CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Christopher called the Committee to order at 10:05 a.m. at the Ridgedale Library, 12601 Ridgedale Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55305

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

OTHERS PRESENT
Sherry Davis White, District Board President; Lars Erdahl, District Administrator; James Wisker, Director of Planning & Projects; Becky Christopher, Lead Planner; Anna Brown, Planner & Project Manager; and Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
The agenda was approved without amendment.

COMMITTEE MEETING
February Meeting Recap
Ms. Christopher summarized the topics discussed at the previous meeting of the Committee. She outlined the process for the development of the District’s 2017 Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Christopher provided the Committee with a diagram representing the Two-Track Approach. She explained that under the “Responsive Implementation” track, the District relies on its city and agency partners to identify and initiate collaborative projects. Ms. Christopher noted that under the “Focal Geography Planning” track, the District would lead a subwatershed-wide planning effort.

Ms. McMillan asked how cities should submit potential projects to the District. Ms. Christopher stated that cities could engage the District by sharing plans, issuing formal requests, and exchanging information informally, among other methods. Manager White added that cities have, in response to an issued MCWD CIP, submitted a project for consideration.
Ms. McMillan stated that the Cities of Orono, Long Lake, and Medina had recently developed a subwatershed partnership agreement to facilitate coordination between the cities on water resource projects in the Long Lake Creek subwatershed. Ms. McMillan asked if any other cities were voluntarily forming similar partnerships. S. Johnson noted that Medina has similar agreements with other cities for shared subwatersheds under the jurisdiction of other watershed management organizations. He added that the agreements have helped to streamline cooperative efforts.

Ms. Palmisano inquired as to the objective of such an agreement. Ms. McMillan stated that the primary goal was to coordinate efforts towards load reductions assigned to the municipalities through TMDLs. S. Johnson agreed, noting that the agreement served as a framework through which cities could more readily cooperate on projects of mutual interest, across municipal boundaries.

Manager White noted that the DNR was in the process of mapping the buffers required by the Governor’s new buffer initiative. Ms. Yearwood confirmed that the DNR was working on completing the maps, and offered to share the maps in their current state with the Committee. Ms. Yearwood added that the DNR provides information on watershed restoration and protection strategies (WRAPS), which is available for use by the District, other agencies, and cities in watershed-scale planning. She commended the District for its systems-level scale of focus.

Ms. Acomb asked if the District prioritizes its grant allocation to water resource projects based on the impairment of and improvement to a given water body. Ms. Christopher confirmed that the District administers grants to projects with high potential to improve water resources.

Ms. Christopher, referring to the handout titled “Changes to Support Partnership Approach,” stated that the District intends to develop the implementation framework of the 2017 Plan with input from the Committee. Ms. Christopher noted that the District could improve coordination between the District and its partners through the following potential actions:

- Increase communication / relationship-building with cities
  - Give annual presentations to city councils
  - Hold regular meetings with city staff from various departments
  - Tailor cooperative efforts by city – determine with city staff who to coordinate with, how often, and through what means
- Provide guidance to cities on model ordinances and best available practices

Ms. McMillan stated that, at regular District-city staff meetings, District staff should request city staff to supply a list of any new or altered ordinances. Ms. Christopher stated that the District would soon be sending out to city staff an information request which would cover ordinances changes. Mr. Stewart asked if cities should request information on current best practices from the District or if the District would readily supply such information as it became available. Ms. Christopher stated that the District would discuss current best practices at the regular meetings with city staff and policymakers.
Ms. Christopher continued outlining potential District actions to foster collaboration:

- Provide guidance to citizen groups to improve effectiveness and focus
- Provide consistent District contacts for city staff and policymakers
- Establish fee-for-service arrangement to help cities meet MS4 requirements
  - Education, outreach, etc.
- Adopt an environmental PUD-type process or policy
  - Meant to provide a streamlined alternative to exception / variance route for applicable development projects
- Establish an MCWD wetland bank
- Cost share funding for:
  - Deferred stormwater BMP maintenance
  - Upgrading street sweeping and / or winter maintenance equipment

Ms. McMillan asked if the District distributed cost share grants for small-scale stormwater infrastructure projects. Ms. Christopher confirmed that the District offers cost share funding for such facilities.

