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Plan Status Overview

Total Plans Expected 168

Plans Received to Date 162
  Plans In Process 0
  Incomplete Plans 23
  Complete Plans 1
  Authorized Plans 138

Outstanding Plans 6
2030 Regional Development Framework

Geographic Planning Areas

- Developed Area
- Developing Area
- Rural Growth Center
- Rural Center
- Rural Residential
- Diversified Rural
- Agricultural Area
- Non Region

2040 Thrive Community Designations

**Metropolitan Urban Service Area**

- Urban Center
- Urban
- Suburban
- Suburban Edge
- Emerging Suburban Edge

**Rural Service Area**

- Rural Center
- Diversified Rural
- Rural Residential
- Agricultural

Regional Natural Resource Areas

2030 Metropolitan Urban Service Area
Questions for Consideration

• What additional foundational information might you need/want in order to fully understand the planning topic?

• What else do you need/want to know to inform land use policy development for the Council? What research question does this information prompt for you?

• Are there other areas not included in today’s presentation that you want/need additional information?
Land Use
Planning for Residential Growth

• Regional forecasts for 2040 are lower
  – New 2040: 1,447,000 households
  – Old 2030: 1,492,000 households

• Change in forecasts is not uniform across region
  – Some cities are growing faster (e.g., Minneapolis, Edina)
  – Some cities have excess capacity

• Metropolitan Council’s commitment
  – “Honor” prior plans
  – Adapt to changing development trends
City Plans for Residential Growth

- Fewer acres, though still plenty to accommodate growth
- Higher density guiding to support multi-family market shift
- Higher capacity resulting from density increase
- Mixed use districts, both vertical and horizontal
Community Designation Land Area

- Urban Center: 5%
- Urban: 5%
- Suburban: 12%
- Suburban Edge: 10%
- Emerging Suburban Edge: 12%
- Rural Center: 2%
- Rural Residential: 8%
- Diversified Rural: 23%
- Agricultural: 22%
Land Supply Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Acreage: 2010-2030</th>
<th>Acreage: 2020-2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Service Area</td>
<td>71,168</td>
<td>52,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>1,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5,969</td>
<td>4,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Edge</td>
<td>18,857</td>
<td>13,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Suburban Edge</td>
<td>31,672</td>
<td>27,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Center</td>
<td>10,969</td>
<td>4,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Minimum Density Increase

- Urban Service Area: 3.7, 5.3
- Urban Center: 22.0, 20
- Urban: 5.8, 15.8
- Suburban: 5.2, 5
- Suburban Edge: 3.1, 3.7
- Emerging Suburban Edge: 3.2, 3.4
- Rural Center: 3.0, 3.2

Density-min: 2010-2030
Density-min: 2020-2040
Midpoint Density Increased
Midpoint Density Increased
Midpoint Density without Minneapolis
## Midpoint Density without Minneapolis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Density Midpoint: 2010-2030</th>
<th>Density Midpoint: 2020-2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Service Area</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Edge</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Suburban Edge</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Center</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The chart shows the density midpoint for different areas without Minneapolis.*
Housing Capacity Increased

210K Forecasted Household Growth

- Urban Service Area
- Urban Center
- Urban
- Suburban
- Suburban Edge
- Emerging Suburban Edge
- Rural Center

- Unit mid-capacity: 2010-2030
- Unit mid-capacity: 2020-2040
More Mixed Use

- Central city downtowns
- Streetcar corridors and nodes
- Streetcar suburbs (e.g., Hopkins)
- Suburban regional centers (e.g., Southdale, Ridgedale, Rosedale)
- Historic village centers (e.g., Shakopee, Lakeville, Hastings)
- Suburban planned districts
- Transitway station areas
Increase in Role of Mixed-Use Districts in Housing

Number of Mixed-Use Districts

94 → 237
Increase in Percentage of Mixed-Use Districts

Chaska – 54%
Cottage Grove – 54%
Shakopee – 48%
Plymouth – 26%
Inver Grove Heights – 24%
Lakeville – 20%
Woodbury – 21%
Maple Grove – 21%

Number of Mixed-Use Districts
8 → 23
Non-Residential Land Use Expansion

- Non-Residential Mixed Use: 45%
- Commercial: 20%
- Industrial: 24%
- Institutional: 11%

Emerging Suburban Edge: 4500
Suburban Edge: 3500
Suburban: 3000
Rural Center: 2500
Diversified Rural: 2000
Agricultural: 1500
Urban Center: 1000
Urban: 500
Rural Residential: 0
Non-Residential Expansion: Case of Lino Lakes

- New Business Campus Designation
Rural and Agricultural Patterns Continue

- **Diversified Rural Area**
  - Consistency with 4:40 policy
  - Long-Term Sewer Service Area

- **Rural Residential**
  - No new Rural Residential communities

- **Agricultural**
  - Most remain the same, very little change
Housing
Trends and Themes in Housing Planning

- Widespread focus on housing for aging populations
- Frequent use of Mixed-use land use categories to guide sufficient land for affordable housing
- A new focus on environmentally-friendly housing in some communities
- Wide variability in identifying local housing needs
Plans Identify Land for Affordable Housing

- Affordable housing allocation
- Total Capacity
  - Capacity from Residential Districts
  - Capacity from Mixed Use Districts
Transportation
Transportation Overview

**Pedestrian**

- Specific Pedestrian Policies
  - Yes: 61%, No: 38%
  - Unindexed: 18%
- Sidewalk/Sidewalk Gaps Mapped
  - Yes: 44%, No: 55%
  - Unindexed: 18%
- Transportation or Parks
  - Yes: 79%, No: 18%
  - Unindexed: 98%
- Local Pedestrian Count
  - Yes: 98%, No: 0%
  - Unindexed: 0%
- Pedestrian Planning Zone
  - Yes: 68%, No: 30%
  - Unindexed: 20%
- Refers to ADA compliance
  - Yes: 79%, No: 0%
  - Unindexed: 0%
- Complete Streets
  - Yes: 0%, No: 20%
  - Unindexed: 80%

