DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 21st, 2017

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hayman called the Committee to order at 10:05 a.m. at the District Offices,

15320 Minnetonka Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55345

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Marvin Johnson, Patty Acomb, Sliv Carlson, and Terri Yearwood.

OTHERS PRESENT

James Wisker, Director of Planning & Projects
Lars Erdahl, District Administrator
Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant
Mike Hayman, Planner & Project Manager
Sherry Davis White, MCWD Board President

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 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. Johnson asked if carp were causing water resource issues throughout the watershed.

Mr. Wisker responded that carp can be found throughout the watershed. He noted that eliminating the species would be incredibly difficult, but added that keeping the carp population low through targeted management can help to benefit water quality and ecological integrity.

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. 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.

Ms. Acomb asked if District staff had yet begun to meet with LGU staff to coordinate
investments.

Mr. Hayman noted that while the District still meets annually with its communities, the District
and LGU staff from most of the cities and agencies have not yet identified a more frequent
meeting schedule.

Mr. Wisker noted that some LGUs’ staff will not wish to meet with the District more frequently
than they already do.

Ms. Acomb observed that the District is promoting coordination between governmental units as
is intended by the Board of Water and Soil Resources’ (BWSR) One Watershed, One Plan
approach (1W1P).

Mr. Wisker agreed with Ms. Acomb, noting that the District’s subwatershed plans serve as the
basic unit for watershed planning in the MCWD.

Mr. Wisker noted that city and agency staff have already reviewed the District’s draft LGU
section language. He encouraged the Committee members to read the LGU section and relevant
subwatershed plans themselves, and provide comment during the 60-day comment period after
the District publishes its draft plan. Mr. Wisker underscored that through coordination, as
recommended in the LGU section, the District is seeking the answers to two questions from
LGUs:

- What actions are LGUs taking in each subwatershed?
- How does each LGU want the District to participate in LGU action and add value?

Mr. Wisker stated that LGU staff from most District communities, after reviewing the draft LGU
section language, have already sent in letters of support for the approach of the District’s plan.
He noted that some LGU staff recommended beginning coordination on city local water plan
requirements in June or July of 2017, before the District formally adopts its Comprehensive Plan,
in order to align with city timelines for the development of their own Comprehensive Plans.

Mr. Hayman stated that the District expects to release the draft plan for the initial 60-day
comment period in late April.
Mr. Wisker noted that the District would include the PAC and TAC members on the distribution list for the draft plan, as well as city mayors and administrators.

The Committee meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Cook
Planning Assistant