

Responses to 6-Month Review Period Comments			
Comment #	Jurisdiction/Person Name	Comment Received	Response
1	City of Eden Prairie	1. Housing - the classification of units as "shallow" subsidy and "deep" subsidy helpful in contemplating need and approaches to meeting it.	Comment noted.
2	City of Eden Prairie	2. Affordable Housing Initiatives and Carver County CDA Services sections provide a good sense of the tools that may be or are being used to support affordable housing and low-income households.	Comment noted.
3	City of Eden Prairie	3. Met Council has an updated map of Owner-Occupied Housing by Estimated Marked Value available. The updated map shows values above and below \$243,500 rather than \$211,500.	Figure revised as requested.
4	City of Eden Prairie	4. The Carver County plan does not address TH 101 (north of TH 5) for any improvements in the 20 year horizon even though it is predicted to be over capacity. The draft Eden Prairie Comprehensive Plan anticipates improvements to the TH 101 corridor before 2040. These improvements are anticipated to be a 4 lane divided roadway, however, further analysis will be needed to determine final design. Carver County should consider addressing the corridor timing and anticipated improvements in its 2040 plan.	Figure 4.13 Volume to Capacity (V/C) Map shows this segment as 'Over Capacity,' but the projected 2040 volume is 10,700-11,300, which is within the planning capacity range defined in Table 4.7 for a 2-lane facility. The County will change the V/C map to fix this error. No capacity improvement is planned for this segment by 2040. This segment is identified as a potential future turn back route from the State to the County. The roadway will need modernization and preservation improvements by 2040. Roadway improvements on this segment will be dependent on the availability of MnDOT turn back funding or other funding programs.
5	City of Norwood Young America	The Norwood Young America City Council has completed its review of Carver County's 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The following comments are provided. 1. Baylor Park Trail Development - It is requested Carver County included in its 2040 Comprehensive Plan for the development of a non-motorized trail from Norwood Young America to Baylor Park. Many Carver County cities currently enjoy direct access to County trails. But the city of Norwood Young America currently has no existing trails that extend to any outside destinations outside its city limits. The development of a trail to Baylor Park would provide for the future opportunity to extend a trail to New Germany and connect into the Dakota Rail Trail. It is requested the development of trail from Norwood Young America to Baylor Park be made a high priority.	The County's Plan shows this corridor as a Regional Destination Trail corridor and a Local Trail Corridor (see Figure 6.11). The City can utilize available land use authority to accomplish trail corridor planning for part of this corridor area.
6	City of Norwood Young America	2. U.S. Highway 212 Four Lane Expansion - The City of Norwood Young America supports Carver County's efforts to seek financial assistance and other participation to complete the four lane expansion of U.S. Highway 212 from Carver to Cologne and from Cologne to Norwood Young America.	Comment noted.
7	City of Norwood Young America	3. Minnesota Highway 5/Carver County Road 33 Intersection Reconfiguration - The City of Norwood Young America supports Carver County's efforts to seek financial assistance and planning for the Minnesota Highway 5/Carver County Road 33 intersection reconfiguration. The combination of an intersection configuration that is confusing to vehicle drivers, the 55 mph speed limit on Highway 5, and the increases in traffic volumes have made this a dangerous intersection.	Comment noted. The list in Section 4.2.D.2 Programmed Improvements will be updated to reflect the addition of this project, as funding has been secured.
8	City of Norwood Young America	4. Support Consideration of Norwood Young America's Turn-Back of Segments of Reform Street/County Road 33 to Carver County and Carver County's Turn-Back of Segments of Railroad Street to Norwood Young America. The City of Norwood Young America supports the consideration for the turn-back of segments of Reform Street/County Road 33 from the County to the City and the turn-back of segments of Railroad Street from the County to the City. Each jurisdiction has lengthier sections of these roadways that they currently own and maintain and it would be practical to consider the turn-back of these streets to the respected jurisdictions.	Comment noted.
9	City of Victoria	Land Use: • The Carver County Plan recognizes the areas of Laketown Township that are slated to be annexed into the City of Victoria under the orderly annexation agreement. The areas shown as transition areas are aligned with the City's 2040 land use and staged development plan.	Comment noted.
10	City of Victoria	• It is noted in the plan that there are properties within the transition area that are currently enrolled in the Agriculture Preserve Program. In order for these properties to comply with the covenants of the Agriculture Preserve program, they need to be guided for long term agriculture. The City of Victoria's current 2040 land use plan guides those parcels for low density residential. This appears to be in conflict with the required guidance as long-term agriculture.	It is up to property owners if they enroll their properties in the Agriculture Preserve Program. We must follow state statutes.
11	City of Victoria	Sanitary Sewer: • Laketown Township has several community sewer systems (see map below) that are currently serving properties within the future annexation area of Victoria. These systems will need to be evaluated by Victoria to determine their future when the property is annexed.	Comment noted.
12	City of Victoria	Transportation: • The City has been involved with the 2040 County wide transportation plan throughout its development. The plan identifies future road projects and improvements, several of which would impact the City of Victoria. The map below depicts the future projects in the County.	Comment noted.
13	City of Victoria	• Project priorities are further broken down by the County and include pavement and intersection improvements for various County roads. Highway 5, County Road 18 and County Road 11 all have planned potential improvements.	Comment noted.
14	City of Victoria	• Marsh Lake Road has been in the planning process for several years and it already a part of the County's CIP plan.	Comment noted.
15	City of Victoria	Parks and Trails: • The County has prepared a County wide trail plan that identifies future trail segments and possible trail corridors. The map below shows the following trails in or adjacent to Victoria: - County Road 18 trail corridor - new trail corridor along County Road 18 between Highway 41 and Marsh Lake Road/County Road 43 - Highway 5 linking trail corridor - connect to existing trail along Highway 5 at east municipal boundary through the City to Waconia - Southwest Regional trail corridor - connecting Minnesota River Bluffs Regional Trail in Chaska through Laketown Development to the Dakota Regional Trail in Waconia	Changes noted and map updated, Page 6.37

		- There is a "4" label shown on Figure 6.1 in the general location of County Roads 18 and Highway 5 along Bavaria Road that appears to be in the wrong location.	
16	City of Waconia	The Waconia City Council and City staff have reviewed the draft of Carver County's 2040 Comprehensive Plan (the "Plan"). In our review the City focused on whether the draft Plan appeared to be consistent with Waconia's planned growth. Specifically, we reviewed the document to insure that as our planned growth continues our transportation system plans, utility plans and land use plans are compatible and connected to the planned growth of Carver County. Based on the afore-mentioned information the city of Waconia offers the following comments regarding your draft Plan: 1. General - The growth areas shown for the City of Waconia on generally all of the draft maps for the County require updates to include the more recent alignment of future growth areas for the City. Specifically, the areas included on the west side of the community near the new high school need to be included in the projected growth areas.	Growth area updated based on shapefile provided from the City of Waconia.
17	City of Waconia	2. Transportation - The City of Waconia is concerned that the improvement of 102nd Street doesn't show up in the County's transportation plan until post 2040. This contrary to what was communicated to the City when the new segment of CSAH 110/10 was planned for and built.	The County does not have funding identified for this improvement. The Metropolitan Council requires the County to exclude projects without funding from its Comprehensive Plan. The County is planning the improvement of 102nd St from TH 284 east to Hwy 10 by 2040. This improvement is included in other County roadway planning and transportation modeling efforts but excluded from the Comprehensive Plan.
18	City of Waconia	3. Transportation - The WeCAB program has recently been extended into the City of Waconia. The Carver County plan should reflect this mode of transportation as another important transportation option in the County.	Information added about WeCAB program.
19	City of Waconia	4. Waconia Township & Laketown Township - The transition areas shown do not match the City of Waconia's draft.	Transition area has been updated.
20	City of Waconia	5. Agricultural Preserve - The agricultural preserve section of the Plan indicates a few areas that are enrolled in the Agricultural Preserve Program within our 2040 growth areas. More specifically, properties that are located within areas to be developed between 2020 - 2030. Clarification of when these areas will be removed from the program would be helpful for future planning.	It is up to property owners if they enroll their properties in the Agriculture Preserve Program. Carver County must follow state statues.
21	City of Waconia	6. Lake Waconia Regional Park - Additional Future Initiatives - This section indicates lighting of park trails and the sledding hill to extend hours of use. The City of Waconia has also included language regarding future trail lighting and possible future lighting of trail loops to allow for extended seasonal use. Any future lighting should be coordinated with the City to allow for a more consistent, usable and looped system for park and trail users.	Text updated, Page 6.23
22	City of Waconia	7. Miller Lake Regional Park Search Area - Trail Connections - The City of Waconia is planning for a future segment of trail along Carver Creek. The County should be aware of this opportunity as Carver Creek drains to the Miller Lake area and additional County trail along the segment outside the City Limits might be a nice addition to the Carver County/City trail system.	Sentence added to document, Page 6.27.
23	City of Waconia	8. Figure C2: Regional Bicycle Transportation Network Alignments & Priorities Map - The map indicates RBTN Tier 2 Alignment along County Road 10. The alignment shown indicates the trail is proposed to extend along Klein Drive just southeast of Waconia. The future alignment should continue along the County Road 10 Corridor and not extend along the Klein Drive road segment.	Alignment updated on map.
24	City of Watertown	Land Use • It is noted in the plan that there are properties within the transition area that are currently enrolled in the Agriculture Preserve Program. In order for these properties to comply with the covenants of the Agriculture Preserve program, they need to be guided for long term agriculture. The City of Watertown's current 2040 land use plan does not guide these properties as long-term agriculture. The City, Township and County should discuss this issue and how to resolve the issue moving forward.	It is up to property owners if they enroll their properties in the Agriculture Preserve Program. Carver County must follow state statues.
25	City of Watertown	Parks and Trails: • There appears to be a discrepancy in the alignment of the County's Western Carver County Regional Trail Corridor and the Metropolitan Council's alignment. The City has shown the alignment to run along the Crow River from the southern municipal boundary to the northern municipal boundary. Clarification should be provided to the alignment.	Alignment updated on map, Page 6.37
26	Dahlgren Township	Add all Eligibility options that the county offers, including: 1. wooded lots 2. conservation incentives 3. all options under bluff provision Giving our residents the most flexibility	Cannot choose all three options under County Policy LU-18F Residential Density Options. Staff recommend choosing Option 3 (High Amenity Areas) and Option 4 (Conservation Incentive) to give residents the most flexibility.
27	Dan Cook	I was able to attend the June 27, 2018 Carver County Comprehensive Plan open house, review the May 2018 version of the Carver County plan, and compare that draft to other plans, such as the Steans County plan. I also was able to participate in land management issues in Carver County and in Waconia Township over the last two years. Based on these activities, I have summarized what I feel are constructive criticisms of the current Carver County 2040 Comp Plan draft. I propose these changes with the goals of: • A better future for all citizens of Carver County • More representation for rural members of Carver County, who have placed their land management trust in the hands of a good plan and honorable commissioners. • More transparency in our county government • Less strife at public meetings by: o providing clear, unambiguous guidance on planning and zoning issues o providing vision, to anticipate, rather than react to issues I respectfully submit these suggestions for your review General Comments on Overall Plan (see 1.3): As a citizen of the county, my hope would be that this plan does more than just meet MN statute 473.859 subd1. I find it does not for these reasons: • Citizens should count: Nowhere in the supporting goals are citizens mentioned. In fact, the plans refer to "Carver County employees as our most valuable resource". Wow.	Comment noted. The people and citizens of Carver County are mentioned in the draft plan supporting goals both directly and indirectly.

