

1 **DRAFT**

2 **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND POLICY COMMITTEE**

3
4
5 **November 19, 2015**

6
7 **CALL TO ORDER**

8
9 Committee Chair Calkins brought the meeting to order at 4:05 PM.

10
11 **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

12
13 Manager Calkins, Manager Miller, and Manager Shekleton.

14
15 **NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

16
17 Manager White.

18
19 **OTHERS PRESENT**

20
21 Lars Erdahl, District Administrator; James Wisker, Director of Planning & Projects; Becky
22 Christopher, Lead Planner; Tiffany Schaufler, Project & Land Program Manager; Michael
23 Hayman, Planner & Project Manager; Anna Brown, Planner & Project Manager; Peter
24 Rechelbacher, Citizen Advisory Committee Member; Laurie Bauer, Himle Rapp & Company;
25 and Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant.

26
27 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

28
29 Mr. Wisker asked to amend the agenda to include an update on the project at 325 Blake Road if
30 time allows. Manager Miller moved to include the item, and the motion was seconded by
31 Manager Calkins.

32
33 **COMMITTEE MEETING**

34
35 Mr. Wisker stated that the next step in the District’s strategic planning effort – as approved by
36 the Board in October – is to define the organization’s mission, vision, values, and goals. As
37 discussed at previous meetings, two primary reasons have been identified for revisiting these
38 foundational elements. One is to ensure that they reflect the evolution in District policy that has
39 occurred in recent years. The other is to ensure that the statements are focused, clear and
40 compelling. Mr. Wisker stated that, as background for the Board’s consideration of these
41 foundational elements, he would begin by providing an overview of the evolution of District
42 policy. Laurie Bauer with Himle Rapp would then discuss best practices for developing effective
43 mission, vision, values, and goals. He noted that this information is intended to help the
44 Managers prepare for their individual interviews with Himle Rapp which will be scheduled over
45 the next few weeks.

47 Evolution of District Policy

48

49 Mr. Wisker noted that, at a previous Committee meeting, it was discussed that staff would be
50 compiling a summary of District policies and progress over the last plan cycle as part of the self-
51 assessment. He explained that the paper in their packet is a preliminary draft that focuses on
52 what has emerged as a central theme of past Board discussions and policy - the integration of
53 land-use and water planning. He also distributed an executive summary of the paper and an
54 outline of the broader policy evolution that staff will continue to refine and write up into a
55 comprehensive self-assessment report. Mr. Wisker stated that he would provide a brief overview
56 of the draft paper that includes the following:

57

58

59

60

61

62

1. Review of MCWD's recent policy history
2. The statewide mandate concerning land-use and water planning
3. Why the "governance gap" between land-use and water planning exists
4. What the MCWD has done to bridge the "gap"

63

Mr. Wisker highlighted a few policy milestones from recent MCWD history:

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

October 2009 – The Board of Managers, during a planning discussion for the Minnehaha Creek Greenway, directed staff to create a partnership for Minnehaha Creek modeled after Hennepin Community Works which acknowledged the ability of natural systems to underpin a local sense of identity, creating economic and social value. The Hennepin County model utilized the power of convening public and private sector partners by “building bridges for effective planning and implementation” to align investment around planned improvements to generate broad community value.

73

74

75

76

77

2010 and 2011 – Louis Smith presented his white paper *Watershed Partnerships*, commissioned by the MCWD and others, highlighting the value and strategy behind partnerships to advance watershed initiatives through collaborative and integrated planning.

78

79

80

81

82

May 2013 – At the Board retreat, the Managers requested that a policy framework be developed to “institutionalize” the District’s goal of, “integrating our work into the plans and work of others” by “expressing a commitment to complement the efforts of cities and private development,” and by “moving away from regulatory focused relationships.”

