



Southwest LRT Community Works Steering Committee

Thursday, November 17, 2016

1:30 – 3:00 PM

Council Chambers, St. Louis Park City Hall

Agenda

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| I. Welcome and Announcements
<i>Chair Jan Callison, Hennepin County Commissioner</i> | 1:30 – 1:35 PM |
| II. Approval of the September 2016 Meeting Minutes
<i>Chair Jan Callison, Hennepin County Commissioner</i> | 1:35 PM – 1:40 PM |
| III. Committee Updates
<i>Technical Implementation Committee (TIC)</i>
<i>Business & Community Advisory Committees (BAC/CAC)</i> | 1:40 – 1:55 PM |
| IV. 2017 Legislative session discussion
<i>Tom Hanson, Winthrop and Weinstine</i>
<i>Bill Schreiber</i> | 1:55 PM – 2:15 PM |
| V. Rail~volution lessons learned | 2:15 – 2:30 PM |
| VI. Shady Oak joint zoning district overview
<i>City of Hopkins and City of Minnetonka staff</i> | 2:30 – 2:40 PM |
| VII. Finance tools discussion
<i>Julie Wischnack, City of Minnetonka</i>
<i>Cathy Bennett, ULI-MN</i> | 2:40 – 3:00 PM |

*The next Southwest Community Works Steering Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, **January 19, 2017** at the St. Louis Park City Hall at 1:30 PM.*



SOUTHWEST LRT

community works

green means go.



Agenda Item 2: September 2016 Southwest Community Works Steering Committee Minutes	
Reviewed By: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chair <input type="checkbox"/> TIC Principals <input type="checkbox"/> TIC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hennepin County staff <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	Steering Committee Action Requested: Action
Background/Justification: Minutes from the May 2016 meeting, submitted for approval.	
Previous Action on Request:	
Recommendation:	Financial Implications? No Are These Funds Budgeted:
Attachments: Minutes will be distributed at the meeting.	
Comments:	





SOUTHWEST LRT

community works

green means go.

Agenda Item 3: Committee Updates

Reviewed By:

- Chair
- TIC Principals
- TIC
- Hennepin County staff
- Other _____

Steering Committee Action Requested:

Information

Background/Justification:

Staff will provide updates from the Technical Implementation Committee (TIC) meetings and the Business Advisory Committee (BAC) and Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings that have occurred since the last Steering Committee meeting.

Previous Action on Request:

Recommendation:

Attachments: None

Comments:

Financial Implications? No

Are These Funds Budgeted:





SOUTHWEST LRT

community works

green means go.

Agenda Item 4: 2017 Legislative Session

Reviewed By:

- Chair
- TIC Principals
- TIC
- Hennepin County staff
- Other:

Steering Committee Action Requested:

Information

Background/Justification: Tom Hanson, Winthrop and Weinstine, and Bill Schreiber will provide thoughts on transportation and transit issues in the upcoming 2017 MN legislative session. Mr. Hanson provides lobbying services to Hennepin County on transportation issues. Mr. Schreiber previously provided lobbying services to Hennepin County on transportation issues and continues to be involved with CTIB in his retirement.

Previous Action on Request:

Recommendation:

Attachments: None.

Comments:

Financial Implications? No

Are These Funds Budgeted:





Agenda Item 5: Rail-Volution Lessons Learned

Reviewed By:

- Chair
- TIC Principals
- TIC
- Hennepin County staff
- Other

Steering Committee Action Requested:

Information/discussion

Background/Justification: Many staff and policymakers from Minnesota attended the October Rail-Volution Conference in San Francisco and the Bay Area. Staff from along Southwest Corridor have provided some information about lessons learned, issues and best practices that they heard at the conference. This is an opportunity for the Steering Committee members to share additional information and lessons learned or ask questions about the staff information provided.

Previous Action on Request:

Recommendation:

Attachments:

- Notes from Rail-Volution, Meg McMonigal, City of St. Louis Park
- Summary of Lessons Learned/Observations, Kathryn Hansen, SPO

Comments:

Financial Implications? No

Are These Funds Budgeted:



Notes from Rail~Volution- Meg McMonigal, City of St. Louis Park

Equitable TOD

- Begin with a stable place to live, and then determine what other services are needed: health/wellness; education; transportation; transit passes, schools, childcare, etc.
- Senior parking can be reduced dramatically and is important because building parking is so expensive
- California has a Cap & Trade law that funds affordable housing and transit

Parking

- California passed a state law on parking that prohibits minimums
- When parking is free, everyone drives; actual costs are hidden
- Charge the right price for on-street parking and return revenues to n'hood
 - Ventura Ca. collected \$.5 m/year and hired additional officers for patrolling the area
 - Berkeley changed from garages charging and on-street parking being free. Have a "premium" and a "value" price depending on location. Revenues go to housing the homeless.
 - Beacon Hill – 4,000 permits for 1,000 spaces non-residents pay fees via phone
 - Laguna Beach and Oceanside have programs also