28	Dan Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture should count: The entire document is plastered with pictures of round bales, barns, and corn touting a strong rural heritage. Yet nowhere in the supporting goals are the words “agriculture” or “farm” mentioned. Instead, the plan basically endorses freely abandoning any notion of Carver County’s rural roots, by “encouraging the development of a broader, and more diverse commercial and industrial tax base.....including the use of rural service districts.” 	Comment noted. The Fundamental Land Use Goal listed in the draft plan lists maintaining the viability of the agricultural economy and the county’s unique and rural agricultural character as its first two items. The main premise of the entire land use plan is to protect agricultural land while cities grow.
29	Dan Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detail is essential to be proactive rather than reactive: The plan’s purpose is said to provide a “framework that guides the county planning for future growth and development...” . Yet little detail exists in the heart of this document, the “Land Management” section. In fact, less than 25% of the content is dedicated to planning and zoning, and that includes the Township sections. As an example of total lack of guiding detail, (remember, the plan is supposed to guide), let’s look at the most caustic issue to be argued in the board meeting room over the past two years - Solar Power. The 2040 plan dedicates a mere four sentences to articulate the county’s goals and policies. That’s all. By contrast, Section 6.52 of Stearn’s County’s land use and Zoning Ordinance outlines over-arching plans (2), sites 46 standards requirements for solar farms, and an additional dozen requirements for solar accessories. Two things to note: Stearns County has a clear distinction on several types of solar power, and Stearns County has enough guidance so developers and adjacent landowners alike know the rules ahead of time. Carver County , on the other hand so little guidance as to guarantee more turmoil. 	This level of detail and guidance should be included in the Zoning Ordinance, not the Comprehensive Plan. These issues can be reviewed when the Zoning Ordinance is updated to align with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
30	Dan Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carver County must lead, not follow, when “conforming” to the Met Council growth plan. The Met Council is NOT an elected agency and can provide guidance to Carver County, but Carver County can and MUST represent its citizenry during this alignment process. The Met Council growth plan should in fact emanate from its constituents, not be forced upon its constituents. The wording in the plan must be clarified to show this to avoid lazy county government and poor representation of citizenry. Carver County should NOT abdicate its authority to the Met Council, and is not required to do so. 	Comment noted.
31	Dan Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carver County must follow, not lead when working with the townships. This concept was obvious to all Carver citizens in the recent past of this county, but the current dual nature of a more populated urban constituency and a sparser rural constituency has led to some unfortunate behaviors that should be corrected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The county has been given authority to pass manage P & Z concerns for the township. Yet the majority of constituents for at least 4 out of 5 commissioners, including district 4, live in cities. The commissioners have a conflict of interest: they represent rural townships, but are beholden to urban viewpoints. o In the past year I’ve seen the commissioners repeatedly overturn guidance by township supervisors . o In the past year I’ve seen the commissioners repeatedly overturn guidance by their own Planning and Zoning committee. 	Comment noted.
32	Dan Cook	<p>Comments on the 2040 Comp Plan Planning Process (section 1-3 again): My impression (which is shared with other community members) is that the “Communication and Engagement” part of the county process has been treated pretty much like a “check the box” set of exercises and the real planning process occurs in the hallways of Carver County office buildings, and that the “draft” is pretty much the final product. Perhaps this is just the reality of a complex government with an apathetic constituency. Or perhaps this is government leading itself (yikes). I’m not sure which. That said, it would be nice to be reassured these suggested changes will actually be reviewed and considered.</p>	Multiple opportunities for community engagement were initiated and attempted including several different online methods, in person discussions and several meetings in the townships. All comments were reviewed and analyzed by Carver County staff. Quite a few of the comments were also taken to public work sessions with the Planning Commission and County Board of Commissioners for guidance.
33	Dan Cook	<p>Comments on Land Management-Vision for the Future (Land Use Sections 3.1-3.52): While nobody has a crystal ball, there are some land issues that have a high likelihood of occurring in the county that need to be added to the comp plan. Below I discuss two technologies: Power and Internet</p> <p>Power Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o As technology changes, more challenges will face rural Carver County. I suggest we tackle these challenges with common sense and return to the basic ideas of zoning practices. Remember, zoning is a construct that is intended to level the playing field for individual homeowners, farmers and industry alike. It provides a framework by which a homeowner can be confident that investment in a home or farm is protected. With those ideas in mind, I suggest current power technologies (like solar and wind) and future power technologies (like large-scale storage) have more articulated planning guidance than the current wording that “we encourage it”. o Plenty of guiding templates already exist that are well thought out – Carver county can benchmark against these. At minimum, the guidance should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Definitions and standards: Technologies need to be carefully defined in real terms, not euphemistic terms like “gardens”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a big difference between a single home array of a couple dozen panels and a 3 MW facility. Rules need to be appropriate for each and spelled out separately. • Wind power is similar. A small home generator is drastically different than large commercial generators, or large arrays of commercial generators. • Electric Storage Facilities ▪ Priorities and Criteria: Placing such facilities need clear guidelines . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As an example, Solar Power has currently been designated an “essential service” and basically throws out ALL other criteria for granting a CUP, including shoreland overlay conflicts, feedlot setback conflicts, and neighborhood appropriateness conflicts. That idea needs to be rescinded. • Criteria needs to be established to give the idea of zoning any meaning whatsoever. Placing solar panels on an existing structure, or in an area already zoned for industry, is far different from plopping the panels on Prime Ag land (where plants grow that reverse CO2 emissions) or in the center of a thriving rural neighborhood. • Criteria need to be unambiguous to minimize cause for litigation by both developers and property owners. ▪ Protecting current and future generations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accepting, on faith, that developers will do the right thing is naïve. Governance must be put in place during all phases of a project: Installation, commissioning, operation, and decommissioning. . • Governing installation, commissioning, and operation of facilities should not place a burden on surrounding residents. The county must accept that responsibility. Any additional costs should be forwarded to the developer. That does not happen today. 	These comments will be considered in Carver County's ordinance revisions. This is the level of detail which would be included in the ordinance, not the comprehensive plan.
34	Dan Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Here’s how Stearns County manages the future. Let’s follow this example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Decommissioning of solar panels must occur in the event they are not in use for twelve (12) consecutive months. The plan shall include provisions for removal of all structures, foundations, electrical equipment and internal or perimeter access roads, restoration of soil and vegetation and a plan ensuring financial resources will be available to fully decommission the site. Disposal of structures and/or foundations shall meet the provisions of Stearns County Solid Waste Ordinance Number 171; or successor ordinance. The applicant shall submit a financial 	These comments will be considered in Carver County's ordinance revisions. This is the level of detail which would be included in the ordinance, not the comprehensive plan.

