Information Item

Land Use Advisory Committee



Meeting Date: July 17, 2025

Topic

Small Communities Planning Program and 2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program Eligibility Criteria Recommendations

District(s), Member(s):	All Districts and Council members
Policy/Legal Reference:	Minn. Stats. §§ 473.191 and 473.867
Staff Prepared/Presented:	Angela R. Torres, Senior Manager, (651) 602-1566
	Merritt Clapp-Smith, Senior Planner, (651) 602-1567
Division/Department:	Local Planning Assistance, Community Development

Background

At its last three meetings, the Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) has considered and discussed two forms of planning assistance the Met Council is planning to offer to communities for 2050 comprehensive plan updates. The first is the Planning Assistance Grant program which will provide direct financial assistance through non-competitive grants, similar to those provided by the Met Council for the 2030 and 2040 planning cycles. Additionally, a new program, the Small Communities Planning Program, is under development to provide direct professional planning services to help some of the region's small communities complete local plan updates.

The Committee members have expressed strong support for the Small Communities Planning Program and proposed criteria to identify potential participants. Members have also been open to potential updates to eligibility criteria for planning assistance grants which would shift the types of communities served.

At its May 15, 2025, meeting, Committee members asked staff to consider if any communities were on the cusp of eligibility for either a planning assistance grant or the Small Communities Program if the eligibility criteria were minorly adjusted. That analysis is addressed in this memo. Staff also reevaluated eligibility based on the update of current population from 2023 to 2024.

It is important to highlight that even if the currently proposed eligibility criteria remain the same, <u>the</u> <u>list of potentially eligible communities for both programs will likely change</u> when staff update the net tax capacity per capita data in early August, following the expected release of 2025 net tax capacity data by the Minnesota Department of Revenue in late July.

Based on the most current information available and the eligibility criteria considerations discussed to date, staff propose eligibility criteria recommendations for discussion. This includes maps and a list of potentially eligible communities (Attachments 1 through 4).

At its meeting on July 17, 2025, the Committee will review the results of the eligibility criteria analysis to-date along with the resulting map and list of communities, confirm the eligibility criteria for both programs, and initiate a conversation about funding considerations for the grants and services proposed with these criteria.

Further Analysis of Potentially Eligible Communities

Staff continue to analyze the criteria data to identify potentially eligible communities based on updated community data and requests from the Committee. Three aspects of updated analysis are noted below.

"On the Cusp" Eligibility Analysis

At its May 15, 2025, meeting, Committee members asked staff to analyze if any communities were very close to, or "on the cusp" of, being eligible for assistance, such that a small change in the criteria would make them eligible. Staff analyzed the data for current population and net tax capacity per capita to identify any communities on the margin of eligibility for a planning assistance grant or the Small Communities Program.

For current population, staff evaluated if a 3% increase or decrease in a community's population would impact its potential eligibility. For example, a 3% variation for a city population of 1,000 would be plus or minus 30 people, and for a city population of 30,000 would be plus or minus 900 people. Based on the 3% margin of change, <u>no communities would change their eligibility status</u>.

For net tax capacity per capita, staff evaluated if a 3% increase or decrease in a community's net tax capacity per capita would impact its potential eligibility. For example, a 3% variation for a city net tax capacity per capita (as percent of regional median) of 125% would be between 122% and 128%. Based on the 3% margin of change, <u>no communities would change their eligibility status</u>.

Based on this analysis, Council staff are not recommending any changes in the thresholds proposed.

Eligibility Changes with 2024 Population Data

The Council recently released the 2024 current population numbers for all communities in the region and provided the opportunity for communities to ask questions or request revisions. Based on new 2024 current population data, as revised per community input, staff updated the eligibility analysis for planning assistance grants and the Small Communities Program. The change in current population from 2023 to 2024 impacted the criteria based on current population, and the criteria based on net tax capacity per capita, since the "per capita" calculation changed with the update to current population.

