

Carver County Board of Commissioners
March 17, 2009
County Board Room
Carver County Government Center
Human Services Building
Chaska, Minnesota

County Board Work Session Agenda

Time	Topic	Page
4:00 p.m.	1. LAND AND WATER SERVICES	
	1.1 Discussion of TMDL priority subwatersheds and direct discharge program for 2009.....	1-4
4:20 p.m.	2. LAND AND WATER SERVICES/PUBLIC WORKS	
	2.1 Comprehensive plan discussion-focus on Parks, Open Space and Trails Plan.....	5-34
6:00 p.m.	Board and Administrator Reports	

David Hemze
County Administrator



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: Discussion of TMDL Priority Subwatersheds and Direct Discharge Program for 2009

Originating Division: Land Water Services

Meeting Date: 17 March 2009

Amount of Time Requested: 20 minutes

Attachments for packet: Yes No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: The staff will present recommendations to the Board on:

Designation of priority subwatersheds for 2009-2010 for implementation of the Carver-Bevens Fecal Coliform TMDL implementation

Direct Discharge program for 2009-2010 including funding recommendations.

ACTION REQUESTED: Direction from the Board to place on a future agenda as an action item.

FUNDING

County Dollars = \$

Other Sources & Amounts = \$

TOTAL = \$

Related Financial Comments:

FISCAL IMPACT

None

Included in current budget

Budget amendment requested

Other:

Reviewed by Division Director

Date: 9 March 2009

2009
DIRECT DISCHARGE SSTS COST SHARE PROGRAM
SUMMARY

Changes have been made to several ordinances to address direct discharge SSTS replacements. The following is to explain how those changes impact the program.

Residents that apply for a permit – When someone applies for a permit the County records will be reviewed prior to issuing. If there is no information in County records indicating that a system with a drainfield has ever been installed, their permit will not be issued until they: provide evidence that there is a drainfield or take action to get a complying system installed. This is **not** a requirement for a compliance inspection for all systems.

COST SHARE QUALIFICATIONS

Must be voluntary with no previous trigger (ie. Current enforcement, compliance inspection as a result of property transfer, complaint, or building permit).

- A. Located in TMDL Priority Sub-Watershed – County will pay 25% of the SSTS replacement cost up to a maximum of \$2000 per SSTS. In addition the owner may apply for a low interest loan with up to a ten year payback.
- B. Located outside TMDL Priority Sub-Watershed – County will pay \$2000 of the SSTS replacement cost. In addition the owner may apply for a low interest loan with a four year payback (as funds available).

Loan Amount - \$15,000 maximum

DEADLINES

- A. Located in TMDL Priority Watershed – Volunteer by July 30, 2009. After that owner will be required to have a compliance inspection completed within ten months, NO COST SHARE and only low interest loan with four year payback (as funds are available).
- B. Located outside TMDL Priority Watershed – No deadlines to volunteer, first come first serve approach until funds are depleted. owner would be required to replace SSTS within ten months of completing Cost Share Form. Incentive payments will be given to Priority Sub-Watersheds.

Payment will be issued to the SSTS contractor upon successful completion of the project (determined by Environmental Services).

Key Points from the 2008 Program:

2008 Program was a huge success, with 59 systems utilizing some aspect of the program in one way or another. We only expected about 30 residents to take part in the program so our funds were depleted quicker than expected.

Total participants: 59

Number in TMDL area: 19

Number outside TMDL: 27

Loans Taken: 46 totaling an estimated \$600,000

Enforcement action possible: 3

Total of \$47,500 incentives have been paid or encumbered in the priority watersheds.

Incentive Payments:

Approx. \$22,500 available for incentive payments in Carver Creek or outside the TMDL watersheds.

\$20,000 available for incentive payments in Bevens/Silver Creek.

\$30,000 available for reallocation in Bevens Creek due to cancelled cost share project

Up to \$15,000 available for payments in Crow River Area due to cancelled cost share project

Loan Payments:

There is approximately \$510,000 available for loans in 2009, enough to fund 34 systems at the maximum loan amount. Based on past performance the average loan taken is about \$12,000 which would cover about 43 systems.

Priority Sub-Watershed Information:

The WENR committee recommended B1, Bent Cr., and SI 3 as the 2009 Priority Sub-Watersheds. B1 and Bent Creek are in the Carver Creek Sub-watershed and total 12 and 4 “likely systems” respectively and SI3 is in the Bevens/Silver Creek watershed and has 27 “likely systems”. The total “likely systems” for 2009 is 43.

Based on those numbers and a \$2,000 payment, we would need a maximum of \$32,000 for incentive payments in Carver Creek and \$54,000 for incentives in Bevens Creek. If every “likely system” took out the maximum loan (15K), that would total \$645,000. Last year there was funding available for people outside of the priority and TMDL areas, but due to the success of last years program, funds have been depleted quicker than forecasted and if everyone if the priority sub-watershed did take the incentive and loan there would be nothing left for areas outside the priority sub-watersheds.

Options for the Board to consider:

All of the below options assume that we will focus on the 3 priority sub-watersheds as the WENR committee recommended.

A.

Make the incentive payments of \$2,000 available only to landowners in the 3 priority sub-watersheds up to July 30, 2009. Loans would work the same as outlined on page 1. Reallocate Bevens Creek Cost share funds to provide an estimated available \$54,000 (27 systems). Allocate \$30,000 of low cost conservation funding to Carver Creek priority sub-watersheds to provide an available \$32,000 (16 systems). . Funds not allocated by July30, 2009 would then become available to landowners outside of the 3 priority sub watersheds up until Oct 31, 2009. Allocate \$15,000 of Crow River funds for landowners requesting incentive payments in that watershed area.

Loans would work the same as outlined on page 1.

B.

Use the same approach as above BUT lower the incentive payment to \$1500 to make incentive funds cover more systems outside of the 3 priority sub watersheds.



CARVER COUNTY

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: Comprehensive Plan Discussion – Review of public comment process – Discussion of responses to the review process– Focus on Parks, Open Space Trails Plan

Originating Division: Land & Water Services

Meeting Date: March 17, 2009

Amount of Time Requested: 1 hour +

Attachments for packet: Yes No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: The last time the Board was updated on the Comprehensive Plan was at its 17 February work session. Following the staff presentation a group of citizens and Township officials from Watertown Township made a presentation regarding the Parks Plan and some serious issues they have with the Parks Plan and Parks System Plan. Residents of Hollywood Township identified serious issues with the Historic Preservation Element and how the Township Chapters were presented to the Town Boards for their adoption. The Plan has been reviewed by the public, informally by Metro Council staff, townships, cities, adjacent units of government, school districts, etc. These reviews and the staff review of the draft plan have raised a number of issues in addition to those mentioned above that will need to be addressed in the draft that will be submitted to the Council for official review. The Plan is still in the review process, the Board has taken no action to adopt it. The next step in the process is to address the issues and comments in the draft to be sent to the Council for review.

The Metro Council staff review comments, comments from the public, and comments from other governments and agencies are attached. A memo further discussing the issues and proposed action steps to address all of the is also attached.

These issues are discussed further in the attached memo.

ACTION REQUESTED: Direction from the Board implement the action steps.

FUNDING

County Dollars = \$

Other Sources & Amounts =

= \$

TOTAL = \$

Related Financial Comments:

FISCAL IMPACT

None

Included in current budget

Budget amendment requested

Other:

Reviewed by Division Director

Date: 12 March 2009



Land & Water Services Division
Carver County Government Center
600 East 4th Street
Chaska, Minnesota
(952) 361-1820 fax (952) 361-1828

Date: 12 March 2009

To: Carver County Board

From: Dave Drealan

Subject: Comprehensive Plan Issues

As you are aware, citizens and township officials from the Watertown and Hollywood areas have expressed concern and disagreement with certain aspects of the draft 2030 Comprehensive Plan. Briefly these issues are:

- The Conservation Corridors as shown in the draft Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) Comprehensive Plan Element and System Plan..
- The Alternative Development Strategy (using land use controls and development negotiations to acquire land) as outlined in the POST Comprehensive Plan Element and System Plan..
- The Historic Resources Element – wording of the policies and implementation activities – particularly the use of the word “shall” and the commitment of resources it would take to fulfill all of the commitments listed.
- Township Plan Chapters – how the Chapters were presented to the Town Boards and the Elements of the County Plan the Townships were asked to adopt while being provided with little or no information on some of the Plan elements.

The comments received from the Hollywood and Watertown area citizens are the latest in the review and comment process. The County has received a variety of comments from the public, other governments, agencies, and institutions, and comments from an unofficial review by Metro Council staff. The complete set of comments is attached. The staff has also identified areas of the Plan that should be modified.

The following issues are significant and need to be addressed in the final draft:

Crow River Regional Trail – Metro Council Staff comments raise the issue of a Crow River regional trail that is included 2030 Metro Council Regional Parks Policy Plan. There will need to be some resolution between the Regional Policy Plan and the direction the County is taking. It is not clear from the Council staff comments if this will be a major issue or not.

Solar Access – add language recommended by Council staff

Aggregate resources - address issues identified in Metro Council staff review

SSTS – (Septic system) issues raised in the Metro Council staff review need to be addressed

Land Use issues – multi-modal and other opportunity sites need to be clarified

Water management – address requirement for updated water management plan and adoption by townships

Transition Areas – how to manage large areas; how to address differences between cities plans and township plans

Commuter Rail – make clear that is currently not in regional plans

Historic preservation – significant comments from City of Carver

Horse trails

Building Eligibility Transfer – development of standards to address issues that have been raised

Crow River Road Crossing

Housing Plan – needs to identify the role of CDA

CIP – a CIP needs to be submitted with the Plan

The staff has developed a set of action steps to address these issues, and, at Board direction, move forward to implement these action steps to address the Hollywood/Watertown issues:

- Remove any reference to the Crow River/3 Lakes Regional Park Search Area
- Remove the Conservation Corridor language from the Parks, Open Space & Trails (POST) Plan Element and System Plan, from the Water & Natural Resource Element, and any other Plan element in which it may appear.

In the current Plan one of the functions of the Corridors is identify connections in the cities and in transition areas (areas that will be urbanized by 2030). Some other method will need to be used in the Plan to illustrate these connections that that will not raise the same issues as the Conservation Corridors.