		guarantee in the form of a letter of credit, cash deposit or bond in favor of the County equal to one hundred twenty-five (125) percent of the costs to meet the requirements of the decommissioning plan.	
35	Dan Cook	<p>Internet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o An entire section needs to be added to the plan discussing communications in general and internet specifically. The County has, in fact spent considerable money in this area already, but not in an even-handed way. For example, a \$7.5 million high speed fiberoptic network was dedicated by the county in 2013 to much applause. Ironically, this helped county cities improve an already reasonable infrastructure but did nothing for rural residents, who basically have no infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The county needs to encourage reasonably cheap options for rural residents to connect that “last mile” and enable them to participate in the 21st century broadband revolution. That includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing rural residents to tap into high speed highways literally buried on their property. • Incenting Carver County municipalities to install “fixed Wi-Fi” (also known as “WISP”) antennas on towers. • Offering incentives to classic broadband providers to upgrade copper wire and fiber optic infrastructure on gravel roads. ▪ Ironically, the county feels free to exploit open rural spaces and resources to improve its tax base, but offers nothing in return. That’s called “colonialism”. 	<p>The County would like to take this opportunity to provide some basic information on fiber optic cable in the County.</p> <p>County Fiber: Since 2007, the County has maintained the following goals, in order of importance, for its own fiber optic cable network, CarverLink:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Our most important operational goal is to provide communications connectivity for the county’s offices located throughout the County, which include our county libraries. 2.Our second community goal has been to make our best and appropriate efforts to provide communications connectivity to all of our public and community support entities, which include our schools, colleges, cities, transit, and primary healthcare organizations. 3.Our third goal for the community has been to build and foster a strong and mutually beneficial public-private relationship with private service providers. Such private firms have the option of using CarverLink’s fiber optic infrastructure for the common goal of providing the opportunity to expand and enhance connectivity options to our businesses and residents. At present, the only primary private service provider that uses CarverLink’s fiber optic cable is Jaguar Communications. <p>Private Sector: Since CarverLink’s inception, we have maintained an important principle: a clear separation between public and private entities with regard to opportunities to expand and enhance service options to our residents and businesses. The County helps foster private expansion using CarverLink’s fiber infrastructure through collaborations with companies such as Jaguar Communications. The County has not directly engaged in any private ventures and is allowing the free market to initiate competition and shape opportunities and services in the marketplace. The cost of communications construction and equipment continues to be a limiting factor for firms with interest in providing improved connectivity options to most rural residents -- not just in Carver County, but throughout the nation. Currently, there are over a dozen private firms providing various connectivity options in the County.</p> <p>Rural Residents: The County has advocated for rural residents in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County has helped to encourage Jaguar to do full fiber overlays in 4 communities (NYA, Hamburg, New Germany, and Mayer), and we are actively working on encouraging Jaguar to work in one or two others in 2020 and 2021. • The County has built a particularly fruitful relationship with Jaguar, leading to the largest ever Jaguar Communications fiber buildout in Carver County, planned for the spring of 2019. Jaguar recently participated in a Federal Broadband Grant Auction called Connect America Fund Round 2, in which they were awarded over \$500,000 toward a roughly \$3 million fiber optic cable buildout that targets rural underserved and unserved broadband customers in Carver County. This project will build out fiber connectivity to roughly 750 rural customers directly as part of the grant as well as all the ancillary rural customers that Jaguar is able to connect along the various routes they are taking to reach the CAF2 customers, the majority of which are in the eastern half of the County basically from Waconia and Cologne east.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jaguar has said that Carver County stands out, among the 13 counties with which they do business, for our efforts to foster a positive public-private working relationship. Jaguar has noted that our positive public-private relationship made it possible for the firm to commit the time and resources that eventually led to their receiving the Federal grant, as well as the commitment of the additional \$2.5 million in Jaguar funds needed to complete this rural expansion in Carver County.
36	Dan Cook	<p>Comments on Transportation (sections 4.1 to 4.104):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I suggest the plan should include wording to strive for less turmoil and better planning of road construction. Examples illustrating opportunity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few years back, County 10 was closed for construction of the highway 7 round-about. The very next year it was closed again for widening and repaving. Really? This year a main artery to Waconia (county 10 again) was closed all summer to allow a major re-route west of the high school. I believe that road could have remained open for most of the summer, and re-closed for the final connection. 	Comment noted.
37	Dan Cook	<p>Comments on Parks and Trails (sections 6.1 to 6.52):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one north-south road (25 or 284) should be widened for bicycles. 	These are both State Highways and are outside of the County's direct roadway jurisdiction. However, the County's Plan supports MnDOT's efforts to widen the shoulders on TH 284 and any efforts to provide a local trail facility along the corridor (see Figure 6.11).
38	Dan Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carver Park system should investigate consolidation with Three Rivers to lower costs and improve services. 	Comment noted.
39	Hancock Township	<p>Whereas: The Rural Service Districts have outlived their intent and purpose in Hancock Township. There are presently no operating businesses that serve the Ag community. They are presently private residences and Ag land and have been for quite a while. There has been no new activity in these areas in the last 30 years.</p> <p>Be it resolved: The Hancock Town board requests to have the Rural Service Areas designation removed from its chapter of the Comp plan.</p>	Rural Service Districts were removed from Hancock Township as requested. Landowners should be contacted by the Township.
40	Hollywood Township	<p>The following comments were approved at the October 8, 2018 Hollywood Township Board meeting for the Carver County 2040 Comp Plan.</p> <p>1. Hollywood Township is asking that Carver County map out 30th St. and to take over the road in the future. It is an arterial road and continues to have increased traffic volume. The road is needed for the future success of our township and county.</p>	A McLeod County count is listed west of the county line with an ADT of 390 (MnDOT Traffic Data). The roadway is gravel on the Carver County side and paved on the McLeod County side. Per guideline in the Comprehensive Plan (page 4.55), the existing ADT for a rural unpaved roadway would need to be > 750 and the roadway would need to create a contiguous sub-regional county route for consideration to be turned up to the County. Additional factors for jurisdictional transfer consideration are listed in Table 4.9. As is, this is a short segment (approximately 2 miles) and duplicates the system connectivity provided by CSAH 20, which is 1.5 miles north of 30th St.
41	Hollywood Township	<p>2. Solar Gardens - Hollywood Township is asking that in Carver County, Solar Gardens not be put in Prime/Productive Ag land.</p>	Following a work session with the Planning Commission and subsequent County Board work session staff were given the direction to not add any additional regulations in the Comprehensive Plan regarding Solar Gardens being put on prime/productive ag land. The use of prime agriculture land is already listed as a factor to consider in the siting process.
42	Hollywood Township	<p>3. Hollywood Township is asking that Carver County map out a connection from County Road 122 to County Road 24, south of Watertown.</p>	The City of Watertown is no longer pursuing a new river crossing on the south side of their city connecting to CR 122/TH 25. The City is planning for a new river crossing north of the existing CSAH 10/Territorial Rd bridge. County staff met with City staff and representatives and added the new alignment connection from CSAH 24 to CSAH 10 into 2040 planning. The connection from CSAH 24 to CSAH 20 will be included in the Comprehensive Plan. The piece from CSAH 24 to CSAH 10 does not have funding identified, so it is not included in the Comprehensive Plan (per Met Council). The full connection from CSAH 20 to TH 25 is included in the County's long range, post-2040 planning. The new alignment now joins TH 25 south and east of the river. These new roadway connections, even though excluded from the Comprehensive Plan, are included in other County roadway planning and transportation modeling efforts. The new alignments will be added to the Future Functional Class map (Figure 4.17) for the updated version of the Plan.

43	Laketown Township	<p>TRANSITION AREA CHANGE REQUEST: Laketown Township has one of the largest transition areas in Carver County. This significantly restricts land ownership rights throughout the Township. The draft 2040 policy, as written, denies conditional use lot options for the next 22 years while the property in the transition area is waiting for annexation which may or may not happen within that time.</p> <p>The Laketown Board requests a countywide land use policy change so that conditional uses for wooded lots, high amenity lots and conservation initiative lots be allowed in the transition area when they are compatible with the annexing cities future zoning. If the future use has been zoned residential, the lots created by the Counties current wooded lot ordinance will not substantially interfere with a future residential development and may actually preserve more of the woods or high amenity area than a higher density residential development in the future.</p>	Requested changes made.
44	Laketown Township	The Board requests making the 2040 transition boundaries smaller within Victoria's western growth area within the township.	Requested change made.
45	Laketown Township	<p>ROAD COUNT CHANGE REQUEST: The 2040 Comp Plan currently states that road counts must be >750 for a rural unpaved roadway transfer to the county. Rural gravel roads with greater than >500 are not manageable nor economical feasible to maintain, as evidenced by Airport Road. The Town Board requests the road count limit be reduced to > 500 for a rural gravel road transfer to the county.</p>	The County recognizes the increased maintenance cost that occurs once the volume on a gravel road exceeds 500 vehicles per day; however, the County must also consider the County purpose and overall impact on the County roadway system to taking ownership of a road if the volume does not exceed 750 ADT. The Comprehensive Plan also identifies Jurisdictional Screening Criteria in Table 4.10, which includes factors in addition to ADT that can be utilized to further discuss and evaluate potential jurisdictional transfers.
46	Laketown Township	<p>BUILDING ELIGIBILITES: Building eligibility transfers currently may only occur within the same taxing district. The Board requests a larger geographic area for transfers, thus allowing township wide transfers. Or, exclude the restriction of the same watershed taxing district.</p>	Requested change made.
47	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>Thank you for submitting the Carver County 2040 Comprehensive Plan (Plan) dated May 2018 to the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) for review. The MCWD has completed a review relative to our shared goals of maintaining healthy, sustainable cities and conserving natural resources through the Six Mile Creek Halstead Bay Sub watershed Partnership and relative to meeting Local Water Management Plan requirements for those jurisdictions of Laketown Township and Watertown Township where Carver County is the land use authority.</p> <p>MCWD commends Carver County for creating a spirit of collaborative planning and flexibility through zoning options to protect and conserve natural resources and maximize their asset value to the built environment within its Draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan. As emphasized through the MCWD Watershed Management Plan and the Six Mile-Halstead Bay Watershed Partnership, MCWD is focused on working with its communities and counties to integrate land use and water resources planning through early coordination of planning processes and to maximize results of our shared investments in the landscape. Carver County's Land Use Policies reflect these ideals, promoting collaboration with townships, cities, and other agencies to preserve, protect and restore valuable natural resources, specifically within Transition Areas such as Laketown Township.</p> <p>As the Land Use Authority for Laketown Township and Watertown Township, partially within the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, the Water Resources chapter of the Carver County 2040 Draft Comprehensive Plan notes that the County and Watershed District Plans are intended to serve as the required Local Water Management Plans for the Laketown Township and Watertown Township. The attached checklist provides guidance on where the referenced plans lack required detail to comply with MCWD and statutory Local Water Management Plan requirements and provide suggested revisions to the certain County Comprehensive Plan sections to satisfy those requirements.</p> <p>Through the completion of your 2040 Comprehensive Plan, District staff are available to assist you and encourage a meeting to further facilitate revisions. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns. I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>The following is a summary of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District's review of the Carver County Draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the Laketown Township and Watertown Township draft policy chapters dated May 2018 for compliance with MN Rule 8410.0160, MN Statues §103B.235, and the MCWD Watershed Management Plan. Please refer to Appendix A of the MCWD Plan for more information on these requirements.</p>	NA
48	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	LWMP Review Checklist	NA
49	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	3. A summary of water resource management-related agreements, including joint powers agreements, into which the LGU has entered with watershed management organizations, adjoining LGUs, private parties or others. Provide in Township Plans - include the SMHP partnership resolution of support in the Laketown Policy Plan	Language added referencing 6 Mile Halstead agreement in Laketown Township's chapter.
50	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	9. A statement of the process to amend the local plans, consistent with Minnesota Statues §013B.235	Water Management Plan attached as appendix and add to surface water management section of the 2040 Comp Plan.
51	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	10. Inventory of real property owned by the LGU, including discussion of (i) water resource issues and opportunities associated with its properties, and (ii) potential opportunities to coordinate with the District or other partners	Narrative description of publicly owned property added.