The 2024 current population changed the list of eligible communities as follows:

- Increased the number of communities eligible for grants from 63 to 68
- Increased the number of communities eligible for the Small Communities Program from 30 to 32

Eligibility Changes with 2025 Net Tax Capacity per Capita Data

Net tax capacity data for every community in the region is released annually by the Minnesota Department of Revenue. The eligibility analysis to date has used 2024 tax capacity data but will be updated to use 2025 data when available. The Minnesota Department of Revenue anticipates release of the 2025 tax capacity data in late July. When the new data is available, staff will update the analysis and list of potentially eligible communities based on the net tax capacity per capita criteria. Staff will provide the updated list and map of potentially eligible communities at the September 18, 2025, Committee meeting.

Small Communities Planning Program

Based on the discussions and direction from the Committee beginning in January 2025, the eligibility criteria analysis prioritizes net tax capacity per capita and community population with the intention to serve as many communities as practical.

Recommendations for the 2050 Small Communities Planning Program Eligibility Criteria

A community would be eligible for direct professional planning services from the Met Council under the new Small Communities Planning Program, if they meet one of three sets of criteria shown below and in Table 1. Under these criteria a total of 32 communities would be eligible for

participation in the Small Communities Planning Program.

- Current population is under 500 AND net tax capacity per capita is less than or equal to 175% of metro median net tax capacity per capita.
- Current population is between 500 to 999 AND net tax capacity per capita is less than or equal to 150% of metro median net tax capacity per capita.
- Current population is between 1,000 and 2,500 AND net tax capacity per capita is less than or equal to 125% of metro median net tax capacity per capita.

	Current Population (2024)	Net Tax Capacity Per Capita (metro median = 100%)	# of Communities Eligible by Criteria	Total # Communities Eligible for the Program
	Under 500	Less/equal to 175% metro median	13	
		OR		
General Eligibility Criteria	500 to 999	Less/equal to 150% metro median	11	32
		OR		
	1,000 to 2,500	Less/equal to 125% metro median	8	

Table 1. 2050 Small Communities Planning Program eligibility criteria and communities served

Program Considerations

While Council staff proposed to handle most of the comprehensive planning requirements in house as part of the agreement with eligible local units of governments, some areas will require external capacity augmentation through contracting.

Local Engineering Service Needs

The engineering services needed for each community are unique to the type of wastewater and water supply services that exist and the local surface water conditions. Engineering services will be tailored to the distinct conditions of each community, based on some key variables noted below.

Wastewater System Plan

Community wastewater services may be provided by:

- the regional wastewater system
- a local municipal system
- individual septic systems
- some combination of the above systems.

The Wastewater System Plan element of a local comprehensive plan update must address planning and engineering unique to each system. The engineering services for an unsewered community will be comparatively simple, while the services for a community with a regional or municipal system will be significant.

Water Supply Plan

Community water supply may be provided by one or more of the following systems:

- Regional/non-municipal public water service
- Independent municipal community public water system with appropriation permit
- Municipal community public water system with water sourced from neighbor
- Neighbor provides municipal community public water system and water source
- Privately-owned wells

The Water Supply Plan element of a local comprehensive plan update must address planning and engineering unique to each system. The engineering services for a rural community with private wells will be simple, while the services for a community with a regional or municipal system will be significant.

Surface Water Management

The type, quality and quantity of water bodies in communities varies widely. Some communities have hardly any water bodies, while others have multiple wetlands, lakes, streams or rivers, which may or may not be impaired (polluted). The two primary factors that influence the level of engineering services needed to create a local Surface Water Management Plan for a community are:

- The local watershed district and its capacity to conduct water management engineering and planning that can be shared with communities in its geography.
- The presence of impaired waters in the community and the level of water management planning needed to help protect them.

The Met Council plans to create a Master Contract for Engineering Services to support the varied engineering needs of communities that participate in the Small Communities Planning Program.

Local Planning Service Needs

Future Land Use Planning

It is likely that the communities participating in the Small Communities Planning Program will range from built out, slow growth communities to suburban edge communities with fast growth, to rural communities with little or no growth. Some will have almost no changes to future land use plans and some will have significant changes. Program staff will respond to the level of land use planning needed by each community in order to meet minimum planning requirements.

Mapping Services

The level of mapping services needed for each plan will be based on the assessment of unique minimum requirements for the Program communities. This assessment can be conducted in advance of the work and compared to the anticipated capacity of existing or new staff to provide Program support.

