

1 **DRAFT**

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

3  
4  
5 **October 15, 2015**

6  
7 **CALL TO ORDER**

8  
9 The Planning and Policy Committee was called to order by Committee Chair Calkins at 6:48p.m.  
10 at the District offices, 15320 Minnetonka Boulevard, Minnetonka, Minnesota 55435

11  
12 **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

13 Jim Calkins, Chair; Dick Miller; Brian Shekleton

14  
15 **NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

16  
17 Sherry White, President; Kurt Rogness, Secretary; Bill Olson

18  
19 **OTHERS PRESENT**

20  
21 Lars Erdahl, District Administrator; Telly Mamayek, Communications and Education Director;  
22 Tiffany Schaufler, Project and Land Program Manager; Becky Christopher, Lead Planner-Project  
23 Manager; James Wisker, Planning and Projects Director; Anna Brown, Planner-Project Manager;  
24 Michael Hayman, Planner -Project Manager; Matthew Cook, Planning Assistant; Craig Dawson,  
25 Director of Research and Monitoring; Jennifer Scharlow, Technical Support Services Specialist;  
26 David Mandt, Operations and Support Services Director; Roma Rowland, Contracted Clerical.

27  
28 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

29  
30 The agenda was approved without amendment.

31  
32 **COMMITTEE MEETING**

33  
34 **5.1 2016 Budget Refinements – Erdahl**

35 Mr. Erdahl introduced the 2016 MCWD Budget Refinement discussion, reminding the  
36 Committee that the budget discussions began in July, with staff refining the budget-levy at Board  
37 direction before the Board of Managers established the 2016 budget and levy by resolution on  
38 September 10. As one example of refinements to date he highlighted the Board's decision to  
39 distribute personnel costs across programs. Mr. Erdahl also acknowledged that the Board of  
40 Managers had recently approved the strategic evaluation framework which had also been  
41 requested by Committee to be utilized in finalizing the 2016 budget discussions.  
42 He noted that while the preliminary tool would provide context for the evening's discussion, that  
43 in the future it would be used to strategically evaluate and align the budget with Board  
44 established priorities.  
45

46 Mr. Erdahl outlined that in order to achieve the Board established 5% levy increase in 2016, that  
47 staff had proposed a list of program adjustments (cuts and postponements) to reduce the 2016  
48 budget approximately 10%. In order to finalize the budget prior to December 10, Mr. Erdahl  
49 noted that this list of adjustments had recently been revisited in preparation for being finalized by  
50 the Board of Managers. He noted that since the September 10 Board action two areas of District  
51 programming had revealed savings allowing for revisions to the list of program adjustments. He  
52 identified that the Japs Olson Project produced approximately \$269,000 in savings and that AIS  
53 communication-education planning had produced \$25,000 in savings.

54

55 Mr. Erdahl identified that these savings could be used to restore the following areas of  
56 programming, while still reducing the budget 10% to meet the 5% levy increase set by the  
57 Board:

58

- 59 • Cost-Share – \$66,000 in grant funds, for a total of \$600,000
- 60 • Cynthia Krieg – \$25,000 in grant funds, for a total of \$125,000
- 61 • Master Water Stewards - \$12,500 to provide training for 15, rather than 10 recruits
- 62 • Bushaway Road - \$158,949 in capital construction funds, directly reducing 2016 levy

63

64 Mr. Erdahl outlined the rationale for these recommendations, stating that Cost-Share directly  
65 restores the District's ability to implement value added water quality improvements, Cynthia  
66 Krieg had recently received a record number of high quality applications, Master Water Stewards  
67 was one of the most successful education-stewardship programs, and that restoring funds to  
68 Bushaway Road which was a proposed two-year levy would directly reduce the 2016 projected  
69 levy by \$158,949.

70

71 Manager Miller commented that the Board had been supplied more information than in past  
72 years and had discussed the 2016 budget many times, and that he was prepared to recommend  
73 approval of staff recommendations to the Board of Managers. Mr. Erdahl reminded the  
74 Committee that Dec. 10<sup>th</sup> represented the final milestone for the 2016 budget and stated that staff  
75 shared Manager Miller's comfort level with the budget.