52	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>20. Identify other regulatory mandates concerning water resources under which the LGU operates, including LGU's roles, responsibility, and compliance status. Include Procedures for enforcement. Specifically addressing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPDES Ms4 stormwater program • TMDL program *impaired waters referend and TMDL framework incorporate • State and Federal anti-degradation requirements • safe drinking water act/wellhead protection program • NFIP, State floodplain management law • State Shoreland Management Law • WCA <p>- provide link to approved SWPP with Laketown Policy Chapter - Discuss regulatory mandates in County Water Resources Chapter</p> <p>21. Identify District assistance or coordination that would benefit any of these programs.</p>	Much of the information referring specifically to the CCWMO was removed, making the section apply more generally to all watersheds in the county.
53	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>22. Describe how regulatory activities are coordinated with the District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are potential permit applications made aware of District permitting requirements • Provide department (s) and positional contact information for regulatory coordination and how this coordination will be initiated by LGU <p>- provide in coordination plan as suggested in 24 below.</p>	Carver County Land Management coordinates with the District at the permit level when applicable.
54	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>23. Contains an implementation program, consistent with MN Rules 8410.0160</p> <p>- MCWD Plan?</p>	Laketown and Watertown Twps adopt and refer to the Districts plan for implementation for the area in the District.
55	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>24. Sets forth a coordination plan that connects the LGU and District in ways that efficiently provide for timely coordination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • annual meeting to review LWMP implementation • transmittal of MS4 report • Describes how the District can receive notice of and consult with the LGU on its land use planning, infrastructure, park and recreation, and CIP efforts. • regulatory coordination - describe how LGU will share information and coordinate on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. pre-application and permit reviews ii. construction site inspection and compliance iv. Implementation of District Rules where LGU is rule authority for any of • Discussion of known coordination opportunities known, on the horizon and/or requested in the future <p>Laketown Township Plan - updates requested: - Policy Chapter states that they rely on MCWD to meet MS4 requirements to avoid duplication of efforts....</p>	For the areas in the District, Laketown and Watertown Twps adopt and refer to the Districts plan for implementation and have very little growth or land use activity. Carver County Land Management coordinates with the District at the permit level when applicable.
56	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>25. For each element in 24 above, describe when and how the communication will occur and indicate the department and position for proposed communication plan.</p>	Carver County Land Management coordinates with the District at the permit level when applicable.
57	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>26. Identify any District rules for which the LGU wishes to assume sole regulatory authority, and provide the supplementary information required under Section 3.6.4 of the WMP</p> <p>- provide in Township Plans</p>	Laketown and Watertown Twps adopt and refer to the Districts plan for implementation for the area in the District.
58	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>27. State whether the LGU intends to assume the role of "local government unit" responsible to implement the Minnesota Wetlands Conservation Act (WCA) or whether it chooses for the District to assume that role</p> <p>- provide in Township Plans</p>	Laketown and Watertown Twps rely on the District to implement WCA for the area in the District.
59	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>29. Land Use - Natural Resources - Policy LU-34 Planning for Natural resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County will reference applicable zoning regulations and applicable plans, including the CCWMO Plan. Please also include MCWD Water Management Plan as Carver County is Land Use authority for Laketown and Watertown Township partially located within MCWD. 	Requested change made.
60	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>30. Guiding Carver County - Land Use Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.4.6 County Policy LU-2, not complete - appears language is missing • P.4.8 County Policy LU-8 Water Planning: revise to state that Local government jurisdictions including cities shall adopt local water plans.. according to the adopted local watershed management organization plan standards and requirements. (It shouldn't be specific to the County Water Management Organization because that plan is not County-wide) (actually pg. 3.12) 	Requested change made.
61	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	<p>31. Water Resources Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the land use authority for townships outside the CCWMO, to assist in meeting local surface water management plan requirements, expand the Surface Water section to be inclusive of County water resources and surface water resource management vs. specific to that area within CCWMO. • Figure 5.4 should be updated, Zumbra and Sunny not listed for nutrients, Turbid lake is listed but doesn't appear to be indicated as such. • Introduction - surface water management, expand to discuss other WMO's including Minnehaha Creek Watershed District where the County is land use authority for townships. 	Requested changes made.

62	Mn DNR	As the agency charged with a mission of working with citizens to conserve and manage the state's natural resources, to provide outdoor recreation opportunities and to provide for commercial uses of natural resources in a way that creates a sustainable quality of life, the DNR's Central Region office appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on your draft plan. We support Carver County's commitment to recognize and protect its natural resources. To further the realization of these goals in the next 20 years, please consider the following: Introduction, Physical Setting, Land Cover section (P. 2.4)We suggest you include a statement about the amount of land that has high or outstanding biodiversity and regionally important wildlife water bodies. Aside from the Minnesota Valley Recreation Area, there are two lakes (of 56 in the state) of Wildlife Significance: Tiger Lake and Patterson Lake and Lake Waconia is a Lake of Biological significance. Natural areas remain within the Minnesota River Valley and the agricultural landscape that retain high and outstanding biodiversity, including rare plant, animal and geologic features.	Paragraph highlighting areas of biodiversity in Carver County added.
63	Mn DNR	County Policy on Conservation. LU-34 Conservation of Natural Features states: "The County will consider potential impacts to natural resources while evaluating or planning potential projects. The County will reference applicable zoning regulations, and applicable plans, including the Carver County Groundwater Plan and CCWMO Water Plan." Consider adding the following:, and review Rare Features (in consultation with DNR), DNR Native Plant Community Maps, and Wildlife Action Network Plan maps when considering development proposals. The DNR Native Plant Community Map and/or the Wildlife Action Network Map could be added to the Plan, as illustrative of the many noteworthy natural resources in Carver County.	Comment noted.
64	Mn DNR	The DNR supports including data from the Natural Heritage Information System (NHIS) in the Comprehensive Plan. We recommend that the plan include goals and strategies to address how rare species and plant communities will be protected. For example, areas of future land use change are in Dahlgren, the location of an important Maple stand in Dahlgren and in Laketown, where Lake Bavaria Fisheries Management Area is located.	This is primarily something that is up to the cities, not the county. However, this information will be included in the 2019-2028 CCWMO Water Plan.
65	Mn DNR	Two data layers useful for land use and conservation planning include the MBS Native Plant Communities and the MBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance. GIS shapefiles of these data layers can be downloaded from the Minnesota Geospatial Commons. The DNR recommends avoidance of these ecologically significant areas, especially MBS Sites of Outstanding or High Biodiversity Significance and DNR Native Plant Communities with a conservation status rank of S1 (critically imperiled), S2 (imperiled), or S3 (vulnerable to extirpation). We recommend that Comprehensive Plans include a map of both of these layers and a list of the types of native plant communities documented within the plan's boundaries.	Comment noted.
66	Mn DNR	For further conservation planning and to ensure compliance with the Minnesota Endangered Species Act, the DNR encourages communities to check the NHIS Rare Features Data for known occurrences of state-listed species. The NHIS Rare Features Data contains nonpublic data and can only be accessed by submitting a License Agreement Application Form for a GIS shapefile or by submitting a NHIS Data Request Form for a database printout. Both of these forms are available at the NHIS webpage. The plan should include a list of state-listed species found in the area and the habitats they use. For more information on the biology, habitat use, and conservation measures of these rare species, please visit the DNR Rare Species Guide. NHIS training includes rules for using/displaying nonpublic data in public documents. Links: MBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/eco/mcbs/biodiversity_guidelines.html MBS Native Plant Communities http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/npc/index.html Two other layers that can inform planning for natural resources and wildlife are: Metro Conservation Corridors. Developed to help counties and local governments prioritize areas for conservation and restoration. Wildlife Action Network. The Wildlife Action Network (2015) provides a template of significant aquatic and terrestrial biological areas across the state providing focus to conservation efforts to address threats imposed by large scale threats such as climate change, invasive species, habitat loss, among others. Large core areas and connections that facilitate species movement will support the biological diversity already present in the network. Targeting conservation within the network will increase the effectiveness and efficiency of actions to reduce the primary causes of population declines.	Comment noted. This information may be more useful if used in individual reviews.

67	Mn DNR	<p>In the Township Policy Chapter, include natural features/assets in the township description to raise awareness of the natural resource amenities that may not be visible on the land or on the maps. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Benton: Schneewind Wildlife Management Area is managed for grassland as well as wetland species. o Camden: The Wildlife Management Area (Gravel Pit 1748 WMA) is 3.2 acres of mainly grassland providing habitat for upland species. o Dahlgren: The township retains the County’s largest quantity of high quality Big Woods stands, including an area known as Dahlgren Woods. o Hancock: Natural features include Assumption Lake with an adjacent WMA managed for wetland wildlife species. The basin is primary used for waterfowl hunting though also small game and pheasants. o Hollywood: Luce Line State Trail and other snowmobile trails provide summer and winter access across the township. o Laketown: Includes several quality Maple-Basswood stands including those in Carver Park Reserve. Lake Bavaria has a Fisheries Management Area. o San Francisco: Bluff and floodplains contain many natural areas with high and outstanding biodiversity. The Carver Highlands WMA adjoins the US Fish and Wildlife Service MN Valley National Wildlife Refuge Rapids Lake Unit –primarily managed for grasslands and upland birds. o Waconia: Contains Lake Patterson, a designated Wildlife Lake, one of 56 in the state. There is a desire to expand the Patterson Lake WMA, as opportunities (willing sellers) arise. The Schneewind Wildlife Management Area is managed for grasslands as well as wetland species. o Watertown: Swede Lake water access provides fishing opportunity and contains several shallow lakes that have been prized for waterfowl hunting. o Young America: Contains Tiger Lake, a designated wildlife lake - important migratory waterfowl habitat. DNR owns WMA lands on the west side of the lake and has an interest in protecting more shoreline and upland nesting areas over time as opportunities to work with willing sellers arise. The USFW Service owns a WPA property on the east side of the lake. In the Township Policy Chapter, include natural features/assets in the township description to raise awareness of the natural resource amenities that may not be visible on the land or on the maps. For example: o Benton: Schneewind Wildlife Management Area is managed for grassland as well as wetland species. o Camden: The Wildlife Management Area (Gravel Pit 1748 WMA) is 3.2 acres of mainly grassland providing habitat for upland species. o Dahlgren: The township retains the County’s largest quantity of high quality Big Woods stands, including an area known as Dahlgren Woods. o Hancock: Natural features include Assumption Lake with an adjacent WMA managed for wetland wildlife species. The basin is primary used for waterfowl hunting though also small game and pheasants. o Hollywood: Luce Line State Trail and other snowmobile trails provide summer and winter access across the township. o Laketown: Includes several quality Maple-Basswood stands including those in Carver Park Reserve. Lake Bavaria has a Fisheries Management Area. o San Francisco: Bluff and floodplains contain many natural areas with high and outstanding biodiversity. The Carver Highlands WMA adjoins the US Fish and Wildlife Service MN Valley National Wildlife Refuge Rapids Lake Unit –primarily managed for grasslands and upland birds. o Waconia: Contains Lake Patterson, a designated Wildlife Lake, one of 56 in the state. There is a desire to expand the Patterson Lake WMA, as opportunities (willing sellers) arise. The Schneewind Wildlife Management Area is managed for grasslands as well as wetland species. o Watertown: Swede Lake water access provides fishing opportunity and contains several shallow lakes that have been prized for waterfowl hunting. o Young America: Contains Tiger Lake, a designated wildlife lake - important migratory waterfowl habitat. DNR owns WMA lands on the west side of the lake and has an interest in protecting more shoreline and upland nesting areas over time as opportunities to work with willing sellers arise. The USFW Service owns a WPA property on the east side of the lake. 	Several of these resources are already shown on the Township Policy Maps or mentioned in the POST chapter. Staff will look for opportunities to add others as possible.
68	Mn DNR	Transportation Chapter. 4.2.H.5 Public Health, Environmental Review Process. Project Development. In another measure to preserve the natural environment, consider adding policies that take wildlife into consideration when transportation and redevelopment projects occur, such as the Hwy 212 project that goes near Tiger Marsh Wildlife Management Area.	N/A in Parks, Trails & Open Space Chapter/A in Parks, Trails & Open Space Chapter
69	Mn DNR	<p>To enhance the health and diversity of wildlife populations, encourage private and public developments to retain or restore natural areas planted with native species. One larger area is better than several small “islands” or patches; and connectivity of habitat is important. Animals such as frogs and turtles need to travel between wetlands and uplands throughout their life cycle. Consult DNR’s Best Practices for protection of species and Roadways and Turtles Flyer for self-mitigating measures to incorporate into design and construction plans. Examples of mores specific measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Preventing entrapment and death of small animals especially reptiles and amphibians, by specifying biodegradable erosion control netting (‘bio-netting’ or ‘natural netting’ types (category 3N or 4N)), and specifically not allow plastic mesh netting. (p. 25) o Providing wider culverts or other passageways under paths, driveways and roads while still considering impacts to the floodplain. o Including a passage bench under bridge water crossings. (p. 17) because typical bridge riprap can be a barrier to animal movement along streambanks. o Curb and storm water inlet designs that don’t inadvertently direct small mammals and reptiles into the storm sewer. (p. 24). Installing “surmountable curbs” (Type D or S curbs) allows animals (e.g., turtles) to climb over and exit roadways. Traditional curbs/gutters tend to trap animals on the roadway. Another option is to install/create curb breaks every, say, 100 feet (especially important near wetlands). o Using Smart salting practices to reduce impacts to downstream mussel beds, as well as other species. o Fencing could be installed near wetlands to help keep turtles off the road (fences that have a j-hook at each end are more effective than those that don’t). 	Comment noted. These types of requirements are more appropriately included in documents such as the Zoning Code.
70	Mn DNR	<p>Parks, Open Space and Trails Chapter.</p> <p>As noted on page 6.30, conservation groups donate land and money to support the acquisition of WMA lands. This source of funding could be added to the chart on p. 6.61. Local groups can access Outdoor Heritage Funding’s conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program.</p>	Added to table, Page 6.63.
71	Mn DNR	In the description of state lands, Tiger Lake and Patterson Lake are state designated wildlife lakes, an important migratory waterfowl habitat that can be managed to improve wildlife habitat. The DNR owns WMA lands west of the Tiger Lake with plans to expand over time as opportunities (willing sellers) arise.	Tiger Lake and Patterson Lake added to list, Page 6.30
72	Mn DNR	Consider discussing snowmobile trails in the park systems plans, especially in the vicinity where future land uses are planned. State-supported grant-in-aid trails connect your community to an extensive network of trails throughout the state. Including the trails on inventories would raise awareness of this recreational activity. The snowmobile GIA Program webpage below also has more information on the program and funding. https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/grants/recreation/gia_snowmobile.html	Bullet about snowmobiles added to list, Page 6.32