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

September 2013 - The Planning and Policy Committee discussed again the value of partnerships, and that while partnerships had been enjoyed under the 2007 plan, it had been structured as a TMDL for local municipalities and was immediately followed by four years of rulemaking, solidifying the District’s reputation as a regulatory agency. The Committee discussed that bolstering the philosophy of partnerships and integration with land-use may establish a central theme for the 2017 plan, also citing the power of convening multi-jurisdictional partnerships within focused geographies to align authority, mission and investment for large-scale implementation and community benefit.

91
92 **March 2014** – The Board adopted the *Balanced Urban Ecology* policy as “a statement of
93 the MCWD’s fundamental philosophy and way of doing business,” to “guide the
94 development of the District’s update to its Comprehensive Plan,” and to operationalize
95 the policy in the District’s “planning processes”. The policy emphasized the
96 interdependence of the natural and built environments, the need for integrated planning,
97 the value of disciplined focus, and the importance of flexibility and bold, creative
98 thinking.
99

100 Mr. Wisker stated that this focus by the District on improving the integration of land-use and
101 water planning has been reinforced by several recent evaluations of water governance in
102 Minnesota that reached the same conclusion:
103

104 **2007** – The Office of the Legislative Auditor released *Evaluation Report on Watershed*
105 *Management*, asserting that water resource condition is driven by land-use. The report
106 found that efforts to manage water quality are most effective when coordinated with land-
107 use planning.
108

109 **2009** – The Minnesota Environmental Initiative completed the *Land and Water Policy*
110 *Project*, which found that land-use and water planning are compartmentalized at all
111 levels, residing under separate bodies of jurisdiction and regulation.
112

113 **2011** – A Hennepin County Water Governance Project concluded that the interaction
114 between technically based watershed management and the political world of the built
115 environment was complicated, requiring significant effort to coordinate.
116

117 **2013** – The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency published a report to the legislature,
118 *Water Regulation and Governance Evaluation*, which found that “opportunities to
119 address water-land-use connections have waned in recent decades,” and that state water
120 management goals can only be achieved with strong links to land-use. Moreover,
121 watershed district plans were criticized for their “focus on engineering solutions, rather
122 than land-use driven issues or trends”.
123

124 Mr. Wisker then began to outline the reasons why it seems that the “governance gap” between
125 planning spheres persists. He stated that watershed districts were created to insulate water from
126 the inherent conflict that exists for cities to manage water on a hydrologic basis across political
127 boundaries. While the creation of watershed districts effectively addressed these issues, the
128 division of land use and water planning into separate jurisdictions created “silos”. Mr. Wisker
129 underscored that, although the Watershed Act calls for integrated land-use and water planning, it
130 does not provide an explanation as to how such integration is meant to happen in policy or
131 procedural context. Furthermore, the framework governing watershed management created
132 unintended consequences that complicate the call for integration:
133

- 134 1. Desynchronized planning – Require prescriptive ten-year implementation plans, creating a
135 tendency towards static watershed management plans that are ill equipped to respond to the
136 dynamic nature of land-use change
137
- 138 2. Cultural differences – Disproportionately emphasizes technical approaches to the identification
139 of issues and solutions, over integrating water planning with land-use planning and decisions.
140 While sound science is a prerequisite of successful water management, the lack of emphasis on
141 integration has perpetuated a cultural (language, knowledge, polices, rules, procedures)
142 disconnect reinforcing the silos of water management and land-use.
143
- 144 3. Reliance on regulation - Due to the desynchronization created by static, technically driven plans,
145 watershed management relies heavily on a reactive safety net of regulation that does not achieve
146 improvement but provides minimum standards to manage land-use change toward “no
147 degradation.”
148

149 Finally, Mr. Wisker described how the District’s policy trajectory has addressed these issues in
150 the following ways:

- 151
- 152 1. Informal and formal planning
 - 153 2. Multi-disciplinary planning, thinking, and implementation
 - 154 3. Innovative urban design
 - 155 4. De-emphasizing regulation, without compromising authority, and emphasizing
156 partnership
157

