

**Saint Paul Planning Commission
City Hall Conference Center
15 Kellogg Boulevard West**

Minutes March 8, 2019

A meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Saint Paul was held Friday, March 8, 2019, at 8:30 a.m. in the Conference Center of City Hall.

Commissioners Present: Mmes. DeJoy, Grill, Lee, Mouacheupao, Reveal, Underwood; and Messrs. Baker, Lindeke, Oliver, Perryman, Rangel Morales, Risberg, and Vang.

Commissioners Absent: Ms. *Anderson, and Messrs. *Edgerton, Khaled, and *Ochs.

*Excused

Also Present: Luis Pereira, Planning Director; Peter Warner, City Attorney, Yaya Diatta and Tia Anderson, Department of Safety and Inspections, Lucy Thompson, Bill Dermody Mike Richardson, Menaka Mohan, Hannah Burchill, Alena DeGrado, and Sonja Butler, Department of Planning and Economic Development staff.

I. Approval of minutes February 8, 2019.

MOTION: *Commissioner Baker moved approval of the minutes of February 8, 2019. Commissioner Lindeke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.*

II. Chair's Announcements

Chair Reveal had no announcements.

III. Planning Director's Announcements

Announcing Commissioner Reappointments

Luis Pereira, Planning Director announced that at the February 13, 2019 City Council meeting they approved the Mayor's reappointments of Anne DeJoy, Kris Fredson, Taquee Khaled, Chong Lee, Adrian Perryman, and Jeff Risberg to the Planning Commission. Also, sad to say that they have received the resignation of Commissioner Kris Fredson who will be moving on to the Metropolitan Council. Unfortunately, a resolution was not prepared thanking him, but Luis Pereira wanted to express his thanks for Commissioner Fredson's service on the Planning Commission.

Chair Reveal added that this creates a vacancy on the Zoning Committee, so they will need someone else to agree to join the Zoning Committee. Which they need to act on very soon.

IV. Zoning Committee

SITE PLAN REVIEW – List of current applications. (*Tia Anderson, 651/266-9086*)

One item to come before the Site Plan Review Committee on Tuesday, March 12, 2019:

- Luther Seminary – Site work at 2481 Como Avenue. Paul Schroeder, SRF Consulting Group. SPR #19-015088

NEW BUSINESS

#19-009-992 Hazel Assisted Living – Conditional use permit to increase adult care home residents from 24 to 28. 1105 Hazel Street North, north of Magnolia Avenue. (*Bill Dermody, 651/266-6617*)

MOTION: *Commissioner DeJoy moved the Zoning Committee’s recommendation to approve the conditional use permit subject to an additional condition. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.*

#19-010-159 Charles Belcher/Pristine Motors – Nonconforming use permit to expand outdoor auto sales (14 “for sale” cars & 8 customer/employee parking spaces currently; 24 “for sale” cars * 5 customer/employee spaces proposed); and variances for maneuvering lane width (20’ required, 18’ proposed), curb cut location, and maximum % of compact parking spaces (50% allowed; 100% of customer/employee spaces proposed). 1265 Arcade Street, NW corner at Orange Avenue. (*Bill Dermody, 651/266-6617*)

Bill Dermody, PED staff clarified that one of the three variances is being recommended for approval by the Zoning Committee, which the applicant would need to have the drive aisle be less than 20 feet. The other two variances that are recommended for denial are moot points because the applicant is okay with them and has adjusted their site plan.

Chair Reveal asked which variance they are voting to approve.

Mr. Dermody said the maneuvering lane width variance to allow it to be 18 feet rather than 20 feet.

MOTION: *Commissioner DeJoy moved the Zoning Committee’s recommendation for denial of variances for curb cut location and maximum % of compact parking spaces, and approval of the nonconforming use permit and variance for maneuvering lane width with conditions. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.*

V. Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee

Ford Zoning & Public Realm Master Plan Amendments and Zoning Text Amendments – Recommendation for approval to the Planning Commission and forward to the Mayor and City Council to adopt amendments to the Ford Site Zoning and Master Plan and corresponding zoning code text and map amendments. (*Menaka Mohan, 651/266-6093*)

Chair Reveal said that in the Commissioners packets is all the information that needs to be acted on today. The last two pages of their packet is the resolution that will be voting on. And all of the actions are in one resolution, so they will be taking a single vote and they will be going through the amendments individually, to see if there are any questions or comments and identify ones which need to have new language considered. Staff put together a matrix that was handed out a separate document which is in their packet but the one in the packet has all the additional supporting information. The matrix includes 32 items that are in the resolution up for a recommendation.

