

DAKOTA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Dakota County Western Service Center – Room L139

14955 Galaxie Avenue

Apple Valley, MN 55124

Thursday, January 25, 2024

7:00 PM – 9:00 PM

Agenda

I. Call to Order

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Public Comments:

Anyone wishing to address the Planning Commission on an item not on the agenda may address the Planning Commission at this time (comments are limited to 5 minutes).

IV. Election of 2024 Planning Commission Officers – Action (Kurt Chatfield – Planning)

V. Approval of the Agenda

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes, December 14, 2023

VII. Establishment of 2024 Meeting Dates - Action (Kurt Chatfield – Planning)

VIII. Planning Commission Administrative Forms – Information (Liz Hansen – Administration)

IX. 2024 Planning Commission Work Plan – Information (Kurt Chatfield – Planning)

X. Miesville Ravine Long-Range Plan and Natural Resources Management Plan - Action
(Lil Leatham- Planning, Joe Walton, Parks)

XI. Preparation for Joint Meeting with County Board - Discussion
(Kurt Chatfield - Planning)

XII. Planning Manager Update and County Board Actions

- Authorized joint powers agreement with Scott County for RecycleZone Plus
- Provided direction on County Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas policy

XIII. Upcoming Public Meetings – Community Outreach

Pilot Knob (CSAH 31) Trail Improvements in Farmington Open House	Tuesday, January 30, 5-6:30pm Farmington City Hall, Atrium Web Site: Pilot Knob Road (County Road 31) Trail, Farmington, Dakota County
Vermillion River Watershed Plan Public Meeting	January 24 th , 5-7pm Pleasant Hill Library, Hastings

XIV. Topics for Next Meeting (Thursday, February 22, 2024 – 7pm, Western Service Center, L139)

- Attend special meeting of the Dakota County Board

XV. Planning Commissioner Announcements/Updates

XVI. Adjourn



Meeting Minutes: Dakota County Planning Commission Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes-DRAFT

Date: 12/14/2023

Minutes prepared by Liz Hansen

Location: Western Service Center

Attendance

Members Present

- Jerry Rich
- Amy Hunting
- James Guttman
- Nate Reitz
- Tony Nelson
- Kelly Kausel
- Mike Cahn
- Dennis Peine
- Barry Graham
- Brady Folkestad
- Lori Hansen

Dakota County staff members attending:

- Kurt Chatfield, Planning Manager
- Georg Fischer, Physical Development Director
- Niki Geisler, Parks Director
- Liz Hansen, Administrative Coordinator
- Lil Leatham, Principal Planner
- Tom Lewanski, Parks Natural Resource Manager

Member(s) Absent:

- Jill Smith

Meeting Called to Order

- Time: 7:00 p.m.
- By Planning Commission Chair, Amy Hunting
- Commissioner Reitz joined the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

- The Planning Commission opened the meeting by reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comments

- Comments/Notes: No audience member wished to address an item not on the agenda.

Approval of Agenda

Chair Hunting asked if there were any changes to the agenda.

The Planning Commission advised no changes, additions, or deletions.

MOTION: Commissioner Folkestad moved, seconded by Commissioner Nelson, approving the agenda. Voice vote: Ayes – 10 – Nays – 0 – Unanimously Approved

Approval of Minutes (from November 16, 2023)

Chair Hunting asked if there were any changes to the previous meeting's minutes.

The Planning Commission advised no changes, additions, or deletions.

MOTION: Commissioner Rich moved, seconded by Commissioner Graham, approving the previous meeting's minutes. Voice vote: Ayes – 10 – Nays – 0 Abstain – 0 – Approved

Item VI. Park System Plan Kick-Off – Information/Discussion (Lil Leatham, Principal Planner, and Tom Lewanski, Park Natural Resources Manager)

Niki Geisler, Parks Director; Lil Leatham, Principal Planner; and Tom Lewanski, Parks Natural Resources Manager, presented this topic and responded to questions.

The Planning Commission received an update on the kickoff of the Park System Plan. Staff provided an overview of the previous plan and shared comments and direction from the Physical Development Committee about their expectations and the scope of the new plan. Planning Commissioners provided comments on the plan's scope and suggested how to conduct the upcoming public engagement process.

Questions and comments by the Commissioners, along with responses from staff (*italics*):

Planning Commissioners commented about the rapid growth of park visits since 2008 and that the growth indicates that Dakota County is providing popular park facilities. Several other questions were raised about who is being served by the park system and who is not being served. Planning Commissioners suggested that staff attempt to gather data about who is visiting Dakota County parks and what facilities/programs have a truly regional draw. A comment was made that it is important to keep the mission of Dakota County's natural resource-based park system in mind to balance natural resource protection and stewardship with a desire for increased visitation.

