

1 **DRAFT**

2 **MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

3
4
5 **February 22nd, 2017**

6
7 **CALL TO ORDER**

8
9 Mr. Hayman called the Committee to order at 1:35 p.m. at the District Offices,

10
11 15320 Minnetonka Blvd

12 Minnetonka, MN 55345

13
14 **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

15
16 Bob Bean, Cara Geheren, Derek Asche, Erick Francis, Jen Kostrzewski, Jennie Skancke, Jessica
17 Wilson, Kristin Larson, Liz Stout, Mike Kelly, Rich Brasch, Ross Bintner, Scott Johnson, and
18 Tom Dietrich.

19
20 **OTHERS PRESENT**

21
22 Chris LaBounty, WSB

23 James Wisker, Director of Planning & Projects

24 Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant

25 Mike Hayman, Planner & Project Manager

26 Stephanie Hatten, WSB

27
28 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

29
30 The agenda was approved without amendment.

31
32 **COMMITTEE MEETING**

33
34 **Introduction and Background**

35
36 Mr. Hayman provided a brief background of the District's approach for the 2017 Comprehensive
37 Plan, noting the overall intent of improving the District's implementation model. He explained
38 that the District is guided by the principles of partnership, focus, and flexibility as the District
39 seeks to integrate water resource protection and enhancement with land use. Mr. Hayman stated
40 that the District's 2017 Plan contains the following themes:

41
42 **2017 MCWD Comprehensive Plan Themes**

- 43
44
45
- Improving effectiveness and service delivery
 - Recognizing the social and economic value of water
 - Creating synergy between the natural and built environments

- 46 • Enhancing how the District and partner communities work together to advance each
47 other's goals
48

49 Mr. Hayman noted that the District's Comprehensive Plan serves as a resource for multiple
50 audiences – the District's own staff and Board, District community partners, and state review
51 agencies. He explained that the structure of the District's 2007 Comprehensive Plan did not meet
52 the needs of the different audiences, as the information contained in the plan was heavily
53 interwoven. Mr. Hayman explained that in order to improve the readability of the plan for each
54 of these audiences, the District's 2017 Comprehensive Plan will have a more modular structure.
55

56 Mr. Hayman stated that the District's 2017 Comprehensive Plan will be structured to contain
57 three volumes:
58

59 **2017 MCWD Comprehensive Plan Structure**

- 60 • Volume I – Executive Summary
61 • Volume II – Data and Inventory
62 • Volume III – Implementation Plan
63

64 Mr. Hayman explained that Volume I will serve as a standalone summary document, potentially
65 used to brief new partners on the District's evolution, new approach to watershed management,
66 and value proposition.
67

68 Mr. Hayman stated that Volume II will serve as the central location for technical information for
69 the District's plan. He noted that this is a departure from the format of the MCWD's 2007
70 Comprehensive Plan, in which the technical information was spread throughout the plan. Mr.
71 Hayman explained that the District has opted to consolidate the inventory of resources and data
72 into one, standalone section. He underscored that this would improve the readability and
73 usability of the other plan sections – especially the Implementation section – and make the
74 District's data and analyses more accessible.
75

76 Mr. Hayman noted that the District will treat Volume II as a living document, updating the data
77 and resource inventory as new studies and analyses are conducted. He added that the Volume is
78 largely organized by subwatershed.
79

80 Mr. Hayman stated that the Implementation Plan – Volume III – describes how the District will
81 act to achieve its mission and vision. He noted that key parts of Volume III would be discussed
82 further during the meeting, particularly the subwatershed implementation plans, the local
83 government unit (LGU) section, and the capital improvement program.
84

85 Subwatershed Plans
86

87 Mr. Hayman stated that the District intends the subwatershed plans to be user-friendly, with a
88 length of 10-15 pages per subwatershed. He explained that each of the subwatershed plans will
89 be customized to contain a stepped approach, moving from the District's regional approach down