Commissioner Mouacheupao will read each one and explain anything that needs to be explained then Chair Reveal will ask if anyone wants to speak on it. People will have a first opportunity then she will ask for a second then they will move on to the next item. There will not be an actual vote until the end.

Commissioner Mouacheupao will read each item and explain anything that needs to be explained then Chair Reveal will ask if anyone wants to speak on it. People will have a first opportunity then she will ask for a second then they will move on to the next item. There will not be an actual vote until the end.

Commissioner Mouacheupao said that the Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee have been meeting every week this month and all of the Commissioners are encouraged to attend, the next meeting will be Wednesday, March 13, 2019, 4:40-6:30 p.m. on the 13th Floor City Hall Annex.

Commissioner Mouacheupao said that after the public hearing on January 25th the record was kept open until Monday, January 28th. The Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee met on February 20th to review testimonies, staff responses and to make final recommendation to the Planning Commission. On February 22nd they met and had two presentations one from staff, and the other from the Ryan Companies about four specific amendments. Between Planning Commission and Committee meetings staff was working with Ryan Companies to negotiate and come to some agreement. Those four specific amendments staff and Ryan Companies were not able to negotiate on and Ryan Companies wanted staff to put more consideration into it, #2 (Lot split on Block 11), #13 (more non-residential parking), #16 (Fee in Lieu of parking) and #22 (Removal of Hillcrest Avenue). Staff went through each and every amendment to vote for approval or to discuss further, this meeting was extended for an additional 30 minutes. They got through it with a few requests to staff, for additional information at the February 27th meeting. They received the additional information and today's resolution reflects both of those meetings and the recommendations by the Committee.

Commissioner Mouacheupao said they have the amendments here, there are 32 of the 110, there are four columns; the description of the amendments, the Ryan Companies concerns yes, no if they have agreed with the negotiations, or if they still have concerns about it. There are only 3 yeses which means they still have concerns. Next column is what the committee is recommending, they're mostly recommendations, a few no recommendation, and notes if there were revisions recommended by the Committee.

Commissioner Mouacheupao made a motion to approve this, and if Planning Commissioners would like to discuss one of the amendments then we would do that.

Chair Reveal said that the resolution reflects the third column, and the Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee recommendation is what's currently in the resolution. If there is anything that they disagree with in the Committee recommendations that would be taken up separately. Going down the list of amendments.

Chair Reveal said amendment #1 allows Single Family Homes in the F-1. Does anyone want to speak on this?

Commissioner Lindeke said that he supports the Committee's recommendation and he pointed out that during the public hearing testimony, the original Master Plan and zoning was put into place affordability and equity were strong parts of the plan originally. He thinks that this recommendation that the Committee made supports that. He is pleased to see that.

Commissioner Baker requested some insight into the conversations from Committee members on why there was a recommendation not to recommend.

Commissioner Mouacheupao said that there was consensus on the Committee that wanted to see more density particularly more density near the river and allowing for single-family homes did not align with that.

Menaka Mohan, PED staff, clarified that Ryan's amendment is not just only single-family homes in the F1 district, but lowering that density range to also allow single family homes. But the density still remains at 6-units for F1.

Commissioner Baker said there was a lot of concerns from public comment about, if this did not happen then there could be concerns about the project moving forward and it sounded like there was a remedy to this and they could still move forward with the project. But he does not know that to be true, he does not know exactly where Ryan Companies falls on that?

Chair Reveal flagged amendment #1 and at the end they will come back to that to see if anyone wants to propose an alternative to the Committee's recommendation. The Committee's recommendation is to leave it as is in the current master plan.

Chair Reveal continued and said that amendment #2 if they choose to leave as is in #1, then the Committee is recommending that #2 be approved. Anyone wish to speak on #2?

#3 is amend the minimum FAR to 1.0 from 2.0 and minimum height to 30 feet from 40 feet. (For the F3 district only). Anyone wish to speak on #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, #12, #13, #14a, #14b?

