

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

**MEETING OF
LAND USE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 19, 2012**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Jon Commers, Tami Diehm, Amy Ihlan, Scott Hoke, Gregory Boe, Andy Hestness, Bob Shaffer, Bill Neuendorf, Phillip Klein, Kristina Smitten, Chip Halbach, Elizabeth Wefel, David Elvig

ABSENT: George Johnson, Kim Kang, Jon Ulrich, Kerrin Swecker, Elizabeth Kautz

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Commers called the meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee to order at 4:02 p.m. on Thursday, January 19, 2012.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

Boe motioned and it was seconded by Diehm to approve the January 19, 2012 agenda. **The motion carried.** Klein motioned and it was seconded by Shaffer to approve the November 17, 2011 minutes. **The motion carried.**

BUSINESS:

Reappointment of Vice Chair

Chair Commers, in accordance with the terms of the LUAC Bylaws, named Tami Diehm as Vice Chair, subject to the approval of the Committee, for 2012.

It was motioned by Elvig and seconded by Klein that the Land Use Advisory Committee approves the appointment of Tami Diehm as the Committee's Vice Chair for 2012. **The motion carried.**

Update on Council Vision and Goals Discussion – Jon Commers

Commers gave an update of the Council's Vision and Goals and stated that the Council has had an ongoing discussion about this Council's priorities and goals. He gave brief highlights of the State of the Region event on January 18 where Chair Haigh highlighted the role of transit in economic development and job creation.

He touched on some of the key priorities and interests of the Council:

- Value or interest in using the forecasting model that we talked about at our last meeting to structure a regional plan around some key macro dynamics including slower population growth.
- Smaller and older households.
- A more diverse population in terms of our ethnic composition.
- Reflecting likely constraints in terms of energy production and consumption – with the goal being what are the things we can do through the planning process to enhance the long term economic and social viability and success of the region.
- Interest in investing more around transportation access (more than wastewater) and matching those investments with other investments that the Council and its partners are making.
- New element of the Livable Communities program – the TOD Fund, which is intended to target investments on transit corridors to elevate the matching of land use with transportation in a new way.
- Growing the effectiveness of the transit system and growing the transit system itself.
- Defining a long term capital and operating strategy for funding transit and transportation system more broadly. What is the long-term plan for making those resources available?

- Putting in place a Regional Housing Plan.
- What can we do to make investments in the spirit of increasing economic opportunities across the region?

Detrick mentioned that the Committee of the Whole met yesterday and discussed a draft of the Council's Vision and Goals for the Framework. She stated that the draft covered the mission, goals, but also values and outcomes the Council would like see. She noted that a lot of the discussion seemed to agree on content, with the exception of having some more information about wastewater treatment and treatment of the water.

Smitten asked if the draft Vision/Goals/Outcomes is on the website. Commers stated it is or we could circulate it if the Committee would prefer. The group concurred that they would like it sent to them.

Smitten asked Chair Commers to elaborate on his comment regarding energy as it relates to the work of the Council. Commers responded that there is some sensitivity around how the Council can engage the important issue of energy without going beyond the scope where we can contribute. He noted that this is a live discussion at this point.

Commers noted that the scheduled timeframe of development of the Regional Development Framework was provided in the handouts. He stated that this Committee will be informing the Council through that continuum. This schedule gives us a sense of how our work plan interacts with the Council's work.

Peer Cities Project Overview

Review of Peers and Initial Analysis – Baris Gumus-Dawes, Research

Gumus-Dawes gave a brief overview of the initial stage of the Peer Cities Project. She discussed the process of choosing peer cities and also initial indicators used to describe the performance of the peer cities as outlined in the PowerPoint (handout provided).

Gumus-Dawes discussed a series of tables showing cities ranked by the following:

- Population
- Employment
- Per Capita Real Gross Metropolitan Product
- Per Capita Income
- Poverty
- Unemployment

Gumus-Dawes reiterated that these indicators are not the basis of the selection process. They are just a descriptive snapshot to give us an idea of where we stand among our peers. Under the next stage of the project the Council will conduct a more thorough examination of some of the best practices under each policy area.

Shaffer asked how groupings of cities were determined. Gumus-Dawes stated that there was a vast list of indicators and they tried not to focus on one specific criterion. She noted that they looked at geographic boundaries of metro areas.

Elvig asked when looking at peer cities – how will this information be used. Gumus-Dawes stated that they would like to create a subset by getting feedback from groups, like this committee, and maximize overlap. The Regional Development Framework will be looking at these peers from a policy perspective.