73	Mn DNR	Land Use Section, County Policy LU-18E Residential Density Options (p. 3.25) when discussing the different options for townships, consider discussing the value of stewardship programs, in the wooded and high amenity areas. For example, adding to the development standard: "Property owners are encouraged to minimize the impact on natural resource areas" and develop woodland and/or conservation stewardship plans for the unbuilt portions of their property.	Comment noted.
74	Scott County	Transportation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 4.26 does not clearly show the RBTN Tier 2 corridor "Merriam Junction Trail" from the City of Carver into Scott County. The County in partnership with Carver County will construct this river crossing and trail as funds become available. 	Map modified to more clearly show, see appendix
75	Scott County	Transit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On page 4.80 in the Transportation plan under 4.3.G.3 Smartlink Transit, we offer the following clarifying language for consideration: "Smartlink is the mobility manager for Carver County which offers TransitLink (Dial-A-Ride) service 6AM-7PM, Monday-Friday for all of Carver and Scott Counties. 	Requested change made.
76	Scott County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On page 4.80 in the Transportation plan under 4.3.G.4 Medical transportation - Waters Edge sentences are correct but is should read: "Smartlink offers qualified non-emergency medical transportation for qualified participants through a program at Carver County administered by Minnesota Department of Human Services - This replaces "Additionally NEMT rides are provided through the twin cities metro area network.." The last 2 sentences in that paragraph are incorrect. 	Requested change made.
77	South West Transit	<p>4.72: Strategy TR-24- change "conduct transit service plans" to "conduct transit studies"</p> <p>4.79: Route 692 now only offers 3 morning trips, not 4</p> <p>4.79: Route 697 now only offers 2 afternoon trips, not 3</p> <p>4.80: Route 699 services Carver Station three times in the afternoon; East Creek is served 8 times in the morning and South West Village is served 9 times in the morning.</p> <p>4.81: 4.3 H: Carver County commuters can access SW Prime at either Southdale or the Optum Campus in Eden Prairie via SWT's Flex service.</p> <p>Table 4.14: Walnut row is missing Route 691.</p> <p>4.86: 4.3 N: Mention the expansion of SW Prime to include non-emergency medical trips in and around the SW Prime service area is planned for the near future (and that the County is supportive of it).</p> <p>4.87: 4.2.P.3: Incorporate SW Prime Expansion plans from SWT Long Range Plan Action Plan. Specifically, expanded SW Prime service throughout Carver County, and a SW Prime non-emergency medical trip service that will provide service to medical facilities in and around the SW Prime service area.</p> <p>4.88: Incorporate SWLRT Service Plan from SWT Long Range Plan Action Plan as the planned local transit routes connecting Carver County to the Green Line.</p>	Requested revisions made.
78	South West Transit	Please incorporate relevant SWT Long Range Plans (attached) (See Action Plan document)	Comment noted.
79	South West Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P.5: Note that Victoria is only served by SW Prime under contract. Also note that Carver is served by fixed route and SW Prime under contract as part of a CMAQ grant. p.5: second paragraph, last sentence - it's not clear which Figure is being alluded to. I believe it means to allude to Figure 3 SW Prime is not one word. It should be "SW Prime" not "SW Prime" throughout the report. P.5: Second Paragraph - Prime now connects with fixed route services at Optum Campus in Eden Prairie on weekdays and Southdale Transit Center on Saturdays. P.8: (Route 691) Change Walnut Park and ride references to "Downtown Chaska" P.9: (Route 699) Change Walnut Park and Ride references to "Downtown Chaska" P.9: SW Prime weekday hours are from 6:30am-6:30pm. SW Prime also operates on Saturdays from 8am-6pm P.9: Change references to "vans" to "buses" or "vehicles" P.11: Flex service is still running. It was not terminated in December 2017. However, the new Flex service transfers Carver County reverse commute riders from the Flex service to SW Prime at Optum Campus in Eden Prairie. Reverse Commuters can also transfer to SW Prime on Saturdays at Southdale Transit Center. P.11 (South West Village): Note that peak usage in 2012 was due to East Creek Station in Chaska being closed during construction. P.15 (Park and Ride Model): Include language alluding to possible Park and Ride expansion along the Highway 5 corridor at Rolling Acres Rd in Victoria. P.16 (Pop over 65): Note that seniors within the SW Prime service area are being serviced by SW Prime and that the service should be considered for expansion west further into Carver County in order to meet the growing demand for senior transportation. P.25 (activity units): Note Prime services as a possibility for Waconia P.31 (Transit Advantages): List the following intersections as high priority for signal priority understanding that coordination would need to occur with State, County, and/or Cities: Highway 41 & Chestnut Street (East Creek Station Entrance), Highway 5 & Great Plains Blvd, and Highway 101 & Crossroads Blvd (South West Village Entrance). P.33: Add potential Prime expansion into Western Carver County communities contingent on adequate funding being made available. P.33 (transitways): There is planned SWT services to the SWLRT station at South West Station in Eden Prairie (see attached service concept). Please incorporate into plan. Please contact me for details as needed. P.35 (Alternative Fuel Vehicles): Note that Prime service is the service best suited to utilizing electric vehicles today and that fixed route services will incorporate alternative fuel vehicles as technologies catch up. Add to Long Range Transit Service Recommendations: Transit Oriented Development (TOD) potential at South West Village, East Creek, and Carver Transit Stations. 	Requested revisions made.
80	South West Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P.9: Do the 3/4-mile buffers for Metro Mobility also include East Creek Station, Carver Station, and South West Village? If so, that should be incorporated. 	Based on information proved on the Metro Transit website, the 3/4 mile buffer does not apply to any stations other than Chanhassen and South West Village. These are already included in the plan.
81	Three Rivers Park District	Chapter VII - Parks and Trails <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "also, visits to Carver Park Reserve and Lake Minnetonka <u>LRT</u> Regional <u>Trail</u> are not included in Carver County visitor counts..." (Page 6.4) 	Text changes made, Page 6.4
82	Three Rivers Park District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "These two regional facilities do not charge..." (Page 6.4) 	Text changes made, Page 6.4

