Minutes of the
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE LAND USE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, February 16, 2017

Committee Members Present:
Phillip Klein, Marvin Johnson, Karl Drotning, Pamela Harris, Kathi Hemken, Elizabeth Wefel, Jon Commers, James Saefke, Kristina Smitten, James McClean, Bill Neuendorf, Michael Webb, and Jamil Ford

Committee Members Absent:
Chip Halbach, Jennifer Geisler, Kathi Mocol, and Bill Droste

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Commers called the special meeting of the Council’s Land Use Advisory Committee to order at 4:05 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 2017.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES
Chair Commers asked for a motion to approve the minutes presented. A motion was made by Johnson, seconded by Saefke, to approve the November 17, 2016, minutes of the meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

Chair Commers asked for a motion to approve the agenda as presented. A motion was made by Saefke, seconded by Drotning, to approve the February 16, 2017, agenda of the special meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

BUSINESS
Appointment of Vice Chair
Chair Commers asked for a motion to approve the appointment of a Vice Chair. A motion was made by Klein and seconded by Johnson that the Land Use Advisory Committee approve the appointment of Kristina Smitten as the Committee’s Vice Chair for 2017. Motion carried.

Review of Bylaws of the Metropolitan Council Land Use Advisory Committee – Jon Commers and Deb Detrick, Local Planning Assistance
Chair Commers asked for a motion to approve the proposed action. A motion was made by Harris and seconded by Neuendorf that the Land Use Advisory Committee review proposed amendments to the Bylaws of the Metropolitan Council Land Use Advisory Committee, amended on January 14, 2004, and direct staff to draft proposed amendments for the Committee’s consideration on March 16, 2017.

INFORMATION
Planit: 2016 Conference Report and 2017 Program Summary – Angela Torres, and Raya Esmaeili, Local Planning Assistance
Esmaeili gave an update on the 2016 PlanIt conference held in December outlined in the materials provided. She noted that presentations and biographies of presenters are on the Council’s website.
McClean asked about online resources. Esmaeili referred to the Community Pages in the Local Planning Handbook (LPH), and noted that past presentations can be found there. She added that the resources are continually updated as more resources and Community Highlights are received.
Neuendorf asked about the locations of future events. Torres stated that there are webinars, which can be done at your desk. There will be workshops (16) across the metro. Staff are trying to be practical while looking at parking, accessibility, transit, etc.

Torres discussed the 2017 program, with the concept of topics that discuss going above and beyond the requirements mode. She discussed the increase in partnerships to collaborate with experts and learning formats – similar to what was used in 2016 plus pod casts (new) and events as listed in the materials provided. She noted that there was a strong preference for workshops, so there will be 16 in 2017.

Torres discussed a subcommittee convened of Council staff that met to discuss equity and what to work on.

Webb asked for a definition of equity. Barajas responded that it is to ensure benefits of public investments don’t have a negative impact and are benefiting all of our residents equally. All voices/analysis and prioritizations lead to better outcomes.

Webb asked if we are talking socioeconomic equity or racial equity. Barajas stated we are talking about social equity in general but it may look different in each community. She stated the broader purpose is to bring all residents to the table (as well as consider future residents) and consider the opportunities.

Harris stated that this comes up all the time and they’ve been dealing with it without calling it equity.

Ford stated that too often decisions are made before involving residents. He discussed meeting people where they are. He feels we need to look at all forms of media and getting to them at the forefront to engage them.

Barajas discussed workshops that are focused around community engagement and how to improve engagement and be more effective.

Torres discussed recent events held this year as well as upcoming events listed in the materials provided.

Chair Commers asked in Community Highlights – is there a way communities can submit engagement highlights or have they. Torres stated yes and noted there is an online submittal form that can be then put online and in the newsletter. She encouraged members to submit strategies that they have used.

McCLean stated he thought the City of St. Paul has some good community planning and had some strategies that would be worth sharing. Torres discussed pop-up meetings and local artists and agreed that St. Paul is doing good things.

Esmaeili noted posted events (workshops) will have resources, who presented and their presentation.

**Revised 2017 Work Plan for Land Use Advisory Committee** – Jon Commers, Chair

Chair Commers stated he takes the work of this committee very seriously and the feedback given to the Council. He thanked the group for the value of work brought to the Council.

Chair Commers discussed six proposed topics for 2017 Work Plan outlined in the materials provided.

Harris commented on how great the work of staff has been on their work with PlanIt and felt it creates great resources that would not otherwise be there.

Neuendorf asked about trends. Commers stated that community trends that occur regionally can inform the work of individual cities doing comp plan work. Detrick added it reflects what staff are seeing during their review of comprehensive plans and also the perspective of the communities.