*Reminder: T<u>he list of potentially eligible communities for both programs will change</u> when staff update the net tax capacity per capita data in early August, following the expected release of 2025 net tax capacity data by the Minnesota Department of Revenue in late July. A revised list of communities based on Committee recommended eligibility criteria will be presented to the Committee at its September 18, 2025, meeting.

Small Communities Planning Program Questions

- Do the proposed eligibility criteria for the Small Communities Planning Program need any further adjustments?
- Do you need any additional analysis or information in order to take action on the Program eligibility criteria recommendations in September?

2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program

Based on the discussions and direction from the Committee beginning in January 2025, the eligibility criteria analysis prioritizes net tax capacity per capita and community population with the intention to serve as many communities as practical.

County and Consortium criteria clarifications

There is one proposed criteria change to note. The criteria for the county and consortium has been edited to more clearly state the intended types of communities eligible within this category. The language shared in May with the Committee stated: *"County or consortium of 5+ communities working collaboratively on comprehensive plan updates."* Scott and Carver Counties are the only two counties that have land use planning authority for the townships within their boundaries. The revision is proposed to make clear that not all counties are eligible, just those with planning

responsibilities for townships.

Secondly, small cities and townships in Dakota County have collaborated during the last three planning cycles (2020, 2030, and 2040) to complete their comprehensive plan updates together. It is likely that many will want to participate in the collaborative effort again given the process efficiencies gained and the shared issues that they contend with. The criteria revision is proposed to clarify that a consortium of communities, specifically in Dakota County and within the Rural Service Area, may create a consortium and be eligible for a planning assistance grant. The communities within Dakota County are most similar to Scott and Carver County, even if the County does not coordinate planning efforts for them. These communities will have the option of participating in the Dakota County Collaborative (consortium) again - even if they are eligible for one of the other programs. However, if they choose to participate in the consortium, they may not participate in another program. They will be required to choose which program (if any) they want to participate in. Eleven of the 16 consortium communities are eligible for more than one program.

Recommendations for 2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program Eligibility Criteria

A community would be eligible for a Planning Assistance Grant under the recommended eligibility criteria for the 2050 planning cycle, if they meet one of three sets of criteria shown below and in Table 2. Under these criteria a total of 68 individual communities, 2 counties, and 1 consortium group would be eligible for planning assistance grants. The County and Consortium eligibility criteria would provide support for up to an additional 35 communities. Participants in the Consortium would forego participation in other planning assistance programs.

- Current population is between 2,500 to 14,999 AND net tax capacity per capita is less than or equal to 125% of metro median net tax capacity per capita.
- Current population is between 15,000 to 35,000 AND net tax capacity per capita is less than or equal to 100% of metro median net tax capacity per capita.
- County with land use planning authority for townships within their jurisdiction OR a consortium of 5 or more Dakota County communities in the Rural Service Area working collaboratively on their comprehensive plan updates.

	Current Population	Net Tax Capacity Per Capita (metro median = 100%)	#of Communities Eligible by Criteria	# Eligible for Planning Assistance Grant	
General	2,500 to 14,999	Less/equal to 125% metro median	41		
Eligibility		OR		68*	
Criteria 15,000 to 35,0		Less/equal to 100% metro median	27		
County or		and use planning authority for os within their jurisdiction	20	2 jurisdictions	
Consortium		OR			
Eligibility Criteria	communities in	of 5 or more Dakota County the Rural Service Area working their comprehensive plan updates*	15	1 group	

Table 2. 2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program eligibility criteria and communities served

* Note: Participants in the Consortium forego participation in other planning assistance programs.

Discussion of Award Categories

In the 2040 planning cycle, there were four categories of grants and funding levels, as identified in Attachment 6 and below. Eligibility for sewered communities provided 43 eligible communities with

Metropolitan Council

grants. There were also 3 unsewered communities that were eligible to receive funds. Typically, unsewered communities have fewer systems planning requirements, so the Council provided a smaller grant amount to those communities. Small cities (21) were provided with a smaller grant amount as well. The County and Consortium communities were providing assistance for many communities in one award, so were provided a higher grant award. There were two awards to counties (Scott and Carver) which both have 10 townships within their boundaries. The Dakota County Collaborative included five cities and 11 townships.

