

1 **DRAFT**

2 **MINUTES OF THE POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

3
4
5 **March 21st, 2017**

6
7 **CALL TO ORDER**

8
9 Mr. Hayman called the Committee to order at 10:05 a.m. at the District Offices,

10
11 15320 Minnetonka Blvd

12 Minnetonka, MN 55345

13
14 **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

15
16 Marvin Johnson, Patty Acomb, Sliv Carlson, and Terri Yearwood.

17
18 **OTHERS PRESENT**

19
20 James Wisker, Director of Planning & Projects

21 Lars Erdahl, District Administrator

22 Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant

23 Mike Hayman, Planner & Project Manager

24 Sherry Davis White, MCWD Board President

25
26 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

27
28 The agenda was approved without amendment.

29
30 **COMMITTEE MEETING**

31
32 **Introduction and Background**

33
34 Mr. Hayman provided a brief background of the District's approach for the 2017 Comprehensive
35 Plan, noting the overall intent of improving the District's implementation model. He explained
36 that the District is guided by the principles of partnership, focus, and flexibility as the District
37 seeks to integrate water resource protection and enhancement with land use. Mr. Hayman stated
38 that the District's 2017 Plan contains the following themes:

39
40 **2017 MCWD Comprehensive Plan Themes**

- 41
- 42 • Improving effectiveness and service delivery
 - 43 • Recognizing the social and economic value of water
 - 44 • Creating synergy between the natural and built environments
 - 45 • Enhancing how the District and partner communities work together to advance each
46 other's goals

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

53
54 Mr. Hayman stated that the District’s 2017 Comprehensive Plan will be structured to contain
55 three volumes:

56
57 **2017 MCWD Comprehensive Plan Structure**

- 58 • Volume I – Executive Summary
- 59 • Volume II – Data and Inventory
- 60 • Volume III – Implementation Plan

61
62 Mr. Hayman explained that Volume I will serve as a standalone summary document, potentially
63 used to brief new partners on the District’s evolution, new approach to watershed management,
64 and value proposition.

65
66 Mr. Hayman stated that Volume II will serve as the central location for technical information for
67 the District’s plan. He noted that this is a departure from the format of the MCWD’s 2007
68 Comprehensive Plan, in which the technical information was spread throughout the plan. Mr.
69 Hayman explained that the District has opted to consolidate the inventory of resources and data
70 into one, standalone section. He underscored that this would improve the readability and
71 usability of the other plan sections – especially the Implementation section – and make the
72 District’s data and analyses more accessible.

73
74 Mr. Hayman noted that the District will treat Volume II as a living document, updating the data
75 and resource inventory as new studies and analyses are conducted. He added that the Volume is
76 largely organized by subwatershed.

77
78 Mr. Hayman noted that the District’s approach to its CIP has changed since the formation of the
79 CIP for the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. He explained that in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan, the
80 District’s CIP will be tailored to fit each subwatershed and will be flexible enough for the
81 District to align optimal natural resource protections with partner investments.

82
83 Mr. Hayman stated that the draft framework for the District’s Capital Improvement Program
84 outlines four categories of potential capital projects:

- 85 • Individual Projects
- 86 • Strategy Projects
- 87 • Opportunity Projects
- 88 • Plan Forward Approach

89
90
91 Mr. Hayman described what information would be identified in each of the categories as follows:

92

93

- Individual Projects

94

- List of known project opportunities 1-5 years out; include estimated date, location, cost, etc.

95

96

- Some flexibility is provided through the annual updating and publishing of the CIP.

97

98

99

- Strategy Projects

100

- Identifies capital project strategies for natural resource protection and improvement.

101

102

- Defined by the issues addressed, approach used, and general location type (e.g. wetland, shoreland, etc.).

103

104

- Overall estimated spending cap identified per strategy, per subwatershed (e.g. the MCWD may spend up to \$X million on stormwater management in the ____ subwatershed).

