

**Minutes of the  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE LAND USE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

May 16, 2013

**Committee Members Present:** Jon Commers, Chip Halbach, Tami Diehm, Phillip Klein, Bill Droste, Any Hestness, Kathi Hemken, Elizabeth Kautz, Ginny Black

**Committee Members Absent:** Kristina Smitten, Gregory Boe, Kim Kang, Elizabeth Wefel, Amy Ihlan, Jon Ulrich, Bill Neuendorf

**CALL TO ORDER**

Committee Chair Commers called the regular meeting of the Council's Land Use Advisory Committee to order at 4:08 p.m. on Thursday, May 16, 2013.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

Chair Commers postponed approval of the proposed agenda and minutes until a quorum was present.

**INFORMATION**

**LUAC Report to Community Development Committee – Jon Commers**

Commers discussed the verbal report to the Community Development Committee given on April 1, 2013, and noted that it was held in Apple Valley. He stated they had a conversation about the discussions, dialogues and themes that have been communicated by this Committee in previous meetings. He felt that efforts to keep communication channels open are productive.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

With a quorum present, Chair Commers asked for approval of the proposed agenda and minutes.

Chair Commers asked for approval of the May 16, 2013, agenda. It was moved by Droste, seconded by Black, to approve the agenda of the May 16, 2013, regular meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

Chair Commers asked for approval of the March 21, 2013, meeting minutes. It was moved by Halbach, seconded by Klein, to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2013, regular meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

**INFORMATION (Continued)**

**Thrive Rountables and Policy Issue Input Reminder - Jon Commers**

Commers discussed the public engagement roundtable discussions being held out in the communities to gather input on Thrive MSP 2040. He noted that they are just finishing Round 2, however there is still time to attend if interested. He stated that there is one being held tonight in Minneapolis and one on May 30 in Jordan. Commers also stated that Metro Cities has scheduled some roundtable discussions and reminded members that the online platform is still open.

Commers stated that he led the one held in St. Paul and felt there was a very good conversation.

**SAC Working Group Update – Jon Commers**

Commers gave an update on the SAC Workgroup that he co-chairs. He noted that the effort is to say that the region is starting a new stage of growth and the door is open to discuss financing of infrastructure. The goal is

to work with consultants and look nationally at how it is done elsewhere. He noted that they meet monthly. If anyone is interested in discussing further, Commers indicated that he would be willing to meet outside of this Committee.

### **Job & Activity Centers – Cole Hiniker & John Kari, Metropolitan Transportation Services Division**

Commers stated that next part of this meeting will be focusing on Geographic Planning Areas (GPAs) and what are the key elements we want to see to help with future development.

Hiniker gave a presentation with John Kari to discuss job and activity centers and why they matter. He gave a quick summary of the Land Use & Planning Resources (LUPRA) Report. He summarized how we plan, including Thrive MSP 2040, Transportation Policy Plan, and local comprehensive plans.

Hiniker discussed jobs and how they are an important factor in economic competitiveness. He noted that growth is tied to the global economy and discussed how jobs are clustered, but decentralized along the freeway system. He noted job-related land use comprise only 6.3% of the region's land area.

Hiniker discussed job growth and how jobs tend to cluster by industries, but more specifically by needs. He also discussed the jobs-housing balance.

Hiniker discussed varying life-spans of structures and noted that commercial/industrial buildings are more likely to be replaced, rehabilitated or added new over a 30-year period. He noted that housing lasts a very long time.

Hiniker stated that 44 centers (major clusters) were identified and that half of all jobs are in these centers. He noted that only 22% of the region's job-related land uses are in these centers, which is less than 2% of the region.

Hiniker discussed an analysis defining job and activity centers and what was looked at, including job numbers, contiguous job locations, job density, and job center type (job classification and major regional activity centers).

Hiniker discussed three classifications of centers in the job analysis including Metropolitan Centers, Regional Centers, and Subregional Centers.

Halbach asked why 10 jobs per acre was selected as the threshold. Hiniker stated that 10 is an important density factor for transit and it was also chosen based on data that was looked at.

Hiniker discussed how centers were classified by type and activity. Centers include Metropolitan Centers, Professional Job Center, Industrial Job Center, Activity Center, and Diversified Centers.

Kari noted that the U of M and MSP Airport were added because the U of M (just the Minneapolis campus) has about 45,000-50,000 people every day and the MSP Airport has about 46,000 a day. Hiniker pointed out that the U of M also has 30,000 employees not included in that count.

Committee members reviewed maps of the areas identified in the different centers (included in the materials provided).

Commers clarified that regional jobs within Professional Centers are defined by number of jobs and not travel patterns. Hiniker responded that this is correct.

Black asked if Industrial Centers contain shift work. Hiniker stated that they don't have that data but this is an important element. He also clarified that we are not looking at freight quantities but rather industrial jobs.

Kautz stated it is also important to look at rail and river in terms of industrial and commercial traffic.

Black discussed online retailers and how this could change Activity Centers.

