

ARM RFP for Valuation Study  
4/30/2026



**AGGREGATE & READY MIX**  
ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA

**Request for Proposals**

**Aggregate Mine Property Valuation Study**

**April 30, 2026**

ARM RFP for Valuation Study  
4/30/2026

## **Request for Proposal - Aggregate Mine Property Valuation Study**

### **Aggregate Ready-Mix Association of Minnesota**

Issue Date: April 30, 2026

Contact: John Cunningham, Executive Director for ARM-MN [jcunningham@armofmn.com](mailto:jcunningham@armofmn.com)

Proposal Due Date: June 4, 2026 5:00 pm

### **Intent to Bid Deadline**

Please provide your intent to bid by May 7, 2026 5:00 pm

### **Questions**

Please submit written questions by May 20, 2026 to the email address above.

### **Attachments**

Attachment A – ARM of MN Anti-Trust Policy and Procedures

### **Introduction**

The process of permitting or expanding aggregate mines, particularly in the Twin Cities metro area has become challenging. One concern often expressed by local residents and elected officials is the perception that the proposed mine will negatively impact property values near the proposed or existing facility.

The goal of this project is to provide defensible data that quantifies the likely effect of aggregate mining (and specific ancillary land use) on nearby property values as well as the location and timing of those potential effects.

### **Problem Statement and Goal**

The goal of the study is to provide a resource for decision makers and others to enhance understanding and draw attention to critical issues that ARM members need to be aware of during permitting/environmental review so that they can be better prepared to educate stakeholders and the public on this issue.

In general, mining operations are located in areas that possess a geologic resource, proximity to markets, a willing owner/lessor, and favorable zoning/land use. This typically means that the operations often start in what are generally rural areas that may or may not become part of a more built-out suburban area in years and decades after operation.

This study is intended to address changes in property values for both rural and suburban operations. Often the concerns in a rural residential setting are driven by concerns regarding new (greenfield operations), whereas a more mature operation in a developed setting may face concerns related to expansion of the mine operation as higher density subdivisions are built out around the operation. However, over time, the principal hypothesis is that property valuation changes in each of these settings may be perceived differently by stakeholders (e.g. the mine or plant will cause property values to decline) and therefore it is critical that this study address both the pre-mine as well as post-mining scenarios for both rural and suburban type settings.

It is assumed (for now) that post-reclamation end use will not be considered as this period would not be associated with many of the operational concerns (noise, dust, traffic) that often lead to a presumed decline in property value.

### **Scope of Work**

#### ***Task 1 – Site Selection***

ARM members will be asked to nominate sites for consideration; however, the successful bidder shall be prepared to independently offer appropriate sites for consideration based on publicly available information, experience, or other resources. Properties included in the study are preferred to be within a half to one mile of the active mine limit and/or operations area of the facility.

The successful bidder shall identify one rural and one suburban site based on criteria below:

#### **Task 1.1 Setting and Comparable Properties**

One project area will be located in what was or is currently a rural residential area and the other will be in what is currently a suburban setting. In order to support sufficient comparable data for the rural residential setting, land zoned as agricultural is acceptable as long as there are at least five properties within one mile of the proposed mine property not including the property owned by the proposer or landowner associated with the mine. However, ARM recognizes that the number of properties available for comparison may be limited. Therefore, the properties used for comparison is up to the successful bidders professional discretion. The successful bidder shall provide a rationale for comparables distance that will be described in the report deliverable.

The areas encompassing the properties should be large enough to capture similar types of housing and land use but should strive to avoid bias related to areas that may reasonably likely to result in outliers of either very high or very low value. For example, homes located on major highways may bias the results if the traffic from the mine is not likely to significantly alter the conditions for that property.

If sufficient numbers of properties are available, the changes should be evaluated using standard valuation and statistical methods. Tax values, real estate sales data, and online resources are deemed valid sources of valuation information. All source data will need to be cited by reference and a brief rationale included for the use of the data in the report deliverable. If alternative methods are used, they shall be described and referenced in Task 3 Report Deliverable described below

### **Task 1.2 Geography**

In order to provide adequate comparable property data the study will likely focus on the 11-county metro area defined by the Minnesota Metro Chamber Foundation described at: ([https://metromsp.org/Definitions\\_and\\_Terms.htm#](https://metromsp.org/Definitions_and_Terms.htm#)).

These counties include Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, Hennepin, Isanti, Ramsey, Scott, Sherburne, Washington, and Wright counties. Outstate Minnesota and Wisconsin border counties of Pierce, Polk, and St. Croix may be considered as well if an appropriate site is identified outside the counties above.

Each operational scenario will consider two land use settings which include rural/agricultural as well as suburban/commercial or industrial settings. ARM members may provide suggestions for specific locations as a starting point.