105

106

107

- Structure based on BWSR-approved 2013 Minnehaha Creek subwatershed plan amendment, items 5.8.2 and 5.8.5.

108

109

110

- Opportunity Projects

111

- Cost share funds to address partner-led capital project opportunities; allows flexible contribution to partner investments of interest to the District.

112

113

- Because projects are created by an external party, the criteria for committing “Opportunity Projects” funds are the goals and objectives set forth in the District’s Comprehensive Plan.

114

115

116

- Resembles a non-capital program of a capital nature.

117

118

- Plan Forward Approach

119

- Where applicable, the District will cooperatively develop project opportunities with partners.

120

121

- The MCWD Board sets priorities and the District’s level of involvement, from participation in cooperative planning efforts to leading such efforts.

122

123

- The Plan Forward Approach would result in a list of known projects and an investment strategy, and would be formally amended into the District’s Comprehensive Plan.

124

125

126

127

Mr. Johnson asked if carp were causing water resource issues throughout the watershed.

128

129

Mr. Wisker responded that carp can be found throughout the watershed. He noted that eliminating the species would be incredibly difficult, but added that keeping the carp population low through targeted management can help to benefit water quality and ecological integrity.

130

131

132

133

Mr. Hayman explained that the Partnership Framework generally outlines how the District and communities will communicate with each other to identify opportunities for project or program collaboration. He stated that the requirements and recommendations for LGUs are found within the Partnership Framework. Mr. Hayman underscored that the LGU section is not a lengthy list

134

135

136

137 of required actions for cities. He noted that the District recommends that each LGU identify how
138 best they can coordinate and communicate with the District to pinpoint opportunities for
139 partnership.

140
141 Mr. Hayman stated that because the state is requiring load reductions, the District will not
142 include its own TMDLs or any additional load reduction requirements in the 2017 Plan. He noted
143 that the District must still list certain LGU requirements in its plan to meet state statute.

144
145 Ms. Acomb asked if District staff had yet begun to meet with LGU staff to coordinate
146 investments.

147
148 Mr. Hayman noted that while the District still meets annually with its communities, the District
149 and LGU staff from most of the cities and agencies have not yet identified a more frequent
150 meeting schedule.

151
152 Mr. Wisker noted that some LGUs' staff will not wish to meet with the District more frequently
153 than they already do.

154
155 Ms. Acomb observed that the District is promoting coordination between governmental units as
156 is intended by the Board of Water and Soil Resources' (BWSR) One Watershed, One Plan
157 approach (1W1P).

158
159 Mr. Wisker agreed with Ms. Acomb, noting that the District's subwatershed plans serve as the
160 basic unit for watershed planning in the MCWD.

161
162 Mr. Wisker noted that city and agency staff have already reviewed the District's draft LGU
163 section language. He encouraged the Committee members to read the LGU section and relevant
164 subwatershed plans themselves, and provide comment during the 60-day comment period after
165 the District publishes its draft plan. Mr. Wisker underscored that through coordination, as
166 recommended in the LGU section, the District is seeking the answers to two questions from
167 LGUs:

- 168
169
 - What actions are LGUs taking in each subwatershed?
 - How does each LGU want the District to participate in LGU action and add value?

170
171
172 Mr. Wisker stated that LGU staff from most District communities, after reviewing the draft LGU
173 section language, have already sent in letters of support for the approach of the District's plan.
174 He noted that some LGU staff recommended beginning coordination on city local water plan
175 requirements in June or July of 2017, before the District formally adopts its Comprehensive Plan,
176 in order to align with city timelines for the development of their own Comprehensive Plans.

177
178 Mr. Hayman stated that the District expects to release the draft plan for the initial 60-day
179 comment period in late April.

180

181 Mr. Wisker noted that the District would include the PAC and TAC members on the distribution
182 list for the draft plan, as well as city mayors and administrators.

183

184 The Committee meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

185

186 Respectfully submitted,

187

188 Matthew Cook

189 Planning Assistant

DRAFT