Mobile Tour to MacArthur Station

- BART owned a parking lot; built a ramp – freed up land for affordable and market rate housing
- Selling land provided funds for BART; collect 1½ % of sales price as a transit-benefit fee
- Housing next to freeway required double-pane windows and additional ventilation
- Non-profit developer; good partnership with BART
- Get cars off of freeway; address air quality
- Allowed reduced parking – ½ stall per unit
- Transit passes are provided for affordable housing residents
- BART has 2/3 fare box recovery (revenue/operating costs)

Kathryn Hansen, Manager TOD and Land Use
Metro Transit, SPO and BPO Project Offices
Summary of Lessons Learned/Observations – Rail~Volution 2016, San Francisco, CA

Workshop Co-Presenter – TOD By The #'s – Realistic Expectations

I recommended an approach to arrive at realistic TOD expectations for a region, station area and a specific project. The approach, teaming TOD “experts” with local real estate developers, was used successfully on the SWLRT project. Three efforts were highlighted:

- Fall 2012 (Region): “TOD 3.0” with Will Fleisseg of TransAct for entire alignment and a more focused look at five SWLRT stations.
- Fall 2014 (Station Area): LISC Twin Cities Corridor Development Initiative (CDI) for three of the five cities along the alignment. Three stations were studied.
- Spring 2016 (Development Project): ULI-MN TAP at two LRT stations (Key input for the St. Louis Park FTA JD project and the Watershed Districts Cold Storage site)

Mobile Workshop Participant – San Mateo, CA – TOD in 1st Ring Suburb of Oakland, CA

San Mateo was very similar to the Downtown Hopkins and the Robbinsdale Station. San Mateo’s LRT Station and Bus service were co-located on the edge of this quaint, historic downtown area. San Mateo’s pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is well designed and provides a good link to the downtown area. The city identified sites within the downtown that could support denser development projects without sacrificing the historic, less dense downtown commercial node. I took many pictures and obtained planning and economic development staff contacts to pass along to Hopkins and Robbinsdale.

Overall Impressions/Themes

1. Zip Code = Life Expectancy: A survey of 17 major U.S. cities found life expectancy differences of 15-20 years in different zip codes within the same city.
2. Problems of Success: San Francisco BART was built for 200K capacity and is currently servicing 440K riders. In addition, the local economy is very strong but only the wealthy can afford to live comfortably in San Francisco.
3. Capitalize Supportive Services: Dommer Development capitalizes the supportive services for their developments so they aren’t dependent on state/local social service programs/budgets. I will make contact with this developer to discuss further.
4. Displacement of Culture and Businesses, not just people: Displacement of people is well understood but displacement of the businesses that supported that population and its culture is often times displaced as well.
5. Corridor/District Perspective is Powerful: HC CW program is a good example for other cities to emulate.



Agenda Item 6: Shady Oak Joint Zoning District Overview

Reviewed By:

- Chair
- TIC Principals
- TIC
- Hennepin County staff
- Other:

Steering Committee Action Requested:

Information

Background/Justification: The cities of Minnetonka and Hopkins have been working together to develop a joint zoning district for the Shady Oak station area, including a board which could have the authority to approve development projects in the district. Staff from both cities will provide an overview of their collaborative efforts.

Previous Action on Request:

Recommendation:

Attachments: None.

Comments:

Financial Implications? No

Are These Funds Budgeted:





SOUTHWEST LRT

community works

green means go.



Agenda Item 7: Finance Strategy Update	
Reviewed By: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chair <input type="checkbox"/> TIC Principals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TIC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hennepin County staff <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	Steering Committee Action Requested: Discussion
Background/Justification: Julie Wischnack, City of Minnetonka, and Cathy Bennett, ULI-MN will provide an update on staff work done since the September Steering Committee meeting on potential TIF legislation for the 2017 session. Staff would like feedback from the Steering Committee.	
Previous Action on Request: Steering Committee requested that staff revisit previous work on finance tools and a potential legislative strategy and report back to the Committee. An update was provided at the September Steering Committee meeting and feedback has been incorporated into a revised draft of the legislation.	
Recommendation:	Financial Implications? No Are These Funds Budgeted:
Attachments: - Revised draft legislation - Summary of draft legislation	
Comments:	



A bill for an act

Relating to the southwest light rail corridor; providing for transit oriented tax increment financing districts

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

Section 1. [SOUTHWEST LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DISTRICTS; SPECIAL RULES.]