Planning Commissioners discussed how increased use of the park system strains County staff and operating budgets. A comment was made that attracting staff for front-line service positions is increasingly difficult and that this problem also challenges many businesses. Dakota County may need to find innovative solutions to staffing challenges. One thing that may be helpful for the Dakota County Board is for staff to identify what service levels are possible with a range of staffing levels to provide options for policymakers.

Planning Commissioners suggested ways to provide services with limited resources to park visitors, such as working with businesses to sponsor concerts, partnerships with schools such as Dakota County Technical College, and inviting food vendors to sell food and beverages at trailheads and visitor centers to appeal to more visitors. In addition, it may be possible to generate revenue from some of these partnerships.

Planning Commissioners discussed the future of the park system and how Dakota County could improve on what exists today. Several comments were made about prioritizing attracting first-time visitors and offering signature facilities such as the bison reintroduction at Spring Lake Park Reserve. One suggestion was to build on the popularity of the county's greenway system by completing it and offering trail loops from greenways to increase popular appeal.

Several comments were made about getting the most out of Dakota County's current park investment. One possibility would be to offer a "passport" program for residents that encourages people to visit some of the less busy parks in southern Dakota County. Several comments were made about the need to market the Dakota County Park system to inform residents about existing park opportunities.

The topic of ADA accessibility was raised. A comment was made about the need to acknowledge the large number of people living with disabilities and provide facilities and equipment to meet their needs. A suggestion was made to work with senior facilities and nursing homes to make parks available to these groups. There may be opportunities to create partnerships with these facilities.

Planning Commissioners asked questions about potentially merging the Land Conservation Plan with the Natural Resources Park System Plan. *Staff described the overlap in these plans and how land protection, restoration, and natural resources management are common to both plans. Staff intend to recommend merging these plans as part of the larger Park System Plan update.*

Planning Commissioners discussed the possibility of adding new parks to the system. Chub Lake was mentioned as a new park possibility. *Staff responded that Chub Lake was evaluated at the time of the last park plan update and that it has the potential to be a new regional park. It could be looked at again.*

A question was raised about whether it would be possible to locate a new park in the north where more of Dakota County's population resides. *Staff responded that locating a large regional park in the north would be difficult because most of the land has been developed. One possibility would be to look at combining Thompson County Park with Kaposia City Park to create a regional park. Another option would be to work with smaller natural areas that may work as a nature center or in partnership with an existing nature center.*

The Planning Commission concluded its comments with a suggestion that the Park System Plan be developed in coordination with the plans for cities and state parks. Dakota County should coordinate and partner with these agencies, and the Park System Plan can help define the County's role.

Planning Manager Update and County Board Actions

Comments/Notes: Kurt Chatfield, Planning Manager, provided the Planning Commission with an update on the following County Board Actions:

- PDC considered 2024 Planning Commission Work Plan
- Opportunity for a combined meeting of Planning Commission and County Board in February
- PDC considered designating 105th Street as the preferred alignment for the Veterans Memorial Greenway
- Received an update on the proposed Park System Plan update

Upcoming Public Meetings – Community Outreach

Vermillion River Watershed Plan Public Meeting	January 16 th , 5-7pm Lakeville Water Treatment Facility
Vermillion River Watershed Plan Public Meeting	January 24 th , 5-7pm Pleasant Hill Library, Hastings

Topics for next meeting (Thursday, January 25, 2024)

Kurt Chatfield, Planning Manager, provided an overview of next month’s meeting topics:

- Election of Planning Commission Officers for 2024
- Establishment of meeting dates for 2024
- Review of work plan for 2024
- Miesville Ravine Park Reserve – Long-Range Plan
- Miesville Ravine Park Reserve – Natural Resources Management Plan

Planning Commissioner Announcements/Updates:

A commissioner asked for an update on the decriminalization of park violations. Staff responded that this topic was on the County’s legislative priority list, but Dakota County’s new approach is to work with other regional park implementing agencies on a combined legislative request.

A commissioner asked for an update on whether the Board had adopted the park regulations (Ordinance No. 107) that the Planning Commission worked on. *Staff responded that the County Board approved the ordinance, which has been in effect as of October 15, 2023.*

Adjournment

Chair Hunting asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Commissioner Folkestad moved, seconded by Commissioner Hansen, to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 p.m. Voice Vote: Ayes – 11 – Nays – 0 – Unanimously Approved.

