



SWOT Exercise Summary

Result from AP Meeting #1, Wednesday, May 26

| Strengths | Weaknesses | Opportunities | Threats |
|--|--|---|---|
| Proximity to Metro Area (Saint Paul/Minneapolis) for access to healthcare, culture, jobs, etc. (4) | Inadequate infrastructure (facilities, public works, water and sewer, fire and safety, etc.) (3) | Growth [development potential] – leverage the natural resources, access to big cities, parks and trails and open land (6) | Council adverse to local business/commercial development (based upon history) (4) |
| Small town charm, historic and rural character (3) | Need to define the community's identity (3) | Technology (e.g. cell phone access, city services online) (3) | Overdevelopment (and density) of residential and commercial uses overall (also along I94) (2) |
| Old Village area with small businesses, local loyalty (some cities do not have)(2) | Citizens are divided: Pro-development or no development (2) | Controlled development (1) | Un-diverse economically and housing pricing (concern about housing for family members and homes affordable for people [family members] 20-35) (2) |
| Open space, natural areas, trails, etc. (1) | City staff instability [turn over] (2) | Development of a strong city center that becomes a destination for community gatherings and better business opportunities (1) | Reputation [potentially poor, given law suit with the Met Council] (1) |
| Community engagement | Desire for more business development than residential (1) | Community loyalty, leverage small business inputs (1) | Excessive taxation (1) |
| Socially tolerant, active, civic minded and educated, high income community | History of the city being short-sighted on political issues (1) | Improve infrastructure | Maintain businesses [existing businesses like Hagbergs or the Lake Elmo Inn going out of business] (1) |
| Natural resources (Parks) recreation | Inadequate mass transit and bus stops | Improve bike trails | Fire and safety |
| Land available for development | Tension with the City Council and Met Council | Maximize access to 36 and 94 | Bond rating |
| City is frugal | City is too cheap and does not invest when it is needed, worry about | Improved upon the charm of the Old Village – shops, | Uniformed residents, need for updated technology |



| Strengths | Weaknesses | Opportunities | Threats |
|--|--|--|---|
| | stagnating [example of city facilities] | recreation and improved administrative buildings | |
| Low crime, good schools | Critical need for public safety assessment. | Expansion of local parks (like Reid) given adjoining land availability and land available to connect bike trails to gateway trails | Big cities encroaching upon Lake Elmo (e.g. annexation) |
| Good mayor who listens and interacts with residents. | Lack of bike trail connections to schools and businesses | | Loss of the charming landscape due to development will take away the reason people were initially attracted to the area |