



2027 Watershed Management Plan

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting 2 Summary

July 14, 2026 | 10:00 AM – Noon

MCWD Office - Boardroom, 15320 Minnetonka Blvd. Minnetonka, MN 55345

TAC Members Present: Bob Bean, Ben Scharenbroich, Jessica Collin-Pilarski, Melanie Curtis, Rachael Crabb, Eric Eckman, Erick Francis, Cara Geheren, Jasper Kruggel, Kristen Larson, Anneka Munsell, Mattias Oddsson, Amy Riegel, Anne Sawyer (for Jen Dullum), Elizabeth Stout, Amy Timm, Ryan Toot, Jessica Vanderwerff Wilson, Brian Vlach.

MCWD Staff Present: Brian Beck, Becky Christopher, Abigail Couture, Samantha Hoppe, Maia Irvin, Corrina Marshall, Veronica Sannes, Gabe Sherman, James Wisker, Garrett Monson (Moore Engineering).

10:00 Overview and Recap

Becky Christopher, MCWD's Director of Policy Planning, welcomed TAC members and noted the meeting's objectives:

1. Understand local water resource priorities and management efforts.
2. Explore challenges and opportunities to improve water resource management.
3. Identify where MCWD can add the most value.
4. Gather feedback on tools and approach for assessing flood risk.

Christopher thanked TAC members who attended the first meeting in April, and highlighted feedback shared during the meeting on the 2027 Plan development process, scope, and areas of work, as well as Committee reflections on MCWD's approach over the last Plan cycle.

Christopher shared how MCWD will be working to implement feedback on the TAC process and areas of work. She also explained how feedback on the last Plan cycle will be carried forward in upcoming TAC discussions as MCWD seeks to identify clear shared priorities, build role clarity, and understand where the District can provide the greatest value to achieve measurable water resource benefits for the watershed.

10:10 Water Resource Priorities

Christopher provided an overview of results from the pre-meeting survey shared with TAC members and highlighted key takeaways on water resource planning priorities and activities in communities across the watershed, which included:

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.



- Water is a high priority for most communities, but may be under-resourced, with limited funding, staff capacity, space constraints, and competing priorities cited as the top challenges impacting implementation.
 - Christopher noted that MCWD's Balanced Urban Ecology approach to planning seeks to support multiple community priorities, such as public safety, fiscal sustainability, and economic development, alongside water resource improvements.
- Water quality goals and actions are primarily oriented around nutrient impairments and meeting regulatory requirements, but few communities are implementing large-scale, proactive projects focused on water quality improvement.
 - Christopher noted that 23 of the 29 cities and both counties in the watershed have at least one waste load allocation under a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), which supports MCWD's ongoing focus on addressing nutrient impairments through focal geographies and the Land and Water Partnership (LWP) Program.
- Flood priorities are variable across the watershed, with more built-out communities in the lower watershed noting higher levels of concern and more active implementation actions compared to the upper watershed, where communities are generally earlier in their flood risk reduction planning, focused on modeling and risk assessments.
- Across both water quality and flood risk reduction work, communities see MCWD's biggest value-add as a planning and funding partner, as well as a technical resource.

After the presentation, MCWD staff led small group discussions around the following questions:

- For cities or counties with a waste load allocation(s), what is your organization's strategy for meeting your required load reduction(s)?
- What water resource activities are supported through your organization's funding sources and which are dependent on grants or partner funds?
- If you could change one thing about the way your organization approaches water resource management, what would it be?
- How can MCWD best support or complement your organization's efforts to make progress toward its water resource goals?

Key takeaways from the discussion included:

- Prioritizing where to focus water resource efforts is a common challenge, particularly in communities with many waterbodies, competing community interests, and funding constraints.
- In most communities across the watershed, water resource work is primarily oriented around meeting MS4 requirements (e.g. regulation, education, maintenance) and responding to constituent concerns such as addressing drainage issues.
- Many communities seek opportunities to integrate stormwater BMPs with transportation or other public projects, but few are implementing large-scale water quality improvement projects, making it challenging for communities to make significant progress toward their required pollutant load reductions under TMDLs.

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.



- Stormwater utility funds typically support maintenance and programmatic activities to meet MS4 requirements, but external funding and grants are critical sources for large-scale projects.
- MCWD could provide significant support by helping communities identify and prioritize large-scale project opportunities, integrate these projects into their planning processes, and support implementation with funding contributions or help securing grants.
- Communities reflected on the differing land use conditions, water resource issues, and management strategies across the watershed, and noted ideas like regional banking or tailored regulatory approaches to accommodate this variability while maintaining water resource protections for the watershed as a whole.
- Communities desire stronger coordination with MCWD, especially through annual coordination meetings, to help align priorities, identify project opportunities, and leverage funding and technical assistance through MCWD's LWP Program.

