CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hayman called the Committee to order at 1:35 p.m. at the District Offices,
15320 Minnetonka Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55345

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Bean, Cara Geheren, Derek Asche, Erick Francis, Jen Kostrzewski, Jennie Skancke, Jessica
Wilson, Kristin Larson, Liz Stout, Mike Kelly, Rich Brasch, Ross Bintner, Scott Johnson, and
Tom Dietrich.

OTHERS PRESENT

Chris LaBounty, WSB
James Wisker, Director of Planning & Projects
Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant
Mike Hayman, Planner & Project Manager
Stephanie Hatten, WSB

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved without amendment.

COMMITTEE MEETING

Introduction and Background

Mr. Hayman provided a brief background of the District’s approach for the 2017 Comprehensive
Plan, noting the overall intent of improving the District’s implementation model. He explained
that the District is guided by the principles of partnership, focus, and flexibility as the District
seeks to integrate water resource protection and enhancement with land use. Mr. Hayman stated
that the District’s 2017 Plan contains the following themes:

2017 MCWD Comprehensive Plan Themes

- Improving effectiveness and service delivery
- Recognizing the social and economic value of water
- Creating synergy between the natural and built environments
• Enhancing how the District and partner communities work together to advance each other’s goals

Mr. Hayman noted that the District’s Comprehensive Plan serves as a resource for multiple audiences – the District’s own staff and Board, District community partners, and state review agencies. He explained that the structure of the District’s 2007 Comprehensive Plan did not meet the needs of the different audiences, as the information contained in the plan was heavily interwoven. Mr. Hayman explained that in order to improve the readability of the plan for each of these audiences, the District’s 2017 Comprehensive Plan will have a more modular structure.

Mr. Hayman stated that the District’s 2017 Comprehensive Plan will be structured to contain three volumes:

2017 MCWD Comprehensive Plan Structure
• Volume I – Executive Summary
• Volume II – Data and Inventory
• Volume III – Implementation Plan

Mr. Hayman explained that Volume I will serve as a standalone summary document, potentially used to brief new partners on the District’s evolution, new approach to watershed management, and value proposition.

Mr. Hayman stated that Volume II will serve as the central location for technical information for the District’s plan. He noted that this is a departure from the format of the MCWD’s 2007 Comprehensive Plan, in which the technical information was spread throughout the plan. Mr. Hayman explained that the District has opted to consolidate the inventory of resources and data into one, standalone section. He underscored that this would improve the readability and usability of the other plan sections – especially the Implementation section – and make the District’s data and analyses more accessible.

Mr. Hayman noted that the District will treat Volume II as a living document, updating the data and resource inventory as new studies and analyses are conducted. He added that the Volume is largely organized by subwatershed.

Mr. Hayman stated that the Implementation Plan – Volume III – describes how the District will act to achieve its mission and vision. He noted that key parts of Volume III would be discussed further during the meeting, particularly the subwatershed implementation plans, the local government unit (LGU) section, and the capital improvement program.

Subwatershed Plans

Mr. Hayman stated that the District intends the subwatershed plans to be user-friendly, with a length of 10-15 pages per subwatershed. He explained that each of the subwatershed plans will be customized to contain a stepped approach, moving from the District’s regional approach down
through the more specific “opportunity area” scale. Mr. Hayman outlined the basic structure of the subwatershed plans as follows:

**Subwatershed Plan Structure**

- Introduction
- Regional water frame
- Regional land use frame
- Local priorities, plans, and opportunities
- Implementation plan

**Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Framework**

Mr. Hayman noted that the District’s approach to its CIP has changed since the formation of the CIP for the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. He explained that in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan, the District’s CIP will be tailored to fit each subwatershed and will be flexible enough for the District to align optimal natural resource protections with partner investments.

Mr. Hayman stated that the draft framework for the District’s Capital Improvement Program outlines four categories of potential capital projects:

- Individual Projects
- Strategy Projects
- Opportunity Projects
- Plan Forward Approach

Mr. Hayman described what information would be identified in each of the categories as follows:

- Individual Projects
  - List of known project opportunities 1-5 years out; include estimated date, location, cost, etc.
  - Some flexibility is provided through the annual updating and publishing of the CIP.

- Strategy Projects
  - Identifies capital project strategies for natural resource protection and improvement.
  - Defined by the issues addressed, approach used, and general location type (e.g. wetland, shoreland, etc.).
  - Overall estimated spending cap identified per strategy, per subwatershed (e.g. the MCWD may spend up to $X million on stormwater management in the ____ subwatershed).
  - Structure based on BWSR-approved 2013 Minnehaha Creek subwatershed plan amendment, items 5.8.2 and 5.8.5.
Opportunity Projects
- Cost share funds to address partner-led capital project opportunities; allows flexible contribution to partner investments of interest to the District.
- Because projects are created by an external party, the criteria for committing “Opportunity Projects” funds are the goals and objectives set forth in the District’s Comprehensive Plan.
- Resembles a non-capital program of a capital nature.

