of existing assets, including giving a higher priority to maintaining existing assets, over new construction where reasonable.

The CBTF does not believe there should be any “natural rights” of county departments or programs to any assets or portions thereof. For example, the CBTF believes that to maximize utilization of all county facilities, present facilities must be adequately maintained to ensure continued usage for whichever department or service may need to utilize that asset now or in the future. This approach reduces the need to commit the county to new construction or major renovation of other facilities. The present capital assets of the county are very valuable but increase in value only if they are well maintained throughout their useful life. The replacement cost of most of the county’s assets is very high. As a result, preservation of the county’s assets protects the county’s investment and saves money in the long run. However, the county should guard against committing resources to assets that have exceeded their useful life.

Flexibility for the Future

The long-range full utilization of county assets can be enhanced if the investment is completed with as much flexibility for the future as possible. The CBTF believes that:

In order to increase the long-term utilization of county assets, as much flexibility as is consistent with operating efficiency should be planned into all new or renovation projects that the county undertakes.

Because of state, federal and judicial mandates, programmatic and regulatory guidelines, reorganization plans and other factors, Hennepin County government will continue to change in the future. The CBTF believes that the county’s assets should be constructed and maintained in such a manner that future growth and change can be accommodated.

Operating Cost Implications

With integrated operating and capital budget preparation cycles, the CBTF expects that future operating cost implications of capital projects be delineated:

The operating cost implications of all capital projects must be identified by

county departments and the priority given to those which will result in a reduction in operating costs where feasible.

Many capital improvements proposed by county departments will require additional operating expenditures, while others may reduce operating costs. The CBTF believes that sound financial planning demands that operating cost implications be considered prior to approval of any capital improvement program.

Inflation and Capital Cost Control

Because the capital improvement program of the county plans expenditures and revenues up to five years into the future, the CBTF has found it useful to estimate inflation rates for capital projects. Although the inflation estimates used in the capital improvement program will probably not prove correct, it is nevertheless important that the impact of inflation be explicitly recognized. As the inflationary experience changes, the inflation estimates can be revised on an annual basis. The CBTF believes that:

Inflation factors for all projects in the capital program should be considered each year and appropriate adjustments made to all project estimates.

Whether caused by inflation, poor cost estimating practices or changes in project scope, capital project budgets have, on occasion, experienced significant cost overruns. The CBTF believes that project budgets, once established, should be closely adhered to and only revised after careful consideration of alternatives.

The extent to which capital project costs can be accurately estimated is dependent upon a given department's ability to clearly and comprehensively describe the requested project's scope and program requirements. The CBTF is very supportive of the capital planning process and encourages taking the time required to conduct the necessary preliminary planning activities for capital projects. As such, the CBTF supports early identification of capital projects and believes that:

Except in extenuating circumstances, the CBTF will not generally recommend implementation of a project in the first year of the five-year program during which it is requested.

This approach will permit a preliminary concept review of proposed capital projects by the CBTF with subsequent opportunity for further project planning activities to be carried out prior to final CBTF consideration of project implementation. It is felt that reviewing and recommending approval of capital projects in this manner will increase the likelihood of obtaining reliable cost figures.

In summary, the general approach of the CBTF to capital project expenditures is to evaluate the project's impact on the department's operating costs as well as the extent to which the investment contributes to full utilization of county assets not only at the present time, but also in the future. The CBTF is concerned about the impact of inflation on capital projects and programming and believes that proper inclusion of inflation factors will help eliminate project cost overruns. Additional information is presented in the project evaluation criteria in Section IV-B.

3. Other Factors

In addition to the CBTF principles regarding revenues and expenditures, there are also other areas which the task force has examined over the years and developed positions as follows:

Transportation and Transit

The CBTF believes that: the construction and maintenance of freeway roads are more appropriately the state's responsibility and the county should continue the policy that all future freeway construction be the responsibility of the State of Minnesota. In addition, the CBTF encourages the county to investigate turning back certain county roads to municipalities where feasible and traffic volumes do not justify county involvement.

With respect to mass transit, the CBTF strongly supports continued efforts and investment but encourages the county to carefully evaluate the considerable risks involved with such large investments and work closely with partnering agencies to mitigate and manage that risk.

Further, the CBTF believes that transportation and transit funding by county debt or property taxes should be limited. Nevertheless, the county has increased funding for transportation and transit in part because state and federal highway funding has not kept pace. Along these lines, the CBTF encourages the county and its Regional Railroad Authority to consider county sponsored construction of transit supportive infrastructure; such as Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) investments.

Sustainability, Energy Efficiency and Climate Impacts

The CBTF is very supportive of the county's initiatives regarding sustainability, energy efficiency and the goals as laid out in the Climate Action Plan, which the County Board approved in May 2021.

In determining the level and extent of funding these initiatives, the CBTF believes that priorities must be established, and realistic pay-back periods realized. As such, the CBTF strongly supports the expenditure of capital funds to carry out such measures. Therefore, the CBTF has established the following guidelines:

The county should pursue capital project opportunities consistent with the Climate Action Plan. However, the county should not make capital expenditures without considering pay-back periods, the expected life of the asset, and an evaluation of climate threats. The evaluation should include measures to mitigate said threats and an assessment of the asset's climate resiliency and whether the asset improvements result in a net increase or decrease in greenhouse gas emissions.

The CBTF will be reviewing climate impacting projects on an annual basis and will favorably consider funding those projects which are consistent with these guidelines.