Kari discussed longevity of structures. He stated that retail has the highest turnover and explained how this affects trends.

Kautz said that this is where looking at ULI Global research can be helpful.

Commers clarified that Activity Center is a broad term and felt that identifying it as retail/restaurant would be more helpful.

Droste asked what the intent is and asked is it to project where new centers should go? Hiniker stated we're identifying where they are today and we're leaving that question open. Kari explained how to serve what is there but use it as a tool in forecasting and future planning.

Commers discussed using these themes/trends as a tool in future planning.

Kautz discussed Greater MSP Ahead and gave an example of hospitality healthcare. She noted that we need to be 'organic' because as change comes, the region is going to look very different.

Hiniker discussed additional considerations.

Kari discussed potential transportation/land use strategies for centers – how can we take research and come up with what kind of transportation impacts hit land use and vice versa. He discussed increasing job density and transit cohesiveness.

Next Kari talked about what our role, as a region, is to support economic development. He stated they looked at street design and connectivity of local transportation networks affect on mode choice. He noted that this is a local responsibility and we need to improve connectivity. We need to make sure we have multi-modal choices.

Kari discussed how mixed land uses influence travel behavior.

Kari discussed how high-quality transit builds ridership including frequent, speedy service and easy access.

Kari discussed looking at density – building in centers with multi-modal regional access, particularly in areas with high-frequency service. He noted that housing has longevity.

Kari discussed the local and private sector and travel demand management and parking influence on travel patterns. It's about accommodating the car while supporting alternative travel modes to support jobs and Activity Centers.

Kari stated as we look at all of this we need to think about how do we get this into Thrive MSP 2040 to guide future regional policy/planning tools.

Hiniker discussed the possible regional policy/planning tools. This was to give a good base of knowledge for recommendations going forward.

Klein discussed internet infrastructure.

Hiniker, regarding six topics Kari discussed, stated we need to look at what are different roles and what are best practices/guidance we can give local communities.

Hemken stated that this presentation would benefit the Regional Council of Mayors.

Kari discussed 'flex space' – buildings that can easily be converted for other uses.

### **Initial Data Analysis for Geographic Planning Areas – Lisa Barajas & Deb Detrick (Preliminary Map Set)**

Barajas stated that the information she has to share is to set the stage for this group to come back in July with recommendations on how/where you feel the Council should be moving with GPAs (for the Committee of the Whole). By grouping communities together based on commonalities that will help the Council and the Region move forward in implementing regional policies at the local level. Communities are our biggest local partners in effectively doing anything regionally. She reviewed the preliminary map set for GPAs analysis (contained in the materials provided).

Barajas began with the 2030 Regional Development Framework GPAs map. It was noted that this map was omitted from the packet, as well as an Urbanized Land Use Map. They will be emailed to members. She noted the distinction between 'developed' versus 'developing' areas which set a threshold for 85% of the land that was already committed for urban uses. Those urban uses include housing of all types, commercial and industrial uses, roads, airports, etc. They do not include agricultural, parks, recreational, or open land. In the course of Council history, this was a very good indicator of whether a community was focused on growing or looking inward at redevelopment and infill development. It is still a valuable tool in marking that threshold of outward expansion and inward looking. However, as the region has grown, the 'developed' category has grown quite large. We have communities that are in their 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> round of redevelopment and are classified

as developed and also communities that have just now become developed and are just learning what it means to do redevelopment. Because the 'developed' category has grown quite large it does not allow for the distinction between communities that are really in different stages of their growth and development over time.

Barajas discussed the existing residential density map and explained the different levels of density. The classifications used in this map are set according to Council policies. These classifications show density required to have land counted towards their supply of land considered available for their production of their share of the affordable housing need of the region. Anything lower than six units per acre was considered 'not available for the market' to reasonably use to provide affordable housing.

Droste asked if these levels are defined anywhere (as far as what communities should strive for). Barajas stated there was a study done in early 2000 for the Council to define what the total reasonable share of affordable housing would be between 2010 and 2020 and to help define how much land would be needed to accommodate this and what could reasonably be presumed a minimum density structure for that. She noted that she could get that study for members if desired. Droste felt it would be helpful to have documentation that defined density that would support different types of services, for example, density above 6 units per acre would make sense for transit lines into the Central Corridor.

Hiniker discussed transit redesign study done in the 1990's that looked at thresholds of densities for transit. This could be provided. Droste stated this would be helpful.

Droste discussed diversity and how that is changing expectations of density. People around the world are not building single family homes and as they come here their expectation is for high density. Barajas stated that map is showing what we have today. We do have the capability of overlapping maps with different data to show what areas would support different types of service options.

Barajas discussed housing age mapped to look at maintenance needs and potential for redevelopment but also to give a sense of where development patterns have occurred and how they're different or may have changed over time. She discussed the percent of housing stock built before 1940, which is more of a grid layout and smaller lots. She then discussed percent of housing stock built before 1970, which is more of a post-war production starting to move to bigger lots and different pattern of development with cul-de-sacs and less connectivity.