Elvig asked how we compare ourselves based on weather, terrain, etc. Gumus-Dawes stated that there are so many variables – it is hard to overcome this.

Wefel asked if these are peers that we look like now or that we aspire to look like. Gumus-Dawes stated this is a good question and stated it is a bit of both. As we go along, aspirational may be the way to look at it.

Halbach asked how many independent local governments exist per metro area and how does this compare. Gumus-Dawes stated that this issue will come up in John Kari's presentation. Peers by policy area will be compared as the Framework is developed.

Neuendorf noted that land use patterns and geographic size of the region and rate of growth is something to compare. Also, economic factors should be considered, such as the number of Fortune 500 companies. Gumus-Dawes noted that this is just a demographic snapshot and stated that the performance measure aspect will come later.

Wefel questioned the grouping of Raleigh-Durham. Gumus-Dawes explained she combined Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill-Cary to get the largest metro to keep the geography comparable.

Elvig suggested adding Hartford, Connecticut and Rochester, New York.

Klein suggested including education level of the population.

Commers asked when feedback will be most helpful. Detrick noted that this Committee will hear about this project the next time we meet, so there will be more opportunities for input. She noted the Framework outreach plan considers LUAC as a stakeholder and encouraged Committee members to give feedback.

Overview of Regional Peers, Regional Governance Structures and Issues – John Kari, Regional Systems Planning and Growth Strategy

Kari did a presentation giving an overview of how we look at peers in terms of regional growth management and land use planning. He noted that there will be a third piece where transportation and environmental services will come in and talk about how they view peers and how it relates to sewer rates and water supply, transit service and/or highways. As we try to create an overall context of peers, in the end you'll have a good sense of who we're looking at in both broad terms and in specific sense of programs.

Kari noted that we may look at a particular region for one area and not everything they are doing. He noted that they will focus on regional growth and change drivers, in particular, land use/infrastructure.

Kari discussed land use patterns and noted that housing is an area that is 'long term' (a major land use shaper of the future), whereas commerce changes far more frequently. He also discussed the mismatch of population (equally spread throughout the metro) vs. jobs (southwest has more jobs), which creates traffic problems.

Kari discussed building on corridors – both highway and transitways. He discussed the policy question – should we add a different way of looking at planning areas and add a new planning area for activity centers along transportation corridors.

Kari outlined a study that found the following elements are needed in transportation/land use design:

- Accessibility
- Street design
- Diversity of uses
- Transit
- Density
- Parking

Kari gave an overview of the six major conclusions of this study including:

1. Access to activity/job centers along corridors is most important when deciding travel mode.
2. Street design and connectivity of local transportation networks effect mode choice.
3. Mixed land uses influence travel behavior.
4. High-quality transit builds ridership.
5. Density linked to other strategies.
6. Travel demand management and parking influence travel patterns.

Kari discussed metro governance and regional planning and the roles and responsibilities of the following – noting that this is on the Council agenda to look at for the Framework:

- Federal Government
- State Government
- Local Government
- Regional
- Business and Nonprofit Sectors

Kari discussed the following regional structures:

- MPOs (Metropolitan Planning Organizations)
- COGs (Council of Government)
- City/County Consolidation
- Metro Government
- Civic/Business/Non-Profit

Kari discussed the need to look at metro peers: issues and approaches that provide lessons for the Twin Cities. He then asked the Committee for feedback regarding what regional growth management issues or topics would they suggest, and what tools would they suggest.

Commers clarified that of the six regional issues of significance, staff is looking for this Committee's feedback on those that are missing or critique of these. Kari stated he is looking for what the Committee thinks is important and a reaction to the use of them in this way.

Klein asked, in terms of transportation, has any consideration has been given to what they're doing in Europe. Kari responded that they have looked in other areas of the world and would welcome specific ideas.

Elvig commented on how long housing lasts and asked how much impact laws that do not allow you to move a neighborhood have. He asked if we can add an incentive to development to build apartments along transit corridors. Kari noted that raises the issue he discussed. It's not just about accommodating and growing out, it's about how we deal with the change. He stated that one of the questions we need to look at is what are the innovative zoning and land use plans that can deal with this type of issue. He noted that we can't just bring in an ordinance from one place because we have a legal and cultural context that needs to be included.

Commers discussed life spans of neighborhoods and development patterns. He reiterated the question being asked - what role can the Council play, partnering with cities to help make the transition to a different kind of pattern, if that is what the city has articulated as its goal. Kari discussed part of the answer is that the region has monies that could incent and leverage other activities. He gave the example of TOD and discussed how you can take a small amount of money to give incentives for growth that would benefit the region as well as the local government.