76

77 Manager Rogness questioned the experience of the Board in past years with regards to how the  
78 organization handled emerging unplanned opportunities. He asked if there were specific line  
79 items to accommodate unplanned opportunities or if the budget could be adjusted by the Board  
80 to adapt in 2016. Manager Miller explained that in past years capital project carryover had been  
81 allocated toward opportunities, but that these funds had been gradually spent down as the District  
82 became more successful at implementation. He noted that the proposed strategic framework  
83 format allows for recognition that not everything is equal priority and that moving forward cuts  
84 and reallocations would reflect Board priorities.

85

86 Manager Calkins commented that Manager Miller was correct in that historically money had  
87 been transferred between capital projects. He also noted that historically the District had  
88 maintained a special project fund to absorb unplanned opportunity driven expenditures.

89

Planning and Policy Committee  
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District  
Board of Managers  
October 15, 2015

90 Manager Calkins reflected on concern that he had previously expressed to Mr. Erdahl regarding  
91 the process of discussing the budget in Committee versus with the full Board, which would allow  
92 various Managers' priorities to be discussed. He also noted a desire to better understand the  
93 effect the proposed budget adjustments would have on the 2016 budget and levy.

94  
95 Manager Miller stated that it was not clear how much information, and in how many different  
96 formats, individual Managers needed to feel comfortable with the proposed budget and levy that  
97 had already been approved by the Board. He noted that those with concerns should take effort to  
98 be more involved in budget discussions and reach out to staff to learn more if they have specific  
99 questions.

100  
101 Manager Calkins explained that he did not feel it was fair to expect all Board Members to attend  
102 a Committee Meeting, and that previous budget discussions leading up to the approval had been  
103 held in Joint Committee Meetings. He stated that he also did not feel that the Board had delved  
104 deep into the proposed line item adjustments, and that they warranted further discussion.

105  
106 Manager Shekleton commented that he agreed with Manager Calkins that the Board should not  
107 limit itself to staff's recommendations with regards to proposed budget adjustments, but that he  
108 believed it was procedurally acceptable for the Committee to vet the information it was being  
109 presented and to make a recommendation to the Board. He also noted his comfort with the  
110 proposed adjustments identifying that they did not substantially change the current direction of  
111 the organization or eviscerate key programming.

112  
113 Manager Calkins expressed being open to being convinced that the proposed adjustments are  
114 acceptable, and again expressed the need to the effects on the 2017 budget and levy. Mr. Wisker  
115 responded that the Board of Managers had seen a projection of this information, which was  
116 based on a broad set of assumptions, before the 2016 budget and levy was approved with a 5%  
117 increase in the levy. Manager Calkins commented that the Board would benefit from reviewing  
118 the 2017 projection based on the decision to pursue a budget reduction and levy increase in 2016.

119  
120 Mr. Wisker suggested that the Committee begin reviewing the revisions to the proposed 2016  
121 budget adjustments and determine next steps following the discussion.

122  
123 Ms. Christopher reiterated that due to the budget reductions of the Japs-Olson partnership and  
124 AIS programming, that the list of 2016 budget adjustments necessary to work within a 5% levy  
125 increase had been revised. Ms. Christopher outlined that the packet material included the list of  
126 2016 budget adjustments previously reviewed by the Board, as well as a revised list for  
127 discussion by Committee. Ms. Christopher noted that the budget adjustments had been  
128 incorporated into the strategic framework diagrams to enhance and facilitate Committee  
129 discussion. She identified that the budgets were broken down into departments, then into tactics  
130 within departments, then further into specific actions under each tactic. Finally, she reviewed  
131 that the original budget for each level of the strategic framework was shown in black, with the  
132 proposed budget reduction shown beneath in red.

133

134 The Committee reviewed the budget adjustments in the strategic framework context in the  
135 following order:  
136

- 137 • Research and Monitoring
- 138 • Aquatic Invasive Species
- 139 • Land Conservation and Restoration
- 140 • Project Maintenance and Land Management
- 141 • Permitting
- 142 • Planning and Projects
- 143 • Cost-Share
- 144 • Education
- 145 • Communications
- 146 • Operations and Support Services

147  
148 Research and Monitoring:

149 Mr. Dawson outlined a total of \$194,938 in budget reduction from the \$1,048,176 program area,  
150 resulting in a revised total budget of \$852,238. He outlined \$94,938 in proposed budget  
151 reductions within the Monitoring tactic (anchor monitoring, subwatershed monitoring, contracted  
152 subwatershed monitoring, contracted services and engineering). He outlined that the reduction  
153 and postponement of monitoring activities were logical because E-Grade metrics were still in  
154 development. He then outlined \$100,000 reduction in the Joint Watershed Grant fund which had  
155 not been successfully utilized in recent years. He noted that this was a direct reduction that  
156 would not impact future years, unless the Board determined it wished to directly fund research  
157 again.  
158

159 The Committee had not questions or recommendations for change.  
160

161 Aquatic Invasive Species:

162 Mr. Dawson outlined a total of \$150,000 in budget reduction from the \$778,388 program area,  
163 resulting in a revised total budget of \$628,388. He reviewed the \$45,000 reduction in AIS  
164 Research, noting that the Zebra Mussel control study funds would be levied over two years, and  
165 that \$25,000 of the \$60,000 funds in early detection monitoring was to be delayed while this  
166 portion of the program was evaluated. He explained that the proposed reduction in the  
167 Prevention Tactic was achieved by levying the total \$75,000 in water access improvement funds  
168 over two years. He reviewed the proposal to reduce the Control tactic by eliminating the  
169 Flowering Rush activity in 2016, saving \$40,000 and allowing the program to be evaluated for  
170 effectiveness if control activities took place every other year rather than annually. Finally, he  
171 identified a \$25,000 reduction in AIS communication and education activities noting that  
172 following coordination with the Communications Department, this could be reduced without  
173 impacting effectiveness.  
174  
175

176 Manager Calkins said he was torn over the proposed 2016 cut in Flowering Rush control, and  
177 asked if there was any more data to explain recent results. He noted that he was unable to assess  
178 whether it was a mistake to stop this area of programming based on the lack of conclusive  
179 evidence in the form of a regression analysis. Mr. Dawson explained that the intent was to  
180 suspend control in 2016 while continuing to monitor and synthesize data, which he hoped would  
181 answer whether control could occur on a bi-yearly time interval versus annually.

182  
183 Manager Olson asked if the synthesis and analysis of 2015 results would be compromised by the  
184 proposed cut. Mr. Dawson answered that it would not.

185  
186 The Committee had no further questions or recommendations for change.

187  
188 Land Conservation and Restoration:  
189 Ms. Christopher reviewed that no budget adjustments were proposed in this program since it was  
190 primarily allocated for debt service obligations and other land-owner contractual obligations.

191  
192 Manager Miller questioned why the budget for restoration appeared to be small. Tiffany  
193 Schaufler answered that following the integration of Land Conservation with Capital Project  
194 Maintenance, that all land restoration budgets were integrated into a Project Maintenance and  
195 Land Management budget, which would be discussed next.

196  
197 The Committee had no further questions or recommendations for change.

198  
199 Project Maintenance and Land Management:  
200 Ms. Christopher outlined a total of \$37,000 in budget reduction from the \$583,429 program area,  
201 resulting in revised total budget of \$546,429. She outlined that the proposed budget reduction  
202 was due to a recommended delay in the implementation of the signage and canoe launch master  
203 plan.

204  
205 Manager Olson questioned the current status of this initiative. Telly Mamayek responded that  
206 the Education Program had delivered to the Board of Managers, at the request of Friends of the  
207 Minnehaha Creek, a plan for standardizing and improving canoe launches and signage along  
208 Minnehaha Creek. She noted that 2016 would be used to advance the implementation  
209 framework by communicating with municipalities and developing an integrated plan for funding,  
210 construction and maintenance.

211  
212 The Committee had no further questions or recommendations for change.

213  
214 Permitting:  
215 Ms. Christopher outlined a total of \$25,000 in budget reduction from the \$656,846 program area,  
216 resulting in a revised total budget of \$631,846. She noted that this reduction scaled back  
217 partnership-planning from \$50,000 to \$25,000 retaining some ability for the Permitting program  
218 to continue developing value added partnerships that achieved greater natural resource outcomes  
219 than regulation alone.

