DRAFT
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND POLICY COMMITTEE
February 18, 2016
CALL TO ORDER
The Committee was brought to order by Manager Calkins at 6:50 p.m. at the District offices;
15320 Minnetonka Blvd Minnetonka, MN 55345
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
James Calkins, Richard Miller, and Brian Shekleton.
NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
Sherry Davis White and Kurt Rogness.
OTHERS PRESENT
Lars Erdahl, District Administrator; James Wisker, Director of Planning & Projects; Becky Christopher, Lead Planner & Project Manager; Anna Brown, Planner & Project Manager; Renae Clark, Planner & Project Manager; Laura Domyancich, Project & Land Technician; Katherine Sylvia, Permitting Program Lead; and Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant.
MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR
Mr. Wisker stated that the American Planning Association recently released a draft Water Policy Guide, in which there was a call for planners to strive for the integration of water resources and conventional infrastructure. He noted that this call for integration, along with other suggestions in the Guide, were initiatives the District has already undertaken and memorialized in the <i>Balanced Urban Ecology</i> policy and the District's recently-adopted Mission, Vision, Goal, and Guiding Principle statements. Manager Miller agreed, adding that the similarity of District policy with the APA's Guide served as an affirmation that the District was headed in the right direction.
Mr. Wisker stated that District staff intended on submitting comments to the APA on their draft Guide. The Committee generally encouraged this.
APPROVAL OF AGENDA
The agenda was approved without amendment.

- 47 **<u>COMMITTEE MEETING</u>**
- 48

49 <u>Comprehensive Plan Update Brochure</u>

50

51 Ms. Clark reminded the Committee that Ms. Christopher has been leading discussions about the

Two-Track Approach with the District's Policy, Technical, and Citizen Advisory Committees.
 At the meetings, Ms. Clark explained, staff referred to successful District projects to illustrate

At the meetings, Ms. Clark explained, staff referred to successful District projects to illustrate how the Focal and Responsive tracks could work moving forward. She added that staff from

55 partner agencies on these projects and others offered testimonials, speaking to the District's

- 56 competency and flexibility as a partner.
- 57

58 Ms. Clark stated that in order to memorialize this external support and to better broadcast the

- 59 District's partnership model and Two-Track Approach, she hoped to lead staff in compiling a six
- 60 to ten page brochure that includes project examples and testimonials, along with descriptions of
- 61 the District's new Mission, Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles.
- 62

63 Manager Miller stated that he was in support of such a product, stressing the importance of

64 proper presentation of the District's approach. Mr. Erdahl echoed this, again emphasizing that

65 District staff should plan to present compelling descriptions of District plans during the writing

- 66 of the Comprehensive Plan and after its adoption.
- 67

68 Manager Shekleton expressed his support for using a format similar to the recent Six Mile Creek

- Focal Geography pamphlet. He added that making the finished product web-accessible wouldserve the District well.
- 71
- 72 Manager Miller suggested that the Board select a Task Force of Managers to assist staff in
 - 73 crafting the brochure.
 - 74
 - 75 Program Evaluation Process

76

77 Ms. Christopher provided an updated process diagram and schedule for the development of the

78 Comprehensive Plan and reminded the Committee that there are three primary areas of work –

the internal strategic planning process, data/technical updates, and development of the

80 implementation framework with the advisory committees. She provided a proposed schedule for

81 the program evaluation process, as discussed by the Committee in January. According to the

schedule, staff would begin the process in March, and the PPC's review would begin in August.

83 She noted that the process would not be completed in time to inform the 2017 budget process but

- 84 would be used to inform the Comprehensive Plan.
- 85

86 Mr. Wisker explained that staff intends for both the Strategic Plan and the Six Mile Plan to be

87 integrated into the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that, given the amount of work needed for

88 each of these processes, it could be challenging to have everything completed and integrated into

- the Comprehensive Plan by January of 2017 the ideal beginning of the formal review period
- 90 for the 2017 Plan. He added that he wanted to bring this to the Committee's attention early in the