11:10 BREAK**11:20 Flood Modeling and Risk Assessment**

Christopher reviewed the 2027 Plan's Flood Management focus area, noting that through the Plan process, MCWD wants to build shared understanding of flood risk across the watershed, evaluate strategies to reduce risk, and identify MCWD's role in flood risk reduction.

Brian Beck, MCWD's Research and Monitoring Program Manager, provided an overview of MCWD's new 2D Watershed Model, which was built to support planning with the watershed's communities to reduce flood risk and build long-term resilience. The 2D Model incorporates new, detailed datasets for both natural systems and stormwater infrastructure, to understand how water moves from city to city through both the natural and built environments. The 2D Model has been calibrated against historic events like the 2014 flood of record and June 2025 storms and has undergone testing at 22 monitoring sites throughout the watershed to validate its accuracy.

Christopher explained that the 2D Model can now be used by MCWD and its communities to inform flood risk reduction goals, priorities, and strategies. The first step in that process will be assessing current and future flood risk, which will serve as a baseline for scoping management scenarios with committee members. Christopher outlined MCWD's approach for this flood risk assessment:

1. Analyze a range of current and future predicted precipitation events, including continuous simulations for wet and dry periods.
2. Layer in current and future land use plans to quantify the impact of changes in impervious surfaces.
3. Use this data to assess impacts to the built environment (structure flooding, road flooding, groundwater fluctuation) and natural environment (stream velocity, waterbody bounce, creek baseflow during dry conditions).

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.



Christopher provided an overview of the timeline and next steps for the flood risk assessment:

- MCWD will refine the assessment's scope using TAC input, before completing it over the next 2-3 months.
- Assessment findings will be presented at the next TAC meeting in November, where members will discuss management strategies and opportunity areas.
- TAC input will inform scenario analysis conducted in December 2026 – March 2027.
- Scenario analysis findings will be discussed at a Spring 2027 TAC meeting, to inform management strategies, priorities, and roles that can be integrated into the 2027 Plan.

Christopher opened the floor for questions and discussion about the 2D Model and MCWD's approach to the flood risk assessment with the following prompts:

- What value would a flood risk assessment provide to your community's flood risk management efforts?
- What refinements could make MCWD's flood risk assessment more valuable?
- What questions or concerns do you have about the model or the flood risk assessment?

TAC members noted general comfort with MCWD's approach to the flood risk assessment and recognized the value of the 2D Model to community and watershed planning efforts. Members indicated interest in exploring how modeled scenarios will differ between the upper and lower watersheds, and how those differences could inform future regulatory policies. TAC members also expressed interest in comparing 2D Model findings to other city models and discussing criteria for evaluating and prioritizing flood risk and mitigation actions. Other suggestions on the flood risk assessment included incorporating flood duration (beyond frequency and depth) to further inform risk, and considering how flood risk data could be shared with the public and regulatory agencies.

11:55**Wrap-Up and Next Steps**

Christopher noted upcoming opportunities for TAC members to share their feedback on the flood risk assessment offline. MCWD will distribute flood inundation maps after the meeting and give members two weeks to review and provide feedback on potential data gaps, errors, or anomalies with city models or observed conditions.

Christopher previewed upcoming meetings, noting that the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) will meet in September to discuss water resource priorities and roles, and the TAC will reconvene in November to discuss the results of the flood risk assessment and identify mitigation strategies, their tradeoffs, and opportunities to inform future scenario analysis. Jasper Kruggel and Jen Dullum have volunteered to serve as liaisons between the PAC and TAC by attending and reporting on discussions with each Committee.

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.



