

Central Mississippi River ~ Regional Planning Partnership

Creating a shared regional vision and goals, then working together to accomplish them

www.RegionalPlanningPartnership.org ♦ regionalplanningpartnership@gmail.com

December 3, 2020 7:30 a.m. ([Partnership and Staff Roster](#))

- Under COVID-19 guidelines, in-person meeting will be held at Sherburne County Government Center - County Board Room, 13880 Business Center Drive, Elk River 55330
- Join the meeting from computer click [Here](#) Join by phone: **+1-510-338-9438** Meeting number (access code): **126 025 0263** Meeting password: **cR6B5DnJAS8** (27625365 from phones)

Lead and Time	Workshop Topics and Notes
<p>Chair Vetsch 7:30 am</p>	<p>1. Welcome, introductions (current public roster)</p> <p>Member Present in person or remotely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becker Township: Brian Kolbinger • Big Lake Township: Dean Brenteson • City of Becker: Tracy Bertram, Rick Hendrickson, Jacob Sanders • City of Big Lake: Lucinda Meyers • City of Monticello: Jeff O'Neill, Angela Schumann and Rachel Lenord • Monticello Township: Shannon Bye, Bob Idziorek • Sherburne County: Tim Dolan, Raeanne Danielowski, Marc Schneider, Dan Weber • Silver Creek Township: Barry Heikkinen • Wright County: Darek Vetsch, Barry Rhineberger, Jolene Foss <p>2. Workshop purpose and format</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose is for the Partners to address outstanding issues, questions, and concerns related to the Partnership and our current primary project, Framework 2030 Workshop format promotes multiple perspectives and open conversation, and seeks ideas and guidance rather than formal decisions; this meeting will not be recorded but detailed notes will support ongoing discussions and future decisions
<p>Chair Vetsch 7:30-7:50 20 Min.</p>	<p>3. Follow up conversation and discussion about 10/22/20 FHWA & MnDOT workshop</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Resource: Presentation with speaker notes and Q&A breakouts Questions and discussion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any questions about content that was presented? (Partners and staff will answer what they can, and other questions will be documented and sent to FMWA/MnDOT for response) Implications: What does this information mean/why does it matter for the Partnership? Reflections, thoughts, comments? Brainstorming: Thinking about these topics as part of your prep for final workplanning and budgeting at the January 2021 meeting, what additional workplan ideas or topics might you want to consider? <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We received realistic recommendations from MNDOT and FHWA of what is needed to accomplish a river crossing. The presentation may have given a bleak outlook at times, but we received realistic expectations for this to move forward. The feeling is we are on the right path as a partnership. This was confirmed with MNDOT and FHWA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There may be budget implications for the development of a river crossing today, but there are pathways to completion. ● Many future plans for utilities, transportation and land use in our region are going to be shaped by the efforts of Framework 2030. ● We need to remain focused and united. We need to leverage political allies in the state capitol. ● A concern is some communities joined the partnership to focus efforts on getting a new river crossing not regional planning. ● We have a lot of work to do to make a river crossing happen, so we need to be more focused on that one item, we can't be so burdened by other distractions. Is the work we are doing getting us toward our end goal? ● Funding challenges brought forth by the MnDOT FHWA are real but not out of the ability of the Partnership if we are committed. ● Some feel we need to focus on land use between the two counties before a river crossing discussion moves forward with transportation? ● The newer members of the Partnership may not be aware of the goals as the members who have been working on this project since its inception 2007. Much of the work early in the partnership was around the land use near the river and its potential impact on traffic in Monticello and the TH Hwy 25 bridge. ● We were told we need to be an organized group with completed studies to get MNDOT attention. ● There is a need to communicate to the public the process we are undertaking to try to get a crossing over the river and that we are following the process outlined by MnDOT, which has led us to Framework 2030. ● It needs to be clear if a river crossing is the end goal of this Partnership.
<p>Members of ExComm 7:50-8:10 20 Min.</p>	<p>4. Review, discuss CMRP's reps, mission and core activities <CMRP overview, orientation></p> <p>a. Update: Clarify changes in CMRP representatives from recent local elections + any staff changes (current public roster)</p> <p>b. Review:</p> <p>i. Mission: The mission of the Central Mississippi River Regional Planning Partnership is to develop and implement a compelling regional vision and framework that guides local decisions on thoughtful and collaborative planning, growth, and development to benefit both individual jurisdictions and the region as a whole.</p> <p>ii. Tagline: The Partnership uses this "tagline" on its letterhead, website, and other communications: Creating a shared regional vision and goals, then working together to accomplish them.</p> <p>iii. Activities: In the Partnership's current Joint Powers Agreement, Partners identified the following activities consistent with its mission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Examining the impacts of growth on Partner jurisdictions. 2. Conducting studies defining and identifying priority improvements. 3. Preparing collaborative project design and delivery recommendations. 4. Studying various risks associated with improvement alternatives and associated timing of the construction of improvements. 5. Developing unified efforts across local and state interests to advocate for and secure public and grant funding for priority activities. 6. Building strong relationships with other jurisdictions, agencies, and groups committed to the Partnership's priorities to contribute to regional policy

decisions and discussions.