220

221 The Committee had no further questions or recommendations for change.

222

223 Planning and Projects:

224 Ms. Christopher outlined a total of \$365,251 in budget reduction from the \$4,441,295 program  
225 area, resulting in a revised total budget of \$4,076,044. She noted that with the budget savings  
226 highlighted by Mr. Erdahl earlier in the meeting the Bushaway Road budget for 2016 would only  
227 be reduced by \$41,051. She reviewed the \$269,200 in budget savings attributed to the Powell-  
228 Meadowbrook Stormwater (Japs Olson Partnership), and a \$55,000 reduction in focal geography  
229 project planning in Minnehaha Creek and Six Mile Creek.

230

231 Manager Shekleton questioned if due to Hennepin County's schedule for Bushaway Road, the  
232 levy for the District's work could be further spread over time. Ms. Schaufler answered that the  
233 causeway portion of Bushaway Road was done and therefore MCWD was in a position to deliver  
234 its shoreline work in the winter of 2016-2017 as outlined in the MCWD-County cooperative  
235 agreement.

236

237 Mr. Wisker identified the option, in 2016 or future years, of reducing the budget allocated to  
238 planning within focal geographies. He noted that these savings would slow down  
239 implementation within these areas, and that this could be an area of consideration for the Board  
240 as it moved into future years.

241

242 The Committee had no further questions or recommendations for change.

243

244 Cost-Share:

245 Ms. Christopher outlined a total of \$34,000 in budget reduction from the \$806,151 program area,  
246 resulting in a revised total budget of \$772,151. She noted that with the budget savings  
247 previously highlighted by Mr. Erdahl that grant funding had been fully restored, and that the  
248 reduction was in the elimination of a new intern position originally proposed.

249

250 Manager Miller questioned the \$25,000 budgeted for legal, asking why agreements were not  
251 standardized as templates. Mr. Erdahl answered that this money was budgeted for larger more  
252 complicated grant arrangements, and that smaller more routine grants had indeed been  
253 standardized.

254

255 The Committee had no further questions or recommendations for change.

256

257 Education:

258 Ms. Mamayek outlined a total of \$45,000 in budget reduction from the \$472,179 program area,  
259 resulting in a revised total budget of \$427,179. She outlined a \$15,000 reduction in the Broad  
260 Education and Outreach tactic, tied to the District-wide signage initiative. She also identified a  
261 \$25,000 reduction in the Priority Subwatershed Programming tactic, in areas of Minnehaha  
262 Creek programming and the canoe launch initiative previously discussed. Finally she identified

Planning and Policy Committee  
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District  
Board of Managers  
October 15, 2015

263 a \$5,000 reduction in the Community Engagement Tactic under workshops and training  
264 activities.

265

266 The Committee had no further questions or recommendations for change.

267

268 Communications:

269 Ms. Mamayek outlined a total of \$45,000 in budget reduction from the \$254,618 program area,  
270 resulting in a revised total budget of \$209,618. She outlined a \$20,000 in the Events tactic with  
271 \$10,000 in reductions in both the watershed heroes event and 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary planning, noting  
272 that the postponement in 2016 watershed heroes could be combined with 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary events  
273 in 2017. Finally she identified \$25,000 in reductions across publications/graphics, marketing  
274 materials and videos, within the Media/Materials tactic.

275 Manager Calkins asked for an explanation on the prioritization of videos versus watershed  
276 heroes. He asked if Ms. Mamayek could speak to the value of videos against cost, and if there  
277 was the potential to have watershed heroes costs subsidized by sponsorship similar to the creek  
278 clean up event. Ms. Mamayek answered that sponsorship while very time consuming could be a  
279 source of funds to support watershed heroes. Regarding the video library, Ms. Mamayek  
280 reflected that videos are a primary communication tool for reaching audiences and increasingly  
281 becoming part of the District's suite of communications tools.

282

283 Following discussion of sponsorship Manager Miller noted his objection to sponsorship of  
284 District work by vendors that may be considered by MCWD as vendors for District work.

285

286 Manager Calkins stated his objection to eliminating watershed heroes given its impact and  
287 relatively limited impact on the budget. He asked staff to consider a potential workaround to  
288 preserve this programming in 2016. Manager Miller stated his disagreement that the event is  
289 needed every year to be effective. Mr. Erdahl noted the need for further discussion and direction  
290 on this issue since it had historically proven difficult to identify award recipients every year.

