

Meeting: SAC Task Force Meeting 8

Date: August 29, 2017 **Time:** 2PM-4PM **Location:** Metro Cities, Saint Paul

Members in attendance: Wendy Wulff, Metropolitan Council Member; Kyle Klatke, City of Brooklyn Park; Kevin Schmieg, City of Eden Prairie; Katrina Kessler, City of Minneapolis; Ron Hedberg, City of Apple Valley; James Dickinson, City of Andover; Patty Nauman, Metro Cities; Merrill King, City of Minnetonka; Loren Olson, City of Minneapolis; Steve Ubl, City of St. Paul

Non-Task Force Members in attendance: Mary Ubl, City of Minneapolis; Leigh Severson, TKDA Consultant; John Berrigan, TKDA

Members Absent: Dan McElroy, MN Restaurant Association; Tom Thomasser, MN Chamber of Commerce; Sue Virnig, City of Golden Valley; Dave Englund, City of Roseville; Bob LaBrosse, City of Cottage Grove

Staff in Attendance: Cara Letofsky, Metropolitan Council Member; Ned Smith, MCES; Kyle Colvin, MCES; Cory McCullough, MCES; Toni Janzig, MCES; Jeanne Landkamer, MC; Sara Running, MCES

Item	Notes
1. Review and Approve Minutes from Meeting 7	Minutes approved with no changes.
2. Recap – Direction by the Task Force	Ned Smith, MCES, provided a recap of the asks from the Task Force from the previous meeting.
3. Findings/results of study	Ned S. discussed the revised GSF study which was a result of asks from the previous Task Force meeting. He discussed the scenarios/options of the GSF study.
4. Determination recommendations	<p>A member (Katrina K.) asked, when you say new restaurants, is remodel defined as moving the existing footprint around, and then an addition would be a new restaurant? Ned S. said yes.</p> <p>Mary Ubl, Minneapolis, asked, is the average new restaurant going to be paying \$12,600? Leigh Severson, TKDA, answered yes. \$12,600 is what the average restaurant is going to pay (see slides).</p> <p>A member (Kevin S.) asked, with the school category, why was the average 1344 and we are using 1150? Leigh S. replied we have the average and median and we looked at both, and the average was typically higher, and with this option we are taking the median instead of the average. Kevin S. replied one thing that is unique with schools is we have either new school or an addition. Leigh S. replied most we analyzed were additions.</p> <p>A member (Kevin S.) asked, would we deal with the gross inside the perimeter walls? Would we still exclude, stairs,</p>

elevators, vestibules, etc.? Leigh S. answered yes. Kyle Colvin, MCES, said there was one nuance with mechanical rooms, if the entrance to the room was inside the building it IS included, versus if the entrance is outside it is excluded.

Mary U. asked, so with malls, are common areas included? Leigh S. answered malls fell within retail multi-use. Mary U. also asked, so would the skyway with the common areas square footage fall into a category? Leigh said typically with a shared tenant space, we would split it between the two businesses. Mary U. asked if we could get more clarification on common areas for malls and skyways that would be helpful.

Ned S. further discussed determination recommendations, with a recommendation of option 7 (or option c).

Leigh S. discussed the ancillary use threshold (10% for office, warehouse, and retail). A member (Merrill K.) suggested we say this is synonymous with building code.

A member (Kevin S.) asked, say we have retail parking garage residential, do we still have fixture units on trench drains? Leigh S. replied yes.

A member (Katrina K.) asked, why did funeral homes go up 50%? Leigh said it's because it's a small category. Because they had only 5 records, it was just a change of 2 SAC collected. The reason we kept it in is because it's already such an area based category that has a very high correlation (in the 90's) so we thought it was a strong enough correlation to include.

A member (Loren O.) asked we wait until we talk with the business community for an official vote. Wendy Wulff, Met Council Member, answered this is just what we are putting forward, not an official Task Force recommendation.

A member (Patty N.) asked to clarify, would this include additional city outreach? Ned answered yes.

A member (Brian H.) asked if we are taking this simplified to the public, businesses, and city outreach? Ned replied yes it will be refined into a more finished product.