7. Incorporating key stakeholder input in planning efforts and decisions.
8. Related and ancillary activities or common issues associated with the Partnership's priorities as they evolve over time

c. **Discuss, consider:**

- i. What about these are still inspiring, hopeful, and valuable?
- ii. What questions arise? What's missing? What needs further refinement going forward?

Notes:

- We need to clarify and define what we mean by regional planning.
- This group was not given Met Council powers, more of an informational group that could be a sounding board to evaluate projects and what impacts they may have on the region. Allowing the Partner communities to communicate about our individual efforts to avoid potential issues.
- Question to the group, are we a regional planning group with a crossing as a goal or a river crossing group that is taking on regional planning?
- The goals and visions of this group are higher level and not individualistic. We need to work together. Each city and township makes decisions on the local level. We should be communicating with the group, but are still accountable to their local residents.
- A feeling is that the group has morphed into something that wasn't the original intent that it was not brought to the public's attention that we are doing regional planning.
- The Partnership has been backed into a regional planning group out of need in our effort to establish a new bridge crossing across TH Hwy 25.
- Question whether CMRP should be TH Hwy 25 focused or regional planning focused. It needs to be articulated back to the public, since the origin of the groups was around a river crossing.
- We need to make some decisions on actionable goals and how to implement them. We may have to break off sub-groups in the future.
- Revisit the mission Statement to bring in transportation improvements as an objective for the partnership.
- It feels as if we have become the Framework 2030 group because most of our work for the last year has been related to that project. We need to remember Framework is a project taken on by CMRP and not to lose our vision/identity.
- This started in 2007 with the concern of a river crossing, but we need to keep planning and working together to further the goals of the planning area. Currently we are waiting for the results of the surveys before moving forward, but we could also be working on other projects while waiting for those results.
- If we make a river crossing the main goal, how do we sell this to the constituents who bought into this project with other goals in mind?
- There are two sides of the public opinion, some who do not want regional planning and others who support it as was demonstrated by the responses to Round 1 Engagement where many said they are looking for a more regional vision.
- It is important to start identifying corridors now for a connection between Hwy 10 and Interstate 94 to help establish plans to preserve these areas. There will be a real need to discuss land use plans with the public because it may impact their ability to develop their property.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There are other organizations competing for a river crossing, so we need to remain together and unified to keep obstacles out of the way for future growth. We need to keep working together. This will move us up the ladder for funding for projects. ● Taglines and mission statements go closer to regional planning efforts, not sure if that is the direction the Partnership intended to go. ● If we are regional planning what are we planning for, economic development, utilities, transportation or land use. We need to be able to articulate to the public if this will continue to be a Highway 25 focused group or if we are shifting to a regional planning group. ● An email will be sent out by Marc Schneider asking the Partners and Alternates to respond to the question in agenda item #4
<p>Liaison Marc Schneider 8:10-8:30</p>	<p>5. Review, discuss CMRP’s regional planning project/Framework 2030 Goals and Objectives (summary below)</p> <p>a. Review these Goals and Objectives, finalized by Partnership in early 2020</p> <p>i. The Partnership will develop, describe, and illustrate a collective regional vision and goals, inclusively engage stakeholders, and thoughtfully plan to maximize benefits and minimize negative impacts of growth. The Framework is expected to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a unified set of regional goals, policies, and priorities that Partner communities work to achieve and implement; it is not a regional comprehensive plan 2. Include guidance developed with Partner communities on how they can refine their local approaches, policies, plans, projects, and regulations over time to harmonize with the regional direction <p>ii. Based on decisions beginning at the June 2019 workshop, there was strong consensus around who, how, what and why of this effort; through the planning process, the Partnership intends to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reach consensus on major opportunities and choices that benefit the region, and successfully collaborate to maximize benefit and minimize risk 2. Position Partners to be leaders and shape their own futures individually and collectively (rather than being the subjects of others’ decisions and direction) 3. Support connectivity within the region, and between the region and beyond <p>iii. As a result of this regional planning project (outcomes), the desire is that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partners align around shared priorities and commitments 2. The region is more collaborative and trusting 3. There are beneficial regional outcomes in the short-, medium-, and long-terms 4. Jurisdictions in the region make measurable, meaningful progress toward shared goals and priorities <p>b. Discuss, consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Which of these still resonate and feel relevant to you? ii. What questions do you have? What topics need to be clarified or refined as part of your 2021-22 workplanning? iii. What information do you need to understand this better or explain it to others? <p>Notes:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limited time for discussion but asked Partners and staff to take time to review these goals and objectives of Framework 2030 so they understand and can feel confident discussing the purpose and objectives of this project. ● The reason why we got into this big regional planning project is because this is where our work to find a bridge crossing brought us. ● The planning effort was supposed to lead us to a corridor and that is still the work we are undertaking.
<p>Liaison Marc Schneider 8:30-8:45</p>	<p>6. CMRP regional planning project/Framework 2030: Review status/Round 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In September 2020, the Partnership reviewed, discussed, provided direction, and approved the conceptual direction, draft vision and strategies, and Round 2 questions, and formally authorized Round 2 launch to gather feedback on draft vision and strategies through a combination of online tools and some in-person sessions By mid-October, staff/consultants prepared and launched the online survey and organized/hosted a few in-person sessions. Planning staff have been “softly” promoting the online through some of the same networks used for Round 1, with minimal support from administrators and Partners. Attendance at in-person sessions in October and November was very small and total online respondents are under 50; by contrast, in Round 1 over 1,200 people contributed over 7,000 ideas/comments. <p>7. CMRP regional planning project/Framework 2030: Discuss identified issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Obligations, timing: It is imperative that we gather Round 2 feedback from community stakeholders via the online survey, from the <i>Partnership</i> through a virtual engagement session, <i>and</i> from Partners’ home elected and appointed bodies likely through a combination of online and virtual engagement sessions. Concerns have been expressed that in light of COVID, recent elections, ongoing and timely obligations, etc., Round 2 is not getting the support necessary to get the outcome needed. Future plans for Round 2 virtual engagements with and hosted by Partner elected/appointed officials. Purpose is to ensure that every Partner elected body and appointed groups directly shape Framework 2030 decisions. These engagements will be supported by consultants and staff. Discuss/provide guidance: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What are other questions or issues with Round 2? What are the pros and cons of delaying major Round 2 online promotion + virtual engagements until January? Assuming that virtual engagement sessions occur in January/February, what do Partners need in order to fully support and actively participate in one session for the Partnership and one session that each of you “hosts” for your home elected and appointed officials + community (host responsibilities: promote the session and encourage participation, then briefly welcome people to the virtual session) <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pause for 30-60 days. ● Reword questions to be more accessible to the public ● Put this on pause for 30-60 days. The pandemic, elections have made this engagement difficult. ● Membership agreed as long as we pick it back up. ● The Questions were difficult, find different ways to ask these questions.