83	Three Rivers Park District	Text revisions requests. • Carver Park Reserve is located in Victoria <u>and Laketown Township</u> (Page 6.24)	Requested changes made.
84	Three Rivers Park District	• "Carver Park Reserve is <u>over</u> 3,700 acres.." (Page 6.24)	Requested changes made.
85	Three Rivers Park District	Text revisions requested for both Lake Minnetonka LRT and Minnesota River Bluffs LRT Regional Trails. • "Beyond Carver County the trail continues east to the City of Hopkins." (Page 6.39)	Requested changes made.
86	Three Rivers Park District	Crow River Regional Trail alignment, general comment. In 2017, Three Rivers Park District, in collaboration with Carver (including Watertown Township) and Wright Counties, adopted the Crow River Regional Trail Master Plan. The master plan identifies the Carver County 0.37 mile segment from the Luce Line State Trail (where it crosses County Road 26) to County Road 20, and east to County Road 17 (Wright County). A map from the master plan is included for reference and consistency when describing and mapping the regional trail. A full version of that master plan can be found online at: https://www.threeriversparks.org/page/crow-river-regional-trail-master-plan (pages 10, 6.37. 6.41)	Alignment updated on map, Page 6.37
87	Three Rivers Park District	Trunk Highway 5 Alternate Regional Trail, general comment. The extension of Trunk Highway 5 Alternate Regional Trail traverses through Carver Park Reserve. While it appears that this alignment may follow existing internal park reserve trails, future coordination and planning will need to incorporate Three Rivers Park District. (6.37 & 6.43)	Text added to document, Page 6.43
88	Victor Township	Recommend the Metropolitan Council be dissolved.	Comment noted.
89	Watertown Township	Requests that pertinent wording of this resolution be placed in the Watertown Chapter: Whereas, Watertown Township has previously adopted a resolution regulating the location of feedlots within the Township via Carver County's Comprehensive Plan; and Whereas, the Township now desires to modify where feedlots between 200 and 300 animal units may be located within the Township; and Now, therefore, Watertown Township sets the following standards for the location of feedlots within the Township: 1. Watertown Township adopts the animal agriculture operations policy and standards contained in the Carver County Land Use Plan and the Carver County Feedlot Ordinance. 2. In addition, to the County standards adopted above, the Township adopts standards which apply to areas east and west of a division line which runs from State Highway 25 on the north Township boundary to State Highway 7, east on Highway 7 to CSAH 10, then south on CSAH 10 to the south Township boundary ("Division Line"). 3. The following standards will apply to animal agriculture operations in Watertown Township: a. New and expanded animal agriculture operation feedlots greater than 50 Animal Units (AU) shall be required to obtain a Conditional Use Permit. b. New animal agriculture operations east of the division line are restricted to 200 AUs or less, except as provided below. c. New animal agriculture operations west of the division line are restricted to 400 AUs or less. d. Expansion of existing animal agriculture operations are restricted to 25 percent above the AU existing of August 6, 2018, the date Resolution 8-6-2018 was first adopted, except as further limited by this Resolution. e. No expansions above 200 AU will be allowed east of the division line, with the exception of PID 100290600 (119.99 acres) which will be allowed expansion to a maximum of 300 AU, but with an absolute exclusion of swine. f. No expansions above 400 AU west of the division line shall be allowed.	Changes made as requested.
90	Watertown Township	Request this be added to the Watertown Township Section: Watertown Township does not foresee the need for the construction of any new roads on the Township system. The Township's primary concern is the maintenance and improvement (when necessary) of the town road system. If new roads are needed to provide service to new development, these roads will be constructed solely at the expense of the developer. Such roads shall meet Township and County standards for local roads or a higher standard if the road will be of a higher classification as shown in the County Transportation Plan. The Township will not accept these as public roads. These roads will be maintained and repaired by a homeowner's association or similar entity consisting of the land owners served by the road. However, the Township may accept a new road if it connects to an existing public road at either end.	Comment noted. Requested language already in plan.
91	Watertown Township	Other road considerations: A minimum of three residences on three separate property sites is required before a roadway leading to said sites will be considered for acceptance as a public road. Roadway must also be brought up to township road standards before acceptance will be considered. If after the roadway has been in existence for ten years serving 1 or 2 residences, and the minimum of 3 residences has not been met, consideration will be given to accept the roadway as a public road providing all other standards have been met.	Requested change made.

92	Watertown Township	<p>The Watertown Township Board of Supervisors provides the following inputs to the proposed 2040 Carver County Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The Township Board of Supervisors do not accept the Land Use Section of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan draft as written, and insist upon the following changes/additions before final acceptance of the plan can be given.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of the words "energy production" from line #1 in LU 20 section. 2. The language ... "Development of Solar Energy Systems is guided by County Policy LU-20 Essential Services and Public Services must be removed from the Solar Resource page, 3.49. 3. Add a fourth category "solar development" into Change LU 19 section to read "Other land uses and criteria for these uses fall into one of four categories: essential services; solar development, large scale land uses that require a location in the Agricultural Policy Area because of a unique need for land or location; and small scale business activities centered around residential or residential/farmstead use of a property. 4. Create a separate solar policy between LU 20 and LU 21 that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage residential solar development that maintains community character. - fairly balance the development rights of land owners with solar resources with the community character rights of adjacent landowners. - encourage solar garden or farm development on marginal farmland rather than prime agricultural soils - encourage solar garden development on closed landfills, vacated gravel pits and brownfields. <p>The above has been reviewed and approved for submittal by the Watertown Township Board of Supervisors via motion and unanimous approval in the Oct 1 monthly board meeting.</p>	<p>Following a work session with the Planning Commission and subsequent County Board work session staff were given the direction to not add any additional regulations in the Comprehensive Plan regarding solar developments.</p>
93	Watertown Township	<p>Watertown Township, by board action, is requesting the consideration Carver County Board of Commissioners of the attached proposal regarding outdoor commercial rifle/handgun shooting ranges.</p> <p>Thus am requesting your assistance in getting this item into an upcoming Carver County Board of Commissioners agenda for consideration and hopefully approval.</p> <p>Item: Proposed addition to Carver County Code of Ordinances and Land Use Policy with regard to a Township option allowing or restricting Outdoor Commercial Rifle and Handgun Ranges within their Township.</p> <p>Item: Proposed addition to Carver County Code of Ordinances and Land Use Policy with regard to a Township option allowing or restricting Outdoor Commercial Rifle and Handgun Ranges within their Township.</p> <p>Background/Justification: Watertown Township residents have expressed concern over the potential of the establishment of a commercial outdoor rifle and handgun shooting range within the township. In that there is little or no specific language in the Carver Code of Ordinances or Policies regarding the foregoing, the Watertown Township Board would like to see action taken to provide a township option.</p> <p>As an example... currently there is a provision in the current Carver County Code of Ordinances (see highlighted item in (Section 5a of Ordinance 152.080) relating to golf courses and the option for townships to opt in or out of this provision in their Comprehensive Plans.</p> <p>Watertown Township proposes this same option provision be made available to all townships within the county regarding commercial outdoor rifle/handgun ranges.</p>	<p>As per work session with Planning Commission and County Board, an option to opt out of shooting ranges will not be added to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Watertown Township can adopt their own ordinance if they would like to restrict shooting ranges.</p>
94	Watertown Township	<p>Action requested: Watertown Township thus proposes language be added to the Carver County Comprehensive Plan, Code of Ordinances and Land Use Policy providing Townships the ability to choose whether or not commercial outdoor rifle and handgun ranges are an acceptable land use with their respective townships. Changes would be required to Carver County Comprehensive Plan County Policy LU-2 and County Code of Ordinance 152.080.</p> <p>Watertown Township respectfully requests that the Carver County Board of Commissioners consider this proposal at an upcoming Carver County Board Meeting.</p> <p>Proposed language to be added is as follows:</p> <p>8. Outdoor Commercial Rifle and Handgun Ranges</p> <p>a) Outdoor Commercial Rifle and Handgun Ranges will be permitted only in those townships where the township comprehensive plan states that the use is a compatible and desirable use within the township. The town board will forward a resolution to the county stating that the proposal is in conformance with its comprehensive plan.</p> <p>§ 152.080 Conditional Uses - Large Scale Activities with Unique Land or Location needs.</p> <p>(A) Minimum criteria for issuance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The Activity conforms to all other county ordinances, state, and federal regulations. (2) Minimum five acre lot size; unless another size is specified under a particular provision. (3) Sewage can be manage in accordance with Chapter 52 of this code of ordinances. The county may require design by a registered engineer. (4) The activity shall be located on a hard surfaced (blacktop or concrete) road unless specific approval for location on a township road is given by the affected township or Carver County, MN Code of Ordinances American Legal Publishing 108 townships. The town board may condition its approval of access top a gravel road on agreements with the applicant regarding dust control, maintenance, or similar issues. The terms of the agreement shall be such that the agreement is in force so long as the permit is in effect. (5) The activity is of a scale that the demand for support services such as sewer, water, police, fire protection, emergency equipment access, roads or streets, can be accommodated within the context of the service levels available in the commercial agricultural area. (6) Land is not subject to the land use restrictions of an AG preserve covenant. (7) The operational characteristics of the proposed activity shall be such that it can be operated on the proposed site and within the current levels of support services and infrastructure. <p>Activities that will have service needs-traffic capacity or roads, waste disposal or management, fire or police protection, sewage disposal-that will exceed those available in the area should locate in municipalities where the services are available.</p> <p>(B) Minimum conditions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Permit shall be subject to administrative review or compliance review as set by the permit. (2) The operational plan and site plan shall become part of the permit. (3) The activity must operate in conformance with the approved site plan and operational plan and other provisions of this chapter. The site plan and operational plan shall become part of the permit. (4) The applicant must submit a copy of workers' compensation insurance or sign an affidavit stating that he or she will not have any employees. (5) All buildings used in the operation must meet the State Building Code. 	<p>As per work session with Planning Commission and County Board, an option to opt out of shooting ranges will not be added to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Watertown Township can adopt their own ordinance if they would like to restrict shooting ranges.</p>