Webb asked about water supply/reuse and where that falls within the responsibilities of the Met Council.
Barajas explained the Met Council reviews three main components of the comp plans. Conformance with regional systems including transportation (transit and aviation), wastewater services, and regional parks/trails. Conformance means not having a substantial impact on any of these regional systems or a representing a departure from those regional systems. If the Council finds non-conformance, by statute, they may ask for a plan modification. The second component is consistency with regional policy. The Council may provide advisory comments. In some cases, this may affect their ability to get funding. For example, if a plan is not consistent with the Housing Plan it may affect eligibility to participate in our Livable Communities Program. The third piece is compatibility with adjacent and affected jurisdictions. Regarding the Water Supply Plan, the Met Council looks at your plan for completeness addressing all required components. She noted staff will then forward their comments on the Water Supply Plan to the DNR – the council does not approve these plans. She noted it is the same with watershed plan - the Watershed District approves. As for the critical corridor area plan – the DNR approves.

Webb noted, looking at the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP), the biggest issue is available state and federal funds. He asked how can this committee have an impact – based on land use. Chair Commers stated the timing of this question is perfect and discussed the ambiguity of this issue. He stated that his sense of the comprehensive plan vehicle as a way to represent community interest on the transportation agenda in general. This remains a critical issue across the region. It makes sense for local input to define key goals and articulate proprieties. Webb agreed and discussed the ability to sit at a level and be able to discuss, rather than being told what to do.

Chair Commers stated this committee has demonstrated some examples where whether it’s the work on the geographic planning areas or the early work the transportation land use section of the TPP – there has been really clear influence of the discussion we have at this table on the final product. He has a strong interest in demonstrating that because he respects all of the committees’ time and wants to make sure to continue to have the high degree of experience and talent that we currently have at the table. The TPP is an example that is between the regional planning cycles that are ten years long where we can focus on where the region is currently, what the trends are as far as the way people are using the transportation system, and how do we make changes to strengthen the land use/transportation connection both for local benefit and regional benefit.

Klein asked if anyone has ever looked at cities that can’t get enough water. Barajas discussed the water supply section and discussed staff that are working on this in our current Water Supply Plan.

Ford commented on the larger push – is this sustainable in terms of managing the quality and the source of where the water is coming from. Are there measure/balances to help – how do we get to a point where people are looking at sustainability. Saefke discussed reuse of grey water.

Harris stated she is interested in economic competitiveness and discussed the staff member who came before this committee last year. Chair Commers stated that this staff person left the Council and he is not sure of the status of replacing that person. Detrick noted that it is important to have topics at a time when feedback can bring back greatest impact. The window for impact on the TPP will be March/May. Also, planning around water supply and water reuse is keeping in mind the greatest chance to give feedback. This is why economic competitiveness has been pushed back.

Harris stated that economic competitiveness is implied in all other topics and may be useful to have it as a component of each of the other topics. Commers agreed.

Neuendorf agreed and felt it could be added to trends and issues affecting land use, as it’s too important to put off.

Neuendorf stated he feels equity is an issue that seems to be missing. Chair Commers hopes that it is embedded in each of the topics listed here.
Barajas noted that the list gives high level topics, however, there are other things that will be discussed.

Detrick stated this is good to hear so we can keep it in mind as we put together discussions.

Ford agreed and stated we need to have necessary measures in place so we can reach goals. Equity is not the same as equality and we should be looking at all measures/accountability in all of these topics.

McClellan likes the idea of weaving equity throughout but it might be helpful to have a presenter to point out some of these issues – give us a framework and point us in the right direction on where/how equity fits in. Chair Commers felt this was a great suggestion and could also be coupled with some work that is being done at the Met Council internally – thinking about how do you actually implement an equity agenda internally.

Harris discussed Snelling Avenue being redeveloped by MnDOT and they’re almost finished – now pedestrians can no longer cross the road and stop halfway because they’ve narrowed the center strip. She feels it’s an equity problem.

Ford noted this gets back to innovation in technology and need for controlled access.

Neuendorf discussed an example in Edina where they deal with this same type of thing.

Neuendorf discussed affordable housing or range of housing and asked is this grouped? Chair Commers stated we will have some discussion of range of housing. Neuendorf discussed retention of affordable housing – single family homes and apartments. He felt there is a Met Council influence, guidance or perspective that could be shared.

Barajas noted the last bullet point on page 2 of the materials provided that will touch on affordable and unsubsidized affordable markets.

Ford discussed the growing trend to push for rent to own program (part of Section 8) and also a push for crowd funding mechanisms for affordable housing.

Neuendorf discussed an article in American City and County Magazine that discussed social benefit bonds sold to investors to invent in affordable housing (being done in Denver).

Chair Commers proposed that staff will send something out in an email and come back with the work plan in March.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

**Next Meeting** – March 16, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

Sandi Dingle
Recording Secretary