

47 Ms. Eberhart asked if the summary of lessons learned would either be incorporated as an element
48 of the final comprehensive plan or be developed as a separate work product earlier on. Ms.
49 Christopher responded that it is being prepared as a separate report and will be completed in the
50 next few months.

51
52 Ms. Eberhart asked if the E-Grade program would include the monitoring and assessment of
53 streams. Ms. Christopher responded that it will. Ms. Eberhart then asked if Wenck was the
54 consultant helping to develop E-Grade, noting that the City of Minneapolis would be interested
55 in a similar program for their own waterbodies. Ms. Christopher again responded affirmatively.
56

57 Ms. Christopher continued reviewing the diagram, moving up to the Plan development process
58 which was divided into three primary buckets of work with the areas of committee/stakeholder
59 involvement highlighted (orange = committees, blue = other stakeholder inputs):

- 60 • **Strategic planning framework** – This would be a largely internal process to refine the
61 organization’s mission and goals and evaluate its programs (discussed more later in the
62 meeting).
- 63 • **Data updates** – A District and consultant-led process to incorporate new studies and data
64 that will feed into the subwatershed plans.
- 65 • **Implementation framework** – This area was highlighted as the primary focus of the
66 Plan update and where the District will be seeking the most help from the advisory
67 committees. Discussions will include refining implementation processes for focal and
68 responsive geographies; developing the partnership framework by exploring streamlined
69 regulation, the role of LGUs in supporting the Plan goals, and the integration of land-use
70 and water planning; and defining the District’s role in specific management areas (e.g.
71 AIS, chlorides, groundwater).

72
73 The diagram then showed these areas of plan development feeding into the three volumes of the
74 Plan – Executive Summary, Data and Issue Identification, and Goals and Implementation Plan.
75 Finally, it showed the formal plan review process, including a 60-day and 90-day review period.
76 Ms. Christopher also referred the group to the corresponding Gantt chart and agenda list in their
77 packet.
78

79 Strategic Planning

80
81 Ms. Christopher continued the presentation by providing an overview of the internal strategic
82 planning process the District is undertaking. The first graphic illustrated how the District will
83 conduct its planning and evaluation at different levels and time scales, including:

- 84 • Long-range mission and vision
- 85 • 10-year Comprehensive Plan
- 86 • 5-year self-assessment and strategic planning
- 87 • 2-year progress reporting
- 88 • Annual work plans

89 After providing a brief background on why the strategic planning framework was developed, Ms.
90 Christopher explained that the purpose of the framework is to facilitate evaluation of existing
91 programs and future initiatives to ensure that the District is allocating its resources to their
92 highest and best use. It provides context for decision-making by linking program activities back
93 to the District's mission and goals; identifying the outcomes, metrics, and resource allocation for
94 each activity; and showing how the District's various programs align. She walked through a
95 series of diagrams explaining how the District staff and Board will use the tool to evaluate each
96 program as part of this plan update. She noted that the District intends to go through a similar
97 process every five years to assess priorities and recalibrate program activities, as needed.

98

99 Plan Structure

100

101 Ms. Christopher provided a brief overview of the proposed plan structure and the content that
102 would be included under each of the three volumes - Executive Summary, Data and Issue
103 Identification, and Goals and Implementation Plan. She explained that the District's intent is for
104 the implementation section of this Plan to focus more on establishing processes for how the
105 District will coordinate with communities to integrate efforts and remain responsive and less on
106 laying out a prescriptive list of activities in each subwatershed, as with the previous plan.

107

108 Ms. Eberhart inquired as to how the District anticipated working with municipalities in relation
109 to land use projections and suggested that the Committee be used as a venue for starting
110 dialogues with the appropriate city staff. Ms. Christopher agreed that it should be coordinated
111 with the Committee members.

112

113 Mr. Brasch asked if the District's goal for the plan structure was to find a way to avoid having to
114 undertake a plan amendment process for every project not specifically forecasted in the plan. Ms.
115 Christopher confirmed, stating that the goal is to create a framework that allows the District the
116 flexibility to respond to opportunities as they arise. The idea is that the plan would outline the
117 known issues, strategies, and priorities for each subwatershed and set a funding cap. The District
118 could then have the flexibility to act on opportunities that align with the plan priorities and fit
119 within the funding cap without the need for a plan amendment. She cited the District's past
120 amendment to the Minnehaha Creek Subwatershed Plan as an example of how this structure has
121 been used and worked successfully for the District already.