Barajas discussed two maps showing affordable housing – ownership, and affordable housing – rental. She discussed the total and percent of each at 60% average median income.

Barajas discussed maps showing populations patterns for age 18 and under, age 65 and older and also by diversity.

Commers commented on the range of trends within municipal boundaries. He stated that cities are typically in one GPA but it's not necessarily a reflection of how the cities function. This is one of the opportunities for GPAs to see what the commonalities are across the city boundaries that we can support or address using GPA even if it's not a specific trend.

Halbach feels the planning should focus on the '44 job and activity centers and connectedness to each other. He feels if we focus on those, it will benefit the region as a whole. He stated we need to look at what will make the region most attractive, including regional parks and also addressing concentrations of poverty. He asked how we maximize value of all these centers across the region.

Barajas discussed urbanized land map (% of land that is urban) and an intersection intensity map.

Commers stated they are looking for key things we want to consider with GPA's, i.e., what to address, what to leverage, etc.

Halbach stated it will depend on each type of center – each will have variables, i.e., one may have housing as important; one may be more about connectivity/rail. He suggested thinking of GPA as nodes within the region that would be best for economic growth.

Black stated we may want to focus on future uses however it is hard to tell as this map shows current uses. She feels we've been losing industrial. Klein asked if there are areas more conducive to industrial development vs. professional development.

Halbach asked if we project by job type. Barajas stated we do not but we can project job growth in general.

Droste stated he feels the numbers are high for job/population growth forecasts.

Hestness asked if we really see the utility of GPA's moving into the future as we're becoming a developed region. We're talking more about networks and systems and suggest the approach needs to be more uniform across the region.

Commers agreed but stated he also thinks some of business that we do is geographic in nature.

Droste suggested eliminating city comprehensive plans and make them regional.

Kautz likes the idea of looking at transportation corridors and stated we need to be flexible.

Black stated that in Plymouth, there's not much land left. Kautz responded that we need to look at our strengths.

Halbach stated that this is the strategic regional planning that needs to be done.

Black feels transportation will be very critical in future development.

Hemken stated that the Met Council needs to look at getting people east to west and not everything is coming out of the center.

Droste asked if the Met Council looks beyond the seven-county area. Commers stated that if you look at percent of population, 90% of population is within the 7 counties. He noted the MSA is now 13 counties.

Diehm asked if the goal is to come up with recommendations like a personality test (Myers Briggs) where a GPA may be several different levels.

Barajas stated we use the regional development guide to help implement regional policy at the local level. To do that effectively we need to come up with a recommendation to the Council that will form planning areas that will be more effective at implementing policy and yet recognize differences as well as new factors identified, i.e., water supply, corridors, etc. We need to look at what are the most important factors are for communities and how their thinking about redevelopment, reinvestment, etc.

Commers referred to Diehm's comment and asked what we would call those different categories. Diehm stated when she looks at the maps what's important to her is housing vs. non-housing, or residential vs. retail. She stated the age of infrastructure is also important.

Halbach stated he would name the planning centers: Metropolitan Center, Professional Job Center, Industrial Job Center, Activity Center, and Diversified Center. If you have one of these areas in your community you're given guidance in what to do with that area so that it maximizes its overall contribution to the regional economy and quality of life.

Kautz still believes things will be changing.

Droste discussed other communities and noted, based on where they're located, they don't all have a corridor. He asked what economic component could we put into the regional plan that could be utilized equally.

Commers listed what he feels the characteristics/themes/influences are:

- Nodal approach (layers)
- Transportation Corridors
- Myers Briggs (personality types)
- Age of Infrastructure
- Water Resources

Hemken stated (in regards to personality types) that cities are best indicators of who they are and felt a survey of them would be helpful.

Diehm stated tax capacity is one area to look at.

Commers stated that the 'personality type' may be all of the things that go into a GPA, i.e., age of infrastructure, demography, tax base, etc.

Droste asked if there is a way to have communities that make up these nodes to work collaboratively as we look to the future.

Barajas stated what we're hearing is that inter-jurisdictional planning efforts, where cities are coming together, to capitalize on infrastructure improvements are happening and feel that we will see more of that with water supply, etc.

Halbach stated that on the Central Corridor, it's the neighborhoods.

Kautz stated that collaboration is important when working on infrastructure.

Detrick stated that some of these discussions could also help the Council with decisions on investment strategies.

Droste stated that if we can figure out an economic component that will drive policy – it would be significant.

Halbach discussed nodes along the transportation corridors and he feels that node area planning is of metropolitan significance.

Black discussed reasons people move to a city is location, school district, and taxes. She noted that we don't have school district listed as a driver at all in what attracts people. She noted that districts change too over time.

Commers discussed the Committee of the Whole and their request to have recommendations from this group. This will be discussed further at our next meeting.

Commers noted, before ending the meeting that Dave Elvig has resigned.

## **NEXT MEETING**

July 18, 2013, at 4:00 pm at the Metropolitan Council in Room LLA.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Sandi Dingle  
Recording Secretary