

## Minutes of the

### REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Monday, April 19, 2021

**Committee Members Present: Chamblis, Cummings, Johnson, Lee, Lilligren, Lindstrom, Vento, Wulff**

**Committee Members Absent: Atlas-Ingebretson, Muse**

**Committee Members Excused:**

#### CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Lilligren called the regular meeting of the Council's Community Development Committee to order at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, April 19, 2021.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Wulff, seconded by Lee to approve the minutes of the April 5, 2021 regular meeting of the Community Development Committee. Motion carried.

[Click here to view April 19, 2021 Community Development Committee meeting video](#)

#### BUSINESS

**2021-68** Battle Creek Regional Park – Pigs Eye Lake Master Plan Amendment, Ramsey County, Review File No. 50010-2

Planning Analyst Colin Kelly presented the business item to the Community Development Committee.

It was moved by Lee, seconded by Wulff, that the Metropolitan Council:

1. Approve Ramsey County's Battle Creek Regional Park – Pigs Eye Lake Master Plan Amendment.
2. Require Ramsey County to continue to coordinate with the Army Corps of Engineers and the Metropolitan Council during the development and implementation of the island monitoring plan.
3. As represented by Ramsey County, acknowledge the Corps' responsibility for monitoring and determining ecological success for the restoration projects it constructs for up to 10 years following project completion, including financial responsibility.
4. Require Ramsey County, prior to initiating any development of the regional park unit, to send preliminary plans to the Environmental Services Assistant Manager at the Metropolitan Council's Environmental Services Division.

#### Motion carried.

Council Members shared some concerns and questions about the master plan amendment. Some watched the Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission (MPOSC) video and commented that their vigorous discussion helped answer many questions.

Council Members inquired about the receipt of public comments and asked whether Council staff responds to all the messages. Mr. Kelly responded that yes, staff responds to messages received. Responses to each message is dependent upon whom the message is directed. For example, regional parks staff will respond to messages sent directly to the Park's unit, but do not respond to messages sent directly to Council Members.

Council Members asked whether the public engagement opportunities provided by Ramsey County were sufficient and asked who abstained from the MPOSC vote. Mr. Kelly responded that it was Commissioner Brown who abstained and that it was her first opportunity to vote as a new Commissioner. And added that it was Commissioner Brown who raised similar questions about public participation at the MPOSC meeting. In response to whether Ramsey County's engagement efforts were sufficient, Mr. Kelly referenced Ramsey County Director of Planning and Development's Scott Yonke's response on page two of the MPOSC staff report.

Council Member Vento requested future updates on the island building project in Pigs Eye Lake. Director Barajas said that staff would be happy to do so.

**2021-88** City of Lake Elmo West Lake Elmo MUSA Planning Area Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Review File 22215-5  
Senior Planner Raya Esmaeili presented the business item to the Community Development Committee.

It was moved by Wulff, seconded by Cummings, that the Metropolitan Council adopt the attached Advisory Comments and Review Record and take the following actions:

1. Authorize the City of Lake Elmo to place its comprehensive plan amendment into effect.
2. Revise the City's forecasts and sewer-serviced forecasts upward in 2030 and 2040 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 in the Review Record.
3. Revise the *Thrive MSP 2040* Community Designation of the subject area from Rural Residential to Emerging Suburban Edge for the area shown in Figure 2 of the Review Record.
4. Revise the City's affordable housing need allocation for 2021-2030 to 1,040 units.
5. Find that the amendment renders the City's comprehensive plan inconsistent with the Council's housing policy and that the City is therefore ineligible to participate in Livable Communities Act programs.
6. Require the City to submit a copy of the Wastewater Intercommunity Flow Agreement between Cities of Lake Elmo and Oakdale to the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services once it has been executed.
7. Advise the City:
  - a. That to be consistent with Council housing policy, the City needs to increase the inventory of land guided to support the development of low- and moderate-income housing for the 2021-2030 decade by at least 15 units by guiding enough residential acres with sufficient minimum densities.
  - b. To implement the advisory comments in the Review Record for Parks, Forecasts, and Land Use.

**Motion carried.**

Council Member Johnson inquired about the impact of this development on the Lake Elmo Phalen - Keller Regional Trail Search Corridor. Ms. Esmaeili responded that as a search corridor, the exact alignment of this trail is flexible and yet to be determined. When Washington County, the regional park implementing agency, starts the master planning process for this Search Corridor, local jurisdictions

and other stakeholders will be involved in the process, which will consider the surrounding area and acquisition options.

Council Members commented the development in this area will provide more job opportunities.

## **INFORMATION**

### 1. Local Housing Incentives Account (LHIA) Affordable Homeownership Pilot

Housing Planner Ashleigh Johnson and Livable Communities Manager Tara Beard presented the information item to the Community Development Committee.

The Livable Communities Act (LCA) includes the Local Housing Incentives Account (LHIA), which provides funds to help participating communities achieve their affordable housing goals.

Since the LHIA was first implemented in 1996, it has been pooled with state and other affordable housing funds through an annual consolidated request for proposals (RFP) that is issued by Minnesota Housing. The ability to partner with other, larger funding sources to layer and award different types of funding that have different goals and requirements is a valuable tool; it allows for a streamlined application process and the potential to award the most possible projects. The Council also gains administrative efficiencies by sharing a project solicitation process with another agency.

Minnesota Housing's consolidated RFP accepts applications for both multi-family projects and single-family projects. Generally, single family projects refer to homeownership opportunity, though the units may be townhomes, duplexes, or other moderate density housing. Most multi-family sources of funding in the consolidated RFP only support rental units, and there have been little or no new affordable multi-family homeownership developments in recent years. For the purposes of this discussion, single-family housing and homeownership can be considered interchangeable, as can multi-family and rental housing.

Multi-family and single-family applications are processed simultaneously but separately by Minnesota Housing. Council staff work with the multi-family and single-family teams at Minnesota Housing to determine recommendations for how much of that year's available LHIA funding should go to each housing type. Those recommendations consider the number of applications for each type, the current funding priorities of the Council, and the funding available that year. Generally, there are many more multi-family applications than single-family applications, and multi-family applications total significantly more dollars than single-family applications.

The following questions were presented to the Committee for discussion.

Is there general support from CDC to develop the pilot?

What should the outcomes/goals for the pilot be?

Increased geographic breadth of applications/awards?

Prioritize projects that decrease racial homeownership disparities?

What else?

What haven't we considered or thought about?

Who else should we talk to/partner with?

The Council members provided feedback, and asked questions. The Council Members wanted more information on the Community Outreach/ Engagement efforts, and interest from Communities. The size of the program was discussed, emphasizing the importance to finding the right size for success.

Local match sources and requirement were questioned. Ms. Beard explained the RFP process for developers, all the acceptable matches.

The challenges to a pathway to homeownership was discuss and agreed the implementation is complicated, innovation is key, and a diverse group of developers is needed.

Many housing options were discussed including preserving existing housing, increase rehabs with local matches, and provide more resources to Communities.

Council members inquired about non-participating Communities, especially Dakota County, and the existing stock of manufactured homes. Ms. Beard explained the State funds allocated to preserve, improve and replace manufactured homes. Regular updates were requested by the Committee.

Council Members expressed their appreciation for the presentation and approved the pilot program. Ms. Beard explained the next steps to specify the goals and plans to bring back to the Community Development Committee in August.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Michele Wenner  
Recording Secretary