- Sewered Communities \$32,000 grant per community
- Unsewered Communities \$20,000 grant per community
- "Small Cities" \$10,000 grant per community
- County/Consortium \$84,000 grant per county or consortium

The categories for sewered, unsewered, and county/consortium are not proposed to change for the 2050 planning cycle. Council staff recommend that the approach to planning assistance for small communities like those provided grants as "Small Cities" in the 2040 cycle (Attachment 6) be provided through direct professional planning services with the Small Communities Planning Program.

*Reminder: T<u>he list of potentially eligible communities for both programs will change</u> when staff update the net tax capacity per capita data in early August, following the expected release of 2025 net tax capacity data by the Minnesota Department of Revenue in late July. A revised list of communities based on Committee recommended eligibility criteria will be presented to the Committee at its September 18, 2025, meeting.

2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program Questions

- Do you support the clarifications to the County/Consortium eligibility criteria?
- Do you support retaining the same award categories from the 2040 planning cycle?
- Do the proposed eligibility criteria for the 2050 Planning Grants Program need further adjustments?
- Do you need any additional analysis or information in order to take action on the Program eligibility criteria recommendations in September?

Funding Considerations

Background

Minnesota Statutes Section 473.867, subd. 2, authorizes the Met Council to establish a Planning Assistance Fund to provide grants and loans to local units of government. The primary purpose is for reviewing and amending local comprehensive plans, fiscal devices, and official controls, as required by the Metropolitan Land Planning Act. Planning grants, along with the Council's suite of technical assistance programs like the Sector Representative program and the updated Local Planning Handbook, facilitate the local planning process to ensure that the region continues to coordinate planning across all jurisdictions.

The Met Council has provided grant funding to designated eligible communities in previous decennial review rounds to update local comprehensive plans. For reference, Attachments 5 and 6 identify the 2040 planning cycle's eligible grant communities and their award amounts.

Planning assistance grants have historically been non-competitive grants that eligible communities may (but are not required to) apply for when funding becomes available following System Statement issuance and conclusion of the dispute period. Distribution of funds has typically been in two parts. The first half-payment is made after the executed grant contract is complete to help initiate the planning process. The second half-payment is made after the comprehensive plan has been authorized by the Met Council, the plan has been locally adopted, and all reporting requirements are met to close out the grant contract. Plans from grant recipients must meet minimum planning requirements identified by the Met Council, must be consistent with regional policy plans, conform to regional system plans, and be compatible with plans of affected jurisdictions to receive the second half-payment.

For Discussion

At the July Committee meeting, Council staff will seek feedback from Committee members on the funding considerations for the two planning assistance programs under review. As part of that discussion, the Committee will consider two potential incentive programs for local governments to not only increase local funding availability, but to help advance regional goals and contribute to an efficient review process. Additionally, Committee members will consider how participants in the Small Communities Planning Program might contribute to their local planning costs.

The Committee also will review three potential funding scenarios for grant awards and review two potential options to consider how funds might be distributed based on programmatic needs.

Advancing Regional Goals

The adoption of Imagine 2050 identifies five regional goals that cannot be achieved in isolation but must be collectively addressed to achieve at a regional scale. In fact, local governments implement regional goals through the policies, priorities, and actions they adopt in their local comprehensive plans. The Met Council is committed to intentional work towards these goals and supports efforts across the Council in taking action to move them forward. They are:

- Our region is equitable and inclusive.
- Our communities are healthy and safe.
- Our region is dynamic and resilient.
- We lead on addressing climate change.
- We protect and restore natural systems.

The Council supports some regional goals by developing research, analytical, or planning tools and resources that help meet new legislative requirements around climate change related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and new policies for natural systems planning. The resources, tools, and planning requirements help local governments contribute to advancing these regional goals.

The regional equity goal is not only key to the values the Council established in Imagine 2050 but also supports the regional goals of healthy and safe communities and a dynamic and resilient region. These are more people-centered goals which encourage a more tailored, individual approach in each community, and would benefit from financial assistance to advance across more communities.