2027 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN

TAC Meeting 2 — July 14, 2026



MINNEHAHA CREEK
WATERSHED DISTRICT

ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Phase	2026-2027 Schedule	TAC	PAC	Subwatershed Groups
Scoping	April	●	●	
Understanding Water	July	●	●	
	Sept-Nov	●		
Land Use Integration	Dec-Jan	●	●	
	Feb-Mar			●
Developing Strategy	Apr - May	●	●	
	Jun - Jul	●		
Plan Drafting	Sept - Oct			●
	Nov - Dec	●	●	

MEETING 2 OBJECTIVES

Understand local water resource priorities and management efforts

Explore challenges and opportunities to improve water resource management

Identify where MCWD can add the most value

Gather feedback on tools and approach for assessing flood risk

AGENDA

▶ **Process Overview and Recap**

▶ **Water Resource Priorities**

▶ **Break**


▶ **Flood Modeling and Risk Assessment**

▶ **Wrap-up and Next Steps**

MEETING 1 RECAP



PROCESS INPUT




Share materials in advance

*Targeting early packet posting
with discussion questions*




Provide summaries while content is fresh

*Sharing meeting summaries
within two weeks*



Leverage time between meetings

*Providing online feedback
tools and materials*



Schedule meetings out in advance

*Setting dates at least two
months out*

AREAS OF INTEREST

How would you like to distribute your time across the Plan's 4 focus areas?






- ▶ Affirmation of MCWD's partnership approach
- ▶ Appreciation for efforts to streamline and re-orient permitting
- ▶ Recognition of the scale and impact of MCWD's projects
- ▶ Interest in support for smaller-scale projects and range of other issues

WATER RESOURCE PRIORITIES



SURVEY FINDINGS – WATER RESOURCE PRIORITIES



Water ranks highly among most organizations.

SURVEY FINDINGS – COMMUNITY PRIORITIES

1	Public Safety
2	Fiscal Sustainability
3	Public Infrastructure and Utilities
4	Community Vitality and Inclusion
5	Sustainability and Resilience
6	Environmental Stewardship
7	Transportation and Mobility
8	Parks and Recreation
9	Economic Development
10	Housing / Housing Affordability

SURVEY FINDINGS – COMMUNITY PRIORITIES

1	Public Safety
2	Fiscal Sustainability
3	Public Infrastructure and Utilities
4	Community Vitality and Inclusion
5	Sustainability and Resilience
6	Environmental Stewardship
7	Transportation and Mobility
8	Parks and Recreation
9	Economic Development
10	Housing / Housing Affordability



SURVEY FINDINGS – WATER QUALITY GOALS

Common Themes

Meeting TMDL waste load allocations

Treating stormwater & protecting groundwater

Maintaining healthy ecosystems



Pursuing cost-effective solutions

**Water quality goals
are most commonly
oriented around
nutrient impairments
and state standards.**

WASTE LOAD ALLOCATIONS


► 23/29 Cities

► 2 Counties



SURVEY FINDINGS – WATER QUALITY ACTIONS

What actions are you taking to make progress toward water quality goals?




SURVEY FINDINGS – WATER QUALITY CONSTRAINTS




Water quality actions are most limited by funding, competing priorities, and space constraints.

SURVEY FINDINGS – MCWD ROLE

How should MCWD support your organization in achieving water quality goals?



SURVEY FINDINGS – FLOOD RISK ACTIONS




SURVEY FINDINGS – FLOOD RISK CONSTRAINTS



Actions to reduce flood risk are most limited by funding, space constraints, and staff capacity.

SURVEY FINDINGS – MCWD ROLE

How should MCWD support your organization in reducing flood risk?



SURVEY FINDINGS – SUMMARY



Water is a high priority, but may be under resourced

There are a range of water quality actions, but larger-scale projects are limited

Cities are at different stages in planning for future flood risk

MCWD can add the most value as a planning and funding partner

DISCUSSION



DISCUSSION

- 
1. For cities or counties with a waste load allocation, what is your organization's strategy for meeting your required load reduction?
 2. What water resource activities are supported through your organization's funding sources and which are dependent on grants/partner funds?
 3. If you could change one thing about the way your organization approaches water resource work, what would it be?
 4. How can MCWD best support or complement your organization's efforts to make progress toward its water resource goals?



SHARE-OUT

Brian Beck
Research & Monitoring
Program Manager

ah Schweiger
City of St. Louis Park

Laura Oakden
City

Melanie

BREAK



FLOOD MODELING AND RISK ASSESSMENT



FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT



Flood Management Strategy

*Assessment of current
and future flood risk*

*Evaluation of management
strategies and opportunities*

*Definition of MCWD's role in
flood management*

**Subwatershed
Planning**

**Land & Water
Partnership**

**Metrics of
Success**

MCWD'S ROLE IN FLOOD MANAGEMENT




UNDERSTAND & PREDICT

Utilize and expand technical capabilities in data collection, analysis and tools to understand and predict the impacts of climate change at a watershed scale.



CONVENE & PLAN


Bring together local, regional, and state agencies to build consensus around the issues, align goals, form partnerships, leverage resources, and develop a coordinated strategy.