Halbach asked if the focus is on human activities and how they play out spatially (retail, etc.) and asked as we think of land use, should we consider concentrations of race and poverty and how they play out spatially. He also discussed the environmental carrying capacity and how this looks different over land use across the metro area. Kari said that that the Council has never dealt with social policy issues (i.e., education, poverty, etc.) He

stated they are focusing more on the land use, traditional growth management, and local comprehensive types of issues. He noted that as we do this, the Council wants us to look at equity as a part of the Framework.

Commers noted that the challenge is Council members have more than one definition of equity. He discussed the social or economic outcomes as a result of physical interventions.

Neuendorf stated that he doesn't feel that the scenario is a win or lose situation. Elvig discussed construction financing difficulties and how can assist financing. He noted that this could be a very strong tool/incentive to private sector/builders.

Shaffer discussed tax dollars from developments coming back to pay for transit. Commers stated that the Legislature commissioned a CTS study on value capture in 2009.

Smitten asked about new planning activities centers along transportation corridors and asked where this thinking comes from. Kari responded that it has been learned from doing other transportation corridors. In each of them, the type of transit has a different impact on the type of land use you can expect at a transit stop.

Kari discussed that they noticed, back in the 70's, that when communities got to 85% developed, the local government started changing as well as the issues that planning commissions faced. We now have the largest part of the region as developed and with that we know that housing (neighborhoods) will remain, however, we know that along corridors at station areas, you will expect change. He stated that we're talking about building a system of transit that will provide a backbone to allow people to get to their jobs.

Ihlan asked about mixed use that combines retail and housing and asked if there is any data that supports this type of longevity that we're seeing in housing alone. Kari stated this is an interesting question and does not have an answer for it. He discussed planning that is getting more flexible regarding these issues. He stated that mixed use is much more 'side by side' at this time and it works, whereas, vertical is a hard market to break.

Neuendorf asked if consideration is being given to changing some of the other classifications, (i.e., developed, developing, rural) to 'redevelopment'. Kari stated the issue with labeling something as redevelopment is it may insinuate that there will definitely be a change and everything will change – this may present a problem with residential.

Elvig stated he is very impressed with development in Helsinki, Finland. He stressed that it seems so well planned.

Detrick commented regarding a question that came up about what sector lost the most jobs (part of Baris Gumus-Dawes presentation). She noted that answer, provided by a Met Council Metro Stat publication, is manufacturing.

Recap of 11/17/11 Forecasting Presentation and Progress Report – Dennis Farmer and Todd Graham, Research

Graham noted that a progress report will actually come this spring. He recapped the report given in November and stated that he and Dennis Farmer were here to explain and respond to any follow up questions.

Graham discussed why we do forecasts. The Council wants to serve growth where we really expect it to occur. He stated that success would be forecasts that help optimize regional plan decisions. Failure would be planning capacity for traffic in the wrong places.

Graham next recapped how we do forecasts. He stated that they are aiming for a forecasting practice that can grapple with complexity that has a valid basis in real estate economics, and can deliver some robust results. He discussed the land use model proposed for use.

Farmer gave an update on this proposed model. He stated that they have a copy that they're testing using 2000 data. They are looking at using 2010 scenarios to test the model's capabilities. He noted that there are three transportation scenarios being used that are pretty dramatic and unrealistic. They want to run them to see how sensitive the model is. New 2010 census data will then be used. They will come back in May with some results on what they've learned and where they're at.

OTHER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Klein asked about communication infrastructure – has this been looked at by the Council. Detrick stated this issue has been raised by the Committee of the Whole. Commers asked if the Council has ever engaged in this area of planning in the past. He noted that he is not aware of any.

Elvig noted that there is a private company that has plans and knows of a map that seems to be a coordinated effort for driving fiber optic cables.

Detrick discussed the Council's involvement in shared communication capabilities through the Metropolitan Radio Board.

Hoke stated that it may be useful to look at this issue from a regional standpoint.

Halbach commented on bi-monthly meetings and asked at what point we would need to meet more frequently in order to provide good direction given fresh information. Commers noted that we did ask members to hold this time on their calendars monthly as we agreed that there may be times when this committee would need to meet monthly.

Detrick noted that there could be background information provided prior to meetings.

NEXT MEETING

March 15, 2012 - 4:00pm at the Metropolitan Council in Room LLA.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Sandi Dingle, Executive Secretary