158 Mr. Wisker explained that the District’s Comprehensive Plan – the organization’s “formal”
159 planning – lays out the policy environment, the planning framework, the financing approach, and
160 relevant philosophies on the District’s approach to its mission. He summarized that the
161 Comprehensive Plan gives the District direction and allows for transparency. Mr. Wisker noted
162 that most of the inroads made in recent years, however, were made through more informal
163 planning processes. He described informal planning as being modeled after Hennepin
164 Community Works’ “building bridges for effective planning”, requiring the development and
165 maintenance of relationships in areas of land-use change, thereby staying updated on
166 infrastructure investments or development that may relate to strategic water resource solutions.
167 Mr. Wisker stated that, with this early awareness of potential land-use change, the District is
168 better positioned to act as an asset to its partners and accomplish water management objectives.
169

170 Mr. Wisker added that once the District is aware of a project early on, staff’s ability to take part
171 in multi-disciplinary planning and implementation has been critical in “bridging” the gap
172 between the land-use and water “silos.” Mr. Wisker defined multi-disciplinary planning and
173 implementation as an approach through which District staff – by understanding their partner’s
174 objectives, language, and processes – can propose mutually-beneficial solutions to partners. He
175 pointed to the District’s involvement with Japs Olson, for which District planners had to learn
176 about the printing businesses goals, municipal annexation, transportation, and road relocation to

177 better comprehend the parameters within which the District could accomplish its water resource
178 objectives.

179
180 Mr. Wisker stated that District has also used innovative designs in urban landscapes to maximize
181 water resource benefit while using the presence of water features and creative stormwater
182 management to increase the value of the land being developed, thereby satisfying another partner
183 need.

184
185 Finally, Mr. Wisker explained that by de-emphasizing the District's regulatory role– without
186 compromising the District's authority – staff have been able to creatively provide improved
187 protection beyond what the rules alone would have required.

188
189 Mr. Wisker looked to the Committee for question or comment.

190
191 Manager Miller stated that he is amazed by the movement the District has made toward
192 integration over the last 7-8 years. He added that the presentation and associated materials made
193 clear that the District's trajectory was heading towards the integration of land-use and water
194 planning. He further noted that having this background on the District's policy progression
195 helped to frame the goal and direction-setting discussions that were to take place at upcoming
196 Committee and Board meetings. Manager Miller finished by affirming his comfort with the
197 District's direction as presented.

198
199 Manager Calkins noted that after reading through the draft white paper that was included in the
200 meeting packet, he found himself disagreeing with the phrasing of some points, though he agreed
201 with the sentiment. Manager Calkins stated that he firmly believes that land-use planning should
202 be and always has been the purview and jurisdiction of the District, and that suggesting there is a
203 “gap” in governance is not entirely accurate. Manager Calkins mentioned that the idea of
204 integrating land-use and water planning was not new as it was the original intent for watershed
205 management. He added that he tracked the policy mandates and audits Mr. Wisker referenced in
206 his presentation, and found that the reports simply restated the known shortcomings of watershed
207 management and provided no solutions. Manager Calkins attributed this lack of watershed
208 involvement in land use to political pressure.

209
210 Mr. Wisker responded by saying that while the known issue was not new, the District's response
211 to the disconnect between land-use and water planning was new. He pointed out that there were
212 two options to address the planning disconnect. The first relies heavily on utilizing regulatory
213 authority to implement watershed management requirements into planned construction initiated
214 by others. The second cultivated an environment in which the District would be increasingly
215 invited into land-use planning because of the District's proven track record of adding value to
216 non-water related projects. Mr. Wisker reinforced that the fragmentation of land-use and water
217 planning does exist, and that the District had demonstrated meaningful progress by changing its
218 overall approach and posture to engender more partnership and increased integration outside of
219 regulation.