The Planning Assistance Grant Program provides an opportunity to offer a financial incentive to support local governments in integrating equity strategies into their local planning processes, set equity-focused priorities, and consider local equity initiatives beyond what might be included in minimum requirements. Imagine 2050 includes four Frameworks that local governments can use or adapt to help establish local equity approaches. Using the adopted regional equity frameworks (below), or others crafted by communities, is just one opportunity to see integration of regional equity goals in local planning that goes above and beyond the "standard," so we can regionally achieve better results.

- Equity Framework
- Environmental Justice Framework
- Anti-Displacement Framework
- Community Centered Engagement Framework

The option to advance regional goals by supporting an incentives approach is included in the funding scenarios and budget considerations portions of this report as it is critical to advancing the Council's commitment to equity. The proposal to partially fund incentive programs is only intended to supplement local efforts and encourage equity-centered planning efforts. Where communities often cite a lack of funding as a barrier, this proposal identifies a means for local governments to increase their funding availability if they opt-in to the program.

Questions

 Are there other regional issues that you want to incentivize? What issues would your community focus on?

 What level of financial incentive (added to a planning grant) would it take for your community to participate?

Incentivizing an Efficient Process

Local comprehensive plans are due to the Council for review on a 10-year planning cycle. Communities have three years to complete their plan updates after System Statements are issued following adoption of a new regional development guide. For the 2040 cycle, plans were due on December 31, 2018. A significant challenge comes when a multitude of plans are submitted simultaneously. In December of 2018, the Council received 76 local comprehensive plans which each require review for conformance with system plans, consistency with regional policy plans, and compatibility with the plans of affected and adjacent jurisdictions. The level of review necessary for each plan is significant, requiring contributions from technical experts in each policy area of transportation, water resources, regional parks and trails, land use, housing, forecasts, and more.

As a government agency, by law, the Council must provide a formal response to an application within 15 business days of receipt that identifies if the plan submittal is missing any information. This is a "completeness" review. The time constraint alongside the sheer number of plans received at the same time poses significant issues with staff capacity across all policy areas. This also creates an opportunity for errors to occur which can have system impacts. When that happens, it inevitably strains relationships with local partners. Additionally, the statutory review timeline must be prioritized over all other tasks which can limit staff's ability to assist local governments with the level of attention they are used to from us.

Again, the Planning Assistance Grant Program provides an opportunity to offer a financial incentive. In this case, the proposal is to encourage a more phased approach to submission of local comprehensive plans. Similar to incentivizing a contractor to complete a road construction project by a specific date by offering a financial incentive to meet a deadline, the proposal seeks to encourage early completion of comprehensive plans in a similar manner. This will allow the Council to establish an "early submittal" deadline for communities to opt-in to receive additional grant funds. This will also increase plan review efficiency and accuracy as well as allow staff to continue to provide high levels of customer service throughout the planning process. All which support more positive relationships with local partners.

Grant eligible communities would not be required to submit their plans early but would have this option under the terms of their grant agreement. There would not be a penalty if they were unable to meet the early deadline; they simply would not receive additional funding.

Questions

- What might limit the ability for your community to plan for submission prior to the deadline of December 31, 2028?
- Is the proposed amount sufficient to incentivize early submission in your community?

Small Communities Planning Program Local Cost-Share

The engineering costs for comprehensive plans are often a significant portion of total planning costs. The costs are usually expended to hire a consultant and have, at times, not met local needs or exceeded initial cost estimates beyond budgeted costs. The intention of the Small Communities Planning Program is to not only provide the needed staff capacity to complete minimum planning requirements, but also to provide more cost-effective services and efficient planning processes for the smallest communities in the region.

As described in the Small Communities Planning Program discussion earlier in this report, the engineering service needs of the eligible Program communities vary. Funding considerations for the Program, as proposed, include funding the wastewater and water supply planning for eligible communities as needed to meet minimum planning requirements. Not only can these elements be the costliest portion of a local comprehensive plan, this focus also ensures conformance with regional system plans and consistency with regional policy plans for these two policy areas.