- Remove the Alternative Development track language from the POST Element and System Plan.
- Disconnect the System Plan from the Comp Plan Element – System Plan would not be adopted at this time
- Change Historic Resources Element - scale back activities; remove the “shall” from the implementation strategy and identify them as possible strategies; re-examine goals & policies
- Remove the provisions for adoption of the Economic Development, Historic Resources, and POST County Plan elements from the Township plan Chapters and determine what, if any, part of the Transportation Plan the Townships wish or need to adopt. Clearly identify and specify which parts of the County plan the Township is adopting. Meet with the Townships again to go over their plan chapters.
- Examine documents such as appendixes, system plans, reference documents, and studies to determine if they need to be adopted by reference and actually be part of the Plan. If not include a reference in the plan but avoid adoption or inclusion in the Plan.
- Include positive statements/policies such as: “condemnation to acquire park land is not being proposed or contemplated in this plan”; “the County will not be adopting architectural standards for historic preservation”.

- Contact Cities & any other interested parties and let them know of the proposed changes
- Develop a process for review of Plan Elements of by citizens and Township officials, cities and other interested parties.

Action steps to address other issues Identified

- Redraft language that will address the other issues identified
- Provide summaries of changes to cities, townships, interested public
- Post changed documents on the web site and make copies available
- Include any relevant changes in discussions with Townships
- Bring changes back to the Planning Commission and County Board

November 21, 2008

Paul Moline, Manager
Planning & Water Management Dept.
Carver County Land & Water Services Division
600 East 4th St
Chaska, MN 55318

RE: **Informal Review of Carver County's Draft 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update**

Dear Mr. Moline:

Metropolitan Council staff informally reviewed Carver County's draft 2030 Comprehensive Plan update (Update), received on August 21, 2008. The Update includes the unincorporated areas of the County including Benton, Camden, Dahlgren, Hancock, Hollywood, Laketown, San Francisco, Waconia, Watertown and Young America townships. The submittal did not include the individual township Updates and therefore this informal review does not address those Updates. In the informal review, staff focuses on whether the Update appears to be complete and identified any major system issues or policy conflicts. Staff offers the following informal review comments. If there are questions about the staff comments, please contact the individual reviewers as identified.

The informal review process found the following sections **complete for review** and did not identify any major system issues or policy conflicts although minor revisions are suggested. The following areas are listed in alphabetical order: Aviation, Forecasts, Historic Preservation, Housing, Solar Access Protection, and Wastewater.

Aviation (Chauncey Case, 651-602-1724)

The Update is complete with respect to aviation.

Forecasts (Todd Graham, 651-602-1322)

The Update is complete for forecast-related content. The 2010, 2020, 2030 forecasts in the Update are consistent with Council's published forecasts, therefore consistent with regional policy.

Advisory comment: The forecasts in the Update (pages 3.3, 3.5, and 3.7) are consistent with Council's currently published forecasts. Community-level forecast revisions are likely in response to city Update requests. Community-level revisions would change the county-level totals. For example, Norwood Young America is planning a 2030 population of 11,900 (vs. 8,800 in the Update) and 5,400 households (vs. 3,800).

Historic Preservation (Jim Uttley, 651-602-1361)

The Update is complete for historic preservation.

Housing (Linda Milashius, 602-1541)

The Update is complete for Housing. The Update provides a County-wide assessment of the housing stock, identifies affordable and life-cycle housing issues and needs, provides goals and strategies to address those needs, as well as implementation tools and programs that the County will use or make available to assist its cities and townships in addressing local housing needs.

Solar Access Protection (Jim Uttley, 651-602-1361)

The Update is complete for solar access protection. The Update makes one reference to “solar access” on page 4.12 where it says “...undue restriction on solar access...needs to be avoided.”

Advisory Comment: The following sample language may provide some ideas for how to address this subject in the Update.

Solar Access Protection

Metropolitan cities in Minnesota are required to include an element for protection and development of access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems in the Update. A solar access protection element is included in the Update to assure the availability of direct sunlight to solar energy systems. Solar energy is an alternative means to energy. It has much less impact on natural resources and the environment than the use of fossil fuels. Currently fossil fuels and nuclear power are needed to heat or cool our homes and businesses. Fossil fuels are also used for most modes of transportation. Increasing the use of solar energy would decrease reliance on fossil fuels and nuclear power. The purpose for including this section of the Update is to ensure that direct sunlight access to active and passive solar energy use is not subjected to shading from nearby trees, buildings, or other structures.

Solar Access Protection Goal and Policies

Goal: Encourage the use of solar energy systems for the purposes of space heating and cooling and hot water heating in new residential developments.

Policies:

1. The County will review its Zoning Ordinance and consider appropriate amendments to exempt active and passive solar energy systems from lot coverage and setback provisions.
2. The County will review its Code and consider appropriate amendments to require swimming pools and hot tubs to be heated using solar or some other form of renewable energy resource, where possible.
3. Within Planned Unit Developments, the County will consider varying setback requirements in residential zoning districts as a means of protecting solar access.

Wastewater (Roger Janzig, 651-602-1119)

The Update is complete for wastewater. The Update establishes transition areas adjacent to the rural centers for future growth through annexation. The delineation of these areas needs to be consistent with each of the city Updates.

The informal review process found the Parks section **complete for review** but **substantive issues** have been found with respect to conformance with regional systems.

Parks (Jan Youngquist, 651-602-1029)

The Update is complete for regional parks. However, the Update does not conform to the 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan (RPPP). The RPPP identifies two regional park search areas—the Miller Lake Search Area and the Minnesota River Bluff and Ravines Search Area in Carver County. The Parks and Open Space System Plan Map (page 4.72) refers to these park search areas, but also includes the “Crow River-Northern Lakes Regional Park Search Area.” Although the Crow River Regional Park search area was part of the 2001 Regional Recreation Open Space Plan, it was not identified in the RPPP. Therefore, the potential acreage and land acquisition costs of this regional park search area were not part of the RPPP adopted by the Council in 2005. The RPPP sets the initial

framework for the regional parks system elements the Council will help fund.

In order to conform to the current RPPP, the reference to a “regional” park search area in the Crow River-Northern Lakes area needs to be removed. The Council will be updating its RPPP in 2009-2010. Council staff recommends that the County seek regional status for the search area during the RPPP update. The County could label the area as the “Crow River-Northern Lakes Park Search Area (will seek regional status).” Additionally, page 4.69 refers to three regional park search areas, although the RPPP has identified two. This information needs to be included in the Update.

The regional trails identified in the RPPP include: the Dakota Rail Regional Trail, Highway 5 Regional Trail, Highway 101 Regional Trail, Waconia-St. Bonifacius Regional Trail, Twin Cities & Western Regional Trail, Chaska-Victoria Regional Trail (also known as the Southwest LRT Connection Regional Trail). Regional trail search corridors identified in the RPPP are the Crow River Regional Trail Search Area and the Carver County North-South Regional Trail Search Area. The Trail and Bikeway System Plan Map (page 4.73) includes these, and additional trails. To ensure conformance to the RPPP, a distinction of which trails are regional needs to be made.

In addition to the Update, Council staff had the opportunity to review the County’s 2030 Parks, Open Space and Trail System Plan. The County has done an outstanding job of defining its vision for the system, including identifying partnership opportunities and potential local connections to the regional system. This Update has set a strong foundation for future master planning of regional parks and trails.

Council staff offers the following comments on the 2030 Parks, Open Space and Trail System Plan:

- The comments given above with regard to the Crow River-Northern Lakes Search Area and labeling of regional trails apply to this Update, also.
- The Update states that Carver County is one of seven regional park implementing agencies (page 3.9). Actually, there are ten regional park implementing agencies—this information needs to be updated.
- The description for Carver Park Reserve (page 3.23) refers to the SW Regional LRT Trail. Three Rivers Park District has renamed this trail the Lake Minnetonka LRT Regional Trail. The trail name needs to be updated in this section.
- The description of the Council’s Regional Parks Acquisition Opportunity Fund (page 8.19) includes outdated information. The Council revised the program to provide up to \$1.7 million per agency to finance up to 75 percent of the costs to acquire land. The remaining 25 percent is not eligible for reimbursement. The program description needs to be updated in this section.

The informal review process found the following sections **incomplete for review**. The following areas are listed in alphabetical order: Aggregate Resources Protection, Individual Sewage Treatment System (ISTS) Program, Land Use, Plan Implementation, Surface Water Management, and Transportation (including Aviation).

Aggregate Resources Protection (Jim Larsen, 651-602-1159)

The Update is incomplete for aggregate resources protection. The Update does not address the presence or absence of aggregate resources in the County. Minnesota Geological Survey Information Circular 46 indicates the presence of viable aggregate resource deposits within rural portions of the County. The final submission will need to be revised to recognize the potential for application for future aggregate mining in the County, and make revisions to the land use element of the Update to minimize the potential for future land use conflicts. The County is directed to Section 3, page 3-10 of

the Council's Local Planning Handbook (<http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/LPH/handbook.htm>) for specific components that need to be incorporated into the formal submission.

Individual Sewage Treatment System (ISTS) Program (Jim Larsen, 651-602-1159)

The Update is incomplete for ISTS. The final submission will need to be revised to include a discussion of the County's ISTS program, including an approximate number of ISTS in operation in the County, a discussion of the County's tracking and notification database, its maintenance management program, and either a copy of the ordinance as an attachment to the Update or address to access the ordinance on the County's website. The Update needs to indicate what townships and cities for which the County provides ISTS oversight.

Land Use (Jim Uttley, 651-602-1361 or Lisa Barajas, 651-602-1895)

The Update is incomplete for land use. The Update that was submitted to the Council for informal review did not include individual township chapters and it is not clear that it was intended to include all of the land use plan elements. The Update does not include the following or answer the questions noted, which are needed for the Update to be considered complete:

- An existing or current land use map.
- A proposed 2030 land use map. The Update contains a development policy plan rather than demonstrating where and how the land will be used. The policy plan map is acceptable as a supplement but is not considered an acceptable "alternative" or substitute for a 2030 land use map.
- Tables showing the acreages of existing and future land uses by type for the County as a whole and for individual townships.
- Rural Service District is an "overlay" district that implies higher density development yet the density is not specified. Are these areas 1 dwelling per 40 acres?
- Towns have the option to follow one of several Rural Residential Density options. These options state that the overall density is 1 dwelling per 40 acres but exceptions (i.e., clustering) can occur in suitable conditions but in no terms are specific locations designated. Hence, by definition, all non-city land is designated Agricultural (1 dwelling per 40 acres). Is this how the County wants this illustrated?
- How are County Policy LU-22 ("OTHER USES" - (NON-AGRICULTURAL, NON-RESIDENTIAL LAND USE)) designated/represented?
- How are County Policy LU-23 (ESSENTIAL SERVICES AND PUBLIC SERVICES)) designated/represented?
- How will the Economic Development Opportunity sites be handled? In the past, the Council has tried to tie geography to specific parcels and designated them as "mixed use" or more specifically "multi-optional use." Are they considered "overlay" districts with the future land use "agricultural" until further study and land use amendments take place?