90 through the more specific “opportunity area” scale. Mr. Hayman outlined the basic structure of
91 the subwatershed plans as follows:

92

93 **Subwatershed Plan Structure**

- 94 • Introduction
- 95 • Regional water frame
- 96 • Regional land use frame
- 97 • Local priorities, plans, and opportunities
- 98 • Implementation plan

99

100 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Framework

101

102 Mr. Hayman noted that the District’s approach to its CIP has changed since the formation of the
103 CIP for the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. He explained that in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan, the
104 District’s CIP will be tailored to fit each subwatershed and will be flexible enough for the
105 District to align optimal natural resource protections with partner investments.

106

107 Mr. Hayman stated that the draft framework for the District’s Capital Improvement Program
108 outlines four categories of potential capital projects:

109

- 110 • Individual Projects
- 111 • Strategy Projects
- 112 • Opportunity Projects
- 113 • Plan Forward Approach

114

115 Mr. Hayman described what information would be identified in each of the categories as follows:

116

- 117 • Individual Projects
 - 118 ○ List of known project opportunities 1-5 years out; include estimated date,
119 location, cost, etc.
 - 120 ○ Some flexibility is provided through the annual updating and publishing of the
121 CIP.
- 122
- 123 • Strategy Projects
 - 124 ○ Identifies capital project strategies for natural resource protection and
125 improvement.
 - 126 ○ Defined by the issues addressed, approach used, and general location type (e.g.
127 wetland, shoreland, etc.).
 - 128 ○ Overall estimated spending cap identified per strategy, per subwatershed (e.g. the
129 MCWD may spend up to \$X million on stormwater management in the ____
130 subwatershed).
 - 131 ○ Structure based on BWSR-approved 2013 Minnehaha Creek subwatershed plan
132 amendment, items 5.8.2 and 5.8.5.

133

- 134 • Opportunity Projects
- 135 ○ Cost share funds to address partner-led capital project opportunities; allows
- 136 flexible contribution to partner investments of interest to the District.
- 137 ○ Because projects are created by an external party, the criteria for committing
- 138 “Opportunity Projects” funds are the goals and objectives set forth in the
- 139 District’s Comprehensive Plan.
- 140 ○ Resembles a non-capital program of a capital nature.
- 141
- 142 • Plan Forward Approach
- 143 ○ Where applicable, the District will cooperatively develop project opportunities
- 144 with partners.
- 145 ○ The MCWD Board sets priorities and the District’s level of involvement, from
- 146 participation in cooperative planning efforts to leading such efforts.
- 147 ○ The Plan Forward Approach would result in a list of known projects and an
- 148 investment strategy, and would be formally amended into the District’s
- 149 Comprehensive Plan.
- 150

151 Mr. Wisker stated that under the structure of the District’s 2017 Comprehensive Plan, the District
152 is seeking to regularly publish a CIP with a two- to five-year outlook. He noted that this mirrors
153 how most municipalities manage their CIPs.

154
155 Partnership Framework: LGU Section

156
157 Mr. Hayman explained that the Partnership Framework generally outlines how the District and
158 communities will communicate with each other to identify opportunities for project or program
159 collaboration. He stated that the requirements and recommendations for LGUs are found within
160 the Partnership Framework. Mr. Hayman underscored that the LGU section is not a lengthy list
161 of required actions for cities. He noted that the District recommends that each LGU identify how
162 best they can coordinate and communicate with the District to pinpoint opportunities for
163 partnership.

164
165 Mr. Wisker emphasized that the District hopes to coordinate with its partner communities at an
166 early stage in the processes for policy and plan generation, capital investments, and development
167 projects. He explained that when communities communicate with the District at an early stage,
168 the District is more able to add value to the policy, plan, project, or development. Mr. Wisker
169 underscored that the District is looking to its communities to identify how they can best
170 coordinate with the District.

