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Overview

- Scenario Planning Recap
- Land Use Findings
- Transportation Findings
- Housing Findings
Regional Growth Scenarios

How much? Where?
Employment per Acre Change, 2020-2050

- Business as usual
- Higher growth, more compact
- Higher growth, more dispersed
- Lower growth, more compact
- Lower growth, more dispersed
## Land Use Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Consumed</td>
<td>Total Acres of Land Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of Land Use</td>
<td>Average Acres of Land Use per Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Land Developed</td>
<td>Total Acres of Agricultural Land Lost to Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land use modeling results

Total Acres of Additional Land Developed, 2020-2050

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Compact</td>
<td>110,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Dispersed</td>
<td>150,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-As-Usual</td>
<td>100,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Compact</td>
<td>57,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Dispersed</td>
<td>106,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Acres of Land Used Per Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Compact</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Dispersed</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-As-Usual</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Compact</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Dispersed</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land use modeling results

Total Acres of Agricultural Land Lost to Development

- High Compact: 52,100
- High Dispersed: 71,700
- Business-As-Usual: 45,400
- Low Compact: 25,800
- Low Dispersed: 52,800

447,000 more HHs
248,000 more HHs
Implications on Land Use Policy

Findings

Compact development uses land more intensely and efficiently.

Dispersed development increases pressure on agricultural land.
## Connection to regional values and vision

### Council Vision Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Equitable Inclusive Welcoming</th>
<th>Healthy Safe Vibrant</th>
<th>Climate Mitigation Adaptation Resilience</th>
<th>Natural Systems Protected Restored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of Land Use</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Land Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transportation Measures of Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Equitable Inclusive Welcoming</th>
<th>Healthy Safe Vibrant</th>
<th>Climate Mitigation Adaptation Resilience</th>
<th>Natural Systems Protected Restored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per Capita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Accessibility by Car</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Accessibility by Transit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Market Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate concerns are better addressed by compact growth, which produces lower GHG emissions than dispersed growth, no matter how much the region grows.
Climate concerns are better addressed by compact growth, which produces lower VMT per capita than dispersed growth, regardless of how much the region grows.
Access to Jobs Increases with Compact Growth (especially with transit)

Percent Change in Number of Jobs Accessible by Car (30 minutes) Compared to Business as Usual

- High/Compact: 2%
- High/Dispersed: -14%
- Low/Compact: -11%
- Low/Dispersed: -22%

Percent Change in Number of Jobs Accessible by Transit (30 minutes) Compared to Business as Usual

- High/Compact: 8%
- High/Dispersed: -34%
- Low/Compact: -10%
- Low/Dispersed: -37%
Compact growth is more conducive to transit.

Compact growth scenarios have more people living in areas that could support all-purpose transit (TMA 1&2).

Dispersed growth scenarios leave more people with minimal transit service (TMA 4&5).

Compact scenarios have slightly more people living in areas that could support intermittent transit (TMA 3).
Access of Low-Income Households to Mobility Options

More low-income households have access to all-purpose transit under the compact scenarios.

Compact development increases the transportation choices of low-income households, giving them the option of not owning a car.
Scenarios and Housing

**Housing Scenario Descriptions**
- What makes each scenario different?
- How do low- and moderate-income households fare?

**Affordable Housing Need 2031-2040**
- What is this?
- How did we calculate 2021-2030 numbers?
- What is the difference between scenarios?

**Land Guided for Affordable Housing 2031-2040**
- What is this?
- How did we create this system for the current decade?
- What is the difference between scenarios?
## Housing: Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Council Vision Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable Inclusive Welcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Safe Vibrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Mitigation Adaptation Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Systems Protected Restored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Need</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Land Guided for Affordable Housing     | ✓                                  | ✓
## Housing Scenario Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **High/Compact** | • Cities with uniform housing stock would see biggest changes  
                 • Retrofit/removal of large single family likely  
                 • Attached ownership opportunities may grow  
                 • Rights to remain in place important for stability of low-income households |
| **High/Dispersed** | • Lot sizes may grow, making it more expensive to enter detached ownership  
                         • Shifts impact on household budgets from housing to transportation costs  
                         • Increased focus on municipal control of detached rental; skilling up in rental programs region-wide |
| **Low/Compact** | • Re-investment in urban center housing  
                         • Less investment in rural centers, preservation & public investment necessary to maintain livable affordable spaces  
                         • Horizontal mixed-use in suburban contexts  
                         • Housing deficit may worsen |
| **Low/Dispersed** | • More maintenance of aging housing infrastructure in rural areas  
                         • More pressure on offering social services over larger distances  
                         • Foreclosure and rental assistance likely necessary  
                         • Lot sizes in urban centers may grow |
## Housing Scenario Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on vulnerable households &amp; where they live</th>
<th>High Compact</th>
<th>High Dispersed</th>
<th>Low Compact</th>
<th>Low Dispersed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinvestment</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation/ Maintenance Need</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Costs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentrification/ loss of community</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Need/risk higher than in BAU
- Need/risk lower than in BAU
- Need/risk present but, not noticeably different from BAU
Scenarios Used to Calculate 2040 Need

**Current Method of Need Calculation**

- Basis is the household growth for each city/township
- Need is a number of affordable units needed
- Broken into three bands of affordability:
  - 30% of Area Median Income (AMI) and below
  - 31-50% of AMI
  - 51-80% of AMI
- Adjustment factors for:
  - Mismatch of low-cost housing and low-wage jobs
  - Existing low-cost housing
In all scenarios, there are always more low-income households

- Nearly 65% of growth in each scenario are households at 50% AMI or below
- Our allocation of need only considers new households each decade, there is a backlog of cost-burdened households
- High Dispersed and High Compact both have growth of about 150,000 households to 2040; 70% are 50% AMI or below
## 2040 Allocation of Need: High Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Designation Grouping</th>
<th>Share of Affordable Housing Need (Need) with Business As Usual (BAU)</th>
<th>Change in share of Need from BAU in High/Compact Scenario</th>
<th>Change in share of Need from BAU with High/Dispersed Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>+11.4%</td>
<td>-29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>+27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Guided for Affordable Housing

In the 2021-2030 decade does each city and township with sewer-serviced growth guide enough acres of land at high enough minimum densities that could (re)develop so that they hypothetically could build enough affordable housing for the number of low-income households (Need) expected in the community?

https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/473.859#stat.473.859.2 controls and land use planning to promote the availability of land for the development of low and moderate income housing.
Cost of Building Affordable Housing: Chaska 2020

**Attached Housing**

Project: West Creek Apartments
Units: 18 Efficiency Units, 2 story walkup
- MN Housing, $2.2M
- Private Donations, $135k
- Federal Home Loan Bank, $400k
- Foundation Equity, $80k
- LHIA, $500k

Total Development Cost per Unit: $320k

**Detached Housing**

Project: Single Family Carver County CLT
Units: 3 single family units
- Chaska TIF, $19k
- Carver County Grant, $90k
- City Housing Trust Fund, $300k
- County CDA Contribution, $100k
- LHIA, $30k

Total Development Cost per Unit: $500k
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