Menaka Mohan, PED staff, said regarding 14b, at the Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee meeting on February 27th, PED staff came back to offer new language on the section in the master plan that deals with structured parking. The intent around the language in the master plan is when building a parking structure, it should be designed with level parking floors, so that in the future that the ramp could be reused for something else, maybe office space or potentially housing. The idea being that in the future there may be less need for cars, and having structured parking have an adaptive reuse could be something that is desirable. Ryan requested changes to this language, instead of must where practical, staff initially had

recommended revised language that would require cost benefit analysis when Ryan would submit their plans.

Staff revised the language again from the meeting on the 27th to match what is actually in the code. And the language in the staff report did not fully match the definitions in the Zoning code, but the language in the handout given out this morning is the revised language. “Above-ground structured parking should be designed with level parking floors and adequate floor to ceiling clearance height to allow the space to be converted to finished floor area if parking is no longer needed in the future and such design is determined cost-effective.” Staff consulted with Ryan Companies to see if that language was acceptable to them and they said yes, it is. It is a compromise on achieving the goal of level parking floors in structured parking but also allowing the flexibility given the cost to build these types of structures.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said that at the Committee meeting two weeks ago they had a long discussion about what the purpose of 14b was. And there was a question about where they see the Ford site in 20 years when it is actually developed, what is currently being proposed, what Ryan wants to do is be able to build ramps that are not level and what staff have informed us is that the City of Minneapolis conducted a study which the City of Minneapolis determined that transforming those ramps into level parking to be able to use the ramps in another use was too costly and it was more efficient to tear it down and rebuild up.

Ms. Mohan said that it's around the building of new ramps to convert them when building them new to make the floors level. And Ryan did not say in their amendment that they do not want to build them, but that where practical they would try to achieve in new structures level floors, but they should not be subject to the “must” statement that is in the current master plan. Ryan is not saying that they wouldn't try, the language that they offered is practical.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said if the goal of the City is to do away with and encourage transit, bike riding, and pedestrians and we see that as the future then this additional language that is being proposed. He thinks of this as vague, “is determined to be cost effective” he does not know who is making that determination, Ryan, the City? And what does cost-effective mean? What's the percentage in which is determined that the cut-off is? Also, 14a -what Ryan is proposing is what the current plan says, any parking would have level floors would have to be commercial – is that correct on the current proposed master plan?

Ms. Mohan replied it would have to be an active use.

Commissioner Rangel Morales and what Ryan is proposing is to be able to have at least 50% of the floor be active use and the other can be a ramp. What the City then proposed is as long as it's not on a main street and its off to the side at the corner, that would be effective. In their deliberation previously, Ryan had provided to staff an example of the Whole Foods development to illustrate how this could possibly look. For those of you familiar with the area, there is the Whole Foods in the corner with the parking ramp running around Selby in the back. That is a situation which 14a is a good illustration for what they foresee doing. That to him is counter intuitive to what this plan is supposed to be. When he goes into that area, when walking on Selby west, and Whole Foods is on the right and all those developments on the left, the left is what they should be trying to get to. Where there are commercial buildings all alongside small businesses and on the right is Whole Foods and their parking lot, but he does not see people using that, it's

not very walkable. Commissioner Rangel Morales does not agree with the amendment on 14a and the language with 14b he also disagrees with.

Chair Reveal stated that she is flagging those and when they get through the list they will come back and consider alternatives on these items. And the resolution if they pass an alternative would then be amended before the vote. Continuing Chair Reveal anyone wish to speak on #15, #16, #17, #18, #19.

Commissioner Rangel Morales questioned #19, asking if there was an area on the site in which they foresee having an employer that has 150 or more employees. Because what Ryan talked about is a lot of retailers and he is not sure if those type of businesses have more than 150 employees. He not sure if effectively making it 150 employees were essentially cutting out that requirement overall.

Ms. Mohan can't speak to the number of employees or if Ryan would be able to speak to that given that right now it's only a use classification, like office or other type of employment use. When staff was researching this the way cities do these requirements, it varied. A lot of cities do this by the square footage of the building and not by the number of employees. They as staff relied on language that Ryan provided given their expertise in certain use projects.

Chair Reveal flagged #19 as well. Continuing to #20, #21.

