

MEMORANDUM

TO: City Planning Commission, Committee of the Whole
FROM: [Wes Durham](#), City Planner, (612) 673-5034
DATE: April 13, 2017
SUBJECT: Location and Design Review of Property and Evidence Warehouse

Authority for Review:

City Charter: Chapter 13, Section 4. "No public improvements shall be approved or authorized to be constructed in the City, nor indebtedness incurred therefor, until the location and design of the same have been approved by the City Planning Commission, provided in case of disapproval the Commission shall communicate its reason to the City Council, and the majority vote of such body shall be sufficient to overrule such disapproval."

State Law: Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2). "...no publicly owned interest in real property within the municipality shall be acquired or disposed of, nor shall any capital improvement be authorized by the municipality or special district or agency thereof or any other political subdivision having jurisdiction within the municipality until after the planning agency has reviewed the proposed acquisition, disposal, or capital improvement and reported in writing to the governing body or other special district or agency or political subdivision concerned, its findings as to compliance of the proposed acquisition, disposal or improvement with the comprehensive municipal plan."

Capital Project: Property and Evidence Warehouse

Department Submitting the Project: Finance and Property Services

Contact Person and Phone: Rebecca Law, (612) 673-5064

CPED Planning Staff Person and Phone: Wes Durham, (612) 673-5034

Proposal Description: As described in the attached materials

Conformance with Comprehensive Plan: This capital project is in conformance with the City's comprehensive plan, as evaluated in the attached materials. The Above the Falls Master Plan Update guides the parcel for mixed use with the additional guidance that within the Lowry Avenue North Riverfront Node (sub area 7) "because of this corridor connection and gateway element of the signature bridge, this is a potential location for a mix of uses, including commercial, office, and light industrial uses" (p.92).

Recommended Finding: Staff recommends that the project is deemed **consistent** with the comprehensive plan.

ATTACHMENTS

- Capital Budget Request for Property and Evidence Warehouse
- Map of Property



Project Title: Property and Evidence Warehouse

Project ID: MPD02

Project Location:

Affected Wards: All

City Sector: Multiple

Affected Neighborhood(s): City-Wide

Initial Year in 5 Year Plan:

Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/16

Project Start Date: 1/1/16

Department Priority: 2 of 2

Submitting Department: Police Department

Contact Phone Number: 612-673-2706

Contact Person: Greg Goeke

Prior Year Unspent Balances: \$0

Project Description:

To acquire and modify an existing building that will meet the operational needs of the Property and Evidence Storage Unit of the Minneapolis Police Department. The proposed facility will be designed to meet all court-mandated chain-of-custody of evidence requirements. The design objective for this Project is to have an evidence storage facility that can be accredited by the International Association for Property and Evidence (IAPE), and by the American Society of Crime Lab Directors (ASCLD). These national organizations have developed the standards for space, safety and operations of evidence storage facilities. The facility will also be designed to meet all applicable fire and building codes and other state and federal codes and standards governing threats to employee safety including airborne contaminants, biohazards, and toxic chemicals.

Purpose and Justification:

The purpose of this Project is to provide a Property and Evidence Storage Unit that is designed both spatially and functionally to meet the current and future needs of the Minneapolis Police Department. The existing Evidence Unit managed by the Support Services Division of the Minneapolis Police Department is located in City Hall with their main offices in Room 33 and evidence storage in the basement and operated with a staff of 10 employees. There is also a Property and Evidence Warehouse located at 6024 Harriet Ave. S. that is operated by six additional staff members. In addition, property and evidence is also stored at a variety of other facilities located throughout Minneapolis. This scattering of facilities around the City lends itself to inefficiencies and logistical problems related to proper evidence storage procedures. But, most importantly, the current facilities are deficient in adequate storage capacity for the volume of evidence and size of items being retrieved from crime scenes.

Anticipated Funding Sources (In Thousands)	2016	Totals by Source
Net Debt Bonds	4,200	4,200
Totals by Year	4,200	4,200

Describe status and timing details of secured or applied for grants or other non-City funding sources:

NA

Operations & Capital Asset Maintenance:

Is this request for new or existing infrastructure? New

What is the expected useful life of the project/Improvement? 30

What is the estimated annual operating cost increase or (decrease) for this project? (70,000)

Describe how operating cost impacts were determined. If new infrastructure, also discuss how the department/agency will pay for the increased annual operating costs:

With the current structure of three locations, the amount of time spent driving between these locations costs the city and the department substantial expense. For one trip to pick up or drop off evidence from Harriet Ave to the NE warehouse and back costs the city \$48 in salary. If the same items were in one location, it would take roughly 15 minutes to handle the same items at a cost of \$6. There is a \$42 savings by having items in one location.

Also, this operation utilizes valuable City Hall space that can be utilized by other departments and reduce the City's overall cost (\$70,000 per year) for leased space downtown.