The initial Program funding analysis acknowledges that the engineering costs exceed available funding. The sewer and water supply planning costs were able to be more readily (roughly)

estimated than surface water management plan costs because the former components have more similarities across planning needs than do surface water management plans. Some watershed districts or watershed management organizations provide a level of planning/engineering that meets local comprehensive plan requirements. Communities in their jurisdictions are sometimes able to adopt those plans by reference. Surface water management plans are also on a different timeline than local comprehensive plans (due in 2027, instead of 2028).

Additionally, the financial support programs for comprehensive planning are not intended to pay the full cost of statutory planning requirements for local governments, it has always been meant to supplement the local government's responsibilities. The current scope for the project assumes that a reasonable cost-sharing approach for the Small Communities Planning Program would be for the local government to retain the financial responsibility for completing the updates to the surface water management plan.

Questions

- How would you recommend distributing funding for engineering services?
 - Is it acceptable to expect local governments to locally fund their surface water management plans?
 - Is there a different way you might suggest breaking out financial responsibilities?
 - Outside of additional funding, are there other suggestions on how to define which portion of the local engineering costs would be provided as part of the Small Communities Program?

Funding Scenarios and Overall Budget Considerations

Based on the recommended criteria that have been established throughout the year with direction from the Committee, staff have considered three funding scenarios for discussion. Using an initial assumption that the continuation of the use of three community types for award amounts (sewered, unsewered, and County/Consortium) would be supported by the Committee, Table 3 below identifies the number of communities by award amount for each of three scenarios (A, B, and C).

Scenario A reflects the same funding amounts from the 2040 planning cycle as a baseline as applied to the communities that meet the recommended eligibility criteria in this report. Scenario B uses an inflation-adjusted approach to funding amounts using the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Inflation Calculator. The 2040 award amounts are adjusted for 133.34% cost of inflation since June 2016 (rounded to the nearest \$1,000). Scenario C applies a minor reduction to each inflation-adjusted award amount to support the incentive programs which help advance regional goals and support an efficient review process. This reserves \$205,000 to support the incentive programs.

		Scenario A		Scenario B			Scenario C					
# of		20	40 Plan		lr	nflation-			A	djusted		
Participants*	Community type		Levels	Total	Α	djusted		Total	for	Programs		Total
63	Sewered	\$	32,000	\$ 2,016,000	\$	43,000	\$	2,709,000	\$	40,000	\$	2,520,000
5	Unsewered	\$	20,000	\$ 100,000	\$	27,000	\$	135,000	\$	25,000	\$	125,000
3	Counties/Consortium	\$	84,000	\$ 252,000	\$	112,000	\$	336,000	\$	110,000	\$	330,000
71				\$ 2,368,000			\$	3,180,000			\$	2,975,000

Table 3: 2050 Plannir	ng Assistance Gran	nt Program Fundii	ng Scenarios
-----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	--------------

*Based on recommended criteria from 7/17/25

As funding scenarios are reviewed, the overall budget available in the Planning Assistance Grant fund and other sources must balance the overall programmatic need (see Table 4 below). The overall budget available from the Planning Assistance Grant Fund is \$4,300,000 which does not include \$300,000 that must remain in the Fund each cycle to rebuild grant dollars before the next planning cycle. Other Council funding sources can support the incentive programs with \$470,000. The total budget is estimated to be \$4,770,000 to implement the Programs as described in this report, with the assumptions described.

The overall programmatic need includes the estimated engineering costs for the Small Communities Planning Program for sewer and water supply plans only, the funding of planning assistance grants at the inflation-adjusted level (Scenario B), and the support for two incentive programs which advance regional goals and encourage early plan submission.

The total programmatic need for the incentive programs calculates all 71 eligible grantees participating and receiving a maximum of \$7,000 for each incentive program (advance regional goals and early plan submission). This would allow each eligible grantee to receive an additional \$14,000 in addition to their planning grant. The maximum grant award for each program can be adjusted based on feedback from the Committee.

With the Small Communities Program engineering costs, the planning grants, and the incentive grants, the overall programmatic need is estimated to be \$5,464,000. As that well exceeds the overall budget, staff considered an adjusted programmatic need which applies funding Scenario C to reserve some funds for the incentive programs and assumes that about 50% of eligible grantees will participate in the incentive programs. This reduces the programmatic need to \$4,762,000 and stays within the overall budget.