Commissioner Lindeke asked to have #21 flagged for discussion about changing what the resolution says talking about exploring east west connections. And also flag #22.

Chair Reveal continued #23, #24, #25, #26, #27, #28, #29, #30, #31, and #32. Commissioner Lindeke asked to flag #24. Now back to #1, anyone wish to make an alternative recommendation.

Commissioner Baker wants to ensure that they have a short discussion or at least an explanation from staff or others around the concerns that were heard from public comment concerning if these amendments do not move forward then that could put the project in jeopardy. In certain instances, staff is going opposite direction of what Ryan is recommending and he at least wants it on the table for discussion.

Chair Reveal short version, does staff believe there is any indication that Ryan will not continue with the project if any of these fails.

Ms. Mohan said that she is not sure that they can speak to that, Ryan has to determine on their own if these amendments would jeopardize their project. The staff view on the application itself was how the amendments related to the master plan and the vision of the master plan, not whether Ryan would walk away or not walk away from the project. That is the view point that staff took in their analysis.

Commissioner Lindeke reminded Commissioner Baker that during the public hearing testimony Commissioner Fredson asked Mr. Ryan about this whether it was an economic necessity that this single-family zoning be in place, and he said no. So, this should not be a primary concern at this point.

Chair Reveal asked if anyone is proposing alternative action? If not, the resolution will stand as it is, which is to not recommend the change that has been requested.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said that if #1 is approved then #2 is also approved. He wants to speak to that.

Chair Reveal said that is what the resolution does now.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said regarding #2, there is at the corner of the development on the upper north west side, there is a block which they are seeking to convert and allow lower development, that is what #2 would be allowing. He thinks that goes to what they are trying to do. It was conditional recommendation because it was a split vote at Committee level. The map on page 8 there is an arrow on that map. Page 8 references what Ryan was trying to do and what the Ryan Companies was trying to make the entire referenced a block into an F1 district that would allow duplexes, or higher up to 6 units. The recommendation from staff was instead of the entire block F1, it would be divided into two, so that would allow F1 in the front facing the river and the west portion staying at F2. And generally, what the city is trying to do is more density, more development, and lot more people access to the river and there is no need to change that to F1 anywhere in the block, that was what the whole debate was about at Committee level.

Commissioner Rangel Morales made a motion to deny the Ryan Companies recommendation and keep it as the master plan has it. Commissioner Lindeke seconded the motion. The motion carried on a 11-1 (Oliver) hand raised vote.

Chair Reveal said that changes #2 to not recommend. Moving on to number 14 a & b.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said for the reasons that he articulated earlier.

Commissioner Rangel Morales made a motion to deny #14 a & b and keep it as the master plan currently has it written. Chair Reveal asked for a second to the motion. Hearing no second the motion failed.

Chair Reveal continued to #19.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said when he reviews and looks at the amendments as a whole with the parking requirements, taking away the showers, there was a thing about bicycles at #15. He asked himself: Are we building this model for development that would work in today's time or a model that would work in 20-years' time? And with regards to the structured parking, with regards to the shower requirement those are all situations that we need to be thinking for the future not for today. Because these developments are not going to occur in the next couple of years and he does not know what the appropriate requirement is for showers but does not foresee many businesses there with over 150 employees. And if that is the case then they are essentially taking away that requirement and that incentive whereas 50 employees seem like a more doable a more likely foreseeable outcome of what's going to occur on that site. Staff does not know that he does not know that, but it is planning towards the future. The idea of having showers in the work place seems odd today but it might not in 10-15 years.

Commissioner Rangel Morales made a motion to deny the shower requirement of 1 shower per 150 employees to 1 per 50 employees. Commissioner Lindeke seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lindeke wanted to know what the employee requirement for the City is to require Travel Demand Management Plan. If there is a larger employer in the City they are asked to do things like provide bike parking, or shower facilities once they reach a certain threshold in size. Which is where he suggests this number should be, its better to ask for 100 employees as the number as a compromise that fits with City policy in general. Commissioner Lindeke suggested a friendly amendment changing the number to 100 instead of 150.

Chair Reveal said the current motion on the table is to deny the recommendation.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said that he will accept the friendly amendment of changing the number to 100.

Chair Reveal said the motion is to change it to 100 instead of 150.