291

292 Manager Calkins expressed that he did not believe the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary and watershed heroes to  
293 be analogous. Manager Olson asked why watershed heroes and the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary could not be  
294 combined in 2017 into one large event highlighting the work of the District. Manager White  
295 asked for clarification that planning funds for the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary would not be impacted in  
296 2016. Mr. Wisker answered that planning funds would be retained and reiterated that should the  
297 Board decide, in the future, to advance watershed heroes in 2016 that it would likely be able to  
298 be funded through reprioritization without a change to the budget.

299

300 The Committee had no further questions or recommendations for change.

301

302 Manager Rogness stated that he hoped the Board would not have to go through this level of  
303 detail again at the next Board Meeting. Manager Calkins disagreed explaining that you can't  
304 expect Managers to attend Committee Meetings they are not assigned to. Manager Rogness  
305 responded that it seemed unreasonable to expect that with six Managers present and all program  
306 directors that the entire presentation would be revisited for one Manager not in attendance.

307  
308 Mr. Wisker noted that the Committee had not yet reviewed Operations and Support Services.  
309

310 Operations and Support Services:

311 Mr. Mandt outlined a total of \$122,700 in budget reduction from the \$1,650,669 program area,  
312 resulting in a revised total budget of \$1,527,969. He outlined \$94,000 in reductions within  
313 Information Technology, including a delay to a District-wide data base, a reduction in the budget  
314 for equipment and upgrades and a \$20,000 cut in budgets planned for operating and maintaining  
315 Board room technology. Finally he outlined \$28,000 in the vehicle budget planned for the  
316 acquisition of a new District vehicle in 2016.

317  
318 Mr. Miller commented that this is the clearest the budget has ever been presented and  
319 commended staff for all the hard work. He observed that he and the Managers have participated  
320 in many budgeting processes, not just the District's, and that he has never seen this much clarity  
321 brought to line items within a budget.

322  
323 ***Manager Miller moved, and Manager Shekleton seconded, to recommend to the Board of***  
324 ***Managers that the budget revisions as presented be adopted.***  
325

326 Manager Calkins asked what the implications were for the 2017 budget if the recommendations  
327 were approved. Manager Shekleton noted that the few projects outlined as being postponed or  
328 levied over two years would not comprise a significant portion of the 2017 budget/levy, therefore  
329 there should not be any more uncertainty or concern from when the Board originally approved  
330 the budget. Mr. Calkins reiterated that the District must look forward beyond next year to  
331 effectively budget and that there isn't currently clarity on what is coming, but rather only  
332 assumptions. Manager Miller responded that it would always be difficult to accurately predict  
333 future project spending, and that the Committee had previously discussed separating the capital  
334 budget in the future to increase predictability of core programming and to stabilize the levy  
335 through use of outside funds and financing capital costs over more than one year. Manager  
336 Olson asked if Mr. Erdahl could prepare an updated version of a graph initially used to depict the  
337 budget-levy gap, to reflect the most current set of assumptions moving into 2017. Mr. Erdahl  
338 responded that this would be done. Manager White added that the proposed adjustments simply  
339 organized the District's work in 2016 to achieve a 5% levy increase and that the strategic  
340 planning process would provide a deeper analysis to help the Board determine future years.

341  
342 ***Following discussion the motion passed unanimously 3-0.***  
343

344 **5.2 Comprehensive Plan – Strategic Framework- Christopher**  
345

346 Ms. Christopher outlined the connection between the Comprehensive Plan update process and  
347 the recently adopted strategic planning framework. She outlined how the roles and  
348 responsibilities of the Board/PPC, external committees and staff reflected the integration of the  
349 strategic framework into the planning process.  
350



351 Ms. Christopher outlined that with the integration of the strategic evaluation, the development of  
352 the Comprehensive Plan would generally be divided into three areas of work:  
353

- 354 1. The strategic evaluation framework – a largely internal process with the staff-PPC-Board  
355 to build on the self-assessment to refine and evaluate: mission, vision, goals, principles,  
356 strategies, tactics and desired outcomes.  
357
- 358 2. Developing a refined policy driven implementation model – a collaborative process  
359 between the District and its stakeholder committees to refine implementation processes  
360 for focal/responsive geographies, defining the role of the District in specific management  
361 areas, and developing the partnership framework by exploring streamlined regulation, the  
362 role of LGUs in partnership with MCWD, and the integration of land-use and water  
363 planning.  
364
- 365 3. Updating technical information – a largely internal, staff/consultant driven update of  
366 technical information assisting in issue identification, etc. feeding specific subwatershed  
367 plans.  
368