The Update identifies certain areas of the County as "transition areas." The Update indicates that transition areas are expected to become urbanized within the next 10 years (page 4.6 of the Update). This is not consistent with some of the municipal Updates, which plan for urbanization to occur through 2030. Some cities have noted in their Updates that the County transition areas do not have the same boundaries as the city's Updates. The County needs to assure that the transition areas shown around various cities in its Update (and in the township Updates) show the same geographic areas as those identified in the Updates for those cities.

The Update identifies five “opportunity areas” including three Multi-modal Rail Opportunity Areas, one Hampshire Road Opportunity Area, and one Hwy 7 and County Road 10 Opportunity Area. These areas are identified on the Carver County Planning Areas on page 4.7 of the Update. It appears from the text that “opportunity areas” are not land use designations but overlay districts within which future detailed planning is needed before any change in land use would be permitted, and that the actual land use designation is the same as that of the surrounding township. This needs to be explicit in both the County-wide land use plan and in the applicable individual township plans.

The County is encouraged to use the Council’s Land Use Table in 5 Year Stages or a similar table modified for County and Township use for the County-wide and individual township plan updates. Please see www.metrocouncil.org/planning/LPH/forms/LandUse5year.doc.

Plan Implementation (Jim Uttley, 651-602-1361)

The Update is incomplete for plan implementation. The Update needs to include either within the document itself or as a separate appendix a complete 5-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) that addresses capital improvements for at least parks, surface water management and transportation. Please see Metropolitan Land Planning Act (Minn. Stat. § 473.859, Subd. 4) for details.

In addition, the Update needs to include a current zoning map and a copy of the current zoning ordinance (or at least that portion that contains the detailed zoning district uses and densities). The Update needs to include a copy of the current subdivision ordinance and other official controls used by the County to implement its Update.

The Update appears to have adequately addressed the matter of future changes to local ordinances needed to help implement the County’s proposed Update.

Surface Water Management (Judy Sventek, 651-602-1156)

The Update is incomplete for Surface Water Management Plans. The County needs to revise its Update to address the concerns raised in the Council’s review of the surface water management issues as discussed below.

Carver County is responsible for watershed management planning for the Carver County Watershed Management Organization (WMO). The Board of Water and Soil Resources approved the County’s WMO watershed management plan in 2001. Carver County is in the process of updating this plan and hopes to have a new plan in 2009.

Carver County is responsible for planning for the townships. All cities and townships within the County’s WMO planning area are required to prepare local water management plans in response to the County’s watershed management plan. However County staff feels the current County WMO plan adequately addresses the need for local water plans for all of the townships.

In order to satisfy the local surface water management plan requirements as found in Appendix B2-b of the Council’s Water Resources Management Policy Plan, the Update needs to be modified to include the following:

- A discussion of the impaired waters in the County and the County’s role in preparing and implementing the total maximum daily loads (TMDL) required for those impaired waters. Since the County is the land use authority and local water plan authority for the townships, the discussion in the Update needs to also include information on what the County expects from the townships related to the TMDLs and the TMDL implementation plans as well.
- The comprehensive plan and chapters for the townships need to clearly state that the County’s watershed management plan will serve as the local surface water management plan required of the townships and that the townships will follow policies and requirements of that plan.

- The comprehensive plan and chapters for the townships need to clearly identify that the County will update the watershed management plan by 2009. The updated watershed management plan must include adequate actions and directions to cover the requirements for watershed plans as well as local surface water management plans. Otherwise the Council may require local surface water plans by the townships once the new watershed management plan is adopted. For more information on specific expectations of the Council for local surface water management plans, please see the Appendix B2-b of the Council's Water Resources Management Policy Plan.
- The County intends for its current watershed management plan to be the local water management plan for the townships, therefore the comprehensive plan and township chapters as well as the updated watershed management plan need to include language that clearly states that when a city annexes land from a township, the city must update its local surface water management plan to cover the annexed area within two years. The County needs to have some clear direction to the cities on this matter and how the process will work.
- Laketown Township is a mandatory MS4 community and is required to submit to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The comprehensive plan and Laketown Township chapter need to incorporate the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for Laketown Township in order to satisfy the requirements for local surface water management plans as found in Appendix B2-b. In the future, this element can be in the County's watershed management plan.

To be complete for review, the Update needs to be amended to include the items discussed above.

Transportation

The Update is incomplete for the highway and transit portions of the transportation requirements.

Highway & Transit (Ann Braden, 651-602-1705)

The Update is incomplete for highways and transit. The Transit planning section is incomplete for the following:

- State that areas of Carver County lie within Transit Market Areas III and IV (Figure 4-3 of the Council's 2030 Transportation Policy Plan) and indicate the appropriate service options for these two market areas. (Service options for Market Area III include peak-only express, small vehicle circulators, midday circulators, special needs paratransit (ADA, seniors), and ridesharing. Service options for Market Area IV include dial-a-ride, volunteer driver programs, and ridesharing.) Market areas are mentioned in the Carver County System Statement for Transportation on page T-3 and the map can be found using the following link: http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/transportation/TPP/2004/TPP04Chapter4_Final.pdf
- The Update needs to map and identify, in narrative form, existing transit routes and facilities and desired future transit service options consistent with the Transportation Policy Plan's transit system service areas (Table 4-1 and Appendix M). In addition to regular route transit service, dial-a-ride service is provided by Carver Area Rural Transit (CART) and ADA paratransit service is provided in Chanhassen and Chaska by Metro Mobility.

In addition the following needs to be clarified:

- The discussion of commuter rail and LRT needs to make a clear distinction between approved regional plans and the County's desire to explore potential corridors with the Council. There are also references (pages 4.40 and 4.41) to what are outdated studies and ridership projections for commuter rail and LRT.

- The discussion of CART service needs to clearly state that the service is open to the general public.
- Finally, on page 3.6 it states that suburban employment growth in Carver County was “propelled by a good transit system....” Employment growth was likely propelled by “ a good transportation system.”
- Roadway Functional Classification - The “Complete Roadway Plan” contains a map of the existing Functional Classification that is clear, precise and accurate. The “Future” Classification map contains a number of roadway designations that depart from the Council’s “official” Roadway Functional Classification Map. The County needs to request these changes through the TAC-TAB process.

Advisory comment: While the “Complete Roadway Plan” describes the TAZ forecasting process and includes a map of the TAZ system, there is no TAZ-allocation table provided in the Update. Table 4 (Page 21 of the Roadway Systems Plan) identifies the community and County forecast totals. The numbers do not reflect the January, 2008 Regional Development Framework numbers. Council staff does not recommend that the numbers be updated as the difference in the 2030 forecasts overall, and the impact of a revised dataset would be negligible and would not alter the results.

The formal submittal of the Carver County 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update needs to include at least one (1) paper copy and one (1) electronic copy on CD or DVD disk in PDF format of the entire Update, CIP, related ordinances and township plans. In addition, the submittal needs to include a land use table for each township and the County as a whole showing existing, 2010, 2020 and 2030 land use acreages. The County Update and township plans do not need to show 5-year incremental changes in the table(s). The formal submittal also needs to include the formal submittal form found at <http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/assistance/CPUFormJan06.doc>

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Update. If you have any questions or need further information with respect to the previously discussed matters, please contact the identified reviewer or Jim Uttley, Sector Representative at 651-602-1361.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Hanson, Manager
Local Planning Assistance

CC: David Drealan, Director, Carver County Land & Water Services
Craig Peterson, Metropolitan Council District 4
Jim Uttley, Sector Representative
Cheryl Olson, Reviews Coordinator



adjacent community/agency comments

Communities/Townships

City of Carver – Cynthia Nash, Collaborative Planning, LLC

- Land Use Element
 - The Figure 3 Planning Land Use Map was not included and could not be reviewed.
 - County Policy LU-15 refers to a Figure 5 that appears to be an incorrect reference. The Figure titled “Carver County Policy Areas” could not be located.
 - County Policy LU-16 regarding agricultural preserves in transition areas may be too restrictive. Perhaps it would be better to consult with the affected City to determine if they have any objection to the enrollment or re-enrollment on a case-by-case basis.
 - One of the multi-modal rail opportunity areas is next to and includes area that is the future northwest gateway to the City of Carver. The City encourages the County to work collaboratively with affected cities when development of these areas is proposed to determine compatibility of any proposed uses with City plans.
 - County Policy LU-24A is not adequately defines and it is unclear as to what the County’s intension is for this area. The plan appears to encourage planning proposals in the Hampshire Road area, but acknowledges that municipal services will be necessary. Despite that this area is not shown in the Comprehensive Plans of any of the three neighboring cities, the City of Carver anticipates that this area will become a part of the planning area for at least one of the municipalities. As such, the City would discourage the County from proceeding with development plans for this area that may not be complementary to the city’s plans or that may hinder future extension of municipal services to this area.
 - Page 36: Much of the available aggregate resources in the County are located in San Francisco Township. Changes to the San Francisco Township chapter that allows density greater than the 1 unit per 40 acre density standard would result in greater encumbrance by development, thereby affecting the feasibility of future extraction. A map of aggregate resources would be a helpful addition to this section.
- Dahlgren Chapter
 - Page 2: The text states that Dahlgren Township is expected to grow significantly in population, while the table shows otherwise. In reality, although the Met Council’s forecasts show rapid population growth within Dahlgren Township, it is being planned to be accommodated within the City of Carver following annexation. We suggest that the text be amended to reflect that this growth will actually be in Carver. The discussion on page 5 related to job growth may be an example of how this can be portrayed consistent with the County’s policy of directing growth to cities.
 - Page 4: This page contains a similar conflict as occurs on Page 2, but this time in its discussion of household growth.
 - Page 6: It is stated that there are currently 8 properties in Dahlgren Township listed on the National Register of Historic Place. Please verify the accuracy of that statement as the City is not aware of these listed properties.
 - Page 6: The City suggests that this map be changes to further break down the “historic sites” shown on the map into different categories such as “National Register” and “potential sites”. In some cases, the previous survey data that identified the site may be old enough that either the site has subsequently lost its historic integrity, or possibly has even been demolished. There is also a difference between sites that have been formally listed on the National Register, and those that have been