	Overall	Overall Programmatic		Adjusted ogrammatic	
	Budget	Need	Assumptions	Need	Assumptions
Small Communities	With Grants	\$ 1,290,000	Sewer & Water Plans only	\$ 1,290,000	Sewer & Water Plans only
Planning Assistance Grants	\$ 4,300,000	\$ 3,180,000	Grants Scenario B	\$ 2,975,000	Grants Scenario C
Incentive Grants	\$ 470,000	\$ 994,000	@ \$7,000 each	\$ 497,000	50% Participation @ \$7,000 each
	\$ 4,770,000	\$ 5,464,000	Total	\$ 4,762,000	Total
		\$ (694,000)	Difference	\$ 8,000	Difference

Questions

- Do you have a preferred funding scenario? Are there other scenarios that you want to consider?
- What additional information might you want to review to consider the overall programmatic need and adjusted programmatic need options?
- Are there other options you want to consider?

Next Steps

On September 18, 2025, the Committee is tentatively scheduled to make a formal recommendation on the eligibility criteria for both the Small Communities Planning Program and the 2050 Planning Assistance Grants Program. Taking action on the eligibility criteria will forward the Land Use Advisory Committee recommendations to the Community Development Committee for consideration.

- If desired, the discussion on approaches to specific grant award categories, and funding considerations can continue separately from the eligibility criteria discussion or staff can include recommendations for these with the eligibility criteria in September.
- Staff will bring back additional information as directed at the July meeting related to:
 - programs that advance regional goals and incentivize an efficient review process
 - Small Communities Planning Program local cost-share options
 - funding considerations and adjusted programmatic needs

Attachments

Attachment 1:	Map of Small Communities Planning Program eligible communities based on recommended criteria (7/17/2025)
Attachment 2:	Map of 2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program eligible communities based on recommended criteria (7/17/2025)
Attachment 3:	Map of Small Communities Planning Program and the 2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program eligible communities based on recommended criteria (7/17/2025)
Attachment 4:	List of Small Communities Planning Program and the 2050 Planning Assistance

Grant Program eligible communities based on recommended criteria (7/17/2025)

Attachment 5: 2016 Planning Assistance Fund – Map of Eligible Communities

Attachment 6: 2016 Planning Assistance Fund – Table of Eligible Communities



Attachment 1: Map of Small Communities Planning Program eligible communities based on recommended criteria (7/17/2025)



Attachment 2: Map of 2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program eligible communities based on recommended criteria (7/17/2025)



Attachment 3: Map of Small Communities Planning Program and the 2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program eligible communities based on recommended criteria (7/17/2025)



Attachment 4: List of Small Communities Planning Program and the 2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program eligible communities based on recommended criteria (7/17/2025)