Ned S. asked the minutes include the note that the Met Council would prefer not to require architectural drawings. However, SAC staff will need to figure out what documents will be required (SAC staff will still need at least the footprint),

	<p>so architects drawings may still be required, although not to the level of detail currently needed.</p> <p>A member (Merrill K.) commented, are we going to talk about cities taking more ownership? Ned said it is not a priority at the moment but we are open to examining it in the future.</p> <p>Voting (Proxy vote only): 11/15 members in attendance. All in favor.</p> <p>Action item: Gather feedback and revise via email (no more meetings)</p>
<p>5. Credits recap & recommendations</p>	<p>Ned S. presented the recommendations.</p> <p>A member (Kyle K.) asked, would this only apply when a new SAC determination is required? Toni Janzig, MCES, said we still need a record so we have better records for the future. A determination would need to be done but most likely SAC would not be due.</p> <p>Ned S. said we need some kind of check that we need to confirm that we know what it is, and there likely won't be SAC due, but we still need to (even a remodel, no change of use) know the use. Ned S. said maybe we need something other than a determination, just a verification from the city.</p> <p>Mary U. commented we are still going to have the pain points with the customer, we are still holding it up to verify/validate each one. How often do you do a validation with the Met Council? Ned S. replied he sees validation being less painful than a determination.</p> <p>A member (Steve U.) said, we need to keep the inventory current. Cory McCullough, MCES, said once we validate it once then we don't need to validate it again though.</p> <p>A member (Steve U.) said we are trying to do two things. We want to present something user-friendly to that business person walking in, and we are also trying to find a way to eliminate a process or at least diminish it so it's user-friendly for a first-time owner. I want to make things extremely user friendly to the business person first, and then second the employees. We have something here that is explainable to businesses.</p> <p>Cory M. commented that for most of our credit inquiries, it is the person applying that tracks down the plan, and coming up</p>

with one from 2009 is pretty easy, and most people can provide a plan. Mary U. replied it's the proof of the footprint that is challenging for her.

A member (Kevin S.) said, so everything that is of consequence since 2009 SAC has now? Ned S. answered MCES started keeping detailed documentation, including plans in 2009. The risk is if things happened since 2009 that we do not know about. So we just have to have proof of existence/use and prove the gross square footage.

A member (Brian H.) said so it's 1999 and we are doing a change of use, what are we giving them credit for? SAC staff replied, we will give them credit for what SAC records we have. If they disagree then they need to provide documentation as to the use prior to 1/1/2009.

A member (Patty N.) asked, are there outstanding questions that need to be answered here? Ned S. answered mainly we need to figure out how we validate use. There is an administrative issue where we make sure we all know what the building is.

Patty N. also commented when there have been credit changes in the past Task Forces, we were provided examples. Ned S. said we can provide examples.

Action item: provide credit examples (via email).

Wendy Wulff, Metropolitan Council Member, asked how frequent do we need to have this proof of use (ex. whenever it comes up, annually...?) *Editor addition: We need proof of use whenever a building is modified, including remodels. Even if it looks like no change of use, MCES may not have record of the most recent use.*

Leigh S. commented that the one issue with the 10% is we haven't talked about how we will validate office/warehouse. If they decide to expand and were 30%/70% and now they will be 90%/10%, now they are office and we will need to figure out how to do a determination.

A member (Kyle K.) commented that it is a great simplification and hope the public doesn't get hung up with the math. TKDA did a fantastic job with the math.

Mary U. asked that when we do the simplification we communicate it out to our customers. We (the city) will hold

	<p>off issuing a building permit until we get a validation. We need to define what validation would be and the timeline for validation, and define determination versus validation.</p> <p>Action Item: SAC staff to determine difference between validation and determination.</p>
<p>6. Next Steps/Timeline</p>	<p>Ned S. reviewed the next steps and timeline for potential implementation of the new process.</p> <p>A member (Katrina K.) said we should be sure to communicate what this meeting is for (GSF and not general SAC questions).</p> <p>A member (Patty N.) commented there were sub-regional meetings that someone presented and then they were able to hear comments and this format would probably be best for this.</p> <p>A member (Brian H.) commented we should reach out to the Architectural Community of MN as well as training building officials in this new process.</p> <p>A member (Loren O.) commented this would be a good opportunity to go to the business community and hearing what they have to say about SAC and an opportunity to share our resources (ex. SAC estimation tool, new site).</p>
<p>Action Items</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Task Force Members - Gather feedback from cities/communities, businesses, and potentially revise GSF report, and send via email (no more Task Forces) - Four sub regional meetings for the public for business owners and communities (Sept. - Oct.). Be sure to let Task Force members know about the public meeting dates. - Simplify the GSF study language so it is understandable for the public. - Provide credit examples via email. - SAC staff to determine difference between validation and determination.