

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 271
Bloomington, Minnesota

REQUEST FOR SCHOOL BOARD ACTION

DATE OF BOARD MEETING: June 27, 2016

SUBJECT: Intermediate District 917 Long-Term Facility Maintenance Budget

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: Finance

APPROVAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE CABINET MEMBER: Rod Y. Zivkovich, Executive Director of Finance and Support Services *RYZ*

RESOLUTION FOR BOARD TO ADOPT:

RESOLVED, that the School Board of Independent School District 271 approves Intermediate School District No. 917's Long-Term Facility Maintenance Program Budget and authorizing the inclusion of a proportionate share of those projects in the District's application for long-term facility maintenance revenue.

RECOMMENDATION OF SUPERINTENDENT:

Approve. *R*

DETAILED BACKGROUND:

The School Board of Intermediate School District 917 has approved a long-term facility maintenance program budget for its facilities for the 2016-17 school year in the amount of \$52,650.00. Member districts may include their proportionate share of the costs of the intermediate school district program in their long-term facility maintenance application, subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Education. Bloomington's portion for 2016-17 is \$12,246.00.

EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF MEETING
OF SCHOOL BOARD OF
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 271
(Bloomington)
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a School Board meeting of Independent School District No. 271, State of Minnesota, was held on June 27, 2016 at 7:00 o'clock p.m., for the purpose, in part, of approving the Intermediate School District No. 917's Long-Term Facility Maintenance budget and authorizing the inclusion of a proportionate share of Intermediate School District's long-term facility maintenance projects in the district's application for long-term facility maintenance.

Member _____ introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

**RESOLUTION APPROVING INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT
NO. 917'S LONG-TERM FACILITY MAINTENANCE PROGRAM
BUDGET AND AUTHORIZING THE INCLUSION OF A
PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF THOSE PROJECTS IN THE DISTRICT'S
APPLICATION FOR LONG-TERM FACILITY MAINTENANCE
REVENUE**

BE IT RESOLVED by the School Board of District 271, State of Minnesota, as follows:

1. The School Board of Intermediate School District 917 has approved a long-term facility maintenance program budget for its facilities for the 2017-2018 school year in the amount of \$52,650.00. The various components of this program budget are attached as Exhibit A hereto and are incorporated herein by reference. Said budget is hereby approved. (Exhibit A)
2. Minnesota Statutes, Section 123B.53, Subdivision 1, as amended, provides that if an intermediate school district's long-term facility maintenance budget is approved by the school boards of each of the intermediate school district's member school districts, each member district may include its proportionate share of the costs of the intermediate school district program in its long-term facility maintenance revenue application.
3. The proportionate share of the costs of the intermediate school district's long-term facility maintenance program for each member school district to be included in its application shall be determined by multiplying the total cost of the intermediate school district long-term facility maintenance program times a formula that weights two components equally between

the member districts; total net tax capacity and Adjusted Marginal Cost pupil units. The long-term facility maintenance costs shall be funded through annual levy instead of issuing bonds. The inclusion of this proportionate share in the district's long-term facility maintenance revenue application for fiscal year 2019 is hereby approved, subject to approval by the Commissioner of Education.

4. Upon receipt of the proportionate share of long-term facility maintenance revenue attributable to the intermediate school district program, the district shall promptly pay to the intermediate school district the applicable aid or levy proceeds.

The motion for the adoption of the foregoing resolution was duly seconded by Member _____ and, upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof:

And the following voted against the same:

Whereupon said resolution was declared duly passed and adopted.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

I, the undersigned, being the duly qualified and acting Clerk of School District No. 271, State of Minnesota, hereby certify that I have carefully compared the attached and foregoing extract of minutes of a meeting of School District No. 271, held on the date therein indicated, with the original of said minutes on file in my office, and the same is a full, true and complete transcript insofar as the same relates to the approval of Intermediate School District No. 917's long-term facility maintenance program budget and authorizing the inclusion of a proportionate share of the Intermediate School District's long-term facility maintenance projects in the district's application for long-term facility maintenance revenue.

WITNESS MY HAND officially as such Clerk this 26th day of June, 2017.

Clerk

School District No. 271

**Intermediate School District No. 917
Levy by Member District, 2016 Payable 2017**

Participating Districts (9):

ISD #	Name	Pay 2016 Taxable Net Tax Capacity				District %	
		Dakota Co. (19)	Scott Co. (70)	Goodhue Co. (25)	Washington Co. (82)		Hennepin (27)
6	South St. Paul	11,727,754				11,727,754	2.9929%
191	Burnsville	47,007,530	15,413,731			62,421,261	15.9297%
192	Farmington	27,609,545				27,609,545	7.0459%
194	Lakeville	51,471,262	12,509,152			63,980,414	16.3276%
195	Randolph	4,015,889		558,341		4,574,230	1.1673%
197	West St. Paul	56,349,741				56,349,741	14.3802%
199	Inver Grove Heights	25,365,382				25,365,382	6.4732%
200	Hastings	26,741,513	101,317	34,183	3,959,395	30,735,091	7.8435%
271	Bloomington					109,091,713	27.8398%
		250,288,616	28,024,200	592,524	3,959,395	391,855,131	100.00%

Note: The Taxable Net Tax Capacity (TNTC) consists of net tax capacity, less captured tax increment and fiscal disparities contribution.