		<p>C) Activities</p> <p>(1) Airports and personal use land strips. Airports must have the approval of the Minnesota Department of Transportation and/or the Metropolitan Airports Commission.</p> <p>(2) Churches. Related structure and activities, including education and classes, located on the same site which are an integral part of the church proper and convents or homes for persons related to the religious functions. The number of dwelling units permitted shall not exceed the number of building eligibilities available or the number of units existing on the church site as of September 1, 1998.</p> <p>(3) New or expanded existing cemeteries. Cemeteries shall not be established in areas with a high water table.</p> <p>(4) Historical sites and activities as recognized by the State Historical Society.</p> <p>(5) Golf courses subject to the following criteria:</p> <p>(a) Golf courses will be permitted only in those townships where the township comprehensive plan states that the use is a compatible and desirable use within the township and the town board forwards a resolution to the county stating that the proposal is in conformance with its comprehensive plan.</p> <p>(b) the course must be located on either a minor collector, a major collector, a minor arterial or major arterial road as identified in the 2020 Transportation Plan. The road must be hard surfaced.</p>	
95	Wayne Hubin	<p>Recommendations regarding Solar Energy Systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited to 1 mega watt or 7 acres (continue) separation of 3 miles of any other solar energy system separation of 1000 feet between the border of any solar energy system and a non participating residence solar energy systems are not considered to be an essential service 	Changes to the minimum distance can be reviewed when updates are made to the Zoning Ordinance to align with the 2040 Comp Plan. Following a work session with the Planning Commission and subsequent County Board work session staff were given the direction to not add any additional regulations in the Comprehensive Plan regarding solar developments.
96	Wright County	Figure 4.17 for the 2040 shows Carver 33 as a Principal Arterial and potential transfer to the State, but in figure 4.4 it does not show the same? Carver 33 lines up with Wright County Highway 8, which is a Major Collector and is planned to be for the future.	Figure 4.4 is meant to show Existing Functional Class. Figure 4.17 is meant to show Future Functional Class. Map titles will be changed to avoid this confusion.
97	Met Council	The preliminary review process found the following sections complete for review and did not identify any major issues or policy conflicts: Aggregate Resources	comment noted.
98	Met Council	<p>The following sections of the draft Plan are considered incomplete. Changes in the draft Plan are definitely need before it is submitted to the Council for formal review.</p> <p>Regional Parks and Trails</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctly and accurately reference the Regional Trails and Regional Trail Search Corridors within the County, as defined by the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (RPPP). The Plan mentions Minnesota Prairie Regional Trail and County Road 11 Regional Trail Corridor, which are not part of the regional system. Parks and trails are identified as regional components, only through the RPPP updates, with the approval of the Met Council. The Plan should distinguish between trails that are part of the regional system, and those that the County may wish to add to the system, and acknowledge the process for doing so. 	Document text and map updated, Pages 6.37, 6.44 & 6.45.
99	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that all the Regional Parks, Park Reserves, and Special Recreation Features are identified on the Planned Land Use map. Carver County Planned Land Use and Laketown Township Planned Land Use maps do not show the boundaries of Lake Waconia Regional Park. 	The maps are updated as requested.
100	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laketown Township Parks, Open Space, and Trails policies on page 11 need to acknowledge both Lake Waconia Regional Park and Carver Park Reserve within the boundaries of the Township. 	Requested change made.
101	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camden Township Parks, Open Space, and Trails policies on page 9 need to acknowledge Baylor Regional Park within the boundary of the Township. 	Requested change made.
102	Met Council	<p><u>Advisory Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Plan references an additional 60,000 households and 16,000 jobs (page 6.1). These numbers do not align with the forecasts from Met Council. Please ensure consistency with Met Council forecast data. 	Revised to align with Met Council forecasts.
103	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 6.4 refers to a chart at the bottom of the page that is not included in the Plan. 	Requested change made.
104	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 6.32 referring to the restoration of Rapids Lake Unit states the year 1002, instead of 2001. 	Requested change made.
105	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On page 6.36, there is a reference to Figure 7.11, which should be Figure 6.11. 	Requested change made.
106	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan categorizes regional trails as either linking or destination trail, it does not specify that distinction for Regional Trail Search Corridors. These details will be identified as part of the master planning and finding the alignments of the Regional Trail Search Corridors. The inventory and map of trails and bikeways on pages 6.36 and 6.37 separate the Regional Trails in those categories, which may not be the case in the future. Council staff encourage the County to use the same references to the regional trails as identified in the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (RPPP). The Carver County 2015 System Statement lists all Regional Parks components within the County. 	Regional trail search corridors revised on map to match 2040 RPPP, see map Page 6.37.
107	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please ensure that all references to Regional Trails and Regional Trail Search Corridors are accurate in the names and whether they are Regional Trail Search Corridors, in both text and maps (e.g. Carver County North-South Regional Trail Search Corridor in the plan v. Lake Waconia-Carver Regional Trail Search Corridor in the 2040 RPPP). 	Trail names updated in text and on map, Pages 6.37, 6.40, 6.44
108	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan mentions County Road 25 Regional Trail on page 6.44. This trail is identified as Western Carver County Regional Trail Search Corridor and should be referenced as such. 	Trail name updated on Page 6.44
109	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please ensure that the language regarding the Trunk Highway 5 Alternate and Arboretum-Lake Minnewashta Regional Trail Connection reference the Highway 5 Regional Trail Master Plan that is currently in the approval process from the Met Council. The alignment for this trail is identified in the master plan and should be referenced in the comprehensive plan as well. 	Text added, Page 6.45
110	Met Council	<p>Transportation</p> <p>Roadways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify the existing number of lanes for Principal Arterials (Pas) and A-Minor roadways in the County. 	No change. The item is included in the draft. (Figures 4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.16)
111	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the functional classification change process. 	Staff will add a description of and/or link to Met Council functional class change process.

112	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan identifies generally future Right-of-Way (ROW) and discussion about an official ROW map. Please add the map. 	Staff will clarify corridors where official ROW mapping is completed: TH 212 & CSAH 101 only. Carver County Right-of-Way Guidelines are listed in Table 4.12.
113	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Section 4.2.D.2, please clarify projects that are consistent with the current Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) (adopted in 2015), then discuss projects that will be in the future (draft TPP). There are no roadway projects in Carver County in the Current Revenue Scenario. To discuss future projects, identify if they are in the current or increased revenue scenario (i.e. if they are fully or partially funded or other). 	Plan includes map of current TPP projects (Figure 4.1). Staff will update language now that draft TPP is adopted by Met Council.
114	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please add discussion about any future interchanges. 	Staff will add description for future interchange locations. The intersection of TH 212 and CSAH 51 will be added as a future interchange location.
115	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please add discussion about any future Mn PASS lanes. 	The Met Council TPP does not identify any MnPASS improvements in Carver County. Additional language will be added for consideration and study of MnPASS lanes on TH 212 in Carver County.
116	Met Council	<p>Bicycle/Pedestrian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe and map the existing and planned on-road and off-road bike facilities, Figure 4.94. 	No change. The item is included in the draft (Figure 4.27).
117	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show the relationship of the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) to the bike network of off road trails and on street bikeways including all existing and planned connections. 	No change. The item is included in the draft (Figure 4.26).
118	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss pedestrian policies in greater detail and talk about the difference between pedestrian facilities near transit facilities and parks/trails. 	This is primarily a city-level planning item. However, there is information about pedestrian policies relating to transit on pages 4.72, 4.73, 4.93, and policies relating to parks/trails throughout the POST chapter (specifically on pg. 6.19, 6.36, 6.38, 6.42)
119	Met Council	<p>Freight</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> map the road network showing volumes of multi-axle trucks for PA and A-Minor roadways. 	No change. The item is included in the draft (Figure 4.5, 4.28, 4.29).
120	Met Council	<p>Forecasts</p> <p>Council staff specifically reviewed Scenario 3 which includes the County's identified improvements to the roadway system, essentially a build alternative such as we evaluate in the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) for the region. Generally, the County forecasts are consistent with those generated by the regional model. Where they differ, it is typically not by a sufficient magnitude to require a different road cross section (such as two-lane versus four lane) except for one location (TH 101).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TH 101 bridge crossing from Carver County to Scott County at Shakopee should be monitored because the County forecast justifies a six-lane cross section. However, the regional model for this road suggests a four-lane cross section, and this bridge crossing is not funded, nor identified in the TPP. 	The TH 101 bridge has adequate 2040 capacity. The 2040 forecast is 36,000 ADT. This segment can perform beyond the refined planning level capacity range identified in Table 4.7 for a 4-lane urban design (28,800-35,200 ADT) due to no access on the bridge facility.
121	Met Council	<p>Advisory Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Plan needs to be consistent with the current 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP). The Plan can discuss the draft TPP, but should provide clarifying text that the draft TPP is not finalized and that policies and projects are compared to the existing TPP. 	Comment noted.
122	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.3.P.4 - Discussion about Green Line extensions into the County should also discuss funding limitations. 	Requested changes will be made.
123	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the Plan maps, make sure to include the free-standing town center of Waconia. 	Comment noted.
124	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan should acknowledge that the TPP has limited funding for bus expansion. 	Requested changes will be made.
125	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify that Highway 169 project is under the Increased Revenue Scenario. 	requested change made.
126	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan provides detail regarding transit service (e.g. trip times, number of trips). Since the plan covers a 10-year period and during which time that detailed information is likely to change, it might be best to not provide such detailed information. 	Detailed information about transit services (trip times, number of trips) has been removed.
127	Met Council	<p>Wastewater Services</p> <p>The plan is incomplete for Wastewater Services. To be complete for review, the Plan needs to address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include a table that details adopted community sewer forecasts in 10-year increments to 2040 for Households and Employment. This should be broken down by areas served by the Metropolitan Disposal System and community and subsurface sewage treatment systems. The County only provides total projections. The plan has 2010 households by MDS, SSTS, and Alternative Community System. 	Requested table added.
128	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide an electronic map or maps (GIS shape files or equivalent) showing the proposed changes in government boundaries based on orderly annexation agreements. 	Comment noted. Shapefile will be submitted with plan.
129	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe your management program for sub-surface sewage treatment systems (SSTS) to comply with MPCA 7080 regulations. 	The county's management policy for SSTS is outlined in the SSTS goals, policies and strategies on pages 5.3 and 5.4 of the plan.
130	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a map or maps (GIS shape files or equivalent) showing the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locations of existing public treatment systems. Locations of private treatment systems including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Package treatment plans. Group sub-surface systems. 	Comment noted. Shapefile will be submitted with plan.
131	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map or maps (GIS shape files or equivalent) showing the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location of sub-surface sewage treatment systems Location of nonconforming systems or systems with problems. 	Comment noted. Shapefile will be submitted with plan.

132	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditions under which private community treatment systems (package treatment plans and community drain fields) would be allowed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allowable land uses and residential densities. - Installation requirements. - Management requirements. - Local government responsibilities. 	Sentence added on page 5.2.
133	Met Council	<p><u>For Laketown Township</u> Include a table that details adopted community sewer forecasts in 10-year increments to 2040 for Households and Employment. This should be broken down by areas served by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St. Bonifacius - Waconia - Chaska - The community mound system that services the north and southeast portions of Pierson's Lake - The community mound system that serves the southwest portion of Pierson's Lake - Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) 	Provided in City Plans.
134	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an electronic map or maps (GIS shape files or equivalent) showing the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing sanitary sewer system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lift stations. - existing connections points to the metropolitan disposal system. - future connection points for new growth if needed. - local sewer service districts by connection point. - intercommunity connections. - proposed changes in government boundaries based on orderly annexation agreements. 	Shapefile will be submitted with Plan.
135	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a copy of any Annexation Agreements impacting Township's in the County. 	Will be included as an appendix.
136	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a copy of the Intercommunity Agreement with Chaska. 	Will be included as an appendix.
137	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define your community's goals, policies, and strategies for preventing and reducing excessive inflow and infiltration (I/I) in the local municipal (city) and private (private property) sanitary sewer systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - include a summary of activities or programs intended to mitigate I/I from both public and private property sources. 	The County does not have sewer infrastructure so there is not a lot of issues. Laketown Township has their own ordinance discussed on page 8 of their chapter.
138	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the requirements and standards in your community for minimizing inflow and infiltration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - include a copy of the local ordinance or resolution that prohibits discharge from sump pumps, foundation drains, and/or rain leaders to the sanitary sewer system. - include a copy of the local ordinance or resolution requiring the disconnection of existing foundation drains, sump pumps, and roof leaders from the sanitary sewer system. 	N/A
139	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describe the sources, extent, and significance of existing inflow and infiltration in both the municipal and private sewer systems. 	N/A
140	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include a breakdown of residential housing stock age within the community into pre- and post- 1970 era, and what percentage of pre- 1970 era private services have been evaluated for I/I susceptibility and repair. 	N/A
141	Met Council	<p>Forecasts The Plan is incomplete for forecasts due to sewer-serviced forecasts missing from the Laketown Township section of the Plan. To be complete for review, the Plan needs to address the following issues. Sewer-service forecasts are required for communities serviced by the Metropolitan Disposal System. The only Township expected to have a sewer-serviced forecast is Laketown Township, partially served by Blue Lake Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). However, this information is missing from the Plan.</p>	Table added.
142	Met Council	<p><u>Advisory Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some cities may request forecast adjustments in 2018; this will affect the forecasts found in table 2.4. Please check back at http://metro council.org/ for updated numbers which the next draft of Plan is prepared. 	Forecasts reviewed and updated.
143	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the County analyzes the need to adjust community total forecasts for any of the Townships, that adjustment can be discussed with Metropolitan Council staff; and can be processed with review of the Plan. Council staff advise that an adjustment is needed for Laketown Township. The forecast showing Laketown Township's population and employment dropping to zero in 2040 was premised on an assumption of full annexation by neighboring municipalities and dissolution of the Township itself; this was the best information available at the time of forecast preparation. However, the preliminary Plan received in May of 2018 indicates only partial annexations and indicates Laketown Township continues as a jurisdiction beyond 2040. Council staff would like to discuss revising (upward) the 2030 and 2040 forecasts for Laketown Township. Adjustments to the forecasts for the cities of Waconia and Victoria will be discussed with the respective municipalities. 	Carver County chooses to leave forecast as is.
144	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note that the Council will update its own Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ) files using the allocations provided by Carver County for TAZs in Townships; and the allocations provided by municipalities for TAZs in municipalities. 	Comment noted.
145	Met Council	<p>Surface Water Management The plan is incomplete for Surface Water Management. To be complete for review, the Plan needs to address the following issues.</p> <p>Carver County has planning and zoning authority in Benton, Camden, Dahlgren, Hancock, Hollywood, Laketown, San Francisco, Waconia, Watertown, and Young America Townships. The Plan is intended to fulfill both the land use planning, as well as local surface water management planning requirements for those ten Townships. According to the Township Policy pages in the Plan, these Townships have adopted the (existing) Carver County Watershed Management Organization's (CCWMO) Watershed Management Plan by reference to serve as their Local Surface Water</p>	Comment noted.