For new infrastructure, describe the estimated timing and dollar amount of future capital investment that will be necessary to realize the full expected useful life of the project:

Future capital investment will be dependent upon the condition of the building purchased and whether the building has been invested in over its life.

Project Cost Breakdown by Major Expense (In Thousands)	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Land Acquisition/Preparation/ROW	3,000	0	0	0	0	3,000
Relocation Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Design Engineering/Architects	50	0	0	0	0	50
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	250	0	0	0	0	250
Information Technology	25	0	0	0	0	25
Construction Costs	500	0	0	0	0	500
Project Management	75	0	0	0	0	75
Contingency	100	0	0	0	0	100
City Administration	200	0	0	0	0	200
Total Expenses with Admin	4,200	0	0	0	0	4,200

Describe how this project contributes to meeting the current City and/or Park Board Goals and Objectives:

This project improves the efficiency of City facilities, and the ability of the Police Department to provide services to the public—in furtherance of the following City Goals.

A SAFE PLACE TO CALL HOME

People and businesses thrive in a safe and secure city

Strategic directions:

- Collaborative and caring communities help prevent crime

A CITY THAT WORKS

Minneapolis is a model of fiscal responsibility, technological innovation and values-based, results-driven municipal government

Strategic directions:

- 21st century government: collaborative, efficient and reform-minded

State Law Chapter 462.356 (Subd. 2) requires review of all capital improvements for compliance with the comprehensive municipal plan. Chapter 13, Section 4 of the City Charter requires Location and Design Review for the purpose of approving the sale of bonds for these projects. Describe how the project is consistent with the adopted City/Park Board comprehensive plans and how the project implements goals and policies as stated in the adopted plans, including specific policy references:

Policy 5.1: Coordinate facility planning among city departments and public institutions.

5.1.2 Explore opportunities for co-location of public services where appropriate.

5.1.4 Develop cooperative programming that takes advantage of the resources and missions of various public institutions.

Policy 5.4: Enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of the city's infrastructure.

5.4.2 Plan for and provide public facilities which anticipate growth needs, use fiscal resources efficiently, and meet

realistic timelines.

Provide the date that Location and Design Review was conducted for the project, the outcome of that analysis and the date formal action was taken by the Planning Commission:

Location and Design Review for this project took place on May 4, 2009. The project was found consistent with the City's comprehensive plan. Additional review will be required when location is determined and site plans are developed.

Describe any collaborative arrangements with outside project partners, including who they are and what their role is with the project:

Currently there are no partners.

Scalability/Funding Allocation Flexibility – discuss any flexibility to increase or decrease funding among the years in the five-year plan and the most that could be spent in a given year:

Acquisition and modification to an existing warehouse facility can be completed within a given year. Also, the City could lease warehousing space in lieu of owning.

Describe project completion status for ongoing projects and plans for unspent balances or if this is a new project, describe the major project phases and timing anticipated for completing the project:

NA

Add any additional supplemental information you feel is important for the CLIC committee, Mayor, City Council members or the general public to know about this potential project and why it should be approved:

With the current structure of three locations, the amount of time spent driving between these locations costs the city and the department substantial expense. From the Harriet Ave warehouse to the NE storage location, our vehicles drive 7.5 miles one way. To add a stop to Room 33 in City Hall adds a second stop. The time it takes to make the 7.5 mile drive through traffic and on the road system means that a one-way trip may take 20 minutes or more. One round trip costs the city \$24 in salary. Once at the storage locations, the time it takes for one person to transfer property or evidence is added. If one hour is spent, another \$24 cost. For one trip to pick up or drop off evidence from Harriet Ave to the NE warehouse and back costs the city \$48 in salary. If the same items were in one location, it would take roughly 15 minutes to handle the same items at a cost of \$6. There is a \$42 savings by having items in one location.



Hennepin County Property Map

Date: 3/13/2017



PARCEL ID: 1002924310092

OWNER NAME: City Of Minneapolis

PARCEL ADDRESS: 3100 2nd St N, Minneapolis MN 55411

PARCEL AREA: 3.13 acres, 136,432 sq ft

A-T-B: Both

SALE PRICE:

SALE DATA:

SALE CODE:

ASSESSED 2016, PAYABLE 2017

PROPERTY TYPE: Industrial-Preferred

HOMESTEAD: Non-Homestead

MARKET VALUE: \$2,450,000

TAX TOTAL: \$98,035.90

ASSESSED 2017, PAYABLE 2018

PROPERTY TYPE: Unavailable

HOMESTEAD: Unavailable

MARKET VALUE: Unavailable

Comments:

3100-3112 2nd St N -
New Warehouse for Police
Property and Evidence

This data (i) is furnished 'AS IS' with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this data.

COPYRIGHT © HENNEPIN
COUNTY 2017