FY18 LTFM Revenue \$ 52,650.00

ISD #	Name	APU's est 2016-17 as reported on 1/5/16		Combined Total		50/50 Blended % Distribution		District's Portion of the LTFM Levy	
		District %	TNTC	District %	TNTC	District %	TNTC	District %	TNTC
6	South St. Paul	6.5525%	11,727,754	2.9929%		4.77%	\$2,511		
191	Burnsville	17.1288%	62,421,261	15.9297%		16.53%	\$8,703		
192	Farmington	12.3988%	27,609,545	7.0459%		9.72%	\$5,118		
194	Lakeville	19.7742%	63,980,414	16.3276%		18.05%	\$9,503		
195	Randolph	1.2049%	4,574,230	1.1673%		1.19%	\$627		
197	West St. Paul	8.9823%	56,349,741	14.3802%		11.68%	\$6,150		
199	Inver Grove Heights	7.0978%	25,365,382	6.4732%		6.79%	\$3,575		
200	Hastings	8.1685%	30,735,091	7.8435%		8.01%	\$4,217		
271	Bloomington	18.6921%	109,091,713	27.8398%		23.26%	\$12,246		
		100.00%	391,855,131.00	100.00%		100.00%	\$52,650		

Intermediate District No. 917, Minnesota
Health & Safety Levy

Estimated Market Value (a)	Levy TNTC	Tax Rate Increase (b):	South St. Paul (6)	Burnsville (191)	Farmington (192)	Lakeville (194)	Randolph (195)	West St. Paul (197)	Inver Grove Heights (199)	Hastings (200)	Bloomington (271)
			\$9,109 \$11,727,754 0.078%	\$48,486 \$62,421,261 0.078%	\$21,446 \$27,609,545 0.078%	\$49,697 \$63,980,414 0.078%	\$3,553 \$4,574,230 0.078%	\$43,769 \$56,349,741 0.078%	\$19,702 \$25,365,382 0.078%	\$23,873 \$30,735,091 0.078%	\$84,737 \$109,091,713 0.078%
\$	50,000		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	75,000		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	100,000		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	200,000		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	500,000		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	1,000,000		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
	3,000,000		29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
	5,000,000		49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49
	7,000,000		68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68
	10,000,000		97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97

Seasonal/Recreational (Residential)											
Estimated Market Value (a)	Levy TNTC	Tax Rate Increase (b):	South St. Paul (6)	Burnsville (191)	Farmington (192)	Lakeville (194)	Randolph (195)	West St. Paul (197)	Inver Grove Heights (199)	Hastings (200)	Bloomington (271)
\$	50,000		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	100,000		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	150,000		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	200,000		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	250,000		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Agricultural Homestead											
Value per Acre Dwelling Est. Market (c)	Acres	Total EMV (d)	South St. Paul (6)	Burnsville (191)	Farmington (192)	Lakeville (194)	Randolph (195)	West St. Paul (197)	Inver Grove Heights (199)	Hastings (200)	Bloomington (271)
			\$9,109 \$11,727,754 0.078%	\$48,486 \$62,421,261 0.078%	\$21,446 \$27,609,545 0.078%	\$49,697 \$63,980,414 0.078%	\$3,553 \$4,574,230 0.078%	\$43,769 \$56,349,741 0.078%	\$19,702 \$25,365,382 0.078%	\$23,873 \$30,735,091 0.078%	\$84,737 \$109,091,713 0.078%
\$	80	\$ 684,000	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$3
	160	1,268,000	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	320	2,436,000	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
	640	4,772,000	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

Agricultural Non-Homestead											
Value per Acre Dwelling Est. Market (c)	Acres	Total EMV (d)	South St. Paul (6)	Burnsville (191)	Farmington (192)	Lakeville (194)	Randolph (195)	West St. Paul (197)	Inver Grove Heights (199)	Hastings (200)	Bloomington (271)
			\$9,109 \$11,727,754 0.078%	\$48,486 \$62,421,261 0.078%	\$21,446 \$27,609,545 0.078%	\$49,697 \$63,980,414 0.078%	\$3,553 \$4,574,230 0.078%	\$43,769 \$56,349,741 0.078%	\$19,702 \$25,365,382 0.078%	\$23,873 \$30,735,091 0.078%	\$84,737 \$109,091,713 0.078%
\$	80	\$ 584,000	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5
	160	1,168,000	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	320	2,336,000	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
	640	4,672,000	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36

(a) Estimated market value is the basis from which the net tax capacity is calculated. This value is not necessarily the price the property would bring if sold.
 (b) The tax rate increase is derived by dividing the average debt service by the taxable net tax capacity. The dollar increase in taxes payable is derived by multiplying the net tax capacity by the tax capacity rate increase.
 (c) Includes house, garage and one acre with an estimated market value of \$100,000.00
 (d) Estimated value per tillable acre is \$7,300.00

Note: Changes in interest rates, timing or size of the bond issue may cause significant alterations of this information.