Commissioner Baker wanted confirmation that about the policy of 100 employees before the vote.

Mike Richardson, PED staff, said he believes its related to the number of parking stalls required. In the zoning code it is 100 parking spaces, which determines that.

Chair Reveal again said that the motion is to change the number of employees to 100, she asked all in favor raise your hand, all opposed. The motion passes 8-5 hand raised vote. Continuing on to #21.

Commissioner Lindeke said that it is important to have redundancy and access to and from the interior of this site. Streets like Saint Paul Avenue and surrounding transportation network, and he would like to amend the resolution changing it to say, “explore the removal of Saunders Avenue and continue to explore east-west connections to the site,” instead of conditionally approve the removal of Saunders Avenue. Having more than one way in and out of the site is important for emergency situations or traffic situations if they do plan transit for the site.

Commissioner Lindeke made a motion to amend the resolution taking out conditionally approve the removal of Saunders Avenue to say, “explore the removal of Saunders Avenue.” Commissioner Underwood seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mouacheupao said the resolution should reflect what is on the matrix, which says what Commissioner Lindeke’ s motion is. So, the change needs to be made on the resolution to reflect what is in the matrix.

Commissioner Underwood moved to change on #21 from conditionally approved to conditionally explore. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. Chair Reveal asked if everyone is okay with that; the response was a unanimous yes.

Chair Reveal continued to #22, #24.

Commissioner Lindeke said he wants to amend #24 to change the language “adequate facilities to high quality facilities” for bicycles and pedestrians.

Chair Reveal said that's a friendly amendment, is everyone okay with that? The Commission's response was yes, they are okay with the friendly amendment.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said that during the Committee meeting they received a matrix and with regards to #17, in the matrix received at Committee level is different than what is being proposed. At Committee he does not think that they voted on what is being proposed today.

Menaka Mohan, PED staff, said that it is, she provided more clarity into the matrix. It is actually in the staff memo there is the recommendation from the original staff report that has this new requirement. This is for the car sharing. The resolution is correct.

Commissioner Rangel Morales would like to know what the current master plan says and how the recommendation is different.

Ms. Mohan said that the current master plan shows it by the number of parking spaces required in the structure, she believes its one car share space for every 20 parking spaces. Generally, when looking at other zoning codes they do it by the number of residential units so that is how they determine the demand for car share. And staff switched the requirement to be based on the number of residential units.

Commissioner Rangel Morales questioned if it ends up accomplishing the same number.

Ms. Mohan replied that it is hard to tell, because they do not have exact site plans now, and this is for the master plan and overall development. And it achieves the goal of getting a car share space.

Chair Reveal the resolution is on the table for vote. And there is a change for #2.

Ms. Mohan said the correct wording for the change in #2 is: Do not amend Block 11 to F1 zoning from F2.

Chair Reveal said there is a change in wording for #21 that would have the word explore substitute for approve. #24 to provide high quality substitute for adequate. Are there any other changes?

Ms. Mohan said yes, #14 would read: amend the structured parking requirement. #14 would switch to the language on the matrix 14a and 14b as it is currently written.

Mr. Richardson noted that not in the resolution, there would be some language changes to the resolution based on what has been handed out.

Ms. Mohan read the correct language for #14, amend the structured parking requirement that above-ground structured parking should be designed with level parking floors and adequate floor-to-ceiling clearance height to allow the space to be converted to finished floor area if parking is no longer needed in the future and such design is determined cost-effective.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said the resolution for #17 reads differently than what was voted on at the Committee level. "Revised language as follows: Amend or remove the car-share parking requirement (based on the number of residential units and stalls in non-residential areas)

via a future amendment submitted within 10 years” so it sounds like what was voted at Committee level which was “to allow a future amendment. Whereas what they are currently voting on is to actually permit the residential units as opposed to the parking stalls.

Ms. Mohan stated that the way it would work in the code is, they would put this requirement in now. The challenge that Ryan brought up in their application to the City is there is not a car-share operator existing now in the Twin Cities area and to require a car-share space when there is not a clear operator, Ryan has challenges with that. And the language here provides the requirement and then if there is not car-share operator the idea is that an amendment could be submitted in the future that would remove the requirement. The idea was to allow flexibility if there is not a car-share operator in the Twin Cities. And what is being switched to now is the table, so what’s in the master plan now is that there is a car-share space required for 1 every 20 spaces and would be replaced with this table.