IMPLEMENT, MEASURE & ADAPT

Coordinate implementation actions with partners to make measurable progress toward goals. Implementation actions may include projects, policy changes, and operational improvements.


MODEL PURPOSE AND APPROACH



MODEL PURPOSE AND APPROACH




PROCESS STRUCTURE




PROCESS STRUCTURE


Understand Water Resource Needs



Lakes, Streams+ Wetlands




Soils + Groundwater




Habitat + Wildlife


Understand Land Use Plans & Priorities



Roads + Infrastructure



Parks + Open Space



Community Development


Align Goals & Evaluate Strategies

Low	Medium	High
Resource Benefit		
Community Benefit		
Cost		
Timing		
Capacity		


Develop Plans for the Next Decade




MODEL PURPOSE AND APPROACH



MODEL PURPOSE AND APPROACH




MODEL PURPOSE AND APPROACH




PROCESS STRUCTURE

Understand Water Resource Needs



Lakes, Streams+ Wetlands




Soils + Groundwater




Habitat + Wildlife


Understand Land Use Plans & Priorities




Roads + Infrastructure





Parks + Open Space




Community Development



PROCESS STRUCTURE





Delano

New Hope
Crystal

NEPIN

Minneapolis

Minnehaha

M

Minneapolis-Saint
Paul
International
Airport


Waconia


Chanhassen


Eden
Prairie

Bloomington

Fort
Snelling
State Park








 XP-SWMM







 XP-SWMM


 Stormwise


XP-SWMM
Stormwise



XP-SWMM
Stormwise










Seamless Surface

- **LiDAR – 2022 USGS LiDAR processed at 0.5 m resolution**
- **Channel bathymetry developed for Minnehaha Creek and ~70 upper watershed channels**
- **Bathymetry integrated for approximately 190 known waterbodies watershed-wide**
- **Bathymetry estimated for an addition 405 waterbodies within 1 mile of watershed boundary**




PROCESS STRUCTURE


Understand Water Resource Needs



Lakes, Streams+ Wetlands




Soils + Groundwater



Habitat + Wildlife


Understand Land Use Plans & Priorities



Roads + Infrastructure



Parks + Open Space



Community Development

Align Goals & Evaluate Strategies


Low	Medium	High
Resource Benefit		
Community Benefit		
Cost		
Timing		
Capacity		

Develop Plans for the Next Decade




PROCESS STRUCTURE


Understand Water Resource Needs



Lakes, Streams+ Wetlands




Soils + Groundwater




Habitat + Wildlife


Understand Land Use Plans & Priorities



Roads + Infrastructure



Parks + Open Space



Community Development


Align Goals & Evaluate Strategies

Low	Medium	High
Resource Benefit		
Community Benefit		
Cost		
Timing		
Capacity		

Develop Plans for the Next Decade



TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS TO SOLVE APPROACH ISSUES




29 cities, 2 counties, and regional/state agencies


59,529 Inlets, Outlets, and Manholes

52,620 Pipes and Culverts


TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS TO SOLVE APPROACH ISSUES





29 cities, 2 counties, and regional/state agencies
59,529 Inlets, Outlets, and Manholes
52,620 Pipes and Culverts



**Reconciling watershed scale with
local scale**







Long Lake Creek

Gleason Lake Creek

Painter Creek

Dutch Lake

Langdon Lake

Lake Minnetonka

Lake Minnetonka


Christmas Lake


Lake Virginia


Schutz Lake


Minnehaha Creek

Six Mile Creek











PROCESS STRUCTURE


Understand Water Resource Needs



Lakes, Streams+ Wetlands




Soils + Groundwater




Habitat + Wildlife


Understand Land Use Plans & Priorities



Roads + Infrastructure



Parks + Open Space



Community Development

Align Goals & Evaluate Strategies

Low	Medium	High
Resource Benefit		
Community Benefit		
Cost		
Timing		
Capacity		


Develop Plans for the Next Decade



REPRESENTING REALITY



MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT REAL-TIME SENSOR NETWORK

- Legend**
- Flow + Stormwater Station
 - Level Only Station
 - USGS Station
 - Subwatershed Boundaries





REPRESENTING REALITY

Schutz Lake Outlet Calibrated Model vs Measured Flow (2025)






REPRESENTING REALITY

Schutz Lake Outlet Calibrated Model vs Measured Flow (2025)