Mr. Wisker noted that the state currently requires cities to inventory municipal stormwater infrastructure and inspect 20% of the facilities each year, inspecting all facilities over the course of 5 years. Mr. Wisker stated that privately-owned stormwater infrastructure is often not inspected or maintained. He explained that he expected another state requirement – regarding the inspection and maintenance of private stormwater infrastructure – would be adopted in the coming years. Mr. Wisker added that, together, the MCWD and partner cities could begin working towards the new standards before they are required.

S. Johnson stated that the City of Medina has taxing jurisdiction over new stormwater infrastructure, but has few means of ensuring previously-installed private stormwater infrastructure is accounted for. Mr. Wisker noted that by leveraging each other’s authority and capacity, the District and cities can find a solution to the issue of unkempt private stormwater infrastructure.

Ms. Christopher resumed guiding the Committee through the “Changes to Support Partnership Approach” handout, focusing on potential actions which cities and agencies could make to strengthen the cooperative framework of the 2017 Plan.

- Share priorities, goals, and plans with the District (to be incorporated into the District’s own plan)
- Invite the District to participate in the city comprehensive and local water planning processes
  - Acknowledge District goals and priorities
  - Identify partnership opportunities
- Contact the District early on in land use planning processes
  - CIPs – infrastructure, transportation, etc.
  - Economic development
• Promote early District involvement in private development planning
  o Identify points for connection in permit review processes
  o Incorporate District contact information into website, application checklists, etc.
  o Notify the District of applications / meetings

• Develop coordination framework and document in:
  o Memorandum of Understanding
  o Policy
  o Ordinance
  o Process

Mr. Wisker asked the Committee what the best method was for memorializing coordination with the District. He noted that not everything written into plans is adhered to. Mr. Wisker suggested that whatever documents cities and agencies refer to regularly ought to be the place where a framework for partnership with the District is outlined.

Mr. Stewart stated that as city staff changes, so too will the nature of the city’s relationship with the District. S. Johnson noted that the habits of staff and councils varies from city to city. M. Johnson suggested that, for certain types of projects, city staff follow a checklist of action items, which would include contacting the District. Ms. McMillan stated that, for Orono, the District should look to continue building its relationship with the Public Works department. She noted that the public and many city staff appreciate the District’s work.

Ms. Palmisano stated that, in Minneapolis, the city’s comprehensive plan is used regularly as a reference and guide to developers. Ms. Christopher noted that some cities may wish to employ multiple methods of documenting and institutionalizing partnership with the District. Mr. Erdahl added that, especially for cities with land in multiple watersheds, the District hoped to help streamline the coordination process for cities.

Mr. Stewart stated that the City of Edina regards the District as a leader in watershed management, and looks to the District for guidance on best practices.

Local Water Plan Requirements

Ms. Christopher gave an overview of the state statute and rule that give watershed districts the authority to assign responsibilities to local government units (LGUs). Ms. Christopher stated that these responsibilities and corresponding implementation actions are to be laid out local water management plans (LWMPs). A LWMP, she continued, is a chapter of an organization’s comprehensive plan that is updated no less than every 10 years. Ms. Christopher explained that LWMP updates, which would be reviewed and approved by the District, are due between January 1st, 2017 and December 31st, 2018.

Mr. Wisker noted that the District ought to be involved in the comprehensive planning process for cities. Ms. Acomb asked if the District was interested in being on the steering committee for a city’s comprehensive plan. Mr. Wisker stated that the District may wish to be on the steering
committee for some cities’ comprehensive planning processes and offer review and comment for
other cities.

Ms. Carlson asked what the overlap was between a LWMP and a municipal separate storm sewer
system (MS4). Ms. Christopher noted that an MS4 is required to have a stormwater pollution
prevention plan (SWPPP), which can typically be fulfilled through developing a LWMP.

Ms. Christopher summarized the LGU requirements that were laid out in the District’s 2007
Comprehensive Plan. She stated that the old requirements assigned pollutant load reductions –
before a total maximum daily load (TMDL) was determined for waterbodies in the area – to
LGUs based on land use. Ms. Christopher referenced an attached list of other local plan
requirements, noting the reporting and meeting requirements. She explained that the old
reporting requirements were typically focused on an LGU’s water resource-specific projects, and
the District met primarily with water resource or engineering staff.

