

1 **DRAFT**

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

3
4
5 **January 21, 2016**

6
7 **CALL TO ORDER**

8
9 The Committee was brought to order by Chair Calkins at 6:50 p.m.

10
11 **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

12
13 James Calkins, Richard Miller, and Brian Shekleton.

14
15 **NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

16
17 William Olson and Sherry White.

18
19 **OTHERS PRESENT**

20
21 James Wisker, Director of Planning & Projects; Becky Christopher, Lead Planner & Project
22 Manager; Anna Brown, Planner & Project Manager; Katherine Sylvia, Permitting Program Lead;
23 Michael Hayman, Planner & Project Manager; and Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant.

24
25 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

26
27 The agenda was approved without amendment.

28
29 **COMMITTEE MEETING**

30
31 **Six Mile Subwatershed Investment Framework**

32
33 Ms. Brown stated that in planning for the Six Mile subwatershed, District staff were upholding
34 the Balanced Urban Ecology's tenets of partnership and integration. She explained that the
35 District sought to coordinate efforts in the following manner:

- 36
37 1. Convene partners
38 2. Understand natural resource needs
39 3. Understand the work of others
40 4. Compile information
41 5. Develop an investment plan

42
43 Ms. Brown noted key investment strategies staff would look to employ, including grant pursuit,
44 County bonding, and leveraging the Permitting program to complete restoration activities. She
45 detailed how District staff would pair management strategies with funding sources and phase in

46 the projects at the appropriate time for both implementation and funding. Ms. Brown added that
47 some outside funding sources would be best pursued through the District’s partners.
48

49 Ms. Brown described how the work scopes for both the USACE and Wenck would interact. She
50 stated that the Corps’ work has two main elements:

- 51
- 52 1. GIS analysis for potential Section 206 funding allocation
 - 53 2. Evaluation of Programmatic General Permit
- 54

55 Ms. Brown added that Wenck’s responsibility would be to supply the Corps with a baseline
56 assessment and a projection of future conditions to inform the Corps’ GIS analysis. Wenck
57 would then assess the validity of the Corps’ deliverables on items 1 and 2.
58

59 Manager Calkins suggested that Wenck include a projection of future hydrology in their “future
60 conditions” deliverable.
61

62 Permitting Partnership Framework Update

63

64 Ms. Sylvia stated that District staff were seeking to construct a framework for the program’s
65 partnership approach. She noted that the District’s legal counsel had advised that the District
66 may make itself vulnerable to litigation unless a clear procedure is laid out for the partnership
67 process. Many of the Managers expressed their comfort with addressing this risk in the manner
68 that the District has been – through MOUs and frequent communication with District partners.
69 They added that having legal counsel architect a framework which minimized risk could restrict
70 the District from implementing the partnership approach effectively. Ms. Sylvia underscored that
71 legal counsel was merely advising the framework drafting, not directing it. The Managers
72 suggested that staff steer towards developing a high-level framework and not a step-by-step,
73 prescriptive process document.
74

75 Strategic Framework – Program Evaluation Process

76

77 Ms. Christopher shared the draft Vision, Mission, Goal, and Guiding Principle statements that
78 Manager Olson, District staff, legal counsel and Himle Rapp had worked on earlier that day. She
79 noted that the group had reached consensus on revised vision, mission, and guiding principles
80 and that further refinements would be made to the fourth goal statement.
81

82 Manager Miller expressed his satisfaction with the statements as presented.
83

84 Manager Shekleton noted that as written, he preferred to use the word “with” instead of
85 “through” in the descriptive statement for the goal of “Thriving Communities.”
86

87 Manager Calkins stated that he did not like the Vision statement because he felt it was too vague,
88 and could be more aptly applied to other government organizations than to a watershed district.
89 He added that the Vision was too focused on the communities of the watershed and not the

90 natural resources. Manager Calkins also expressed that he was not impressed by the Mission
91 statement.
92

93 Manager Olson noted that he imagined the Vision and Mission statements would be appealing to
94 the District's cities with the focus on vibrant communities, collaboration, and creating value. He
95 added that he would show the draft statements around to gauge how people immediately react to
96 the language used.
97

98 Mr. Wisker asked the Committee if they would like to put the statements on the agenda for the
99 Board meeting on January 28th as a discussion item. The Committee generally agreed.
100

101 Ms. Christopher then stated that staff was preparing for the next phase of the strategic planning
102 process which is the evaluation of programs. She handed out a revised draft of the District's
103 strategic framework diagram. She explained that the program titles were removed to move away
104 from putting the District's activities in "silos" and instead focusing on the strategies and tactics
105 that each implements. The framework was restructured around two primary strategies:

- 106 • Protect high value resources
 - 107 • Improve degraded resources
- 108

109 To achieve the strategies, the District employs four primary tactics:

- 110 • District implements (e.g. capital projects)
 - 111 • District funds others to implement (e.g. cost share grants)
 - 112 • District influences others to implement (e.g. education)
 - 113 • District requires others to implement (e.g. regulation)
- 114

115 Below the tactics, the framework showed supporting activities including project maintenance,
116 data collection, support-building, and operational needs. Mr. Wisker noted that by sorting
117 program actions not by programs but by general strategic intent, staff hoped to better map out
118 how programs interact.
119

120 Manager Miller expressed his approval, stating that the framework was very clear.
121

122 Manager Olson noted that he liked how the programs were clearly shown on the previous draft.
123 Manager Miller responded that the revised layout allows for better analysis by focusing on
124 mission and goals rather than current programs.
125

126 Ms. Christopher detailed the process staff intended to go through to evaluate programs, asking
127 the Committee for input. She noted that the process was designed to be inclusive and transparent.
128 It was also intended to give the departments ownership over their program's framework while
129 ensuring that input from other departments is heard and considered. The evaluation process will
130 include an analysis of return on investment for the various strategies and tactics.
131

132 Mr. Wisker noted that a first step would be to compile program histories for staff and Board
133 review, suggesting that past program shifts could inform the planning of new programmatic
134 initiatives. He referred to the outline provided and asked the Committee if there were other items
135 they would like to see in the program histories.

136
137 Manager Shekleton noted that these histories could be a resource for future Board members. He
138 suggested that an additional piece could be a media analysis to reflect on past events that
139 generated ill will with the communities.

140
141 Manager White questioned whether the program histories were a worthwhile undertaking for
142 staff, noting how time-intensive the process would be. Manager Miller agreed that developing
143 program histories would be a significant amount of work, but stated that such information was
144 needed for the staff and the Board to properly evaluate programs. He noted that the program
145 histories would be useful to inform the 2017 budget process. Mr. Wisker suggested that the
146 program histories be slimmed down and begin development immediately, alongside an early start
147 to the budget process.

148
149 Wayzata Lake Effect Update

150
151 Manager White relayed information from recent Policy Advisory Committee meetings she
152 attended on the Wayzata Lake Effect Project. She noted that the City of Wayzata owns little
153 shorefront, presenting a significant challenge for the project. She stated that the Technical
154 Advisory Committee would be meeting on January 26th, and again on February 27th, at which
155 time the overall project Committee would also meet.

156
157 Knollwood Mall Update

158
159 Mr. Wisker updated the Committee on planning efforts around the Knollwood Mall area. At this
160 juncture, staff is in discussion with the owners of the mall about opportunities to place all
161 stormwater management under the Knollwood parking lot. The Committee discussed supporting
162 information and associated costs.

163
164 The Committee Meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

165
166 Respectfully submitted,

167
168 Matthew Cook
169 Planning Assistant