91

92 given that the review process itself takes up to six months, BWSR would likely be comfortable 93 so long as the District has an initial draft of the Plan by the deadline of June 2017. 94 95 Mr. Wisker added that if staff had a larger window of time to craft the Plan pieces, they could 96 drive down costs by exporting less of the workload to consultants and doing more in-house. 97 98 Manager White noted that District staff would likely need to be prepared to issue progress 99 reports to BWSR and the Board given that the ideal deadline may not be met. The Committee 100 was generally supportive of remaining flexible to ensure all of the respective plans would be 101 aligned and completed a level of satisfactory quality. 102 103 After inquiry from Manager Calkins, staff confirmed that the 2017 Plan was still an update of the 104 2007 Plan, and that staff were not going to re-write the entire Plan. Mr. Erdahl added that staff 105 were not planning to take more time than initially allotted to complete the Plan, but were merely 106 bringing the topic to the Board early to manage expectations. 107 108 Wenck Scope of Work 109 110 Ms. Christopher stated that staff is in the process of developing a scope of work for Wenck 111 Associates to assist with the technical aspects of the Plan update, including the following six 112 tasks: 113 114 1. Write the land and water resource inventory section 115 2. Write the water resource section of each subwatershed plan 116 3. Review staff's water quality and quantity trend analyses 4. Review and edit staff's E-Grade program description 117 118 5. Quantify progress toward 2007 phosphorus load reduction goals resulting from District 119 regulations 120 6. Prepare a technical report of the District hydraulic and hydrologic model 121 122 Manager Miller asked staff what known progress has been made on pollutant load reduction. Ms. 123 Christopher stated that progress has certainly been made, but how much progress in relation to 124 the 2007 Plan's goals is not yet known. Mr. Wisker reminded the Committee of previous 125 discussions on the difference between progress that can be measured in the water and progress 126 that can be assumed through modeling or other short term metrics, noting that it may be years 127 before the results of the District's projects and programs are measurable. 128 129 Manager Calkins noted that, to Mr. Wisker's point, it will take years for benefits to truly 130 manifest themselves given the time it takes for the waterbodies to respond and the natural 131 variation that occurs from year to year. He agreed that modeled data must be used as a surrogate. 132 133 Mr. Erdahl agreed, noting that the discussion of progress must include an educational piece 134 which would provide accurate context for the improvements garnered through the District's

event that the District may wish to pursue an extension from BWSR. Ms. Christopher stated that,

135 investments. Manager Shekleton agreed, stating that the narrative is key in reporting load 136 reduction progress. 137 138 February Advisory Committee Meetings 139 140 Ms. Christopher stated that the topics to be discussed at the next meetings of the District's 141 Advisory Committees would include the following: 142 143 The District's recently-adopted Mission, Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles • 144 • Criteria for selecting a focal geographies 145 • Process for planning in focal geographies 146 • The District's responsive track – co-developing a framework for coordination and 147 integrated planning 148 149 Six Mile Outreach Efforts 150 151 Ms. Brown stated that District staff and Board liaisons have met with several stakeholders to 152 introduce the Six Mile Planning process, and that they will soon be meeting with Carver County, 153 Hennepin County, and Three Rivers Park District (TRPD). She noted that the meetings have 154 gone well thus far, and that the formal kickoff for the subwatershed meetings would likely be 155 scheduled for April in order to allow time to meet with the three remaining parties separately 156 beforehand. 157 158 Six Mile Process Scoping 159 160 Ms. Brown presented a diagram which laid out the planning process for the Six Mile Creek subwatershed, as follows: 161 162 Phase 1: Science 163 • HHPLS 164 2007 Comprehensive Plan 165 • 166 • TMDLs 167 • Diagnostic Study 168 Carp Assessment • 169 170 Phase 2: **Planning** 171 • Informal Planning & Project Development • Formal Planning 172 173 • Plan Development 174 **Project Technical Feasibility** • 175 176 Phase 3: Implementation 177 • Design, order & build projects

- 178 Leverage investments
- 179

• Manage projects

180

181 Ms. Brown noted that in developing the planning documents, the team of staff and consultants 182 she would seek assistance from would be different depending on the timeline and overall content 183 expectations that the Board hadfor the final plan. She added that a temporary Planning Assistant 184 position may be able to bring much of the mapping and formatting work in-house, depending on 185 the level of product the Board was seeking. Ms. Brown asked the Committee for preliminary 186 comment.

187

Manager Miller stated that he would be in support of a Planning Assistant position provided thatit would result in the quality that the Board desires. He added that he assumes such a position

- 190 would be temporary.
- 191

192 Manager Calkins asked what the water resource goals were for the subwatershed, and how they

would be determined. Mr. Wisker stated that the results of the Diagnostic Study and the Carp
 Assessment would largely inform what issues or stressors must be addressed, and thus what

Assessment would largely inform what issues or stressors must be addressed, and thus what goals must be set. He added that staff is currently working with Wenck to build the water frame

for the subwatershed which will include how issues, goals, and management strategies nest. Mr.