Subd. 1. [AUTHORIZATION.] Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the cities of Eden Prairie, [Edina,] Minnetonka, Hopkins, St. Louis Park, and Minneapolis or an authority of any such cities may establish redevelopment tax increment districts within one-half mile of the southwest light rail corridor and one mile from southwest light rail corridor train ~~station~~stations for the purposes of promoting economic development, redeveloping blighted areas, and the development of housing near the southwest light rail corridor. Any tax increment district created under this Section shall be deemed to meet the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, section 469.174, subdivision 10, and Minnesota Statutes, section 469.176, subdivision 4j.

Subd. 2. [ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES.] For all tax increment districts created under this section, eligible expenditures within the district include but are not limited to (1) the city's or authority's share of the costs necessary to provide for the construction of any southwest light rail transit station and related infrastructure, including but not limited to parking facilities, including structured parking, pedestrian overpasses, pedestrian connections, and walkways or trails; (2) infrastructure and roadway improvements, including but not limited to sanitary sewer, water, storm sewer and utility improvements; (3) land acquisition costs; (4) costs related to environmental remediation, soil correction, demolition, and relocation; (5) site improvement costs; (6) costs incurred with respect to the development of or rehabilitation of housing ~~projects~~; and (7) related administrative costs.

Subd. 3. [FIVE YEAR RULE.] The requirement of Minnesota Statutes, section 469.1763, subdivision 3, that activities must be undertaken within a five year period from the date of certification of a tax increment financing district, is considered to be met for any district created under this section if the activities are undertaken within ten years from the date of certification of the district.

Subd. 4. [POOLING WITHIN PROJECT AREA.] Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in Minnesota Statutes, section 469.1763, subdivision 2, paragraph (a), not more than 25% of the total revenue derived from tax increments generated from properties in any district, measured over the life of the district, may be expended on activities outside the tax increment district but within the project area; Minnesota Statutes, section 469.1763, subdivision 4, does not apply to any district created pursuant to this section.

Subd. 5. [POOLING FROM OTHER TIF DISTRICTS.] Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in Minnesota Statutes, section 469.1763, subdivisions 2 and 4, cities or authorities

may use tax increment from other tax increment districts located within the city's corporate limits to pay for the eligible expenditures of tax increment districts created under this section.

Subd. 6. [POOLING TO TIF DISTRICTS CREATED UNDER THIS SECTION.] Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in Minnesota Statutes, section 469.1763, subdivisions 2 and 4, if two or more cities or authorities propose a joint development or adjacent developments, the cities or authorities may expend up to 25% of the total revenue derived from tax increments generated from a tax increment district created under this section (measured over the life of the district) to pay for the eligible expenditures of another tax increment district created under this section and located outside the city's corporate limits.

[EFFECTIVE DATE.] This section is effective for each city upon approval by the governing body of such city and upon compliance with Minnesota Statutes, section 645.021, subdivision 3.

LEGISLATION RELATED TO SOUTHWEST LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DISTRICTS

- The cities, EDAs or HRAs of Eden Prairie, [Edina,] Minnetonka, Hopkins, and St. Louis Park may establish redevelopment TIF Districts within one-half mile of the southwest light rail corridor and one mile from southwest light rail corridor train stations
- Each TIF District created would be deemed to meet the definition of a redevelopment district under the TIF Act and meet the requirement that 90% of the revenues of the TIF District be used to correct conditions that allow the designation of a redevelopment district
- Eligible expenditures of TIF within each TIF district include but are not limited to (1) the city's or authority's share of the costs necessary to provide for the construction of any southwest light rail transit station and related infrastructure, including but not limited to parking facilities, including structured parking, pedestrian overpasses, pedestrian connections, and walkways or trails; (2) infrastructure and roadway improvements, including but not limited to sanitary sewer, water, storm sewer and utility improvements; (3) land acquisition costs; (4) costs related to environmental remediation, soil correction, demolition, and relocation; (5) site improvement costs; (6) costs incurred with respect to the development of or rehabilitation of housing; and (7) related administrative costs
- Requirement that activities must be undertaken within 5 years from the date of certification (the "five year rule") of a TIF District is considered to be met if the activities are undertaken within 10 years of certification
- Up to 25% of TIF generated from properties in the TIF District (measured over the life of the district) may be expended on activities outside the TIF District but within the project area and expenditures of TIF are not limited after the sixth year of the TIF District
- TIF from other TIF Districts located within the city's corporate limits may be used to pay for the eligible expenditures of TIF Districts created under the legislation without regard to pooling restrictions
- Cities or authorities may propose a joint development or adjacent developments and may expend up to 25% of the total revenue derived from TIF generated from a TIF District created under the legislation (measured over the life of the TIF District) to pay for the eligible expenditures of another TIF District created under this section and located outside the city's corporate limits