220

221 Manager Calkins agreed, adding that watershed management should have always been as Mr.
222 Wisker suggested, and that the District's trending towards this optimal practice was not a new
223 idea, but overdue fulfillment of founding intent.

224
225 Manager Miller disagreed with Manager Calkins' identification of politics as the central reason
226 for water and land-use planning remaining compartmentalized. Manager Miller instead offered
227 that that it was due to a lack of understanding of each other's goals and that the two planning
228 spheres speak a different language. Manager Miller elaborated, noting that the District's work
229 with Japs Olson and neighboring projects, including the cooperation between Hopkins and St.
230 Louis Park, may not have happened without the District being welcomed as a broker. Manager
231 Miller pointed out that the ability of District staff and Managers to "put themselves in the shoes"
232 of Japs Olson – a printing company – is what allowed the development of the relationships
233 necessary to deliver the final project.

234
235 Manager Calkins concurred, restating that watershed management should have looked like the
236 District's model from the beginning, adding that it was a matter of common sense.

237
238 Mr. Erdahl recapitulated the general discussion, saying that while the concept of integrated
239 planning was not new, as Manager Calkins said, the practice of separated planning has been the
240 predominant trend for years. Mr. Erdahl then offered that the overlapping authorities and
241 jurisdictions in land-use planning, namely of cities and watersheds, tends to warrant discussion
242 and convening. He suggested that this role of convener could be a useful way for the District to
243 become more involved and stay involved in land-use planning.

244
245 Manager White added that even based on recent experience the reputation of watershed
246 technicians, when involved in land-use projects, is to limit the options of the land-use planners,
247 invariably costing the parties subject to watershed regulation significant amounts of money. She
248 suggested that the District could break this perception, as Mr. Erdahl and Manager Miller alluded
249 to, by facilitating projects instead of inhibiting them.

250
251 Mr. Wisker offered staff's perspective, noting that through implementing the incremental policy
252 changes of recent years, staff has enjoyed an increasingly positive reputation amongst its partner
253 cities, with the District being invited to co-plan land-use projects. This newfound reputation, he
254 continued, is juxtaposed against the District's recent history. Mr. Wisker agreed with Manager
255 Calkins in that the integration land-use and water planning should be a common sense practice,
256 but added that despite it being common sense concerted action in this direction is required to
257 generate results. He noted that until the District passed policy and began meaningfully
258 partnering with land-use management organizations, the reality was that cities and developers
259 saw the District as a necessary obstacle and not a crucial asset. He noted that planning and
260 regulatory staff have started to see these attitudes shift in their frequent interaction with the
261 broader community.

262

263 Mr. Wisker finished by stating that he anticipated that the materials presented would be the
264 subject of ongoing dialogue amongst the Board in the coming weeks, being revisited and revised
265 as needed.

266
267 Himle Rapp: Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals
268

269 Ms. Bauer began by noting that Himle Rapp has been enlisted to assist the District in developing
270 a set of foundational elements for its Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Evaluation, including
271 mission, vision, goals, and guiding principles (values). These foundational elements will be used
272 to focus and prioritize program activities and resources internally through the program evaluation
273 process. They will also be a critical part of the District's branding and communication to external
274 stakeholders. She added that it is typical for organizations to review these foundational elements
275 during strategic planning, so it is good timing to do so.

276
277 Ms. Bauer reviewed the current state of the District's mission and goals. She pointed to the most
278 visible messaging item, the District's mission statement. She noted that it was too long and had
279 too many items to be useful, as the mission is supposed to be easy to remember and convey a
280 clear message. Ms. Bauer stated that the District's 17 goals were far too many in number and that
281 many were not, in fact, goals – some were strategies and others were tactics. She noted that the
282 District does not currently have a vision statement, and while not all organizations have a vision
283 statement, a vision is a messaging item that functions as a complement to mission, values, and
284 goals, and therefore worth considering . In addition, Ms. Bauer noted that she would highlight
285 emerging themes from District policy as elements to possibly include in a future declaration of
286 the District's values.