Next Regular Meeting: Thursday, January 25, 2024, at 7:00 p.m., Dakota County Western Service Center, Apple Valley

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Hansen, Administrative Coordinator

DRAFT

2024 Draft Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Proposed for Adoption by Planning Commission on 1/25/2024

Planning Commission Dates	Event
January 25, 2024	Meeting
February 22, 2024	Meeting – Work Session with County Board
March 28, 2024	Meeting
April 25, 2024	Meeting
May 23, 2024	Meeting
June 27, 2024	Meeting
July 25, 2024	Meeting
August 22, 2024	Meeting
September 26, 2024	Meeting
October 24, 2024	Meeting
November 21, 2024 (3 rd Thursday)*	Meeting
December 19, 2024 (3 rd Thursday)*	Meeting

* Meetings moved from the 4th Thursday to the 3rd Thursday to avoid conflicting with holidays

**Dakota County Planning Commission Member
Consent to Release Private Data - 2024**

Minnesota Statutes Ch. 13 on data privacy requires that you be informed that the following information about you is considered **private data: home telephone number and e-mail address.**

I hereby grant permission to use the information provided below by me, including that which is considered **private data**, for use in preparing a Planning Committee membership roster to be distributed to members.

Name: _____
Last Name First Name

Home Address: _____
Street
_____ MN
City State Zip

Telephone/Fax: () () ()
Home Business Fax

E-mail Address: _____

This consent expires one year from the date of signature.

Signature of Committee Member

Date

Citizen Advisory Committee Member Statement of Representation

The purpose of this form is to either confirm or waive individual eligibility for per diem compensation to citizen appointees to boards, committees, commissions, councils, or task forces appointed by the Dakota County Board of Commissioners.

According to the Citizen Advisory Committee Membership Policy: County Board appointees to the following committees, who are not representing a governmental unit, receive \$50 per diem (but no additional expense reimbursement) for attendance at regular and special meetings of the committee:

Community Corrections Advisory Board
Extension Committee
Human Services Advisory Committee
Library Board
Planning Commission
Zoning Board of Adjustment

Please check ONE of the following statements:

- I represent another governmental unit in connection with my presence on this board, committee, commission, council, or task force and:
 - a) I receive compensation, in the form of salary or a per diem, from that governmental unit for my participation. Therefore, I am not eligible to receive per diem compensation from the County for my attendance at regular or special meetings of this group.
 - b) I do not receive compensation from that governmental unit for my participation. Therefore, I am eligible to receive per diem compensation from the County for my attendance at regular or special meetings of this group.
- I do not represent another governmental unit in connection with my presence on this board, committee, commission, council, or task force. I am therefore eligible to receive per diem compensation from the County for my attendance at regular and special meetings of this group.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name of the board, committee, commission, council, or task force to which you have been appointed to serve:

***Please complete and return this Statement of Representation to your Committee
Staff Liaison.***

Planning Commission 2024 Work Plan

Board Goal	Committee's Goal for 2024	Project/Activity	Outcome Measure	Timeline
A Healthy Environment with Quality Natural Areas	Park System Plan Update	Review research findings, park units, service levels, and system needs and amend plan as needed	Recommendation to PDC	Q1-Q4*
	Park Natural Resource System Plan Update	Monitor progress on natural resource restoration and modify as needed	Recommendation to PDC	Q3-Q4*
	Park Visitor Services Plan Update	Monitor progress on visitor services programs and modify as needed	Recommendation to PDC	Q3-Q4*
	Mississippi River Greenway Long Range Plan	Update plan in coordination with "Mississippi River Interpretive Plan" and "Connecting People to the River Plan"	Recommendation to PDC	Q1-Q4*
	Mississippi River Greenway Natural Resources Management Plan	Prepare assessment and plan to restore and manage natural resources	Recommendation to PDC	Q1-Q4*
	Veterans Memorial Greenway Natural Resources Management Plan	Prepare assessment and plan to restore and manage natural resources	Recommendation to PDC	Q1-Q4
	Historic Sites Loop Trail in South St. Paul, West St. Paul, and Inver Grove Heights	Prepare new plan, connecting to County greenways	Recommendation to PDC	Q3-Q4
	Solid Waste Management Plan	Amend plan based on progress toward plan	Recommendation to PDC	Q1-Q4*
A great place to live	Transportation ADA Transition Plan Update	Update plan	Review and comment to PDC	Q2-Q4
	Trunk Hwy Plans and Design Studies (Highways 3 & 55)	Review and discuss proposed improvements to State highways as part of multi-agency coordination effort	Review and comment to PDC	Q1-Q4

* Indicates that project will extend into 2025 work plan.