<p>Chair Vetsch 8:45-9:00</p>	<p>8. Plan next steps, future meeting agendas: Based on discussions and guidance above, identify any <u>new</u> future CMRP work activities and/or agenda items. <u>Previously</u> identified CMRP work for December 2020-February 2021 includes the following:</p> <p>a. CMRP governance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Prepare, review, and as needed receive/approve end-of-year financial reports, Workplan updates, and project updates ii. Seat, welcome, and provide formal orientations for new Partnership representatives and alternates iii. Update 2021 Partnership workplan iv. Finalize and approve 2021-22 working budget v. Make decisions about new Partner membership/recruitment vi. Elect 2021 officers vii. Complete and submit annual Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest declarations viii. Review, update as needed, and approve/reaffirm governance documents including the Joint Powers Agreement, bylaws, policies, agreements, and forms <p>b. CMRP regional planning project/Framework 2030</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Plan/host/participate in virtual workshops to provide Round 2 feedback on draft vision and key strategies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partnership 2. Partner elected and appointed bodies 3. Other key stakeholders in region ii. Conduct/participate in Partnership workshop to review and discuss Round 2 feedback analyses and resulting proposed revisions to conceptual framework, vision, and regional strategies; provide direction and approval iii. Review and provide guidance on draft Framework 2030 materials, action plan, and related; finalize and take action <p>c. New/additional items?</p> <p>d. Plan for Partnership work: Extra meeting in December? Two meetings in January?</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Question to be added to the email Marc Schneider will be sending out are we a regional planning group or a river crossing group. ● No extra meetings necessary.
<p>9:00 am</p>	<p>9. Close workshop</p>