REPRESENTING REALITY





SLP 100 Year Inundation




SLP 100 Year Inundation




Stormwise 100 Year Inundation

PROCESS STRUCTURE


Understand Water Resource Needs




Understand Land Use Plans & Priorities



Align Goals & Evaluate Strategies



Develop Plans for the Next Decade



AREAS OF WORK



Flood Management Strategy

Assessment of current and future flood risk

Evaluation of management strategies and opportunities

Definition of MCWD's role in flood management

Subwatershed Planning

Land & Water Partnership

Metrics of Success

APPROACH – PRECIPITATION


Storms events:

- ▶ Current:
 - ▶ Atlas 14 - 1, 10, 100 yr 24-hr
- ▶ Future:
 - ▶ Atlas 15 - 1, 10, 100-yr 24-hr (once available)
 - ▶ 100-year 24-hr = 8.5"

Continuous simulations:


- ▶ Wet periods - summer 2014, 2019
- ▶ Dry period - summer 2022

Twin Cities Annual Precipitation 1920 - 2020



Source: Minnesota State Climatology Office • Created with Datawrapper

APPROACH – LAND USE



- ▶ Met Council 2020 & 2040 land use
- ▶ Quantify changes in impervious
- ▶ Assume current regulations

APPROACH – RISK ASSESSMENT



- ▶ Built environment:
 - ▶ Structure flooding
 - ▶ Road flooding
 - ▶ Groundwater fluctuation

- ▶ Natural environment:
 - ▶ Stream velocity
 - ▶ Waterbody bounce
 - ▶ Creek baseflow

OUTPUTS AND NEXT STEPS

- ▶ July-Sept:
 - ▶ Flood risk assessment
- ▶ Nov TAC Meeting:
 - ▶ Present risk assessment findings
 - ▶ Discuss management strategies and opportunities
- ▶ Dec-March:
 - ▶ Scenario analysis
- ▶ May-July TAC/PAC Meetings:
 - ▶ Present management strategy findings
 - ▶ Develop management framework



DISCUSSION



DISCUSSION

- 
- 1. What value would a flood risk assessment provide to your community's flood risk management efforts?**
 - 2. What refinements could make MCWD's flood risk assessment more valuable?**
 - 3. What questions or concerns do you have about the model or the flood risk assessment?**

WRAP-UP




OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADDITIONAL INPUT

Review of Flood Inundation Mapping

- ▶ Atlas-14 100-year
- ▶ 2014
- ▶ 2025

Distribution by July 28

Review Period: 2 weeks



UPCOMING MEETINGS

Committee	Month	Plan Phase	Meeting Topic
Policy Advisory Committee #2	September	Understanding Water	Discussion of regional priorities, management goals, and policy considerations
Technical Advisory Committee #3	November		Understand current and future flood risk, and identify management strategies, tradeoffs, and opportunities



THANK YOU!


MINNEHAHA CREEK
QUALITY OF WATER




WATERSHED DISTRICT
QUALITY OF LIFE

2027 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN TAC #2 PRE-MEETING SURVEY


Please rate the level of priority your organization prescribes for the following planning and implementation areas.



Where does surface water quality rank among your organization's priorities?




Where does flood risk reduction rank among your organization's priorities?




2027 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN TAC #2 PRE-MEETING SURVEY

Where are your organization's water resource goals and priorities memorialized today? Select all that apply.




How defined are your organization's water resource goals and priorities?




2027 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN TAC #2 PRE-MEETING SURVEY


Please note your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.



Which programs or departments are involved in water resource activities and programming in your organization?




How are water resource projects and activities funded for your organization? Select all that apply.




2027 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN TAC #2 PRE-MEETING SURVEY

What actions are being taken by your organization to make progress toward its water quality goals?




When water quality projects are implemented, what typically drives them?




2027 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN TAC #2 PRE-MEETING SURVEY


What challenges or limitations constrain your organization's water quality improvement actions? Rank them in order of impact.



What role should MCWD play to add the most value in supporting your organization in reaching its water quality goals? Please select up to three top roles for MCWD.




On the scale below, rank your organization's level of concern related to current and future flood risk?




Basic statistics				
Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.00	5.00	4.00	3.57	1.12

What actions are being taken by your organization to make progress toward its flood risk reduction goals?



What challenges or limitations constrain your organization's actions on flood risk reduction goals? Rank them in order of impact.



2027 WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN TAC #2 PRE-MEETING SURVEY

What role should MCWD play to add the most value in supporting your organization in reaching its flood risk reduction goals? Please select up to three top roles for MCWD.