- surveyed and denoted as potentially being eligible for listing. Further, the map should denote the boundaries of National Register Districts that exist in the County. Finally, not all of the “sites” shown on the map exist any longer.
- Page 13: The City of Carver is concerned that the use of the “Option 2 --- Wooded Lot” may encourage development in the sensitive bluff areas that would be protected under the City’s ordinances. In addition, development at a density greater than one unit per forty acres may result in a situation that makes it financially unfeasible for future development at urban densities.
 - Page 15: Township Policy TR-2 is an incomplete sentence.
 - Page 17: The Transportation Map does not show the access roads near TH 212 that were constructed by MN/DOT to serve several properties. These should be added to the map.
 - Page 17: Labels for new TH 212 are visible, but the linework is not.
 - Page 17: In the transition areas, the color coding of the road network does not correspond with the legend.
- San Francisco Chapter
 - The City of Carver has significant concerns with increasing development potential for residential development in San Francisco Township at densities of greater than 1 unit per 40 acres, and is of the opinion that this conflicts with the Regional Plan. The potential challenges with developing large-lot rural development are as follows:
 - Significant portions of the Township contain aggregate resources that will not be financially feasible or politically popular to mine if the Township is subdivided into additional residential units encumbering these resources or areas that are near those resources.
 - Although not included in the Carver Comprehensive Plan at this time, the City of Carver is aware of numerous property owners within San Francisco township that are interested in having future urban density development occur on their properties. Subdivision of the Township into 10-acre parcels as provided in the County’s plan would result in expensive and inefficient use of future water and sewer utility development, and may preclude the occurrence of future development. The current “gain” from the sale of a few extra units/lots would then result in other Township property owners being unable to annex to the City if the City determined that it could not cost-effectively extend urban services due to past development practices.
 - Page 2 contains a different population forecast table than the Dahlgren Township chapter. All of the future urban Dahlgren Township growth should be shown as being in the City of Carver by virtue of the City’s approved 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The same would apply to the household and employment forecasts shown on pages 4 and 5 respectively. The City did not review these tables for the other townships, but would maintain that the same table should be shown in all Township chapters.
 - Page 12: This section is incomplete as it alludes to information that was not included.
 - Page 15: Township Policy LU-3 suggests that the County and Township would allow for development to occur on the top of the bluff.
 - Page 15: The Township’s Mineral Extraction Ordinance should be reviewed to determine whether it complies with the Regional Plan in terms of preservation of aggregate resources for future extraction. Township Policy LU-4 and the Ordinance may potentially preclude the fiscally feasible extraction of the resources in this area.
 - Retail and Service Space and Land Demand 2030
 - **Given the concerns expressed below and the fact that the Economic Development portion of the plan is optional, the City of Carver requests that the County exclude this chapter from its adopted plan.**
 - The City is disappointed that the various changes that were discussed in detail with staff from the Carver County Community Development Agency (CDA) and its consultant and agreed upon were not made to the plan. Specifically, discussion related to the TH 212 development areas is extremely focused on the City of Chaska to the exclusion of Carver. The City of Carver has abundant ready-to-develop

commercial and industrial land located at the interchange of TH 212 and CSAH 11 that is merely included into the City of Chaska's South New TH 212 section in a general manner. A reader of this plan who is looking for information supporting their decision-making process to pursue retail development in Carver would learn from the plan that only 142,000 square feet of retail space was needed through 2030. This plan may actually cause harm to the City of Carver's efforts to develop its prime commercial and industrial area located at TH 212 and CSAH 11.

- Page 1-8: says that Carver is showing an expanded downtown. Please note that this is downtown in the historic sense, not the business sense. The City's 2020 plan also shows a larger downtown than what is contained within the actual CBD. The point in doing this is to recognize the history that needs to be preserved, and to allow for some expansion of commercial uses into neighboring residential areas to the extent that it is compatible with residential and is consistent with maintaining the history of the structures (i.e. conversion of homes into B&Bs, etc). This would be in keeping with the idea that downtown becomes more of a destination, rather than necessarily neighborhood commercial. There are not any plans to level and redevelop large segments of the downtown, which is constrained by the bluffs, floodplain, historical significance, and FEMA restrictions.
- Page 1-9: The Future Land Use map has been updated since the version that was included in the plan.
- Population projections used in this plan are not consistent with the Metropolitan Council's projections.
- Map 2-1, Page 2-3: Please change the name to Historic Downtown Carver Trade Area.
- The South New TH 212 development area would appear to the reader to be completely within the City of Chaska. From a retail perspective, the first and primary retail area to develop will be within the City of Carver and to the west of CSAH 11.
- The South New TH 212 trade area appears to encompass 2 interchanges with TH 212 where the other interchanges to the east each warranted their own individual analysis in the plan. If analyzing these interchanges separately is not possible, then perhaps the maps in general could identify business districts by a polygon shape rather than a point. This may help some readers in understanding that, for instance, the South 212 retail area is not actually within a very small point in Chaska's greenbelt, but encompasses a much larger area in two cities.
- Maps throughout this document do not adequately show either CSAH 11 or CR 45. By 2030, this combination of roads is projected to carry approx 35,000-40,000 ADT. On the maps, these very important roads have the significance as a cartway in a township. The CSAH 11/CR 45 status as a river crossing location does not seem to be considered in this analysis.
- The City of Carver envisions the TH 212 and CSAH 11 area as a significant regional center, and present developer interest suggests that the trade area for this site is much larger than that projected in the County's plan. The trade area should include areas of Scott County from Jordan south since it will be faster for people from those areas to access this regional center than the one in Shakopee at Marschall Road. Similarly, would the residents from Norwood Young America and other similar locations skip over this area and drive into Eden Prairie or Chaska to shop at a regional center.
- It would be helpful to know how these estimations of future demand/support were made. For comparison to the South 212 area, a review of the Victoria Chapter was made. The report estimated that 1.2 million square feet of retail can be supported in the South 212 area, and that 848,000 square feet can be supported in Victoria. The City does not agree with the County's conclusion that there is inadequate support for significantly more development than is projected to be demanded inside the City of Victoria. Victoria is constrained by a strong market and potential in Waconia to the west, geographic barriers to the north that inhibit the trade area extending in that direction, strong development in Chanhassen/Chaska to the east, and strong

development in the South 212 area along the freeway. By comparison, the CSAH 11/South 212 area contains an interregional corridor (TH 212) along with a county road that is one of the few that crosses the Minnesota River, along with Chaska's planned Bioscience Center.

- Draft Business Park Space and Land Demand
 - **Given the concerns expressed below and the fact that the Economic Development portion of the plan is options, the City of Carver requests that the County exclude this chapter from its adopted plan.**
 - What methodology was used to determine the market demand for these uses?
 - Since the Retail study looked at Carver's Downtown, was the same process used in the Business Park Space study in that the projections are for the historic downtown area rather than the TH 212/CSAH 11 area? Is the South 212 area contained completely within Chaska again?
 - Did the study give any consideration to CSAH 11/CR 45 being a river crossing? The City's potential employee base includes areas on the other side of the Minnesota River, plus utilizing this road is a fairly convenient means of transporting products to the 169 corridor.
 - There is an incredibly high difference in demand projected between Chaska and Carver. The City would like to see more detailed information on how this analysis was conducted, what inputs were used, etc. Existing Chaska in 2006 has just under 3 million square feet of office/warehouse/industrial before TH 212 was completed and the local transportation network is improved, and they are projected to add an additional 3 million square feet. According to the County's plan, Carver, which will have convenient access and visibility to TH 212, will only add 256,000 square feet including contingency through 2030 despite only a couple extra miles to drive and a savings in land acquisition costs versus developing in Chaska.
- Future Transit Strategies and Ridership
 - The City of Carver disagrees with the projections made regarding transit usage in Carver and subsequent recommendations of the plan. Further, it is our understanding that Southwest Transit also has concerns regarding this plan. The City of Carver requests that the analysis for the transit section of the plan be re-evaluated and updated.
 - The population projections in Figure 2-1 are not consistent with the Metropolitan Council's system statements or the Carver Comprehensive Plan.
 - The City of Carver would like further information to determine how the estimated daily demand by park and ride lot was determined for Exhibit 3-6. It does not seem logical that under any scenario that less than 110 people would be utilizing the site at CSAH 11/TH 212 in 2030 given future population projections and the high ADT levels on TH 212 and CSAH 11.
- Parks, Open Space, and Trail System Plan
 - Map 4-2 identifies a large portion of the Carver growth area as a search area for a Carver Ravine acquisition. This acquisition is not identified in the City of Carver Comprehensive Plan. However, the City is open to discussion with the County and the Metropolitan Council regarding this topic. No further detail on this proposed unit or the Bevens Creek one could be located later in the chapter, so the City could not determine if there are any conflicts with the City's plans.
 - The concepts in this chapter of preserving the high value resources (which are frequently wooded) is in conflict with the County's and township land use policy and zoning practice of allowing additional residential density in "amenity" areas.
 - Figure 4-5 should show the Union Pacific rail to trail conversion with a future extension to Scott County, similar to how other corridors that link to the County border are shown with an arrow.
 - Figure 6-9 is labeled as "City of Mayer".
- Historic Preservation Chapter
 - The City of Carver actively supports historic preservation efforts made by all levels of government and has made substantial investments itself in promoting and protecting

historic resources. However, the City also recognizes that there are numerous other important goals that are not always completely compatible with historic preservation. IN addition, the necessary financial resources do not exist at the local, state or federal level to preserve all historic resources, necessitating that priorities should be made. Finally, the resources vary tremendously in their integrity and importance. Given the practical and financial limitations, the County's plan is extremely ambitious and a number of the strategies and goals should be reconsidered. Further, the historic preservation efforts planned by the County are generally not compatible with the City of Carver's 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