171
172 Mr. Hayman stated that because the state is requiring load reductions, the District will not
173 include its own TMDLs or any additional load reduction requirements in the 2017 Plan. He noted
174 that the District must still list certain LGU requirements in its plan to meet state statute.

175
176 Mr. Wisker stated that the District defers to each LGU to determine the level of coordination
177 between said LGU and the District.

178

179 Mr. Asche asked if LGUs could incorporate updates to Local Water Management Plans via
180 reference, as LGUs would rather not constantly manually update the plan.

181
182 Mr. Wisker stated that cities could incorporate requirements outlined in the District's Plan by
183 reference in their own plans. He underscored that the District hopes to be the easiest watershed
184 organization to do business with.

185
186 Mr. Asche asked if the District had sufficient capacity to truly tailor the District's approach for
187 each city.

188
189 Mr. Wisker responded that the District should be able to accommodate differing levels of
190 coordination with each city. He explained that some cities may not be interested in coordinating
191 heavily with the District, and that would likely translate to fewer instances of collaboration
192 between one such city and the District. Mr. Wisker noted that the District's time commitments to
193 those cities would likely be lower as a result of such a mutual understanding.

194
195 Mr. Wisker underscored that the District is hoping to streamline routine business between cities
196 and the District – such as permitting coordination – in order to spend more time aligning city and
197 District investments through collaboration.

198
199 Mr. Wisker stated that the language of the Partnership Framework was not to mandate watershed
200 goals for city plans, but to invite cities to align with watershed goals.

201
202 Mr. Hayman stated that the District can provide a number of services as a project or program
203 partner:

- 204
- 205 • Technical assistance
 - 206 • Education assistance (especially to meet MS4 requirements)
 - 207 • Joint grant application
 - 208 • Information dissemination (models, studies, etc.)
- 209

210 Mr. Hayman noted that the District was not requiring any new reporting in the LGU section
211 beyond standard annual reporting.

212
213 Mr. Hayman invited the Committee members to provide comments to District staff regarding the
214 District's draft plan language, especially for the District's CIP structure and LGU requirements.
215 He listed the upcoming milestones for the District's 2017 Comprehensive Plan process:

- 216
- 217 • The Policy Advisory Committee would meet on March 21st to discuss the District's draft
218 CIP and Partnership Framework
 - 219 • The District's draft 2017 Comprehensive Plan would be distributed for a 60-day review
220 and comment period in late April or early May
 - 221 • Following the 60-day comment period, the District board and staff would review
222 comments, revise the Plan, and host a public hearing.
 - 223 • The District would then distribute the Plan for a final 90-day review period in September.

- 224 • Once approved by BWSR, the District will adopt the Plan in November or December of
225 2017.

226

227 Mr. Wisker noted that District staff hoped to receive all comments by March 15th. The
228 Committee members generally confirmed that this timeline was reasonable.

229

230 Mr. Bean asked when the District's annual meetings with cities would begin.

231

232 Mr. Hayman asked the Committee when they would like the meetings to begin.

233

234 Mr. Bean suggested that the meetings begin sooner rather than later, perhaps in the fall of 2017.
235 He explained that as long as the LGU requirements largely remain the same as proposed, it
236 would be in the best interest of both the District and for city staff who are currently updating
237 their cities' Comprehensive Plans to meet soon and ensure that the city and District water
238 management plans are aligned.

239

240 Ms. Geheren echoed this sentiment, encouraging the District to begin the annual meetings prior
241 to the formal adoption of the District's 2017 Comprehensive Plan.

242

243 Ms. Skancke suggested that District staff plan to meet with city staff immediately to address any
244 issues not raised at the Committee meeting.

245

246 Mr. Wisker stated that the District had offered to meet with individual city planning staff or city
247 councils, but only a few city staff had requested visits thus far.

248

249 The Committee meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

250

251 Respectfully submitted,

252

253 Matthew Cook

254 Planning Assistant