DAKOTA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: 1/25/2024

AGENDA ITEM: Miesville Ravine Park Reserve – Recommendation to Adopt Long-range Plan and Natural Resources Management Plan and Authorization to Submit the Long-range Plan to the Metropolitan Council (*action*)

PREPARED BY: LIL LEATHAM AND JOE WALTON

PURPOSE

Provide Planning Commission:

1. Review the public comments received on the Draft Miesville Ravine Long-range Plan (LP) and Park Reserve Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP) and resulting plan changes.
2. Consider recommending that the LP and NRMP be forwarded to the Physical Development Committee for adoption by the County Board

BACKGROUND

At the August 24, 2023 meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed the Draft Miesville Ravine Park Reserve Long-range Plan and the Draft Natural Resources Management Plan. On September 26, 2023, the Dakota County Board approved releasing the plans for public review. During the review period, the public was able to provide feedback through online review and comment, an online questionnaire, a virtual and an in-person open house, input at meetings with stakeholders, and at a pop-up input opportunity at the HACER Resource Fair in Thompson County Park. Stakeholders and members of the public were asked to share what they liked about the plans, what would make the plans better, and their top five priorities for near term implementation. Overall, there was support for the plans and the draft priorities. Changes are highlighted in yellow in the Long-range plan document and summarized in Attachment C. A summary of engagement is in the Long-Range Plan, *Chapter 3 Partner and Public Engagement and Participation* starting on page 38. Full comments and meeting summaries are in *Appendix A* starting on page AA 22 of the LP and *Appendix G* of the NRMP.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. *Miesville Ravine Park Reserve Long-range Plan Link* [MiesvilleRavineLongRangePlanDraft.pdf \(dakota.mn.us\)](#)
- B. *Miesville Ravine Park Reserve Natural Resource Management Plan link* [MiesvilleRavineNRMPDraft.pdf \(dakota.mn.us\)](#)
- C. *Long-range Plan and Natural Resource Management Plan Public Review Comment Summary and Plan Response*

QUESTIONS

The following questions are intended to help assist in review of the packet materials.

1. *Is the Miesville Ravine Park Reserve Long-range Plan and is the Miesville Ravine Park Reserve Natural Resources Management Plan complete?*
2. *Does the Planning Commission agree with the proposed plan changes outlined?*
3. *Are there any other changes that should be made to the plans prior to adoption?*

Dakota County Miesville Ravine Park Reserve Long-range Plan and Natural Resources Management Plan

Summary: Public Review Period Comments and Draft Plan Changes

Community engagement activities for the second phase of the Miesville Ravine Park Reserve Long-range Plan update and Natural Resources Management Plan were held October-December 2023. The purpose was to offer Dakota County residents, park visitors, stakeholder representatives, and partners the opportunity to review the plans, to suggest changes, and provide feedback on priorities for future improvements.

For the most part, feedback was supportive of the plan recommendations and priorities for improvements. Many appreciated the focus on natural resource and cultural landscape protection and management while making improvements to allow visitors access to more of the park. Many appreciate the recommended improvements that will allow people with physical disabilities better access to Trout Brook and the Cannon River area. Because effort was made to reach a variety of stakeholders, the focus of feedback varied by outreach method and audience. Feedback was received from people very familiar with the park as well as from people who had never visited the park.

Below is a summary of comments and plan changes. Changes responding to comments are noted in the table below and are highlighted in yellow in the Long-range plan document. A summary of comments is in the Long-range Plan, *Chapter 3 Partner and Public Engagement and Participation* starting on page 38. Full comments and meeting summaries are in *Appendix A* starting on page AA 22 of the LP and *Appendix G* of the NRMP.

Comment	Plan Changes
Long-range Plan	
POLCO Questionnaire Comments (33 responses, comments summarized)	
Most participants identified habitat restoration and Trout Brook restoration as high priorities.	No change.
Narrow natural surface hiking trails, accessible trails near the Cannon River were identified as high recreation improvements. Participants supported increased accessibility (both ADA access and park access). There was support for the connection to the Cannon Valley Trail.	No change.
Some participants (16) requested that mountain bike trails be developed and/or proposed hiking trails be operated as shared use mountain biking and hiking trails.	<p>No change in program. Page 39.</p> <p>Request acknowledged and rationale for not allowing mountain biking added to the community engagement chapter.</p> <p>Not recommended currently to protect the natural and cultural landscape.</p> <p>Approach is to minimize new trail development on steep ravine slopes with soils sensitive to erosion, uphill of Trout Brook, on</p>