2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program and Small Communities Planning Program - DRAFT LIST OF ELIGIBLE COMMUNITIES (Based on recommendations to LUAC on 7/17/2025)								
	2050 Planning Assistance Grant Program							
Small Cities and Townships (2,500-14,999)	Mid-sized Cities (15,000-35,000)	County or Consortium	Small Communities Planning Program					
Arden Hills	Andover	Carver County, includes:	Bethel					
Bayport	Anoka	Benton Twp.	Birchwood Village					
Belle Plaine	Brooklyn Center	Camden Twp.	Coates					
Carver	Champlin	Dahlgren Twp.	Cologne					
Centerville	Chaska	Hancock Twp.	Douglas Twp.					
Circle Pines	Columbia Heights	Hollywood Twp.	Greenvale Twp.					
Columbus	Crystal	Laketown Twp.	Grey Cloud Island Twp.					
Corcoran	Farmington	San Francisco Twp.	Hamburg					
Dayton	Forest Lake	Waconia Twp.	Hampton					
East Bethel	Fridley	Watertown Twp.	Hilltop					
Elko New Market	Ham Lake**	Young America Twp.	Lake St. Croix Beach					
Empire	Hastings		Lakeland					
Falcon Heights	Hopkins	Scott County, <i>includes:</i>	Lakeland Shores					
Greenfield	Hugo	Belle Plaine Twp.	Landfall					
Jordan	Lino Lakes	Blakeley Twp.	Lauderdale					
Lake Elmo	New Brighton	Cedar Lake Twp.	Loretto					
Lexington	New Hope	Helena Twp.	Maple Plain					
Linwood Twp.**	Oakdale	Jackson Twp.	Marine on St. Croix					
Little Canada	Prior Lake	Louisville Twp.	Mendota					
Mahtomedi	Ramsey	New Market Twp.	Miesville					
Mayer	Rosemount	Sand Creek Twp.	New Germany					
Mound	Savage	Spring Lake Twp.	New Trier					
Mounds View	Shoreview	St. Lawrence Twp.	Nininger Twp.					
Newport	South St. Paul		Pine Springs					
North St. Paul	Stillwater	Dakota Co. Consortium <i>includes:</i> *	Randolph					
Norwood Young America	West St. Paul	Coates	Ravenna Twp.					
Nowthen**	White Bear Lake	Miesville	Sciota Twp.					
Oak Grove**		New Trier	St. Bonifacius					
Osseo		Randolph	St. Marys Point					
Robbinsdale		Vermillion	Vermillion					
Scandia		Castle Rock Twp.	Waterford Twp.					
Spring Lake Park		Douglas Twp.	Willernie					
St. Anthony		Greenvale Twp.						
St. Francis		Hampton Twp.						
St. Paul Park		Marshan Twp.						
Vadnais Heights		Nininger Twp.						
Victoria		Randolph Twp.						
Waconia		Ravenna Twp.						
Watertown		Vermillion Twp.						
West Lakeland Twp.**		Waterford Twp.						
White Bear Twp								
41	27	35	32					

*Participants in the Consortium forego participation in other planning assistance programs.

**Indicates that this is one of five unsewered communities.

Metropolitan Council



2016 PLANNING ASSISTANCE FUND

LOCAL PLANNING H A N D B O O K

LIST OF ELIGIBLE COMMUNITIES

Sewered Communities	Unsewered Communities	"Small Cities"	County/Consortium*		
\$32,000 Maximum Award	\$20,000 Maximum Award	\$10,000 Maximum Award	\$84,000 Maximum Award		
Andover	Ham Lake	Birchwood Village	Carver County		
Anoka	Nowthen	Centerville	Dakota County		
Apple Valley	Oak Grove	Circle Pines	Scott County		
Bayport		Columbus	*Includes the following:		
Belle Plaine		Greenfield	Belle Plaine Twp.		
Bethel		Hampton	Benton Twp.		
Blaine		Lake St. Croix Beach	Blakely Twp.		
Brooklyn Park		Lakeland	Camden Twp.		
Carver		Landfall	Castle Rock Twp.		
Chaska		Lauderdale	Cedar Lake Twp.		
Cologne		Lexington	Credit River Twp.		
Coon Rapids		Long Lake	Dahlgren Twp.		
Cottage Grove		Loretto	Douglas Twp.		
Davton		Miesville	Empire Twp.		
East Bethel		New Trier	Eureka Twp.		
Elko New Market		Pine Springs	Greenvale Twp.		
Farmington		Randolph	Hampton Twp.		
Forest Lake		Spring Park	Hancock Twp.		
Hamburg		St. Bonifacius	Helena Twp.		
Hastings		Vermillion	Hollywood Twp.		
Hilltop		Willernie	Jackson Twp.		
Hugo		www.ciriic	Laketown Twp.		
Inver Grove Heights			Louisville Twp.		
Jordan			Marshan Twp.		
Lakeville			New Market Twp.		
Lino Lakes					
			Nininger Twp.		
Maple Plain			Randolph Twp.		
Maplewood			Ravenna Twp.		
Mayer			San Francisco Twp.		
New Germany			Sand Creek Twp.		
Newport			Sciota Twp.		
Norwood Young America			Spring Lake Twp.		
Osseo			St. Lawrence Twp.		
Prior Lake			Vermillion Twp.		
Ramsey			Waconia Twp.		
Rosemount			Waterford Twp.		
Savage			Watertown Twp.		
Shakopee			Young America Twp.		
St. Francis					
St. Paul Park					
Stillwater					
Waconia					
Watertown					