

Minutes of the

REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Monday, December 5, 2016

Committee Members Present: Cunningham, Chávez, Commers, Dorfman, Elkins, Letofsky, Munt, Wulff

Committee Members Absent: Kramer

Committee Members Excused:

Due to a lack of quorum the first information item was presented.

INFORMATION

1. Parks and Trails Legacy Investment Highlights in the Metropolitan Region
Planning Analysis Jan Youngquist presented a short overview of the Parks and Trails Legacy Fund, followed by a video that showcases projects that have been developed using these funds. The projects include:

- Mississippi River Regional Trail in Dakota County
- Dakota Rail Regional Trail and Coney Island at Lake Waconia Regional Park in Carver County
- Blakeley Bluffs Park Reserve in Scott County, and
- Eastman Nature Center at Elm Creek Park Reserve in Three Rivers Park District.

In 2008, Minnesotans passed the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment (also known as the "Legacy Amendment"), which is funded by a 3/8 percent state sales tax. Minnesota's parks and trails of state and regional significance receive 14.25 percent of the funds generated by the Legacy Amendment, which make up the Parks and Trails Fund. These dollars are then allocated to the Metropolitan Council, the Department of Natural Resources and Greater Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails Commission, who act as the fiscal agents of the fund. The Metropolitan Council's share of the Parks and Trails Fund are distributed to the ten-regional park implementing agencies through the Council's Parks and Trails Legacy Fund grant program based on a formula specified in state statute

Committee members discussed the legislatures authority to issue bonds and the calendar cycle with the summer date for matching bonds. Also, the Eastman Nature Center and White Tail Woods was mentioned for their unique play areas.

CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Cunningham called the regular meeting of the Council's Community Development Committee to order at 4:20 p.m. on Monday, December 5, 2016.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

It was moved by Munt, seconded by Elkins to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

It was moved by Elkins, seconded by Letofsky to approve the minutes of the November 21, 2016 special meeting of the Community Development Committee. Motion carried.

BUSINESS

none

INFORMATION

2. MUSA discussion continued – Local Planning Assistance Manager Lisa Barajas and ES Finance & Revenue Director Ned Smith presented information to the Community Development Committee to continue the discussion of MUSA.

At the October 17, 2016 committee meeting, staff presented information on the history and evolution of the Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA), in response to a request from the Committee.

In *Thrive MSP 2040*, the Council set the land use policy for the region, including differentiating among communities via the MUSA and through the use of Community Designations. Specifically, Thrive states:

The Metropolitan Urban Service Area includes a diverse set of communities ranging from the urban cores of downtown Minneapolis and Saint Paul to edge communities planning for staged growth and expansion. Developing at different times in the region's history, these communities include a variety of residential neighborhoods, housing types, and densities, as well as a varying mix of commercial and industrial areas. The Council supports the Metropolitan Urban Service Area through investments such as regional wastewater services, regional highways, transit service, the Regional Parks System, and programs that support redevelopment. In turn, the Council works with local communities to support growth that best capitalizes on regional infrastructure and systems. To respond to this variation in development patterns, the Metropolitan Urban Service Area is divided into five community designations:

- Urban Center
- Urban
- Suburban
- Suburban Edge
- Emerging Suburban Edge (p. 94)

Thrive provides further direction on land use expectations, including overall density expectations for new growth, development, and redevelopment in the Orderly and Efficient Land Use Policy (p. 116, *Thrive MSP 2040*).

The committee members and staff discussed the challenges to communities regarding growth, usage, investments, and financing projects. Mr. Smith explained the experimental investments for water re-charge will be part of future portfolios.

Ms. Barajas discussed development patterns and overall densities per acre. Accessibility to regional systems is considered; transit, and infrastructure. Plans serve to support densities.

Another discussion included the SAC charge framework on new development. Staff explained the regional scale and impact of local services. Mr. Smith explained the SAC distribution vs flow.

Ms. Barajas explained the Land Use policy; allowable density ranges, zoning, and remaining consistent with comprehensive plans.

The staff and committee discussed the changes in housing patterns, new development, and housing market. Committee members have noticed changes in multi and single family housing. National data support the shift from suburbs to urban areas.

Committee members and Research and Policy manager Libby Starling discussed the data from permits representing new development vs current development. Job growth on the edge of the metro was discussed and the lack of transit and housing.

The lack of investment for principle and minor arterials was highlighted, and the density requirements per lots was discussed.

The city of Portland's housing development policy was discussed. Suggesting it is a policy driven market with objectives and measurements to meet. We should explore Portland; same land use control, property tax structure?

The committee and staff continued to discuss the boundaries of MUSA, working inside and outside MUSA lines. Smart development is needed and how much sprawl is occurring and where?

Ms. Barajas reminded the committee of the MUSA implementation guidelines. And the tracking, benchmarks, growth forecast all adopted in Thrive.

Ms. Starling explained the differences in planning vs development and Thrive indicators. Commenting on the question of effectiveness of Thrive she explained the measurements included aerial photography and development changes.

Committee members questioned the forecasts and revisions regarding the two kinds of MUSA expansion. Commenting it is a confusing distinction and should include Environmental Services.

The Committee members realized more discussion is needed regarding major interceptor expansion, changes in pipe needs, minimum and maximum density, effective use of resources and solutions.

The Committee requested from staff information on studies of sprawl, with a matrix of measurements.

Senior Research Todd Graham commented on the National comparison. Comparing the Twin Cities metro area and the area outside the Metropolitan Council boundary.

Committee members had questions regarding the impact of leakage and SAC charges. Mr. Smith explained the allocations, debt service bill, SAC formula, flat rates and the financing of debt through the Monthly Wastewater charge.

Committee members requested a definition of interceptor expansion vs rehab and the percentage of cost. Mr. Smith explained the deferral program; SAC payments spread over 10 years at a low interest rate.

The CDC chair asked its committee members if this discussion should be continued. The committee members responded yes with suggestions; a refresher, a clear definition of extension vs expansion, discuss issue at an upcoming Committee of the Whole meeting and convene a Joint ES & CDC meeting.

A video recording of meeting is available at the link below:

http://metro council.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=2600

ADJOURNMENT

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Michele Wenner
Recording Secretary