- Section 3.1 states that the County has a goal of serving “as the primary historic preservation organization in the county.” It further identifies a strategy of “enacting a heritage preservation ordinance”. Additional strategies outline that if a local government is a CLG, that the County shall delegate its historic preservation responsibilities to that community's HPC. The City of Carver suggests that the County give further consideration to these items prior to adopting these policies and associated strategies into the Comprehensive Plan. If the County adopts regulations impacting upon historic preservation intending to apply those inside communities that have chosen not to do so themselves, then conflicts between those other communities' plans and the County preservation efforts may occur. On the other hand, in the interest of equity, the County shouldn't be providing historic preservation services and staff assistance to some communities without providing those same services to the Cities of Carver and Chaska (Certified Local Governments) if they would choose to receive them.
- The Plan states that historic preservation considerations shall be incorporated into all County development and environmental review processes, and that any potential adverse effects shall be avoided or mitigated. Holding all County projects, including private projects, to this standard would be extremely costly, inhibits development, and generally is not in the best interest of the taxpayers. In the event that the County chooses to enact and enforce this standard, the City of Carver would request to opt out. **This provision of the County's Draft Comprehensive Plan is not compatible and is in conflict with the City of Carver's 2030 Comprehensive Plan.**
- A set of related strategies is included that identifies and designates a County register of local landmarks, and then also states that if a city annexes a County designated landmark that an intergovernmental agreement shall be executed between the County and the City to ensure the preservation of the property. The County plan has already identified in Table 7 over 40 properties that are at least 50 years old and may potentially have some historic value within the Carver growth area. A historic property consists of not only the buildings but also the context of the landscape surrounding it, particularly important when the historic resource is a farmstead. Since it is unlikely that any of these properties would be annexed unless there was intent to develop the properties for urban density uses, then the mandated preservation of annexed historic resources is directly in conflict with the purpose for annexation. **This policy and strategy is not compatible with the City of Carver's 2030 Comprehensive Plan as it would require that the City preserve, rather than develop, properties that contain historic resources.** These provisions would make it more difficult to annex and develop in an economic and orderly manner, which has long been a key policy of the County's land use plan.
- The Plan states that undesignated properties that are eligible for local designation or for listing on the NRHP shall be protected from destruction or a substantial loss of historic character until the County has an opportunity to consider alternatives to adverse effects, or to pursue designation and find parties interested in acquiring it. **If applied to the City of Carver or the growth area, this strategy is not compatible with the City of Carver's 2030 Comprehensive Plan.** It is the City's opinion that there is unlikely to be enough funding resources to actually protect more than a couple of the rural properties, if even that many can be protected. It is an

undue burden on the owners of the various potentially historic properties to be required to wait to do anything until such time as the County finds a way to protect it. In addition, not all of these resources are planned to be protected under the annexing City's Comprehensive Plans.

- Page 33 did not include the Figure 1 for review.
- Page 47 did not include the Figure 2 for review.
- Table 7 provides a vaguely identified list of properties that are 50 years of age or older in the growth areas of the various communities. However, beyond stating that these properties are at least 50 years of age, there is not sufficient documentation to determine if any of these properties are significant, retain their integrity, and may ultimately be eligible for the National Register.

City of Chanhassen – Kate Aanenson, Community Development Director

- Section 3 – Parks and Open Space System Plan
 - Page 3.24 & 3.25: An existing pedestrian trail connection between a City property, Herman Field Park and Minnewashta Regional Park may be noted by inference, but in the best interest of the public, should be included in the County's master plan. Acknowledgement and improvement of this connection will lead to improved awareness of this convenient access from neighborhoods north of the park leading to increased park use. It is also the City's desire to see a future local trail connection to the expanding neighborhoods south of the park included in the parks master plan.
 - Page 3.37 – Figure 3.11 MN DNR/USFWS Land Holdings and Future Collaborative Opportunities: Update to include acquisition of the Seminary Fen SNA.
 - Page 3.4 – Figure 3.3 Natural Resources Inventory Map of Carver County: Data for a majority of Chanhassen is omitted.
 - Page 3.4 – Equestrian Trails: Carver County boasts a sizable community of horse owners who are seeking expanded opportunities for trail riding within the area.
 - Page 3.49 – Disc Golf Course: It is noted that typically only one disc golf course would be provided in each regional park district. The County already maintains a course at Baylor Regional Park. The City would welcome the opportunity to partner on a second course within the Carver County System at Minnewashta Regional Park. Through resident input and feedback we are aware of a significant interest in expanded disc golf opportunities in Eastern Carver County.
- Section 4 – Trail and Bikeway System Plan
 - Page 4.21: We do not concur that the Highway 101 North Trail in Chanhassen offers a less than compelling trail experience, which likely reduces the level of use it receives. This trail was the most widely sought-after section of trail in the community leading to its' construction in 2002, assisted by a \$500,000 grant from the State of Minnesota.
 - Page 4.22 Equestrian Trails: The City of Chanhassen receives numerous inquiries concerning the lack of equestrian trails in the area. On a county-wide basis horse ownership and interest in facilities associated with recreational riding compounds significantly. We encourage the inclusion of equestrian trails in the County's master planning efforts.
- Section 6 – Local Systems Connections
 - Page 6.14 – Figure 6.4 City of Chanhassen Trails Map with Regional Trail Corridors Overlaid: The map depicted is a "Future Possibilities" map describing park and recreation planning ideas expressed during our public open house sessions. This map needs to be replaced with a current park and trail master plan. A note recommending a regional trail connection through the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum should be reviewed with the University of Minnesota.
 - Page 6.14: Note concerning protection of the Seminary Fen needs updating to acknowledge recent partial acquisition by the State of Minnesota.
 - Page 6.15: It should be noted that the City is a partner in *GoCarverGo*, an active living program administered by Carver County.

City of Mayer – Luayn Murphy, City Administrator

- Land Use

- Section 4 of the Carver County Comprehensive Plan Update (CCCPU) includes goal statements supporting healthy, sustainable cities and direction of most residential, industrial, commercial, and institutional growth to the municipalities. The statements compliment the basic goals contained in the Mayer Comprehensive Plan relating to urban development.
- The Planning Areas identified in Land Use Map 1 (Sect. 4, Pg 7) accurately reflect the urban growth boundary (UGB) contained in the Mayer Comprehensive Plan. The area external to the corporate limits but within the Mayer UGB is represented in the CCCPU as a “transition area”. Under the goals of the CCCPU, transition areas will be managed to ensure that they are available for urban development when needed and that development can occur in an economic and orderly fashion.
- Policies for land use in transition areas are contained in **County Policy LU-18A Management**. Under this policy set, land within the transition area remains in the County’s “A” Agricultural Zoning District with a maximum density of 1 dwelling per forty acres. In addition, conditional use permits will not be issued unless the affected city certifies the use will conform to the city’s comprehensive plan or the contemplated use is *“easily removable or would have minimal impact on future land uses”*. The City may wish to request the CCCPU cite examples which clarify this description. It is noted examples are used to clarify intent in other portions of the CCCPU. It is further noted the CCCPU contemplates maximum densities for residential units but does not allude to maximum density for commercial, industrial or institutional uses.
- **County Policy LU-22 “Other Uses” (Non-Agricultural, Non-Residential)**. (Sect. 4, Pg 18) This policy provides for other uses in the agricultural use policy area which may be necessary or appropriate. The policy statement specifically states the intent *‘is not to provide an alternate location for uses that belong in the urban area’*. Non-agricultural, non-residential categories are:
 - Essential services (i.e. public/quasi-public uses),
 - Large scale land uses that require a location in the agricultural policy area because of a unique need for land or location (i.e. marina, gravel mine, ski slope, golf course, shooting range, motor vehicle recreation area, summer camps, retreats, hunting preserves), or
 - Small scale business activities centered around a residential or residential/farmstead use of a property. These uses must be located on a site either with an existing residence, or residence/farmstead.

This policy is consistent with goals, objectives, and policies contained in the Mayer Comprehensive Plan.

- **County Policy LU-23 Rural Service District Overlay**. (Sect. 4, Pg 19) This policy area provides for rural small settlement clusters that have developed in previous years. Areas to be treated as rural service districts (RSD) under the CCCPU are limited to Bongards, Assumption, East Union, Gotha, Maple Hollywood Station, and Hollywood (Sports Complex). The **Watertown Township Policy Chapter, Township Policy LU-5** finds no Rural Service Districts (RSD’s) lie within Watertown Township at this time. The same policy states: *“The Township supports future studies and planning for potential economic development along the Highway 7 corridor”*. The City may wish to request the County clarify that this township policy relates to the ‘transitional area’ and is not applicable to the ‘agricultural policy area’ as represented in Land Use Map 1 as contained in the CCCPU.

- Transportation

- Figure 2 in Section 4 is inconsistent with the Mayer Comprehensive Plan. Both the City and County Transportation Plans illustrate westerly extension of West 70th Street to CR 33 with functional class re-designation of the new segment to ‘A minor arterial’ (CR 30). The County Plan (but not the City plan) calls for existing CR 30 to revert to a functional classification of ‘Major Collector’. In addition, that segment of current CR

30 (like TH 25 in the downtown if a new alignment is constructed) would be turned back to city ownership. When appropriate, the City may want to seek a meeting with the County to further discuss turnback issues. The City may also wish to request the County adjust the legend of Figure 2 in Section 4 to illustrate the intent of dashed lines as opposed to solid lines.

- Figure 4 in Section 4 illustrates the future trunk highway system in Carver County. The City should be aware of the ‘trunk highway’ designation being moved from 25 to 33/133. The City may wish to work with the County to proactively inform property owners in the Central Business District of the anticipated change as a means of curbing the potential for misinformation in terms of impact on traffic volume and business sales potential. For example, some business owners may feel the re-designation of trunk highway status will mean less traffic which would lead to lower sales, when the actual reality may be quite different.
- Section 4, Map 1 on Page 44 of the CCCPU illustrates transit planning areas. The City of Mayer is designated as a community served by Carver County Transit (CART) ‘feeder routes’ or potential commuter rail. A potential commuter rail station is included in the City of Norwood Young America just south of Mayer. The Mayer Comprehensive Plan contemplates the development of a park and pool facility within the *Fieldstone* development. The park and pool location could also potentially serve as a stop for a commuter rail feeder route.
- Economic Development
 - Policy ED-2.3 in Section 4 of the CCCPU (Page 87) provides an excellent opportunity for the City to partner with the County regarding downtown revitalization efforts.
 - The **Watertown Township Policy Chapter, Township Policy ED-1** states, “Watertown Township supports the county policy of directing commercial development to cities and Rural Service Districts. Watertown Township supports economic development along HWY 7 corridor”. The City may wish to seek clarification of the intent of this policy statement as the County does not appear to have a policy to direct commercial development to rural service districts. The intent of the statement regarding support for economic development along Highway 7 corridor should also be clarified as the CCCPU does not intend to allow for alternate locations for uses that belong in an urban area.
 - There appears to be a misprint in **Watertown Township Policy Chapter, Township Policy ED-2**. Clarification as to the correct verbiage should be requested by the City.
- Historic Preservation
 - The CCCPU makes a strong statement regarding historic preservation and cultural resource protection to the benefit of the entire County and the community of Mayer. Goal HP-2 on Page 93 of Section 4 offers the City an opportunity to partner with the County to both identify and evaluate historic and cultural resources. Policy HP-1 names the County as the primary historic preservation organization in the County and tasks the organization with identification and evaluation of all types of historic and cultural resources. The City has an excellent opportunity to partner with the County to identify and evaluate historic and cultural resources within the community.