287
288 Ms. Bauer opened up her section on vision statements by beginning what was to be a continuing
289 analogy throughout the presentation to help illustrate the role of each messaging item in
290 communicating to both internal and external audiences. She related the vision statement with the
291 destination an organization wanted to arrive at, an ideal ultimate situation. Ms. Bauer stated that
292 a vision should be a long-term pursuit – being the biggest organization in a given field, being the
293 best organization, or to be unique and redefine the understanding of a given organization's field.
294 Visions such as these, she noted, were meant to be brief and provide the simplest, highest-level
295 focus for an organization. Ms. Bauer added that a vision statement, by being aspirational and
296 purpose-driven, is supposed to provide motivation and inspiration to an organization's
297 employees and supporters. She then provided examples of vision statements from various
298 organizations, highlighting that the examples were all short, to-the-point statements.

299
300 Ms. Bauer continued her analogy, suggesting that if the vision is the destination, the mission is
301 the path taken to reach the destination. She pointed out that while a mission statement is typically
302 more specific and a little longer than a vision statement, it is still meant to be clear and concise.
303 Ms. Bauer stated that mission statements are often the most useful tool for initial external
304 communication, and thus should employ simple, readily-understood language and not contain
305 field- or organization-specific jargon. She identified the purpose of a mission statement as
306 answering the question “why does your organization exist?” Ms. Bauer provided examples of

307 effective mission statements. In contrast to the examples, she then offered up the mission
308 statement of Carpenter Nature Center, an organization for which she sits on the Board. Ms.
309 Bauer drew parallels between the Center’s mission statement and the District’s own mission
310 statement, pointing to the cluttered and lengthy nature of both statements. She then presented a
311 proposed revision to the Center’s mission statement. Ms. Bauer pointed out that the revision was
312 shorter and simpler, as it had boiled down to their essence the scattered points of the original
313 version. For comparison, she selected the core elements of what the District’s current mission
314 statement and recent policy suggest a new mission would logically be:

315
316 **What:** protect and improve natural resources

317 **How:** through partnership

318 **Why:** to support sustainable communities

319
320 Ms. Bauer suggested that these elements, in the District’s context, answer the questions a
321 mission is supposed to address.

322
323 Ms. Bauer moved on to values adding that if the vision is the destination and the mission is the
324 path taken to get to the destination, then the values of an organization are the signposts that give
325 incremental direction along the path (mission) to reach the destination (vision). This incremental
326 direction, she explained, is to keep the organization’s progression along a path true to the
327 organization’s identity. Ms. Bauer stated that organizations ought to have between five and seven
328 values. She suggested that this number of values could complete a definition of an organization’s
329 identity, while remaining simple enough to help focus the organization on its way of doing
330 business. As Ms. Bauer provided examples of various organizations’ sets of values, she
331 highlighted Andersen Corporation. Andersen, she noted, has each of their five values displayed
332 on the walls of their office buildings, acting as a constant reminder of the company’s direction
333 and approach. Ms. Bauer added that establishing clear and descriptive values helps potential
334 employees identify whether or not they would enjoy or be successful in working at the
335 organization. She identified the following themes as potential values for the District based Himle
336 Rapp’s analysis of the District’s policy.

337
338 **Focus**

339 **Responsiveness**

340 **Partnership**

341 **Integrated planning**

342 **Innovation**

343 **Leadership**

344 **Sound science**

345
346 Ms. Bauer stated that an organization’s goals help to provide parameters for strategic planning,
347 allocating resources, and identifying opportunities for development. She suggested that the
348 District should follow the SMART model, which posits that useful goals will be:

349
350 **Specific**

351 **Measurable**
352 **Attainable**
353 **Realistic**
354 **Timely**
355

356 Ms. Bauer listed the four proposed goals that the District been using as placeholders in various
357 frameworks and documents. These goals were:

358
359 **Water Quality**
360 **Water Quantity**
361 **Ecological Integrity**
362 **Community Engagement**
363

364 Ms. Bauer restated that these proposed goals, given the proper metrics and scale, would satisfy
365 the SMART requirements. She added that they would also ensure that the seventeen priorities
366 laid out in the District's 2007 goals would still be accounted for, as they nest well under the four
367 proposed goals.
368

369 Ms. Bauer laid out the process that the Board and Himle Rapp would be taking to help inform
370 and craft draft statements for the District. She stated that first, she and John Himle would be
371 conducting one-on-one phone interviews with individual Managers over the coming weeks. Ms.
372 Bauer stated that then Himle Rapp would aggregate and synthesize these results, and incorporate
373 input from staff discussions with Himle Rapp's review of existing materials and policy. With
374 these three inputs, Ms. Bauer continued, Himle Rapp would work to draft two to three potential
375 options for each element which would be presented to the Committee, and then bring the
376 statements with Committee input to the Board for review.
377

378 Manager Shekleton suggested that the draft statements be brought through a Board workshop
379 prior to requesting action at a Board meeting. Mr. Wisker concurred that this would likely be the
380 recommended process.
381

382 Manager Shekleton asked if the 4 proposed goals would be ranked and if the current 17 would be
383 organized under the 4. Ms. Bauer confirmed that all 17 can be nested under the proposed 4 but
384 that some will show up as strategies or tactics under a broader goal.
385

386 After staff probed for any questions, the Committee generally agreed that the background
387 provided was helpful and they were ready for the process with Himle to move forward.
388

389 Mr. Erdahl acknowledged that the Managers, staff, and Himle Rapp have all been through
390 strategic planning processes before, but noted that this particular effort may perhaps be different
391 in the quality of the background information provided by staff and Himle Rapp, which is
392 extremely useful in clearly defining terms. He continued, that by establishing a common
393 terminology, the Board could move forward with developing the materials that will be the crux
394 of the District's strategic planning framework.

395 Manager Miller concurred with Mr. Erdahl that the background was helpful, and attested to the
396 merits of adopting useful mission and vision statements, as well as applicable values. He
397 provided his personal experience with Wells Fargo as an example.
398

399 Manager White concurred, stating her appreciation of the process laid out for developing a new
400 mission statement.
401

402 Comprehensive Plan Update 403

404 Ms. Christopher stated that, now that the advisory committee meetings were underway, she
405 would like to begin providing the PPC with regular updates. She noted that the recent Policy,
406 Technical, and Citizen Advisory Committees have gone well and have had good participation
407 from the Committee members. She added that the Committees were all supportive of the process,
408 scope, and committee roles as presented. Ms. Christopher stated that the next meetings in
409 December will focus on the Two-Track Approach and its use as a model to improve integration
410 of land-use and water planning. She added that an important message for these meetings will be
411 to make it clear that having “focal” geographies does not mean that these are the only areas
412 where the District will dedicate resources. She explained that both tracks provide opportunities
413 for partnership and the difference between the two is mainly in who initiates the process.
414

415 Gray’s Bay Dam Easement 416

417 Ms. Schaufler summarized for the Committee a proposed adjustment to the easement the District
418 has on a parcel to the north of Gray’s Bay Dam. The City of Minnetonka, who owns the parcel,
419 has had a dispute with a private property owner (whose property is immediately east of the City’s
420 parcel) over where the City’s property stops and the neighboring property begins. To settle the
421 disagreement, the City was willing to cede a strip of property 35 feet wide along the eastern edge
422 of its parcel and simultaneously settle another dispute with the same land owner concerning
423 access rights through the parcel immediately north of the City’s parcel. Mr. Wisker pointed out
424 that, should the District cooperate with the City’s request to vacate the 35-foot section of
425 easement, the District would formally gain right of way access to the parcel in order to drive
426 heavy construction machinery from the street (Crosby Road) to Gray’s Bay Dam for
427 maintenance. Ms. Schaufler added that the District’s engineers have looked at the proposed
428 reduction to the easement and do not feel that it affects the District’s ability to access and
429 maintain the dam. Given this, Ms. Schaufler noted that staff was seeking a recommendation from
430 the Committee to accommodate the City of Minnetonka’s request to vacate 35-feet of the
431 District’s easement and enter into a new easement agreement over the new boundary of the City
432 Parcel.
433