		Management Plan (LSWMP). However, the current CCWMO plan is being revised and updated in 2018. When the new CCWMO plan is adopted by the Watershed, the Townships will need to either adopt that new plan as their LSWMP or prepare their own new LSWMP within two years.	
146	Met Council	<u>Advisory Comments</u> When the Plan is submitted for formal review, we request that the full CCWMO Watershed Management Plan be included in the Plan - either as a freestanding chapter or an appendix. In the interim, we suggest the County submit their Water Resources Plan Update for independent review and comment by Council Water Resources staff when it is available, to streamline the Township LSWMP adoption and formal Plan submission review processes.	Existing plan added as an appendix.
147	Met Council	Community Wastewater Treatment and Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) Carver County is responsible for oversight of all operating SSTS within the County with the exception of those located in Chanhassen, who has chosen to adopt and implement its own management program. As of 2010, approximately 212 households in the County were being served by a Community Wastewater Treatment System. Additionally, there are currently three cluster treatment systems which share drain fields serving 53 households. Approximately 5,624 SSTSs are in operation serving households and businesses in the County. County Ordinance Chapter 52 (accessible on the County's website) is used to regulate all aspects of SSTS design, construction, operation, maintenance, and enforcement in the County. The County's program is consistent with Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Rules (Minnesota Rules Chapter 7080-7083) and Council 2040 Water Resources Policy Plan requirements. Specifically needed to be included in the final Plan for it to be found complete for review is a (dot) map depicting the location of all existing Community, cluster, and individual SSTS in operation in the County, as indicated in the text, including highlighting any areas known to have nonconforming systems or systems with known problems (if possible). Council staff is aware that the map will be very "busy," based upon the large number of systems and scale of the map, but will still be of value to show relative density of existing rural development across the County. If the County or their planning consultant needs any assistance in preparing the map or would like Council staff assistance, please contact Steve Hack, MCEs GIS System Administrator at 651-602-1469 or Steven.Hack@metc.state.mn.us for that assistance.	Requested map added.
148	Met Council	Water Supply The Plan is incomplete for water supply. To be complete for review, the Plan needs to address the following issues. • Pages 5.16 and 5.17 address Water supply and include a map of surface water features and their interaction with the regional groundwater system. This section also references the Carver County groundwater plan. Both the County groundwater plan and the updated comprehensive plan lack maps of groundwater level monitoring and areas designated as wellhead protection areas. Please include this information.	Requested changes made. Groundwater level monitoring map added.
149	Met Council	<u>Advisory Comment</u> The county should consider including land use implementation strategies to protect water supply source areas (page 3.51).	Comment noted.
150	Met Council	Solar Access Protection & Development The Plan is incomplete and inconsistent with statutory requirements (Minn. Stat. 473.859. Subd. 2; Section 103B.235) and Council policy regarding planning for the protection and development of access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems as required by the Metropolitan Land Planning Act (MLPA). The Plan must provide the following: • Minnesota's Solar Suitability Analysis Map for the County • Calculations of the community's gross solar and rooftop solar resource <u>Advisory Comments</u> The links to access the map and calculations are available online as follows: • Solar suitability Map: https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Gross-Solar-Potential-Map/PDF/019_CarverCounty_Solar.aspx • Map's Calculations: https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Solar-Resource-Calculation/019_CarverCounty_SolarCalc.aspx	Requested changes made.
151	Met Council	Land Use The Plan is incomplete for land use. To be complete for review, the Plan needs to address the following issues. • Provide a Future Land Use Map and land use legend, including allowable maximum densities for all land uses that allow residential development. The Planned Land Use Map on page 3.8 uses the Metro Council's Generalized Land Use information as a base map. Generalized land use is different than planned land use. As a minimum, the map must more clearly define Regional Park lands and lands enrolled in or eligible for the Agricultural Preserves Program. • The Planned Land Use Map does not clearly define residential areas. Farmstead, for example, is typically part of an Agricultural use and defining it separately is confusing. Single family attached, single family detached, manufactured housing parks, seasonal/vacation uses are residential uses. A different land use category would be necessary if there was a different density assigned to the use. • Any changes to the Future Land Use Map need to be reflected in the individual Township Chapters, for consistency.	Map updated as requested.
152	Met Council	• Provide a Future Land Use Table. Calculate total acres and percent of total acres for each land use category for each 10-year planning year period (2020, 2030, 2040). Table 3-1 includes a Land Use Summary but does not provide the information in 10-year planning periods.	Requested table will be added.
153	Met Council	• Land use categories must include types of allowed uses and the maximum density for all categories that allow residential uses. Allowed uses should include a description of allowable housing types.	Requested information added.
154	Met Council	• Mixed use categories should define an expected share (%) of individual land uses and identify the permitted density range for allowed residential uses.	N/A
155	Met Council	• The Policy Maps for the individual Township chapters should identify the white areas as Agricultural Policy Areas.	Requested change made.
156	Met Council	<u>Advisory Comments</u> • It may be useful to adapt the Policy Area Map as the base map of the Planned Land Use Map instead of generalized land use data. This provides parcel level information and reinforces land use policy expectations with planned land use guiding. There may need to be other adjustments in the plan if this approach is used for consistency.	Map updated as per comments.
157	Met Council	• The Metro Council has Agricultural Preserves Program information updated to 2016. Upon request, GIS shapefiles can be made available. The current Agricultural Preserves Report is located online at http://metro council.org/Communities/Publications-And-Resources/ANNUAL-REPORTS/2016-Metropolitan-Agricultural-Preserves-Report.aspx	Comment noted.

158	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laketown Township opted to use flexible development options in the County's Plan, which must be consistent with the Flexible Development Guidelines adopted by the Metropolitan Council in August 2008 and discussed in Thrive. These guidelines apply to Diversified Rural communities with staging areas for future urbanization identified as Long Term Service Areas for regional wastewater services. If local ordinances are adopted that allow densities greater than 1 unit per 10 acres, such as open space ordinances, cluster developments, or density bonuses, (or other similar ordinances), please ensure consistency by reviewing these guidelines (https://metro council.org/Communities/Services/Planning-Assistance-Resources/Maps-forms-misc./Flexible_Residential_Development_Guidelines.aspx). This will be more closely reviewed when the County's Plan is submitted for formal review. 	Comment noted.
159	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transition Areas surrounding the communities of Hamburg, Cologne, Waconia, and Mayer are different than the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. These areas should be confirmed and consistent with the 2040 Plans for these cities, to the extent possible. Transition Areas should be reflective of Orderly Annexation Agreements approved by the Office of Administrative Hearings. This will be reviewed more closely when the County's final 2040 Plan is submitted for review. 	Transition areas have been updated.
160	Met Council	<p>Housing</p> <p>The Plan is incomplete for Housing. To be complete for review, the Plan needs to address the following issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan provides the percentage of housing cost burdened households but needs to break that down among the following levels of affordability: 30% AMI and below, 31-50% AMI, and 51-80% AMI. These values should be shown numerically, not only as percentages. 	requested change made.
161	Met Council	<p><u>Advisory Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the existing housing data (including the owner-occupied home values map) sourced from the Metro Council has been updated with 2016 data (published in 2018). Council staff recommend reviewing the updated Existing Housing Assessment on the County's community page in the Local Planning Handbook and updating any relevant data. 	Comment noted.
162	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the existing housing data provided at the County-wide level should also be provided for the townships alone, since that is where Carver County has additional authority to address those housing needs. Township data could be summed in total, but Council staff recommend using each Township's Existing Housing Assessment in the Local Planning Handbook to supply the data in the context of each Township's individual Land Use section of the Plan. 	Comment noted.
163	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide additional narrative/context about the existing housing needs in the townships, particularly addressing what their Existing Housing Assessments contain. 	Comment noted. The Housing Assessments do not show a lot of demand in the Townships, but the housing policies would still apply.
164	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County may wish to consider permitting Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in the townships (the CDA section mentions accessory units but it's not clear what role they play in the townships). ADUs can diversify housing stock and increase rental options for areas that don't have lots of density or access to sewer. 	Comment noted.
165	Met Council	<p>Implementation</p> <p>The Plan is incomplete for implementation. To be complete for review, the Plan needs to address the following issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define a timeline as to when actions will be taken to implement each required element of the Plan. 	Timeline added.
166	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe all relevant official controls addressing at least zoning, subdivision, water supply, and private sewer systems. 	Description added.
167	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a schedule for the preparation, adoption, and administration of needed changes to official controls. 	Schedule added.
168	Met Council	<p><u>Advisory Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan references the need to review and update official controls within 9 months of adopting your 2040 plan. Official controls must not be in conflict with your updated plan. You must provide copies of all revised official controls to us. 	Comment noted.
169	Met Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Along with the County's Zoning Map, include the local zoning category descriptions. Identify what changes are needed to ensure zoning is not in conflict with the new land use plan and consistent with regional system plans and policies. 	Requested changes made.