MCWD Comprehensive Plan Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting #3
December 16, 2015
Agenda

- Integration of land-use and water planning:
  - Connection of land-use and water
  - Historic disconnect
  - MCWD efforts to integrate

- Two-track approach
  - Purpose
  - Overview of 2 tracks
  - Examples

- Committee discussion
BALANCED URBAN ECOLOGY:
THE EVOLUTION OF
MCWD POLICY

Bridging the Land-use
Water Governance Gap
OUTLINE:

1. Where did watershed districts come from?

2. Pitfalls of the MN watershed management framework.

3. Minnehaha Creek Watershed District’s evolution in policy and planning.
WHY WATERSHED DISTRICTS?
LAND-USE AND WATER
UPSTREAM - DOWNSTREAM NEIGHBORS
POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST
MINNESOTA WATERSHED ACT
“To conserve the natural resources of the state by land-use planning, flood control, and other conservation projects by using sound scientific principles for the protection of the public health and welfare”
PITFALLS OF WATERSHED FRAMEWORK: UNINTENTIONAL SILOS?

SILOS DON’T COME DOWN, THEY JUST AGE.
A CALL FOR INTEGRATED PLANNING!

2007 Evaluation Report on Watershed Management (Legislative Auditor)

2009 Land and Water Policy Project (MEI)

2011 Water Governance Study (Hennepin County/Humphrey School)

2013 Water Regulation and Governance (MPCA)
WHY HAS INTEGRATION BEEN LACKING?

1. Desynchronized Planning

2. Cultural Differences

3. Reliance on Regulation
1. DESYNCHRONIZED PLANNING
2. CULTURAL DIFFERENCES?

Diagram:
- Social Justice, Economic Opportunity, Income, Equality
- The property conflict
- "green, profitable and fair" (sustainable development?)
- Overall Economic Growth and Efficiency
- The resource conflict
- Environmental Protection
- Development conflict
3. REGULATION AS A SAFETY NET
MCWD POLICY HIGHLIGHTS

October 2009 – Hennepin Community Works Model

2010 and 2011 – Louis Smith’s Watershed Partnerships Paper

May 2013 – Board Retreat Discussion

September 2013 – Policy Discussions for 2017 Plan

March 2014 - Balanced Urban Ecology
CENTRAL THEME OF MCWD’S PLAN

Help us be a partner!
Two-Track Approach
Evolution of Two-Track Approach

Challenges with 2007 Plan:
- Static plan, out of sync with land-use planning
- Overly prescriptive
- Spread resources too thin

Successes in Minnehaha Creek Greenway:
- Integration/collaboration
- Focus
- Flexibility
## 2 Approaches to Partnering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Track</th>
<th>Responsive Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High-need area</td>
<td>• Partner initiates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large-scale, complex issues</td>
<td>• Can leverage District resources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District leads/convenes</td>
<td>• Capital project requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Results in coordinated implementation/</td>
<td>• Cost share grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investment plan</td>
<td>• Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Responsive Track Examples

- Capital projects:
  - Taft-Legion Lake
  - Meadowbrook/Hiawatha
  - Long Lake WWTP
  - Highway 101 Causeway

- Cost share grants:
  - Edina – Arden Park
  - Mound road reconstruction
  - Wayzata Bay Center
  - Nokomis alleyways

- Programmatic support:
  - AIS management – Christmas Lake
  - Excelsior – assistance with MS4 requirements

- Technical assistance:
  - Land conservation/restoration – Painter Creek
  - Permitting - Mader wetland
Summary

- Goals of two-track approach:
  - Focus for greater effectiveness
  - Flexibility to act on opportunities
  - Improved integration with land-use planning

- Keys to success:
  - Requires early coordination
  - District viewed as value-added partner, not regulator
Discussion

- How can we improve integration of land-use and water planning?

- How can we improve coordination to better track local plans and opportunities?

- Have you noticed a change in the District’s approach?

- How do you see this approach working in your community?
Next Steps

- Next meeting:
  - Continue discussion on integration:
    - Regulatory framework
  - February 17 or 24 at 1:00 or 2:00