

# 2040 Comprehensive Plan Debrief

## Evaluation of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Review Process

Land Use Advisory Committee

January 20, 2022



# 2040 Comprehensive Plan Debrief

- **Project Purpose**

- Evaluate resources and review procedures for the 2040 planning process
- Engage with local government staff and other stakeholders about their experiences

- **Project Outcomes**

- Rebuild and strengthen local government relationships
- Listen and learn from experiences of local government staff
- Specific recommendations for process improvements

# Project Components

- 2020 Planner Survey
- Sector Rep One-on-Ones
- External Focus Groups (4)
- Land Use Advisory Committee (July 15, 2021)
- Internal Focus Groups (3)
- Summary and Recommendations

# Discussion Questions

Do these findings match your experience?

Are there any gaps in what you heard today?

Do you have specific ideas for resources/technical assistance?

# Feedback: What went well...

## Resources



- Local Planning Handbook
- PlanIt Program
- PlanIt Conference
- Checklist
- Preliminary Reviews

## Direct Assistance



- Planning Assistance Grants
- Sector Representatives
- Staff presentations
- Mapping and data

## Process



- Deadline extensions
- Online submittal



# Feedback: What didn't go well...

## Process

- Incomplete letters
- Overly complex
- Lack of flexibility
- Difficult for small communities

## Plan Components

- Inflow and Infiltration
- Housing policy
- Mixed use ratios

## Clarity

- Connections between elements
- Required vs nice-to-have
- "How" to meet requirements
- "Why" required

# Recommendation Categories



Improve Communication

Evaluate Planning Resources

Expand Technical Assistance

Focus on Quality Assurance and Quality Control

# Improve Communication

More frequent One-on-Ones

Improve incomplete letter communications

Convene an advisory group of local planners for 2050 process



# Evaluate Planning Resources

Update the Local Planning Handbook

Clearly outline the review process for all

Effectively explain completeness, conformance, consistency, and compatibility

# Expand Technical Assistance

Encourage more participation in preliminary reviews

Engage with local planners early and often

Provide more templates and examples

# Focus on Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Explain the “why” behind requirements

Explore how to simplify checklists

Evaluate staff capacity needs for 2050 reviews

# Next Steps

- Metro Cities partnership
- Re-engaging with local partners
- Finalize report and recommendations
- Prioritize and carry out improvements

# Discussion Questions

Do these findings match your experience?

Are there any gaps in what you heard today?

Do you have specific ideas for resources/technical assistance?



# Questions

Patrick Boylan, AICP

[Patrick.Boylan@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Patrick.Boylan@metc.state.mn.us)

651-602-1438

Katelyn Champoux

[Katelyn.Champoux@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Katelyn.Champoux@metc.state.mn.us)

651-602-1831

Jake Reilly

[Jake.Reilly@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Jake.Reilly@metc.state.mn.us)

651-602-1822