Disparity Reduction

The CBTF supports the county's efforts to reduce disparities across the county. As such, the CBTF views capital projects that address disparities consistent with the goals of the county to be a higher priority than similar investments that do not impact recognized disparities.

Consultant Costs

Consultant studies that are included in the capital program should be related to specific capital project requests involving space or architectural and engineering issues and be undertaken only when there is a reasonable likelihood that the capital project to which it is related will be initiated within close time-proximity to the completion of the study.

The county should include in the capital program only those consultant studies that relate to capital projects and space issues likely to be initiated or addressed within close time-proximity to the completion of the study.

Based on these principles and the evaluation criteria presented below, the Capital Budgeting Task Force reviewed and is recommending the Capital Improvement Program which is presented in Section V of this Report.

B. Capital Project Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria have been used by the Capital Budgeting Task Force over the years to evaluate capital projects. The criteria are not used by the CBTF as an absolute grading system to determine the ranking of projects but rather as a guideline to ensure that the relevant factors to be considered are addressed in any recommendation on capital projects.

1. **Policy and Program Objectives** – relating to county policy generally and to the objective of the major program, sub-program and activity as stated in the annual Hennepin County budget:
 - Is the project considerate of other county functions, particularly in terms of co-locational factors?
 - Are there non-capital alternatives to the project that would also assure program continuity?
 - Is it possible to defer the project to a later date without adversely affecting the program?
 - Is the project an integral part of an overall plan to accomplish program and county priorities?
 - Will it increase the availability of service to populations currently underserved or unserved?

2. **Financing** – funding sources and financing methods:
 - What are the proposed funding sources?
 - Is the funding source secure?
 - Have aid monies been applied for?

- Are they subject to adjustment or cancellation?
 - Is the project a candidate for bonding, consistent with CBTF principles?
3. **Project Cost** – relation of cost to similar projects or building types and to other responsibilities of program provision:
- Does the cost appear reasonable as compared to projects of a similar nature?
 - Are site acquisition costs adequately reflected?
 - How does the request compare to potential alternatives?
 - What alternatives have been explored and what are the cost and effectiveness of these alternatives compared with the requested solution?
4. **Operational Cost** – long range commitment to maintain the facility and program:
- What costs are associated with the project for maintenance, staffing patterns, energy utilization and accessibility?
 - Have the identified operating costs been included in the project request?
 - How do these costs compare to existing program operation?
 - How do these costs compare to total departmental operational costs?
 - Are cost/benefit factors applicable?
 - What does the benefit imply?
5. **Time Frame** – scheduled initiation and completion to meet policy and program objectives:
- Is start-time realistic in view of project status and magnitude?
 - Is time frame essential to interface with other committed projects?
 - Are these projects approved for execution?
 - Do they represent a joint or cooperative effort with other service delivery agencies?
 - Do these projects involve public and/or private developments?
6. **Economic, Cultural and Environmental** – consideration of economies in timing, resource conservation, needs and perspectives of all generations, impact on area development and cultural and physical environment:
- Would the project aid the general economic condition of the area?
 - Would it serve to generate additional reinvestment or renewal?
 - Would this activity be private as well as public?
 - To what extent could the project also benefit from a favorable bidding climate?
 - Are costs for any unique structural or equipment requirement expected to rise faster than normally expected inflation?
 - Does the project possess particular recreational, historical or social benefit?
7. **Life Safety / Code Compliance** – relation to the protection of life and property:
- Does the project meet all appropriate building, housing, fire prevention and zoning codes?
 - Is the project proposed to alleviate unsafe conditions for existing highways/facilities?
 - Does the project properly consider the safety and security of employees and visitors?

- Is it prompted by legal requirements for safety standards (fire prevention, building codes, Americans with Disabilities Act, OSHA, etc.)?

8. Intergovernmental Relations – cooperation with other service delivery agencies:

- Is the project in harmony with development and service delivery policies of the municipality, Metropolitan Council and State of Minnesota?
- Does the project contribute to local government cooperation and mutual support?
- Are there any possibilities for joint usage or cooperating with other counties, municipalities, or other units of government?

9. Project Support - Is there specific support for or opposition to the project:

- Is it from community organizations, special interest groups, individuals?
- Does it come officially from an affected unit of government?
- Is it representative of the general public?

10. Legal Obligations – A legal obligation is understood to mean a valid written agreement or contract to perform a service for the county.

- Has the county entered into a binding legal contract or agreement for construction of the project?
- Is it likely the county will enter into a binding legal contract for construction of the project by the end of the current year which will obligate future year budget authority?
- Are there any options open to the county to delay or terminate the contract and if so, what are the financial consequences?

V. 2024-2028 Capital Improvement Program Commentary

Presentation of the 2024 Capital Budget and
2024-2028 Capital Improvement Program
to the Administration, Libraries and Budget Committee

Susan Carlson Weinberg, Chair
12:00 PM October 16, 2023

NOTE: The Chair's comments will be available for distribution on 10/16/23. On-line and hard copy documents will be updated and distributed at that time.

For additional budget information visit:
www.hennepin.us/budgets



This material can be provided in alternative forms. For further information, please call 612-348-5125.

Hennepin County does not discriminate and provides equal access to employment, programs and services without regard to race, color, creed, religion, age, sex (except when sex is a bona fide occupational qualification), disability, marital status, sexual orientation, public assistance status, socio-economic status, education, ethnicity and/or national origin. If you believe you have been discriminated against, contact the Human Resources Department, A-400 Government Center, 300 S. Sixth St., Minneapolis, MN 55487, or call 612-348-2163. (9/09)

 Printed on 30% recycled post-consumer fiber.