CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Christopher called the Committee to order at 1:00 p.m. at the Minnetonka Community Center, in the Shady Oak Room;

14600 Minnetonka Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55345

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Ross Bintner, Nate Stanley, Liz Stout, Tom Dietrich, Bob Bean, Derek Asche, Erick Francis, Cara Geheren, Kristin Larson, Randy Anhorn, Steve Christopher, Kate Drewry, Karen Jensen, Deb Pilger, Chris Zadak.

OTHERS PRESENT

Bill Olson, District Board Manager; 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. 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
  o Give annual presentations to city councils
  o Hold regular meetings with city staff from various departments
  o 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
• 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
  o Education, outreach, etc.
• Adopt an environmental PUD-type process or policy
  o Meant to provide a streamlined alternative to exception / variance route for
    applicable development projects
• Establish an MCWD wetland bank
• Cost share funding for:
  o Deferred stormwater BMP maintenance
  o Upgrading street sweeping and / or winter maintenance equipment

Referring to the environmental PUD, Mr. Bintner asked for an example of what a good tradeoff
might be in terms of environmental protection measures. Ms. Christopher stated that allowing for
equal or greater treatment from a facility other than the treatment required in rule would be a
favorable tradeoff.

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
  o Acknowledge District goals and priorities
  o Identify partnership opportunities
• Contact the District early on in land use planning processes
  o CIPs – infrastructure, transportation, etc.
  o 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 (MOU)
  o Policy
  o Ordinance
Mr. Bintner recommended that to improve coordination with cities, the District meet with city staff as they are developing their CIPs in spring. Ms. Geheren noted that a MOU was sufficient to promote coordination between City of Victoria and District staff. Mr. Bintner confirmed that meeting with a city’s land use planning, economic development, or administrative staff would indeed help the District integrate into the city’s planning processes.

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.

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  
  o TMDLs replace District load reduction requirements  
  o TMDL credit sharing policy  
  o 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  
  o Annual report/meeting requirement  
  o Exchange of plans/CIPs  
  o Early involvement  
  o Document coordination framework | • Acknowledge District services, processes, and how they intend to utilize them  
  • Describe how city will coordinate with District  
  o Acknowledge report/meeting requirement |
| Best practices              | • Recommendations for best practices:  
  o Street sweeping  
  o Chloride management/winter maintenance  
  o Others? | • Describe current practices and whether they meet District recommendations |
| Regulation                  | • Recommendations for city ordinances:  
  o SFH hard cover restrictions/stormwater management  
  o Shoreland management  
  o 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 |

Mr. Asche stated that City of Plymouth staff notifies the District of projects after reviewing the plans and before they are sent to preliminary plat. He asked if this practice was the sort of early involvement the District was seeking. Ms. Christopher confirmed that it was.

Mr. Bean noted that cities engage in many different scales of planning – comprehensive planning, capital improvement planning, project-specific planning, and reacting to development. He suggested that the District attempt to integrate with the city in each of the realms of planning. Ms. Geheren stated City of Victoria staff send project concepts to the District early on as an informal practice.
Mr. Bintner stated that the City of Edina invited the District to participate in early planning discussions. Mr. Bintner noted that given this early coordination, the District was able to present new opportunities for managing stormwater that the city had not anticipated.

Mr. Bean suggested that the District aggregate the progress made by the District and cities towards TMDL goals and display the information online. Ms. Christopher stated that the District was calculating its progress made thus far, and would be requesting a pollutant load reduction progress report from cities in the coming information request.

Mr. Bean stated that the District ought to consider hosting round-table discussions between cities.

Ms. Drewry noted that the DNR would be updating its model ordinance for shoreland management in the next three to six months. She welcomed city staff to consider adopting such an ordinance.

Mr. Bintner stated that he had drafted a management plan for street sweeping, noting the cost efficiency of street sweeping to remove pollutants from drainage areas.

Ms. Stout stated that she was uncomfortable with the District offering recommendations on best management practices, as the capacity of cities to accommodate a recommended practice varies. She noted that “recommendations” tend to become requirements. Mr. Bean added that many of the suggested recommendations are already in the stormwater manual, and that city staff can consult the manual instead.

Mr. Dietrich asked if the District made its XPSWMM model available to cities for consideration in flood mitigation planning. Ms. Christopher responded that the District supplies the model as needed. Mr. Dietrich noted that the District’s involvement in flood mitigation projects is helpful to cities.

Ms. Christopher asked the Committee what the condition of stormwater ordinances was in the watershed. Mr. Bean stated that the ordinances for his cities require a watershed permit for stormwater. Mr. Asche noted that some cities have attempted to create an all-encompassing ordinance. Ms. Christopher stated that the District was interested in streamlining and simplifying the regulatory process across agencies.

Ms. Geheren echoed Ms. Stout, agreeing that “recommendations” typically become requirements.

Ms. Jensen stated that the Metropolitan Council has several tools and reference guides online for cities to use concerning stormwater management. She noted that cities must do water supply planning as part of their comprehensive plan process, and should consider using the Met Council’s available tools. Ms. Jensen added that Council staff can provide technical advice, through experts such as Brian Davis of Met Council Environmental Services.
Mr. Bintner stated that he supported the District’s use of the term “recommendations.” Mr. Bean noted the difficulty of explaining to a city council the necessity for a stormwater ordinance that limits hardcover.

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 boat tour – 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. 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 part of the information request, to be returned in 30 days from the deadline for the first part, would provide 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. Geheren asked if, to give the District a better understanding of future development, city staff could send the District the shapefiles used in the city’s comprehensive plan to represent development projections. Ms. Christopher confirmed that shapefiles would be welcomed.

Ms. Pilger asked if agency staff would receive a similar information request. Ms. Christopher noted that agencies would receive an information request, albeit somewhat simplified, as many of the items would not apply to regional agencies.
Ms. Drewry noted that the District should be sure to include agencies such as park and trail authorities, counties, and MNDOT in the information request and any related meetings.

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 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Cook
Planning Assistant