Plan Forward Approach
- Where applicable, the District will cooperatively develop project opportunities with partners.
- The MCWD Board sets priorities and the District’s level of involvement, from participation in cooperative planning efforts to leading such efforts.
- The Plan Forward Approach would result in a list of known projects and an investment strategy, and would be formally amended into the District’s Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Wisker stated that under the structure of the District’s 2017 Comprehensive Plan, the District is seeking to regularly publish a CIP with a two- to five-year outlook. He noted that this mirrors how most municipalities manage their CIPs.

Partnership Framework: LGU Section

Mr. Hayman explained that the Partnership Framework generally outlines how the District and communities will communicate with each other to identify opportunities for project or program collaboration. He stated that the requirements and recommendations for LGUs are found within the Partnership Framework. Mr. Hayman underscored that the LGU section is not a lengthy list of required actions for cities. He noted that the District recommends that each LGU identify how best they can coordinate and communicate with the District to pinpoint opportunities for partnership.

Mr. Wisker emphasized that the District hopes to coordinate with its partner communities at an early stage in the processes for policy and plan generation, capital investments, and development projects. He explained that when communities communicate with the District at an early stage, the District is more able to add value to the policy, plan, project, or development. Mr. Wisker underscored that the District is looking to its communities to identify how they can best coordinate with the District.

Mr. Hayman stated that because the state is requiring load reductions, the District will not include its own TMDLs or any additional load reduction requirements in the 2017 Plan. He noted that the District must still list certain LGU requirements in its plan to meet state statute.

Mr. Wisker stated that the District defers to each LGU to determine the level of coordination between said LGU and the District.
Mr. Asche asked if LGUs could incorporate updates to Local Water Management Plans via reference, as LGUs would rather not constantly manually update the plan.

Mr. Wisker stated that cities could incorporate requirements outlined in the District’s Plan by reference in their own plans. He underscored that the District hopes to be the easiest watershed organization to do business with.

Mr. Asche asked if the District had sufficient capacity to truly tailor the District’s approach for each city.

Mr. Wisker responded that the District should be able to accommodate differing levels of coordination with each city. He explained that some cities may not be interested in coordinating heavily with the District, and that would likely translate to fewer instances of collaboration between one such city and the District. Mr. Wisker noted that the District’s time commitments to those cities would likely be lower as a result of such a mutual understanding.

Mr. Wisker underscored that the District is hoping to streamline routine business between cities and the District – such as permitting coordination – in order to spend more time aligning city and District investments through collaboration.

Mr. Wisker stated that the language of the Partnership Framework was not to mandate watershed goals for city plans, but to invite cities to align with watershed goals.

Mr. Hayman stated that the District can provide a number of services as a project or program partner:

- Technical assistance
- Education assistance (especially to meet MS4 requirements)
- Joint grant application
- Information dissemination (models, studies, etc.)

Mr. Hayman noted that the District was not requiring any new reporting in the LGU section beyond standard annual reporting.

Mr. Hayman invited the Committee members to provide comments to District staff regarding the District’s draft plan language, especially for the District’s CIP structure and LGU requirements.

He listed the upcoming milestones for the District’s 2017 Comprehensive Plan process:

- The Policy Advisory Committee would meet on March 21st to discuss the District’s draft CIP and Partnership Framework
- The District’s draft 2017 Comprehensive Plan would be distributed for a 60-day review and comment period in late April or early May
- Following the 60-day comment period, the District board and staff would review comments, revise the Plan, and host a public hearing.
- The District would then distribute the Plan for a final 90-day review period in September.
• Once approved by BWSR, the District will adopt the Plan in November or December of 2017.

Mr. Wisker noted that District staff hoped to receive all comments by March 15th. The Committee members generally confirmed that this timeline was reasonable.

Mr. Bean asked when the District’s annual meetings with cities would begin.

Mr. Hayman asked the Committee when they would like the meetings to begin.

Mr. Bean suggested that the meetings begin sooner rather than later, perhaps in the fall of 2017. He explained that as long as the LGU requirements largely remain the same as proposed, it would be in the best interest of both the District and for city staff who are currently updating their cities’ Comprehensive Plans to meet soon and ensure that the city and District water management plans are aligned.

Ms. Geheren echoed this sentiment, encouraging the District to begin the annual meetings prior to the formal adoption of the District’s 2017 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Skancke suggested that District staff plan to meet with city staff immediately to address any issues not raised at the Committee meeting.

Mr. Wisker stated that the District had offered to meet with individual city planning staff or city councils, but only a few city staff had requested visits thus far.

The Committee meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Cook
Planning Assistant