122

123 Ms. Eberhart asked if some projects would still require a plan amendment if they were
124 considered significantly different from the strategies that were outlined in the plan. Ms.
125 Christopher confirmed, stating that occasional plan amendments may still be needed but the goal
126 is to minimize the need.

127

128 Updates

129

130 Ms. Christopher provided a brief overview of the information that was submitted in response to
131 the District's information request. She noted that a summary was also provided in their packet,
132 and the full submittals are available on the District website. She stated that the District will

133 continue to refer back to the submittals as the Plan is developed to ensure that the priorities
134 provided by the cities and agencies are being considered and addressed.

135
136 Anna Brown provided an update to the committee on the development of the Six Mile
137 implementation plan. The Six Mile planning process will mirror the process for the
138 Comprehensive Plan, convening both a technical and policy advisory committee and serving as a
139 subchapter of that plan. The objective of the Six Mile process will be to improve how the District
140 coordinates with its partner agencies in that geography by identifying their goals and missions,
141 regulations and authorities, and plans for development and growth. The output should not only
142 reflect the District's goals, but also the existing plans of its partners and a framework for how
143 these will work together. The lessons learned from this process will serve as the implementation
144 model for focal geographies in the comprehensive plan.

145
146 Ms. Jensen asked for clarification on what exactly a "focal geography" meant. Ms. Christopher
147 explained that, under the District's two-track approach, the District will identify 1-2 high-need
148 areas (focal geographies) where the District will lead a process to convene stakeholders and
149 develop a coordinated implementation plan to make significant improvements to the system. The
150 Six Mile planning process is the first such effort.

151
152 Mr. Bean asked if the E-grade program will help identify focal geographies and if it will account
153 for development pressure. Ms. Christopher responded that the E-grade program will be used to
154 identify the needs of each subwatershed and help the District determine where the "focal
155 geography" approach is needed.

156
157 Mr. Wisker noted that the E-grade program provides an assessment of current conditions so it
158 would not capture future development projections, though this is a factor the District will
159 consider in selecting focal geographies. He added that not every subwatershed will need the focal
160 geography approach. In some cases, the District's responsive tools and programs can be used to
161 address the needs of the area. The goal will be to help cities understand how they can leverage
162 the assets of the District to address their unique needs and priorities.

163
164 Ms. Van Der Wurff asked how the extent of a focal geography's boundaries would be
165 established. Ms. Christopher responded that this would be dependent on the needs of a particular
166 area and would not necessarily include an entire subwatershed.

167
168 Ms. Eberhart asked if there was a set number of focal geographies to be identified in the next
169 comprehensive plan. Ms. Christopher responded that the plan will likely establish a process for
170 identifying and planning in focal geographies but not a prescriptive list of where and when the
171 District would use this approach. Mr. Wisker added that this is because the need for and timing
172 of the approach will often be externally driven based on what is happening on the landscape.

173
174 Mr. Brasch asked if the District's new approach would affect how it does permitting. Mr. Wisker
175 responded that it would and explained that the District is currently in the process of mapping out
176 the various layers of regulation to identify areas of overlap and conflict in an effort to streamline

177 the regulatory framework. He noted that, through the Six Mile planning process, the District will
178 be working with the communities to map out areas of likely impact (through development,
179 infrastructure projects, etc.) and coordinating early to identify opportunities for mitigation.

180

181 Ms. Drewry asked for clarification on who would be invited to the Six Mile advisory committee,
182 stating that her colleague, Ms. Skancke, should be included. Ms. Brown responded that she
183 would add Ms. Skancke to the list.

184

185 Ms. Christopher informed the group that they would be receiving an online survey to help inform
186 the District's self-assessment and strategic planning process.

187

188 Ms. Christopher asked if there were any volunteers to serve as the liaison for the next Policy
189 Advisory Committee meeting on December 15th at 10:00 AM. After a brief discussion of
190 whether it should be a consultant or city staff person, it was generally agreed that Ms. Eberhart
191 would attend.

192

193 The Committee generally agreed that December 16th, at 2:00 PM was the best time for its next
194 meeting.

195

196 The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.

197

198 Respectfully submitted,

199

200 Becky Christopher

201 MCWD Lead Planner and Project Manager