### **Task 1.3 Timing Relative to Mining Operations**

For each of the two land use settings, two operational scenarios evaluated. These will include the “pre-operational period” consisting of no less than 5 years prior to the start of mine operations. The other scenario is the “active operational period” which can include all of the pre-mine preparations but should also include a minimum of 3 years of typical operations generating a change in noise, dust, traffic etc.

### **Task 1.4 Valuation and Rate of Change**

For each site and each period, residential and commercial property values shall be identified determined on an annual basis. The underlying data shall be compiled by individual property but summary statistics such as average, mean, median, variance and

rate of change (in percent) per year of valuations will be expected measures for comparison. The goal is to provide a “before and after” comparison of the overall property value as well as the time dependent percent change in value for the pre-mine period compared to the active operational period for each property and as an aggregate.

#### **Task 1.4 Operational Requirements**

The selected sites shall include at least one sand and gravel operation or one quarried rock aggregate operation that includes blasting and/or dewatering. The sites selected may have any of the following features:

- Mining of some form of rock (sand and gravel excavation or quarrying; preferably both)
- Crushing operations
- Washing/classifying operations
- Stockpiling; if possible specify if stockpiles are managed at or below surrounding ground surface.
- Blasting operations (if quarry operations present)
- A concrete ready-mix batch plant that operates during at least a portion of the site operation
- Truck traffic, dust, and noise issues consistent with typical operations
- Screening berms (if possible note the presence of or lack thereof)

Identifying as many of the above variables as possible, will help future users identify salient details that may add additional context to the information provided as part of this project.

What the study will not include (at least for now) due to added cost and complexity that may skew results:

- Asphalt plants
- Value added concrete products
- Retail sale to public if it is likely to add additional traffic

These items can be included in follow up studies by ARM or ARM members under separate scope and budget. However, if an otherwise promising site is apparent, the successful bidder may request permission from ARM to include these features.

#### ***Task 2 Report Deliverable***

This task will consist of a professional report that describes methods, analysis, and conclusions with supporting figures, data, and tabulation of data necessary to support the report conclusions. The report shall provide an executive summary of the primary findings

of the study. ARM envisions a scattergram of property values plotted against distance from the active mine area, with summary statistics and regression analysis for each land use/operational scenario. Additional measures of the data including average, mean, median as well as other changes (e.g. rate of valuation change over time) may be added as needed at the professional discretion of the successful bidder.

### ***Task 3 Progress Meetings and Communications with ARM***

The bidders shall assume one kickoff meeting with ARM staff and/or the ARM Environment and Land Use Committee. This will be followed by a progress meeting a month later and a final meeting 90 days after report completion. Any additional project administration costs shall be included in this task and identified separately in the cost summary.

### **Other Requirements**

#### **Form of Proposal**

Your proposal shall consist of concise letter proposal with a summary of approach, tasks to be completed, an itemized cost table and at most three project examples of similar work including the dates, locations, and client references (do not identify confidential work product). The proposal shall identify the team conducting the work along with a brief biography of each person including their role on the project.

The bidder's value-added ideas are welcome. If there are proposed deviations from the scope please provide an attachment that describes the rationale for the deviation and the proposed scope and separate budget for the deviation. Innovation and approach carries as much weight as cost in our scoring as shown below.

#### **Qualifications**

A firm conducting this work may include specialized appraisers in the aggregate industry and/or planning firms with market analysis capabilities. Preference should be given to existing ARM members, but non-ARM firms wishing to submit a proposal can become ARM associate members at the time of award or final contracted agreement.

#### **Schedule**

Notice of Award – Successful bidders shall be notified within 2 weeks of proposal due date. Work shall not begin before 30 days after award. The successful bidder shall schedule a kickoff meeting within 8 weeks of award. Project milestones will be developed at the kickoff meeting but is assumed that the work will be completed within 120-150 days of the award. Ability to conduct the work more quickly will be a factor in scoring regarding Approach/Innovation below.

**Terms**

All work shall be in strict compliance with ARM’s Anti-Trust Compliance Policy and Procedures (Attachment A). Please provide standard terms and conditions as attachment to the proposal. The successful bidder shall demonstrate efficiency in performance by minimizing administrative overhead related to contracting and terms. This project does not include design or field work, so a detailed contract document is not expected or anticipated. Streamlined contracting is included in the scoring as shown below.

**Scoring**

The scoring for the proposal shall be weighted toward the following criteria:

Approach/Innovation – 30%

Cost – 30%

Qualifications and Experience of Team – 20%

Efficiency and brevity of proposal/contracting – 20%

**Disclaimer**

This RFP does not guarantee that a contract will be issued and ARM reserves the right to select or reject any bid for any reason. All costs related to the preparation of this proposal will be borne solely by the proposer.