434 ***Manager Miller motioned, seconded by Manager Shekleton, to recommend to the Board of***
435 ***Managers that the District accommodate the City of Minnetonka’s request to vacate 35-feet of***
436 ***the District’s easement over the City parcel and enter into a new easement agreement over the***
437 ***new boundary of the City parcel. Upon vote, the motion passed 3-0.***
438

439 Stonegate Conservation Easement Update

440

441 Mr. Wisker stated that on October 6, the City of Medina approved preliminary plat for the
442 Stonegate Subdivision. He described Stonegate as a 170-acre project, containing 41 residential
443 lots and 91 acres of a potential conservation easement. As per a Medina ordinance, noted Mr.
444 Wisker, a conservation easement agreed upon by the City and the project developer must be held
445 by a third party. He explained, the Stonegate developers and the City of Medina turned to the
446 District as a potential third party, herein beginning the District's involvement with Stonegate.
447 Mr. Wisker detailed what holding a conservation easement would mean in this context, citing
448 that the burden of inspection would be on the District. He added that maintenance and
449 establishment costs would be funded initially by the developer, secured by a line of credit, then
450 eventually by Stonegate's Homeowner Association through an escrow account.

451

452 Mr. Wisker called attention to an adjacent property, for which the District has a memorandum of
453 understanding with the landowner, Mr. Rechelbacher. In tandem, Mr. Wisker noted, these
454 properties could form a sizeable conservation corridor in Medina without any direct cost to the
455 District long-term outside of staff time spent monitoring the sites.

456

457 Now that preliminary plat has been approved, Mr. Wisker stated, the City of Medina and the
458 Stonegate developer must secure the conservation easement holder before final plat can be
459 approved. He suggested that staff would continue working with the developer and the City to
460 define the terms of the arrangement before returning to the Committee for discussion.

461

462 Mr. Wisker highlighted the trail feature of the proposed conservation easement, in which the City
463 has reserved the right to pave the trail. He stated that the developer had expressed tentative
464 interest in exploring opportunities to enhance the public experience along the trail through the
465 potential inclusion of educational signage and natural play elements, like boulders. The
466 Committee expressed its support for staff continuing to advance the partnership with the
467 developer and the City of Medina.

468

469 325 Blake Road Update

470

471 Mr. Wisker started by reminding the Committee that the District had an agreement with the city
472 of Hopkins and Hennepin County for planning work related to transit-oriented development
473 (TOD) implementation at the intersection of Blake Road and the Southwest Light Rail Transit
474 (LRT) corridor. LHB and CB Richard Ellis (CBRE) are the consultant team tasked with
475 investigating three publicly owned properties in the area – 325 Blake Road (Cold Storage), 43
476 Hoops, MCES Lift Station site – and developing conceptual site plans based on market
477 assessment, project viability and implementation opportunities.

478

479 Mr. Hayman provided a rough timeline for the TOD early implementation process. He noted that
480 the District would receive a package of refined concepts within a week, and that these draft
481 concepts would be utilized in the upcoming Urban Land Institute (ULI) technical evaluation

Planning and Policy Committee
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
District Offices, 15320 Minnetonka Blvd, MN 55345
11-19-15

482 panel (TAP) process. Mr. Hayman added that finalized concepts would be distributed to the
483 project partners in mid-January, and that final reports were due in February.

484

485 The Committee Meeting adjourned at 6:05 PM.

486

487 Respectfully submitted,

488 Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant

DRAFT