Commissioner Underwood said that the language about potential future amendments is below the grid in the resolution.

Commissioner Rangel Morales said what was voted on at Committee level was it would be amended to the residential units via an amendment. And what he is realizing now is what that actually translates in terms of number of parking stalls. He’s not sure if they are doing something similar as the shower requirement or drastically reducing it or if it ends up being 2 for 2. He does not believe that staff has that answer, it took him by surprise that its not what they had discussed that was his point.

Ms. Mohan said its not drastically reducing it so the number of car-share spaces for residential is based on the number of units that are built for residential. If you build less than 50 units no car-share space would be required but if you build 50-100 one would be required, and they took these from other city codes that require them. Those cities also don’t know when projects are coming in how many residential units there will be, that is why they do these tables.

Commissioner Baker added that there was a change to #19 from 150 to 100.

Ms. Mohan replied yes, a change from 150 to 100.

MOTION: Commissioner Mouacheupao moved to approve the amended resolution and the Ford Site Zoning and Master Plan and corresponding zoning code text and map amendments forwarding to the Mayor and City Council for adoption. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

Commissioner Mouacheupao announced the item on the agenda at the next Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee meeting on Wednesday, March 13, 2019.

VI. Transportation Committee

Commissioner Lindeke announced that at their last meeting they heard from the City’s Parks Department about transportation improvements at Phalen Park which is some trail adjustments and larger parking lots over by Lake Phalen. Also, Ramsey County talked about Cleveland Avenue, Como north to the City border on Larpenteur by the University of Minnesota campus. They talked about different plans that they could put in that street to add bike infrastructure in and

how they would impact trees and there are a lot of different options. And at their next meeting on Monday, March 11, 2019, they are going to recommend one of the choices to Ramsey County. They will also talk about Como Lexington pedestrian crossing with Parks & Recreation, and more mill & overlays and how the city will work with that.

VII. Communications Committee

Planning Director's report on achievements during 2018 and work priorities for 2019.

Luis Pereira, Planning Director said that a sheet was distributed to the Commissioners, a memo consisting of several pages that includes the 2018 Planning Team Accomplishments, some of these items were in the 2018 Annual Report for the Planning Commission. The difference is these items on this list that staff were involved with, that maybe did not come to the Planning Commission. There is a star at the end of each item that did come to the Planning Commission. That is a report on accomplishments both from the Planning Team and on the other side of the sheet the Heritage Preservation Team which is part of a broader planning team for the City. On the third page is the 2019 Planning Team Work Program, under the heading "Transportation/Public Systems," staff has been busy finalizing the Transportation Management Plan for Allianz Field and getting to a conclusion moving that out into the community so that people understand what that entails. The idea is as games begin in April at the stadium what public input can they be receiving to update that plan. Note they don't know for certain how things are going to turn out, but they have assumptions based on other sports facilities and how transportation worked in those situations.

The Riverview Transit Corridor this year the station area planning process will be kicking off they will be coming to the Planning Commission looking for one co-chair if not two for a Station Area Planning Committee and a Community Advisory Committee. Under the heading "Neighborhood and Site/Redevelopment Planning," the Ford Site project continues to have lots of different dimensions. The Alternative Urban Area Wide Review process will be underway soon, which is a document that is the City's the City of Saint Paul is the responsible government unit and they have some requirements to review comments on an order and the final AUAR document to accept that. They did hear from Dr. Corrie about Cultural Destinations Areas and the Planning Team and the broader PED Team is very busy working with community groups on that to develop that initiative. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan is coming forth and the Citywide Parking Code Standards update Tony Johnson has been busy on, that will be coming to the Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee in the future sometime this year. Under "Other Major Projects," the HUD Consolidated Plan is something that as an entitlement community the City of Saint Paul has to provide a planning document per a template to HUD that US Department of Housing and Urban Development requires for CDBG and HOME federal dollars. What are the needs in the community and how are they going to propose to use those dollars over the next 5-years, that is something that has to be completed this year and submitted to HUD.