**Transit**

- Opportunities Beyond Transitways/Non-Transitways
  - Yes: 39%, No: 58%
- Increased Revenue Transitways
  - Yes: 36%, No: 61%
- Unique Strategies
  - Yes: 14%, No: 83%
Transportation Overview

### Land Use
- Link Transit and Land-Use:
  - Yes: 36%
  - No: 59%
- Centers of Growth with Potential to Impact Multi-Modal Transportation:
  - Yes: 42%
  - No: 56%

### Miscellaneous
- CAV:
  - Yes: 33%
  - No: 64%
- Drone:
  - Yes: 6%
  - No: 91%
- Transp. Safety & Crash Data:
  - Yes: 44%
  - No: 53%
Water Resources
Wastewater

- More specificity in I/I and forecasted growth locations
- Rogers WWTP acquired by Council in July 2019
- Loretto to connect to system in Summer 2021

Identified system capacity improvements/acquisitions

- Lino Lakes – New interceptor first planned in 2008, now required by 2030
- Lake Elmo – Capacity enhancement for SW area of City.
- Savage – Trunk sewer acquisition for Credit River Twp. Service by 2030.

Minor refinements in timing of system enhancements
Wastewater

• Long Term Service Area Eliminations
  – Oak Grove – Eliminated through Statute
  – Baytown Twp. – Eliminated due to inability to expand St. Croix Valley WWTP.
• **177 communities** submitted plans for review
  - **142 individual community plans**
  - **1 plan** for Dakota County Rural Collaborative covers 15 small communities and townships
  - **1 plan** for Scott County Townships local water plan covers 10 townships
  - **1 plan** for Carver County Townships local water plan covers 10 townships
• **4 plans** not yet received for review as required
Water Supply Planning by the Numbers

NEW WELLS
50+ communities

DISTRIBUTION
60+ communities

WATER TREATMENT
35+ communities

Source: 2040 Local water supply plan updates submitted as part of community comprehensive plans. Not all local plan updates have been submitted to the Council; this information will be updated as plans are received.
## Trends and Themes in Water Supply Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Water Demand</th>
<th>Groundwater-Surface Water Interaction</th>
<th>Source Water Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant region-wide investment planned for water supply system infrastructure: wells, distribution, and treatment</td>
<td>Decreasing per capita water demand as a region, varying by community type; Growing appetite for considering a range of water demand forecast scenarios</td>
<td>Address groundwater assessment and protection through local watershed management plans</td>
<td>65% of the metro area has been designated as a source water management areas (surface water and/or groundwater); increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks, Climate Change, and Natural Resources
Regional Parks and Trails

- 86% of communities have at least one existing, planned or proposed unit of the Regional Park System.

- 16 plans included parks and trails content that exceeded expectations or went above and beyond minimums.
  - Service area or gap analyses
  - Trend information
  - Public engagement findings
## Resilience, Climate Change, and Natural Resources by the Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience Chapter or Section</th>
<th>Element Present</th>
<th>Element NOT Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience Integration in Plan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Plan</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Plan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Conservation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVs and Charging Infrastructure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Element Present**
- **Element NOT Present**
## Trends and Themes in Resilience & Climate Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewable Energy</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</th>
<th>Electric Vehicles (EVs)</th>
<th>Energy Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase community-wide use of renewable energy</td>
<td>Reduce local emissions in alignment with State goals</td>
<td>Encourage installation of EV charging stations to make the community “EV-ready”</td>
<td>Incorporate energy efficiency practices in new development and implement retrofits in existing buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Trends and Themes for Natural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Canopy and Urban Forestry</th>
<th>Relationship between Development and Natural Resource Conservation</th>
<th>Natural Resources Inventory or Management Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and enhance the local tree canopy through urban forest or tree preservation policies</td>
<td>Implement low-impact or sustainable development techniques to help conserve natural resources</td>
<td>Support initiatives to preserve and conserve local assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity
Equity by the Numbers

Of the 136 communities:

- **52** Explicitly included equity terms in the comprehensive plan
- **40** Minimally included equity terms in the comprehensive plan
- **44** did NOT include equity terms in the comprehensive plan
In response to increasing community diversity and growing disparities.

Most frequently in the Transportation, Housing, and Parks and Trails elements.

Framed in various ways: Social Equity, Health Equity, and Racial Equity.

Focus on initiatives to advance equity in the community as well as in internal processes.

Trends and Themes for Equity in Comp Plans.
Questions for the Committee
Questions for Discussion

• What additional foundational information might you need/want in order to fully understand the planning topic?

• What else do you need/want to know to inform land use policy development for the Council? What research question does this information prompt for you?

• Are there other areas not included in today’s presentation that you want/need additional information?
Next Steps
Next Steps

• Additional Research
  – Questions resulting from today’s conversation
  – Land Use (TAZs, Rural Areas, etc.)
  – TOD Analysis
  – Water Resources data updates (MUSA)
  – Metropolitan Area Water Plan Initiative

• Process Improvements (2040 Debrief)

• Technical Assistance for Implementation (PlanIt)

• 2050 metropolitan development guide
Contact Information

Angela R. Torres, AICP
Manager, Local Planning Assistance
651-602-1566
angela.torres@metc.state.mn.us

Michael Larson, AICP
Planning Analyst
651-602-1407
michael.larson@metc.state.mn.us