369 Ms. Christopher reviewed that the strategic evaluation framework would largely be advanced by  
370 the PPC/Board as a way to improve the internal organization and alignment of programs. This  
371 would be advanced from a foundational understanding created by the self-assessment process,  
372 including (1) what had been accomplished by programs since 2007 towards the Plan goals, and  
373 (2) new policies and guiding principles. Manager Miller questioned the status of the Self-  
374 Assessment and requested that it be compiled into a report format as a basis from which to move  
375 forward. Ms. Christopher responded that this was the intent. Mr. Wisker added that the policy  
376 discussions have largely already taken place at staff, Committee and Board levels and could be  
377 aggregated into a draft report in advance of program data being collected and synthesized.  
378 Manager Calkins asked if this satisfied the request. Manager Miller responded affirmatively.  
379

380 Ms. Christopher then reviewed that the stakeholder committees (Policy, Technical, Citizen)  
381 would be used primarily to focus on developing and refining a policy framework that would  
382 improve the District's ability to implement its mission. This would involve crafting policy and  
383 process for operating within focal/responsive geographies, defining the District's management  
384 role in specific water resource issues, and developing a framework for improving partnership by  
385 exploring improvements across a number of policy topics.  
386

387 Ms. Christopher proceeded to outline the updating of technical information as the third and final  
388 major work area in developing the next generation plan. She noted that while this would inform  
389 issue identification within specific subwatersheds, this would largely be completed as a technical  
390 exercise between staff and District consultants.  
391

392 Mr. Wisker reinforced these points and asked if the attending Board Members were comfortable  
393 with the general division of labor as it placed various work groups in areas of their respective  
394 expertise and interest rather than having every piece of the plan iteratively reviewed by each

395 committee group. He noted that this would avoid the plan “being designed by committee”, while  
396 still affording ample feedback loops and the ability to comprehensively comment on the entire  
397 plan. The Committee supported this approach.

398  
399 Ms. Christopher also provided an update on strategic planning process and the next steps for  
400 developing mission, vision and goals by outlining a proposed scope of work with Himle Rapp  
401 and Company, and its accompanying staff-Board process.

402  
403 Manager Miller commented that having Himle Rapp and Company involved in developing  
404 compelling messaging to effectively articulate the shift in policy would be extremely helpful and  
405 would assist in generating a more thorough understanding of the District’s work.

406  
407 **Six Mile Update- Anna Brown**

408  
409 Ms. Brown provided a brief update on the Six Mile Creek planning process, noting that the goal  
410 is to develop an implementation plan integrated with the plans and spending of other agencies,  
411 and accounting for local priorities. She outlined that the process through which such a plan will  
412 be developed will be the basis of the focal geography policy-process for the next generation plan.

413  
414 Ms. Brown identified the need for staff and MCWD Board liaisons to meet with individual  
415 policy makers and their staff in advance of establishing committee meetings to begin the formal  
416 Six Mile planning process. Manager Olson commented that he and President White had some  
417 meetings already scheduled and welcomed the opportunity to connect and to work with staff to  
418 develop consistent messaging.

419  
420 Ms. Brown then outlined the relative order of discussions with external committees being to first  
421 provide a baseline understanding of the technical water resource aspects of this geography and  
422 the goals of the District; mapping out each respective agencies mission, goals, plans and  
423 investments; and then intersecting these plans with the water resource management strategies for  
424 this subwatershed to produce an implementation plan integrated with other efforts.

425  
426 Ms. Brown concluded her presentation by outlining how the work of the USACE would intersect  
427 and relate with work staff was currently scoping with consultants. In addition to providing some  
428 technical analysis of the subwatershed, the USACE proposal will serve as the basis for a  
429 potential future regulatory delegation agreement as well as identify projects that can be funded  
430 through USACE Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration fund. The District will be  
431 conducting its own technical analysis (CIP development), building on the 2013 Diagnostic  
432 Study, the results of which can be compared to the Corps’ work product for Section 206  
433 eligibility. Further, the mitigation areas produced by USACE will be integrated into a critical  
434 resource area analysis, which will inform targeted landscape areas for projects and policy.