City of Victoria – Holly Kreft, Community Development Director

- Transportation Element
 - The Transportation Element should acknowledge the TH 5 Corridor Study even though it isn’t complete, but at least to include for future reference.
 - Although the proposed realignment for County 43 is in conceptual stage, the City strongly recommends that the road be placed as far east as possible to ensure developable area on the west side. The City owns approximately 94 acres in that area for future development and would like to be closely involved with the County as more detailed plans for the roadway move forward.
- Transit Element

- The map on 4.44 does not include a planned park and ride in Victoria. The City has serious concerns with this. Both the 2020 Comprehensive Plan and the 2030 Comprehensive Plan update show the following:
 - A future park and ride at County Roads 10 and 11
 - A future park and ride along TH 5
 - The existing park and ride at the Victoria Field House
- The City of Victoria feels it is imperative that at a minimum one park and ride be planned in the area of County Roads 10 and 11 to complement the type of high density/commercial development that we have guided for this area.

City of Watertown – Crystal Foust, Senior Planner

- Land Use
 - County Policy LU-3: Aren't transition areas shown as being urbanized until 2030? This policy conflicts with number 15
 - County Policy LU-15: This policy states that areas receiving sewer service by 2030 will **typically** be placed in the Transition Policy Area. What does the word **typically** imply? What are examples of when the area covered in the 2030 plan would not be placed in the Transition Area?
 - County Policy LU-16: How about existing acres enrolled in the Agricultural Preserve Program that are in the 2030 growth area? How does this affect property owners that are enrolled in the program?
 - County Policy LU-18A, second bullet: What are examples of exceptions that will not be reviewed by the City?
 - County Policy LU-24: Planning for the multi-modal rail opportunity area should include an analysis on the competition to nearby cities that may result with such development.
- Transportation
 - County Goal TR:R-1: The City of Watertown would support more integration of active living principles stated in the transportation section including pedestrian safety, integration of complete streets network, and the County supporting trail development along County Roads as well as other areas.
 - Page 4.46: The strategy "Support a balanced transportation system that provides for the safety and mobility of pedestrians, bicyclists, those with strollers, and those in wheelchairs at least equal to that of auto driver" should be incorporated into the Roadways section.
 - Page 4.33 Official Mapping: The City of Watertown has conducted a study for the east loop of the future county road corridor. The City and County have invested time and money into this study and the City will be adopting the route as the "locally preferred route" in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. As development occurs to the east surrounding this corridor, it is recommended that the County integrate this preferred route as well to preserve key corridor alignment in this area with significant growth pressures.
 - TR:R Map 1: County Road 13 in Wright County connecting to County Road 10 heading north out of the city is classified as a "Major Collector" according to the Wright County Engineers staff met with. Please check the classification of the segment. The Metropolitan Council has commented on the large number of changes to the roadway classifications around Watertown. The City of Watertown has integrated all the changes to the County system into their Transportation Chapter. The changes will need to be forwarded to the TAC-Planning Committee for approval before they can become "official" on the Council's map.
 - TAZ information: With respect to population, household, and employment forecasts, the Metropolitan Development Framework of January, 2008 is not accurately reflected in the County TAZ allocation table. The City's numbers should total 7,700 for population, 3,000 for households, and 1,770 for employment. This was a comment made by the Metropolitan Council.
- Transit

- CART: With the increasing demand on CART, the County in collaboration with the Office of Aging, cities and Senior Commissions may want to explore the opportunity for alternative transit for senior citizens and those unable to drive.
- County Goal TR:T-3: Encourage park-n-ride facility opportunities and other non-auto options in Western Carver County Highway 7 and 25 or County Road 20.
- County Policy TR:T-3: Redefining the CART system may be helpful. It is the number one issue that has come up in the open houses and forums is that CART has become ineffective.
- Housing
 - County Goal HS-1: Is this not the vision of Carver County as a whole?
 - County Policy HS-4: This policy needs more detail to be clear about the message it is conveying.
 - County Policy HS-8: The City of Watertown is interested in pursuing ways to provide and encourage affordable housing including Land Trust. Are there other methods to encourage affordable housing and partnership within the County?
- Parks, Open Space & Trails
 - Page 4.66: Direct Purchase/Fee Simple Acquisition should be put last on the list of strategies for projecting and managing natural resources because it is not the preferred method.
 - Page 4.69: Is Lake Minnewashta Regional Park on the priority list for acquisition of land or just for improvements as stated on page 4.71?
 - The City of Watertown is supportive of a Crow River-Northern Lake Regional Park Search Area. The City is currently seeking land for a community park with an array of facilities and amenities including off leash dog park, disc golf course, outdoor performance area, access drives and parking lots, restrooms, visitor/interpretive center, paved & Nature trails, multi-recreational fields, etc. Although the community park would not meet the recommended regional park size, conservation corridors and interconnected trails with the regional park will be important to consider and evaluate with searching for a Northern Lakes Regional Park.
- Water & Natural Resources
 - No comments
- Watertown Township Policy Chapter
 - This chapter references San Francisco Township on page 5.
 - Township Policy LU-4: The City of Watertown supports the area guided under the 2030 Comprehensive Plan as described as Transition Area in the County Comprehensive Plan.
 - Township Policy WNR-1: Is Mapes Creek supposed to be referenced instead of Carver Creek watersheds?
 - Township Policy ED-2: Policy does not make sense and seems to be incomplete.
 - Township Policy TR-5: Is this standard to create private roads?
 - Map on page 17 references Waconia. Why is the golf course a brown color? It is not labeled on the map.
- Economic Development – Mark Kaltsas, Terramark
 - There are some discrepancies in the timing of construction for the new Watertown Industrial Park and when the CCCDA/McComb Business Park & Retail Study was completed which may have altered the findings and recommendations for Watertown in the plan. Comments and concerns have been addressed with Director of Economic Development, John Sullivan.
 - The McComb Group recommends that Watertown should consider identifying 15 to 20 additional acres for future business park development. This area will most likely be provided in the newly developing Watertown Industrial Park.
 - McComb's suggested additional retail development potential of 21-26 acres. Watertown's current (draft) 2030 Land Use Plan does have sufficient land area guided for commercial development. The three main areas where this will occur are Watertown Industrial Park, Downtown redevelopment area and neighborhood commercial in the Forest Hills development area.

- Historic Preservation – Karyn Islam, Assistant Planner
 - While the goals and policies section is quite thorough, some of the goals and policies seem to overlap. Examples:
 - County *Goal* HP-1: Integrate historic preservation planning into all aspects of planning, including comprehensive land use, zoning, housing, parks and trails, and transportation planning; and County *Policy* HP-2: Integrate Historic preservation planning into planning processes.
 - County Goal HP-4: Develop incentives to encourage the preservation of historic and cultural resources; and County Policy HP-14: Offer financial to the owners of County designated landmarks and contributing properties in historic districts to encourage the retention and preservation of these historic... (incomplete)
 - When reading the policies, they seem somewhat like variations of each other – conveying essentially the same message, only worded differently. (You may already be aware of this). Examples:
 - County Policy HP-15: Serve as a clearinghouse for technical information on how to preserve, rehabilitate and reuse historic resources, and County Policy (p. 4.96): Serve as a clearinghouse for information on federal, state, and county incentives for historic resources and promote them to owners of historic properties, and County Policy HP-14: Offer financial incentives to the owners of County designated landmarks and contributing properties in historic districts to encourage the retention and preservation of these historic... (incomplete)
 - Regarding County Policy HP-1: The County will serve as the primary historic preservation organization in the County...
 - First, I understand the County's desire to have within it the capacity to offer the most comprehensive information on the area's historically significant buildings, properties, materials, etc., as well as its desire to hold the greatest amount of influence regarding historic preservation. However, I would suggest expounding a bit on the sentence to add more of a context behind the statement. Would the County's role as the primary historic preservation organization ever conflict with local interpretation of what is considered historically significant? Maybe the policy could say something like, *Draw from local historical and cultural resources to serve as the primary historic preservation organization at the County level.*
 - County Policy HP-7: Create designation criteria and a methodology for determining the significance of historic and cultural resources for local significance within the County.
 - The sentence is a bit redundant and/or wordy. How about: *Create methodologies and criteria for designating historically and/or culturally significant resources within the County.*
 - Incomplete Policies: HP-12 & HP-14
 - Not sure what the 3rd County Policy on page 4.96 is actually trying to say. Consider rephrasing for clarity.
 - Page 4.97, 8th strategy: If a municipality is a Certified Local Government, the County shall delegate many of its historic preservation responsibilities to the community's heritage preservation commission.
 - This strategy somewhat contradicts County Policy HP-1 (*The County will serve as the primary historic preservation organization in the county*).
 - Page 4.98 5th strategy: Properties not currently 50 years of age shall be surveyed when they reach 50 years of age. Properties that are less than 50 years of age that are known to have special significance as soon as their significance is recognized
 - The meaning in the second sentence is a bit unclear to me.
 - Page 4.98: I was able to pick out a *highest priority*, a *secondary priority* and a *lowest priority* from the strategies listed. I would suggest placing those strategies serially for a better flow/read.
 - Some strategies are repeats, and again, some strategies appear to be variations of each other and seem to jump/skip around. I would suggest cleaning this up a bit. For example, group together the strategies that discuss the creation of a database, clearinghouse, information gathering, etc. in one section, then place the priorities in