A few more items under "Other Major Projects" category, there is an effort now with the Mayor's Office to get community input on the Climate Adaption and Resiliency Plan. Which is something that planning staff and some students from Humphrey have been supporting Chief Resiliency officers Stark on and there will be some events in the community around that to hear from people, talk about the document and make that more real. In terms of in house the work of Bob Spaulding and other people in PED are trying to get a better handle on the data systems. We have

a variety of data bases many that are manual in Excel which is not a best practice for an organization, we are trying to modernize our systems and there will be a lot of work associated with that. That should facilitate things such as developing indicators around things like equity, concerns around how the Planning Team is doing as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan and the City as a whole. A lot of that requires good systems and systems that we can go to periodically to get updates to get the right data needed to do the work.

Commissioner Baker said the Cultural Destinations Areas and Neighborhood Nodes do not need to be a full-blown presentation, but he would like to know the progress of that. Maybe through an email, the Chair or something like that, it would be helpful just to know how things are going. And when there are updates it would be good to know about the Rondo Land Bridge feasibility. There was a presentation at the Planning Commission earlier and there is a lot of work that needs to go into that but where are they at? Lastly, planning for equity specifically developing indicators and showing progress about how we're doing. He would like to bring that before the Commission if possible, so they can have conversations about that and provide input and think through if they are not meeting certain goals how to move forward.

Mr. Pereira said that part of what he wanted to talk about at the retreat in May is the indicators, at least share what they have at they point. Something that they are beginning to develop with the team, he has had several meetings since the beginning of the year. Part of what he is trying to do is align what the Mayor's Administration is looking for, what the department is doing and what the team is doing. There is some alignment that has to happen, but also determining what are those base line indicators that they really want to track. And equity is a key lens that they are looking at.

Commissioner Perryman asked if this was available on the web site.

Mr. Pereira said today not yet, but it can be.

Commissioner Perryman wanted to know if it was possible to have something like hyperlink?

Mr. Pereira said that is something they can look into.

Commissioner Mouacheupao encourages the City to think about disaggregated data collection. There is legislation that passed in education that could be a model in terms of how you disaggregate, what are the key, particularly as it related to culture and ethnicity. There are models available and it's important to think about that in the beginning while the system is being developed versus trying to do that later.

Chair Reveal suggests having Bob Spaulding back to give an update on Market Watch or go through what the status of the databases are, and what's accessible and what is not.

Commissioner Grill said regarding data management governance, that is her job, so she will be asking a lot of questions, and she knows there is an open data site, but she is wondering if they are planning on using that to start and communicate some of this stuff.

Mr. Pereira said that the open data site is a city-wide enterprise system through OTC – Office of Technology and Communications, we need to develop the indicators first then we need to figure out how to get those out. His priority has been to actually develop the indicator, that is not

something that they have had in the past. It's something new and it's a new work item so there is significant work associated with it. Mr. Pereira said these are things that he has talked with on the team as well as other people in the department work that has floated down to the team as a priority.

Commissioner Grill said that when pulling things in and translating them into Excel and doing all that work it's good to know on the front end that it's something being thought about. So, if talking with the Office of Technology about this to talk about what needs to be done for requirements, because it might save some time.

Commissioner DeJoy said under the Neighborhood and Site/Redevelopment Planning the bullet for Districts 2,5,7,8,9,12,15,16, & 17 does that mean they have already done the updates to their neighborhood plans or district plans?

Mr. Pereira said those are districts that staff is aware that the community has talked about an update all the way to a draft that staff has begun to review and give them comments back on. They're not driven by the City but by the community in getting that draft in to begin that review process. The district plans are plans that the community spearheads and the city brings that through city staff review, PED staff facilitates the review across the different departments, what comments does the City have and that informs the plan before its finalized.

Commissioner DeJoy said at one point there was a Payne Avenue Zoning Study in the pipeline. Is that still on the list?

Mr. Pereira said that it is on the list, just not on the list for this year. Realistically there were certain things they had to table for next year and that is on the 2020 list.

VIII. Task Force/Liaison Reports

No report.

IX. Old Business

None.

X. New Business

None.

XI. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Recorded and prepared by
Sonja Butler, Planning Commission Secretary

Planning and Economic Development Department,
City of Saint Paul

Respectfully submitted,



Luis Pereira
Planning Director

Approved April 19, 2019
(Date)



Lue Vang
Secretary of the Planning Commission