435  
436 Ms. Brown explained that these areas of technical analysis – USACE, CIP development, and  
437 critical resource area analysis - will be presented to the committees to identify areas of  
438 collaboration, partnership, and coordination. MCWD will assess local priorities through this

439 process and can adjust the CIP to address community focal areas. All the information will be  
440 pulled together and influenced by local plans and have local watershed management principles.  
441

442 Ms. Brown will provide the PPC with a calendar of when these meetings will take place. Prior to  
443 a kickoff meeting in late December to early January, staff and Board liaisons will meet with staff  
444 and policy makers of key stakeholder groups to generate early buy-in to the process and make  
445 any needed adjustments.  
446

447 Mr. Miller encouraged staff that when communicating with policy makers, they should be made  
448 aware that any capital project conducted by the MCWD will need help from them, whether  
449 directly or through assistance in securing state and federal funds, or through other means to be  
450 determined.  
451

452 Mr. Wisker explained process would ideally result in the integration of critical resources into  
453 municipal and county plans, ultimately impacting policy changes. He provided an example of  
454 how including LGUs in the planning process and communicating the district's plans with these  
455 governments will allow for advanced coordination, and the district would not be surprised at any  
456 municipal developments such road construction or developments, nor would the District's  
457 municipal partners be dissatisfied with our priority implementation strategies.  
458

### 459 **5.3 South Katrina Marsh Easement - Schaufler**

460

461 Ms. Schaufler provided an update on the opportunity to leverage conservation easements over a  
462 portion of South Katrina Marsh, in exchange for the District replacing culverts that are creating a  
463 hydraulic constriction along Painter Creek. Ms. Schaufler reminded the Committee that during  
464 her update in September she noted that staff would continue to coordinate with the landowners  
465 and work on acquiring letters of intent in support of the partnership. She noted that since the  
466 September meeting, staff has acquired letters of intent from nine landowners. Ms. Schaufler  
467 explained that through those nine letters of intent the District is positioned to acquire  
468 approximately 90 acres of conservation easement over South Katrina Marsh and 2000 feet along  
469 Painter Creek, in exchange for the District designing and constructing two culvert replacements  
470 along Painter Creek.  
471

472 Ms. Schaufler noted that the estimated cost to design and construct the culverts is \$50,000-  
473 \$60,000, therefore putting the cost of the potential easement acquisition around \$550-\$660 per  
474 acre. She noted that culvert project would be funded through the Land Conservation program, as  
475 the District would essentially be paying for the easements through the costs of the culvert  
476 replacement.  
477

478 Mr. Wisker noted that obtaining these easements could represent the District's "local sponsor"  
479 match to a potential Section 206 funded capital improvement completed in partnership with the  
480 United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Ms. Schaufler noted that a couple of  
481 additional landowners have indicated they would be supportive of issuing the District a  
482 conservation easement if and when a USACE project or District project is identified for the area.

Planning and Policy Committee  
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District  
Board of Managers  
October 15, 2015

483 She also noted that staff will continue to coordinate with the remaining landowners in the area in  
484 an effort to acquire easements over the remainder of South Katrina Marsh.

485  
486 Manager Calkins inquired if the District has a good understanding of the hydrology in this area  
487 and how the proposed culvert project fits into the big picture for the Painter Creek subwatershed.  
488 Ms. Schaufler noted that the District engineer performed an analysis to show that there will be no  
489 downstream effects by increasing the culverts size. Mr. Wisker suggested that the preliminary  
490 technical analysis performed by the District's engineer be provided to the Board of Managers.

491  
492 Ms. Schaufler noted that staff was seeking a recommendation from the Committee to move  
493 ahead with the partnership framework which would begin by initiating the Land Conservation  
494 acquisition process.

495  
496 ***Manager Calkins motioned, seconded by Manager Shekleton, to recommend to the Board of***  
497 ***Managers that staff move forward with the partnership framework as proposed and begin the***  
498 ***Land Conservation acquisition process. Upon vote, the motion passed 3-0.***

499  
500  
501 The Committee Meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

502  
503 Respectfully submitted,  
504 James Wisker