- another section, place the strategies that discuss other agencies in another section, and etc.
 - Page 4.100: Examples of historically significant historic resources that embody... shall be acquired by the County.
 - Consider rephrasing this sentence so it doesn't sound like Carver County is out to seize someone's historic farm and turn it into a museum.
 - Page 4.101 1st strategy:
 - Consider revising for clarity
 - Page 4.103 3rd strategy: I appreciate the strategy pertaining to Native heritage. Even more strategies and/or policies – even a goal – would be nice.
- Public Health – Karyn Islam, Assistant Planner
 - Very well done – neat, comprehensive yet concise, and easy-to-follow. Ideas presented are right on target with Active-Living concept – not just in the built environment, but also as those concepts pertain to overall societal well being.
- Aging – Karyn Islam, Assistant Planner
 - No comments
- Public Safety – Karyn Islam, Assistant Planner
 - Page 4.105 strategy 1, 5th bullet point: Perhaps replace the sentence, *Dragging for drowned bodies and searching and looking for lost persons* with *Locating lost persons and/or recovery of bodies* – for the purpose of avoiding dismal imagery.
 - Page 4.107 strategy 4: The meaning of the very last sentence in the Community Outreach paragraph is a bit unclear: *In this ever-changing world, new opportunities to victimize our citizens are immerging*. It sounds like this sentence means, *nowadays, opportunities to immerse victimized citizens are arising*. Perhaps the message this sentence is trying to convey is: *In this ever-changing world, new opportunities to empower our citizens are emerging*.
 - Page 4.108 strategy 6, 2nd bullet point:
 - Add the word, *protocol*, after the word, *Internet: ...future forms of voiceover Internet protocol services (VOIP)...*

Laketown Township –

- Page 2, 1st paragraph: Change from Benton Township to Laketown Township in last sentence.
- Page 3, 1st paragraph: Change comma to period to show 32.2 in 2nd sentence.
- Page 5, 3rd paragraph: District 276 (Minnetonka) is not part of Laketown Township.
- Page 5, chart: Questioning numbers in chart associated with Laketown Township.
- Page 9, last sentence: Last sentence is incomplete.
- Page 13, Policy LU-1: Replace reference to Dahlgren Township with Laketown Township in 2nd sentence.
- Page 15, Policy ED-1 & ED-2: The two policies conflict. Consider adding reference to multi-modal.
- Page 15, Policy TR-3: Replace reference to San Francisco Township with Laketown Township 4th sentence.

Adjacent Communities

Scott County – Brad Davis, Planning Manager

- Transportation
 - Scott County's 2030 Transportation Plan (Chapter VI) identifies MN TH 41 as a Principal Arterial in the Future Functional Classification Map (Figure VI-17) due to the proposed river crossing, forecasted traffic needs, and the increasing regional importance of the connection between US TH 169 and US TH 212. Carver County's Future Functional Classification Map (page 4.38) identifies MN TH 41 as an A-Minor Arterial. Scott County staff recommend MN TH 41 be classified as a Principal Arterial from the county border to US TH 212 to acknowledge this corridor's importance to the growth of both counties.

- Scott County looks forward to collaborating with Carver County on future transportation and transit planning efforts. There is an opportunity in the next round of plan updates to collaborate on a more synchronized process to take advantage of our common transportation issues in the southwest metropolitan area. Scott County staff is interested in partnering with Carver County staff to identify and prepare a work plan that meets both of our common objectives.
- Parks and Trails
 - The Scott County Regional Park and Trail System Map (Figure VII-2) identifies the Union Pacific Railroad “Chaska Spur” line (that is in the process of being abandoned) as a Proposed Trail Corridor Search Area. This corridor could serve as a trail crossing into the City of Carver, and Scott County believes this trail corridor would serve a regional purpose. Scott County staff recommend the Carver County’s Trail and Bikeway System Plan on page 4.73 acknowledge this trail connection across the Minnesota River. Scott County looks forward to continue to work with Carver County, Metropolitan Council, and the cities of Carver and Chaska in acquiring the “Chaska Spur.”

School Districts

Watershed Organizations

Other

Metropolitan Council – Phyllis Hanson, Manager

The informal review process found the following sections **complete for review** and did not identify any major system issues or policy conflicts although minor revisions are suggested. The following areas are listed in alphabetical order: Aviation, Forecasts, Historic Preservation, Housing, Solar Access Protection, and Wastewater.

- Aviation – Chauncey Case, 651-602-1724
 - The update is complete with respect to aviation.
- Forecasts – Todd Graham, 651-602-1322
 - The Update is complete for forecast-related content. The 2010, 2020, 2030 forecasts in the Update are consistent with Council’s published forecasts, therefore consistent with regional policy.
 - Advisory comment: The forecasts in the Update (pages 3.3, 3.5, and 3.7) are consistent with Council’s currently published forecasts. Community-level forecast revisions are likely in response to city Update requests. Community-level revisions would change the county-level totals. For example, Norwood Young America is planning a 2030 population of 11,900 (vs. 8,800 in the Update) and 5,400 households (vs. 3,800).
- Historic Preservation – Jim Uttley, 651-602-1361
 - The Update is complete for historic preservation.
- Housing – Linda Milashius, 612-602-1541
 - The Update is complete for Housing. The Update provides a County-wide assessment of the housing stock, identifies affordable and life-cycle housing issues and needs, provides goals and strategies to address those needs, as well as implementation tools and programs that the County will use or make available to assist its cities and townships in addressing local housing needs.
- Solar Access Protection – Jim Uttley, 612-602-1361
 - The Update is complete for solar access protection. The Update makes one reference to “solar access” on page 4.12 where it says “...undue restriction on solar access...needs to be avoided.”

- Advisory Comment: The following sample language may provide some ideas for how to address this subject in the Update.

Solar Access Protection

Metropolitan cities in Minnesota are required to include an element for protection and development of access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems in the Update. A solar access protection element is included in the Update to assure the availability of direct sunlight to solar energy systems. Solar energy is an alternative means to energy. It has much less impact on natural resources and the environment than the use of fossil fuels. Currently fossil fuels and nuclear power are needed to heat or cool our homes and businesses. Fossil fuels are also used for most modes of transportation. Increasing the use of solar energy would decrease reliance on fossil fuels and nuclear power. The purpose for including this section of the Update is to ensure that direct sunlight access to active and passive solar energy use is not subjected to shading from nearby trees, buildings, or other structures.

Solar Access Protection Goal and Policies

Goal: Encourage the use of solar energy systems for the purposes of space heating and cooling and hot water heating in new residential developments.

Policies:

1. The County will review its Zoning Ordinance and consider appropriate amendments to exempt active and passive solar energy systems from lot coverage and setback provisions.
 2. The County will review its Code and consider appropriate amendments to require swimming pools and hot tubs to be heated using solar or some other form of renewable energy resource, where possible.
 3. Within Planned Unit Developments, the County will consider varying setback requirements in residential zoning districts as a means of protecting solar access.
- Wastewater – Roger Janzig, 651-602-1119
 - The Update is complete for wastewater. The Update establishes transition areas adjacent to the rural centers for future growth through annexation. The delineation of these areas needs to be consistent with each of the city Updates.
 - Parks – Jan Youngquist, 651-602-1029
 - The informal review process found the Parks section **complete for review** but **substantive issues** have been found with respect to conformance with regional systems.
 - The Update is complete for regional parks. However, the Update does not conform to the 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan (RPPP). The RPPP identifies two regional park search areas—the Miller Lake Search Area and the Minnesota River Bluff and Ravines Search Area in Carver County. The Parks and Open Space System Plan Map (page 4.72) refers to these park search areas, but also includes the “Crow River-Northern Lakes Regional Park Search Area.” Although the Crow River Regional Park search area was part of the 2001 Regional Recreation Open Space Plan, it was not identified in the RPPP. Therefore, the potential acreage and land acquisition costs of this regional park search area were not part of the RPPP adopted by the Council in 2005. The RPPP sets the initial framework for the regional parks system elements the Council will help fund.
 - In order to conform to the current RPPP, the reference to a “regional” park search area in the Crow River-Northern Lakes area needs to be removed. The Council will be updating its RPPP in 2009-2010. Council staff recommends that the County seek regional status for the search area during the RPPP update. The County could label the area as the “Crow River-Northern Lakes Park Search Area (will seek regional status).” Additionally, page 4.69 refers to three regional park search areas, although the RPPP has identified two. This information needs to be included in the Update.
 - The regional trails identified in the RPPP include: the Dakota Rail Regional Trail, Highway 5 Regional Trail, Highway 101 Regional Trail, Waconia-St. Bonifacius Regional Trail, Twin Cities & Western Regional Trail, Chaska-Victoria Regional Trail

(also known as the Southwest LRT Connection Regional Trail). Regional trail search corridors identified in the RPPP are the Crow River Regional Trail Search Area and the Carver County North-South Regional Trail Search Area. The Trail and Bikeway System Plan Map (page 4.73) includes these, and additional trails. To ensure conformance to the RPPP, a distinction of which trails are regional needs to be made.

- In addition to the Update, Council staff had the opportunity to review the County's 2030 Parks, Open Space and Trail System Plan. The County has done an outstanding job of defining its vision for the system, including identifying partnership opportunities and potential local connections to the regional system. This Update has set a strong foundation for future master planning of regional parks and trails.
- Council staff offers the following comments on the 2030 Parks, Open Space and Trail System Plan:
 - The comments given above with regard to the Crow River-Northern Lakes Search Area and labeling of regional trails apply to this Update, also.
 - The Update states that Carver County is one of seven regional park implementing agencies (page 3.9). Actually, there are ten regional park implementing agencies—this information needs to be updated.
 - The description for Carver Park Reserve (page 3.23) refers to the SW Regional LRT Trail. Three Rivers Park District has renamed this trail the Lake Minnetonka LRT Regional Trail. The trail name needs to be updated in this section.
 - The description of the Council's Regional Parks Acquisition Opportunity Fund (page 8.19) includes outdated information. The Council revised the program to provide up to \$1.7 million per agency to finance up to 75 percent of the costs to acquire land. The remaining 25 percent is not eligible for reimbursement. The program description needs to be updated in this section.

The informal review process found the following sections **incomplete for review**. The following areas are listed in alphabetical order: Aggregate Resources Protection, Individual Sewage Treatment System (ISTS) Program, Land Use, Plan Implementation, Surface Water Management, and Transportation (including Aviation).