Ms. Christopher stated that the requirements of the District’s 2017 Plan would allow for more
flexibility and collaboration. She explained that the 2017 Plan would see the elimination of
pollutant load reductions required of LGUs by the District, deferring instead to the established
TMDLs. Ms. Christopher noted that the new LWMP requirements would focus on incentivizing
cooperation, rather than mandating implementation.

Referring again to the list of additional LWMP requirements, Ms. Christopher stated that the
District would simplify the list, as many of the requirements duplicate other agencies’
requirements. She added that the District was interested in discussing LGU land use projects
with land use planning and economic development staff, not just discussing water resource-
focused projects with water resource staff.

Ms. Christopher highlighted some of the key proposed LWMP requirements of the District’s
2017 Plan, as detailed below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>District Plan</th>
<th>City Local Water Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Implementation plans    | • District goals and priorities  
                      • TMDLs replace District load reduction requirements  
                      • TMDL credit sharing policy  
                      • Keep 2007 targets for non-impaired lakes  
                      • Local goals and priorities  
                      • Partnership opportunities and roles | • Acknowledge District goals and priorities  
                      • Acknowledge partnership opportunities  
                      • Explain how city will make progress toward TMDL requirements and District goals |
| Coordination framework  | • Program services and processes  
                      • Coordination strategies/expectations of cities  
                      • Annual report/meeting requirement  
                      • Exchange of plans/CIPs  
                      • Early involvement  
                      • Document coordination framework | • Acknowledge District services, processes, and how they intend to utilize them  
                      • Describe how city will coordinate with District  
                      • Acknowledge report/meeting requirement |
| Best practices          | • Recommendations for best practices:  
                      • Street sweeping  
                      • Chloride management/winter maintenance  
                      • Others? | • Describe current practices and whether they meet District recommendations |
| Regulation              | • Recommendations for city ordinances:  
                      • SFH hard cover restrictions/stormwater management  
                      • Shoreland management  
                      • Others?  
                      • Process for city to assume sole regulatory authority | • Describe current ordinances and whether they meet District recommendations  
                      • Identify rules for which city wishes to assume sole regulatory authority |

Ms. Acomb suggested that the District consider requiring stormwater reuse for redevelopment projects.

Ms. McMillan stated that the District could help cities by clarifying what the requirements for the state buffer program were. Ms. McMillan asked if the District had any advice on establishing a stormwater fund and if stormwater facilities could be priced like other utilities.

Ms. Christopher stated that the District could offer a comparison of city ordinances to help municipal policymakers see what options are available.
Mr. Stewart expressed interest in having the City of Edina included in the development of a process for managing aged, privately-owned stormwater infrastructure.

Ms. Christopher stated that cities had the ability to take on the authority of and responsibility for permitting for water resource protection. Mr. Wisker noted that if the District did not maintain permitting authority, that both the cities and the District would lose a fundamental opportunity for coordinating on projects.

**Updates and Next Steps**

Ms. Christopher briefed the Committee on upcoming District events:

- Comprehensive Plan brochure – potential May distribution
- City Planners meeting – July
- NEMO boat tour – August 3rd
- City Council meetings / presentations – June-August
- Local subwatershed meetings – August-October

Ms. Christopher stated that District staff would soon be sending out an information request to city and agency staff. Ms. Christopher stated that the first part of the request, to be returned in 60 days, would inform local subwatershed meetings by providing the following:

- Goals and priorities
- Plans – public infrastructure, transportation, economic development, etc.
- Development projections
- Partnership opportunities

Ms. Christopher noted that the District is currently using Met Council development projections for land use. She suggested that if cities or agencies had any more up-to-date projections, that they include that information in their response. Ms. Christopher stated that the second portion of the information request, to be returned 30 days after first deadline, would include the following:

- Ordinances and standards relevant to natural / water resources
- Review process for proposed development
- Progress toward load reduction goals
- Optional information:
  - Identified policy, ordinance, procedure, or practice change(s) to support partnership model
  - Desired or currently utilized District services

Ms. Christopher stated that at the next meeting, the Committee would discuss the District’s role in various management topics.

The Committee discussed dates in late June for the next meeting.
The Committee meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Cook
Planning Assistant