

**METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
390 N. Robert St., St. Paul, MN 55101**

**MEETING OF
LAND USE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 28, 2010**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Tony Pistilli, Deborah Haugh, Terry Schneider, Tami Diehm, Karl Drotning, Jon Ulrich, Duane Arens, Marvin Johnson, Dave Beaudet, Barb Thomas, Bob Shaffer, Nancy Schouweiler, Steve Elkins, Michael Noonan, David Elvig, Bob Kermes, Jerry McDonald

ABSENT: None.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pistilli's called the meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee to order at 4:07 p.m. on Thursday, January 28, 2010.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

Johnson motioned and it was seconded by Beaudet to approve the January 28, 2010 agenda and the October 1, 2009 minutes. **The motion carried.**

BUSINESS:

Carbon Footprint Definition and Timeline of Report Work Program - Mark VanderSchaaf

VanderSchaaf began with a definition of carbon footprint referring to the amount of greenhouse gases (GHG) emitted into the atmosphere. He noted the definition for this study is based on travel-related GHG emissions from interaction of land use and transportation. The definition is also from a 2005 baseline and compared over time. He noted that there would be a measure for the region and each community.

VanderSchaaf discussed the rationale for this study's definition noting that the 2009 Legislature assigned a focus on land use and transportation; both regionally and locally.

VanderSchaaf described the carbon footprint tool which looks at land use/development patterns and transportation systems to generate travel patterns, which in turn give us vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which gives us the carbon footprint. He noted that the more VMT, the greater the carbon footprint. VanderSchaaf indicated that our next meeting will have more details from our transportation division.

VanderSchaaf explained that looking at travel patterns is the easier part to analyze. If we know what the travel patterns are we have a good idea of what the carbon footprint is. The difficult part is understanding how various land use and transportation system variables work together to generate travel patterns.

Noonan asked how travel patterns are established from the land use and development patterns and then how are VMT's established. VanderSchaaf stated that we have data on how many miles are traveled through the region and in individual communities. There will be more on this at our next LUAC Meeting.

VanderSchaaf noted that a travel behavior inventory is done every ten years. He noted that the US Environmental Protection Agency has been working for nearly ten years to update its software and data base for estimating pollution from emissions, called 'Moves 2010'.

Connie Kozlak, Transportation discussed a regional travel model that is used having four steps:

- How trips are generated – home to work, etc.

- Gravity model – where is the pull greatest (people will travel to the closest store).
- Mode choice – train, car, bus, etc.
- Assign those trips to an actual street using ‘zone’ models.

Kozlak stated the outcome from this travel model is then plugged into an environment model to give us pollutant output.

Schneider stated that speed traveled and congestion are major contributors to pollutants. Kozlak stated that this is considered under the mode choice portion of the data.

Pistilli asked if everyone agrees with this model. Kozlak stated that it has been around for 40 years and is generally accepted.

Thomas asked if the gravity model counts stops vs. pass through trips within a city. Kozlak stated yes, these are determined.

Kermes asked if information is proven. Kozlak stated that it is calibrated against road data and noted that a travel behavior inventory done every ten years.

Elkins stated that it was once said that ‘all models are wrong, some are useful.’ He noted however that this model is a widely used model in transportation forecasting.

McDonald asked how does current data not fall apart with future assumptions. Kozlak stated that different scenarios are tested using traffic analysis. Also, the comprehensive planning process is used to look at future land use and assign traffic analysis zones.

VanderSchaaf continued his presentation and noted that this is to be a voluntary tool to help communities with their decision making. He discussed the timeline and what is expected to be in the report.

Review of Land Use and Transportation Strategies and Policies - Debra Detrick

Detrick discussed strategies and policies we have that related to this legislative effort. She stated that we are looking at four expected outcomes:

- Identify Council policies and strategies
 - Reduce air pollution
 - Mitigate congestion
 - Reduce transportation infrastructure costs
- Assess effectiveness of local and regional strategies and processes
- Reduce or manage travel demand
- Relate policies and strategies to carbon footprint

Detrick next talked about the two main resources:

- Identify strategies from *Regional Development Framework*
 - Include land use & transportation policies (exclude wastewater & water supply strategies)
 - Concentrate on personal transportation (exclude freight & aviation strategies)
- Describe implementation strategies from *Transportation Policy Plan*

She noted that other sources will be added as time goes on.

Pistilli asked why are we excluding freight and aviation and asked aren't these a huge part of the carbon footprint? Kozlak stated that aviation travel is not related to local land use, so it is not pertinent to land use strategies. She stated that we don't have a model for predicting truck counts or a good measure on how truck

traffic relates to land use. We could estimate based on truck counts from MnDOT and could possibly do this in the future based on a freight study that the Council will be working on with MnDOT.

Thomas agreed with Pistilli and stated that at the local level planning must be done for traffic, especially truck traffic. She felt that this is a huge hole in the data.

Kozlak stated that estimates could be done from what exists now. She felt that truck traffic doesn't affect land use. Thomas disagreed. Kozlak stated that the amount of truck traffic is related to the strength of the economy. Kozlak stated that this is something they could look how this could be done, but our currently modeling system does not allow for this.

McDonald discussed the airport in Eden Prairie and its effect on the region in regards to land use planning. He also agreed with Pistilli regarding truck traffic. Kozlak stated that we could look at this for 2005 but predicting into the future would be difficult. She agreed that there is a big impact on local streets but noted that we do not assign cities for through trips, as a lot of these are.

Noonan stated that this model assigns a disproportionate role to residential traffic. He feels that there needs to be some attention to counting trucks and include them in the formula as well as develop strategies whereby improvements could be made to reduce the impact of VMT in the truck population.