197 Wisker noted that this information might be back in front of the PPC in March

198

 Boundary Change with Carver County WMO

200

201 Ms. Brown stated that the Carver County Watershed Management Organization (CCWMO) was 202 seeking a boundary change with the District to more closely align the legal boundaries to the 203 hydrologic boundaries of the two agencies. She noted that the only parcels of immediate interest 204 which may change hands are part of the Marsh Lake Hunting Club, which lies on Marsh Lake. 205 Ms. Brown stated that District staff would be meeting with staff from the CCWMO and the City of Victoria next week to discuss these changes, and to develop a rough framework to guide 206 207 permitting practices for developments that cross boundaries. She added that CCWMO Board action would occur on March 15th, and the District's Board would need to issue a Letter of 208 209 Concurrence by April before the proposed change can be submitted to BWSR.

210

211 Grandview District Stormwater Planning Update

212

Ms. Sylvia stated that the Grandview neighborhood of Edina is engaged in transportation planning within the Grandview redevelopment district. Ms. Sylvia explained that recently,

214 planning within the Grandview redevelopment district. Mis. Syrva explained that recently, 215 District staff met with the City to discuss permitting for the area.Staff partnered with Edina and

their transportatin consultant, LHB to undertake a preliminary analysis to identify the cost-

benefit of regional solutions for the area which drains largely untreated to Minnehaha Creek.

217 Schern of regional solutions for the area which drains largery uniteated to while and Creek. 218 Ms. Sylvia informed the Committee that this informed would be incorporated into the City's

219 planning documents, following the recent public informational meeting as a long-term

220 placeholder for the potential to pursue water management for this area.

221

222

223 Park Nicollet Update

224

225 Mr. Wisker reminded the Committee that he District had entered a MOU with Park Nicollet 226 Methodist Hospital in 2014 following initial inquiries by Methodist Hospital regarding the 227 potential for a flood wall. Mr. Wisker explained that District staff suggested that a wetland 228 restoration on Park Nicollet-owned land to the north may be able to provide the necessary 229 compensatory storage while creating ecological lift for the area which the City has interest in due 230 to its high visibility and proximity to the proposed Louisiana SWLRT Station. Mr. Wisker 231 outlined the next steps and timeline for Committee, being partnership meetings in the upcoming 232 month, and promised to provide an update in March.

233

234 Mound Senior Living Community Update

235

236 Mr. Wisker stated that District staff had recently met with the City of Mound and a potential

developer to discuss partnerships on property located on County Road 110, which was under

238 purchase agreement and being contemplated for Senior Living. Mr. Wisker noted the

opportunities and site development constraints and promised to provide an update in March.Development.

240

242 Knollwood Mall Update

243

244 Mr. Wisker stated that District staff had recently met several times with St. Louis Park and the 245 property managers of Knollwood Mall to discuss the opportunity to satisfy regional stormwater 246 management on the mall property. Mr. Wisker noted that the property managers had discussed 247 the regional management concept with the senior asset managers of the pension fund which owns 248 Knollwood Mall, and had received report back that the owners were not receptive based on a 249 variety of perceived risk factors. Mr. Wisker detailed those factors and how MCWD and SLP 250 staff had outlined how those risk points may be able to be mitigated. He informed the 251 Committee that MCWD and SLP were waiting to hear back final confirmation of the decision in 252 writing in the next couple of weeks. He noted that assuming the decision was final, staff would 253 prepare a summary for the Board of Managers.

- 254 Deer Hill Preserve Update
- 255

256 Ms. Domyancich reminded the Committee of the District's history with the Deerhill Preserve

257 development (formerly referred to as Stonegate) as a technical advisor and the potential to serve

as the conservation easement holder. She stated that the final plat for the project was to be

considered by the City of Medina at a Council Meeting on March 15th, requiring District Board

- approval of the easement at the March 10^{th} Workshop.
- 261

262 Ms. Domyancich explained that the restoration work would be done in the first phase of

- 263 construction, in 2016. She noted that the District would continue to provide technical advice, and
- 264 monitor the easement. Ms. Domyancich added that the District would remain responsible for

- 265 monitoring the easement after the HOA assumes funding management of the conservation areas266 after the developer's initial restoration work.
- 267

Manager Miller and Mr. Wisker commended Ms. Domyancich for her work on the Deerhill
 Preserve, noting the early involvement of the District in the planning process.

270

271 The Committee Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

- 272
- 273 Respectfully submitted,274
- 275 Matthew Cook
- 276 Planning Assistant