- Aggregate Resources Protection – Jim Larsen, 651-602-1159
 - The Update is incomplete for aggregate resources protection. The Update does not address the presence or absence of aggregate resources in the County. Minnesota Geological Survey Information Circular 46 indicates the presence of viable aggregate resource deposits within rural portions of the County. The final submission will need to be revised to recognize the potential for application for future aggregate mining in the County, and make revisions to the land use element of the Update to minimize the potential for future land use conflicts. The County is directed to Section 3, page 3-10 of the Council's Local Planning Handbook (<http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/LPH/handbook.htm>) for specific components that need to be incorporated into the formal submission.
- Individual Sewage Treatment System (ISTS) Program – Jim Larsen, 651-602-1159
 - The Update is incomplete for ISTS. The final submission will need to be revised to include a discussion of the County's ISTS program, including an approximate number of ISTS in operation in the County, a discussion of the County's tracking and notification database, its maintenance management program, and either a copy of the ordinance as an attachment to the Update or address to access the ordinance on the County's website. The Update needs to indicate what townships and cities for which the County provides ISTS oversight.
- Land Use – Jim Uttley, 651-602-1361 or Lisa Barajas, 651-602-1895
 - The Update is incomplete for land use. The Update that was submitted to the Council for informal review did not include individual township chapters and it is not

clear that it was intended to include all of the land use plan elements. The Update does not include the following or answer the questions noted, which are needed for the Update to be considered complete:

- An existing or current land use map.
 - A proposed 2030 land use map. The Update contains a development policy plan rather than demonstrating where and how the land will be used. The policy plan map is acceptable as a supplement but is not considered an acceptable “alternative” or substitute for a 2030 land use map.
 - Tables showing the acreages of existing and future land uses by type for the County as a whole and for individual townships.
 - Rural Service District is an “overlay” district that implies higher density development yet the density is not specified. Are these areas 1 dwelling per 40 acres?
 - Towns have the option to follow one of several Rural Residential Density options. These options state that the overall density is 1 dwelling per 40 acres but exceptions (i.e., clustering) can occur in suitable conditions but in no terms are specific locations designated. Hence, by definition, all non-city land is designated Agricultural (1 dwelling per 40 acres). Is this how the County wants this illustrated?
 - How are County Policy LU-22 (“OTHER USES” - (NON-AGRICULTURAL, NON-RESIDENTIAL LAND USE)) designated/represented?
 - How are County Policy LU-23 (ESSENTIAL SERVICES AND PUBLIC SERVICES)) designated/represented?
 - How will the Economic Development Opportunity sites be handled? In the past, the Council has tried to tie geography to specific parcels and designated them as “mixed use” or more specifically “multi-optional use.” Are they considered “overlay” districts with the future land use “agricultural” until further study and land use amendments take place?
 - The Update identifies certain areas of the County as “transition areas.” The Update indicates that transition areas are expected to become urbanized within the next 10 years (page 4.6 of the Update). This is not consistent with some of the municipal Updates, which plan for urbanization to occur through 2030. Some cities have noted in their Updates that the County transition areas do not have the same boundaries as the city’s Updates. The County needs to assure that the transition areas shown around various cities in its Update (and in the township Updates) show the same geographic areas as those identified in the Updates for those cities.
 - The Update identifies five “opportunity areas” including three Multi-modal Rail Opportunity Areas, one Hampshire Road Opportunity Area, and one Hwy 7 and County Road 10 Opportunity Area. These areas are identified on the Carver County Planning Areas on page 4.7 of the Update. It appears from the text that “opportunity areas” are not land use designations but overlay districts within which future detailed planning is needed before any change in land use would be permitted, and that the actual land use designation is the same as that of the surrounding township. This needs to be explicit in both the County-wide land use plan and in the applicable individual township plans.
 - The County is encouraged to use the Council’s Land Use Table in 5 Year Stages or a similar table modified for County and Township use for the County-wide and individual township plan updates. Please see www.metrocouncil.org/planning/LPH/forms/LandUse5year.doc.
- Plan Implementation – Jim Uttley, 651-602-1361
 - The Update is incomplete for plan implementation. The Update needs to include either within the document itself or as a separate appendix a complete 5-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) that addresses capital improvements for at least parks, surface water management and transportation. Please see Metropolitan Land

- Planning Act (Minn. Stat. § 473.859, Subd. 4) for details.
 - In addition, the Update needs to include a current zoning map and a copy of the current zoning ordinance (or at least that portion that contains the detailed zoning district uses and densities). The Update needs to include a copy of the current subdivision ordinance and other official controls used by the County to implement its Update.
 - The Update appears to have adequately addressed the matter of future changes to local ordinances needed to help implement the County's proposed Update.
- Surface Water Management – Judy Sventek, 651-602-1156
 - The Update is incomplete for Surface Water Management Plans. The County needs to revise its Update to address the concerns raised in the Council's review of the surface water management issues as discussed below.
 - Carver County is responsible for watershed management planning for the Carver County Watershed Management Organization (WMO). The Board of Water and Soil Resources approved the County's WMO watershed management plan in 2001. Carver County is in the process of updating this plan and hopes to have a new plan in 2009.
 - Carver County is responsible for planning for the townships. All cities and townships within the County's WMO planning area are required to prepare local water management plans in response to the County's watershed management plan. However County staff feels the current County WMO plan adequately addresses the need for local water plans for all of the townships.
 - In order to satisfy the local surface water management plan requirements as found in Appendix B2-b of the Council's Water Resources Management Policy Plan, the Update needs to be modified to include the following:
 - A discussion of the impaired waters in the County and the County's role in preparing and implementing the total maximum daily loads (TMDL) required for those impaired waters. Since the County is the land use authority and local water plan authority for the townships, the discussion in the Update needs to also include information on what the County expects from the townships related to the TMDLs and the TMDL implementation plans as well.
 - The comprehensive plan and chapters for the townships need to clearly state that the County's watershed management plan will serve as the local surface water management plan required of the townships and that the townships will follow policies and requirements of that plan.
 - The comprehensive plan and chapters for the townships need to clearly identify that the County will update the watershed management plan by 2009. The updated watershed management plan must include adequate actions and directions to cover the requirements for watershed plans as well as local surface water management plans. Otherwise the Council may require local surface water plans by the townships once the new watershed management plan is adopted. For more information on specific expectations of the Council for local surface water management plans, please see the Appendix B2-b of the Council's Water Resources Management Policy Plan.
 - The County intends for its current watershed management plan to be the local water management plan for the townships, therefore the comprehensive plan and township chapters as well as the updated watershed management plan need to include language that clearly states that when a city annexes land from a township, the city must update its local surface water management plan to cover the annexed area within two years. The County needs to have some clear direction to the cities on this matter and how the process will work.
 - Laketown Township is a mandatory MS4 community and is required to submit to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The comprehensive plan and Laketown Township chapter need to incorporate the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for

Laketown Township in order to satisfy the requirements for local surface water management plans as found in Appendix B2-b. In the future, this element can be in the County's watershed management plan.

- To be complete for review, the Update needs to be amended to include the items discussed above.

- Transportation – Highway & Transit – Ann Braden, 651-602-1705

The Update is incomplete for the highway and transit portions of the transportation requirements.

- State that areas of Carver County lie within Transit Market Areas III and IV (Figure 4-3 of the Council's 2030 Transportation Policy Plan) and indicate the appropriate service options for these two market areas. (Service options for Market Area III include peak-only express, small vehicle circulators, midday circulators, special needs paratransit (ADA, seniors), and ridesharing. Service options for Market Area IV include dial-a-ride, volunteer driver programs, and ridesharing.) Market areas are mentioned in the Carver County System Statement for Transportation on page T-3 and the map can be found using the following link:
http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/transportation/TPP/2004/TPP04Chapter4_Final.pdf
- The Update needs to map and identify, in narrative form, existing transit routes and facilities and desired future transit service options consistent with the Transportation Policy Plan's transit system service areas (Table 4-1 and Appendix M). In addition to regular route transit service, dial-a-ride service is provided by Carver Area Rural Transit (CART) and ADA paratransit service is provided in Chanhassen and Chaska by Metro Mobility.

In addition the following needs to be clarified:

- The discussion of commuter rail and LRT needs to make a clear distinction between approved regional plans and the County's desire to explore potential corridors with the Council. There are also references (pages 4.40 and 4.41) to what are outdated studies and ridership projections for commuter rail and LRT.
- The discussion of CART service needs to clearly state that the service is open to the general public.
- Finally, on page 3.6 it states that suburban employment growth in Carver County was "propelled by a good transit system...." Employment growth was likely propelled by "a good transportation system."
- Roadway Functional Classification - The "Complete Roadway Plan" contains a map of the existing Functional Classification that is clear, precise and accurate. The "Future" Classification map contains a number of roadway designations that depart from the Council's "official" Roadway Functional Classification Map. The County needs to request these changes through the TAC-TAB process.
- Advisory comment: While the "Complete Roadway Plan" describes the TAZ forecasting process and includes a map of the TAZ system, there is no TAZ-allocation table provided in the Update. Table 4 (Page 21 of the Roadway Systems Plan) identifies the community and County forecast totals. The numbers do not reflect the January, 2008 Regional Development Framework numbers. Council staff does not recommend that the numbers be updated as the difference in the 2030 forecasts overall, and the impact of a revised dataset would be negligible and would not alter the results.

Minnesota Department of Transportation – William Goff, Senior Planner

- Page 4.38, Figure 5, Carver County Future Trunk Highway System: at present, money has not been set aside for the jurisdictional transfer of TH 284 and the designation realignment of TH 25. As budgets allow, Mn/DOT Metro District will continue to consider any jurisdictional transfer proposals and attempt to seize all opportunities that advance the goal of improving the efficiency of managing the highway system.
- Page 4.39, Figure 5, Carver County Recommended Future Access Spacing: it appears that there are numerous inconsistencies with the proposed access spacing and the spacing identified in

Mn/DOT's Access Management Manual <http://www.oim.dot.state.mn.us/access/>. Mn/DOT would welcome the opportunity to work with Carver County as Access Management Plans are refined.

- Page 4.32: Carver County places strong importance on right-of-way preservation and enhancement, to meet the future roadway capacity needs. As Mn/DOT is currently updating its 2030 Transportation System Plan (*TSP*), it is important for Carver County to continue to work with Mn/DOT to insure consistency between the Carver County Comprehensive Plan and the Mn/DOT TSP.

CARVER COUNTY

Land and Water Services Division

Planning and Water Management Department

Government Center, Administration Building

600 East 4th Street

Chaska, Minnesota 55318

952.361.1825

pmoline@co.carver.mn.us

The Carver County 2030 Comprehensive Plan

www.co.carver.mn.us/2030plan