Kozlak stated that truck traffic only accounts for about 10% of the total traffic.

Schouweiler pointed out in some areas of the region have much more truck traffic and gave the example of UPS at certain times of the day.

Pistilli summarized that the recommendation from LUAC would be to consider, rather than exclude, all forms of transportation in this calculation.

Elkins commented regarding wastewater and the constraints on development this can impose.

Drotning agreed and stated that he feels industrial parks have a big influence and it would be nice to measure their impact as well.

Kermes stated that rail traffic needs to be considered as well.

Detrick discussed the core primary policies from the framework, as well as a few transportation and land use strategies. She noted that examples are included in the handout she provided.

- Accommodate growth in flexible, connected and efficient ways.
- Plan and invest in multi-modal transportation choices to slow growth in congestion and serve the economy.
- Encourage expanded choices in housing and improved access to jobs and opportunities.
- Reclaim, preserve, protect and enhance natural resources.

The group discussed the third policy and its relationship to affordable housing and transportation dependencies.

Examples of Community Strategies - John Kari, Susan Hoyt

Kari discussed examples of community strategies. He stated that our focus will be on land use and transportation. He also noted that the PCA is hoping to have a web based resource to address broader issues. In addition, Kari noted our focus will be on using the carbon footprint tool in local communities and how it relates to air quality, congestion mitigation and efficient use of transportation and overall travel demand management.

Kari stated that he and Susan Hoyt, Local Planning Assistance contacted local communities and in their conversations with them they identified a number of trends. He stated that overall most communities are doing types of activities for multiple benefits. Kari listed some of those benefits:

- economic development reasons
- to achieve sustainable development
- environmental stewardship
- implementation of their comprehensive plan

Kari stated that we are looking for what people are finding effective and gave examples such as travel demand management and transportation management organizations. Another is transit oriented design in which parking and parking requirements is a key aspect. Another relates to urban tree canopy as trees help mitigate air quality issues as well as storm water run off.

Kari discussed trail usage and stated in their last survey they asked questions only related to recreational usage, however now find that it would be beneficial to know how many users are utilizing the trails for a commute to work. He noted that they are seeing communities that are adopting sidewalk plans and bicycle and trail plans making connections internally into the regional system.

Kari stated that when they asked communities about tools or things that they would find useful, they stated that they would do it on their own. He stated they are designing a website for communities to go for resources and tools to help them in their land use and transportation planning.

McDonald asked how do some of these things fit into formulas to address the carbon footprint. Kari stated that this is a good question and what we'd like to look at over the coming year. Looking at trip types is one area that can be a tool in transportation planning.

McDonald discussed the cost of development in their community (Chanhassen) and complaints from developers because of their standards (trees, parks, open space, etc.). This is economic development in their community that they want to take place, but asked what the trade off is. He stated in other words, how are they to justify the standards they've imposed.

Thomas asked what type of feedback is there regarding working in a community on road types. Kari commented regarding transportation and stated 'we need money'. The other comment is related to more boulevard trees. Thomas discussed developing county roads and local lack of control. Kari suggested looking at success stories.

McDonald gave examples of what works. He discussed working with the county utilizing a memorandum of understanding between the county and the city.

Schneider discussed the correlation between affordability and density. He stated people are no longer working where they live in this economy. They work where they can find work. He feels people are not moving because of the poor housing market. He sees communities investing in infrastructure for telecommuting.

Elkins discussed BRT station development and stated that the challenge is determining how dense we can build and be supported by current roads.

Kari stated that many of the professionals are saying that transportation / land use are important together but a big payoff is going to be long term.

Pistilli discussed transit ways and connecting people to public transit sounds efficient but noted that busses get around 1.5 miles to the gallon. He asked if we have compared this to 40 people driving, each getting 30 miles to the gallon. He asked which is more efficient.

Schneider discussed the gridlock that would occur with this increase in cars. Pistilli commented that we did not see this during the bus strike, so is mass transit an answer. VanderSchaaf stated that our tool needs to take this into account.

Pistilli asked will we look at increased mileage, extra lanes, etc. VanderSchaaf stated that we can look at these things.

Thomas asked about planning for density when transit will not come.

Elkins stated that it does not take a lot of buses to give you the equivalency of an extra freeway lane.

Pistilli stated that there is only 5% of the metro area that is truly transit dependent.

Beaudet stated that he feels cars are very convenient but discussed energy usage if we don't have mass transit.

Kermes commented that whatever the list of strategies ends up being, he hopes there is a lot of flexibility. With technology changing all the time, hard strategies will not work.

Pistilli stated that these are good points and reiterated the importance of not focusing on one solution but rather coming up with a multiple solutions to provide as resources for communities.

Schneider pointed out that the study will produce one of two venues. The first, worst case, is that people will take these recommendations as mandates where there is no choice vs. a tool box for communities to use as they choose.

Pistilli noted that one of the major contributors to the carbon foot print is the heating of our homes in the winter.

Shaffer asked if there will be an analysis of between a community with more jobs than people, vs. a community with fewer jobs and more people traveling out. Kari stated that this is something we want to look at. Once we get data and start analyzing the types of trips. This is one of the things that we hope to come up with so that if you are a community that is exporting a lot of trips, is there anything that you can do in your land use planning – and if there is, what is it. Kari stated there is a need to create more public understanding.

Pistilli noted that there are visitors in the audience from the Transportation Land Use Report Stakeholders Committee.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be February 18, 2010 at 4pm in Room LLA. There may also be a meeting on March 18th.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Sandi Dingle, Executive Secretary