	<p>ravine slopes that contain plant communities designated by the State of Minnesota as Vulnerable and Imperiled, and areas that contain Indigenous Traditional Cultural Places (TCP).</p> <p>Currently Dakota County Parks does not operate shared use mountain biking and hiking trails for safety reasons.</p> <p>Page 74. The need to carefully consider location, amount, and impact of recreation to natural resources and Traditional Cultural Places added.</p>
The need for restrooms was identified.	<p>Page 86. Language added to emphasize that portable restrooms at each trailhead will be ADA accessible and that the possibility of full restrooms with septic, running water, and adult changing stations will be evaluated when trailhead improvements are made.</p>
Suggestions for wayfinding signage to indicate allowable winter uses and be in multiple languages.	<p>Page 92. Suggestions added to the wayfinding section.</p>
Comments that the trails are mowed too wide.	<p>No change. Mowing will be explored with park maintenance.</p>
Comment that the park does not feel safe to people of color and there needs to be increased park patrol or staff presence in the park to improve safety.	<p>No change. Increased patrol will be explored with law enforcement.</p>
Some participants expressed support for indigenous people's involvement and engagement with the park and voiced a concern for Dakota County's accountability.	<p>No change. Plan recommends partnership with Indigenous communities to protect and manage TCPs.</p>
Konveio on-line comments (8 comments, 4 individuals and Trout Unlimited)	
Perspective that high priority is keeping the park natural and that the plan includes too many new trails.	<p>No change. Recommended trail expansion weighs impact to natural resources with public access.</p>
Trout Unlimited expressed high priority for Trout Brook restoration and support of acquisition of agricultural lands upstream from Trout Brook and along its tributaries with the goal of returning these areas to perennial vegetation. Suggested partnership with	<p>No change.</p>

Trout Unlimited for invasive species removal, volunteer events, letters of support, reducing nitrates in the watershed.	
Twin Cities Trout Unlimited suggested wording change on Page ES8. “Restore natural hydrology and habitat to the Trout Brook channel and floodplain and tributaries, via landscape-level management practices and partnerships” be adjusted as follows, “Restore natural hydrology and habitat to the Trout Brook channel and floodplain and tributaries, via stream restoration projects, landscape management practices and partnerships.”	Page ES8. Suggested change made.
Pop up input at Hispanic Advocacy and Community Empowerment Through Research (HACER) resource fair in Thompson County Park	
Participants placed a high priority on wildlife viewing, Cannon River recreation (kayaking, canoeing, tubing), and trail recreation.	No change.
Open Houses	
Many in attendance expressed interest in and support for natural Resource Management.	No change.
Some voiced concerns about the safety of the current water access on Orlando Trail and support for improving water access. There is concern that parking on Orlando Trail is unsafe.	Pages 86-87. Cannon river water access concept and narrative refined. Page 119. Parking and Roadways sections edited to recognize safety concerns.
Various suggestions were made regarding County and Township roads leading to the park. For some there is interest in paving the roads, some requested that the County take over the Township roads, many expressed concerns regarding safety of park visitors parking along nearby roads.	Page 119. Parking and Roadways sections edited to acknowledge concerns, current road jurisdictions, and operations responsibly. Comments will be passed along to the appropriate agency.
Desire from park neighbors that the park boundary be clarified and the boundary between the park and private property be clarified. Request for additional park boundary signs and the public wayfinding maps not depict the private inholdings within the park boundary.	Page 92. Park boundary signs added to wayfinding section. Page 114. Map request added to narrative.
Dakota County Public Art Citizens Advisory Committee	
Overall support for plan, interested potential future partnership on art and interpretation at rest stops and overlooks.	No change.

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR)	
<p>Group discussed The pertinent Wild and Scenic Rules related to the potential bridge crossing include Minnesota Rule <u>6105.0190</u> and <u>6105.0200</u>.</p> <p>Group discussed natural resource management techniques for invasive species and brown trout removal from Trout Brook.</p> <p>MnDNR staff has concerns about the safety of the Cannon River access on Orlando Trail. It may be possible to partner with the MnDNR in the future on water trail improvements (boat landing, camping). More discussions will need to occur.</p>	<p>Page 15. Wild and Scenic River rules noted.</p>
Cannon River Canoe and Bike Rental, Welch Mill Outfitters	
<p>Supportive of river access improvements. Suggestions: ensure drop-off turnaround is wide enough to allow for long unloading times and passing; space with river visibility for 1-2 buses to wait is desirable; more visitor parking along the new entry drive is desirable if feasible; Flat staging area for staging (about the same size as the one on the east side of the confluence/ 1,000 SF); river-oriented wayfinding.</p>	<p>Page ES7. Figure ES6 updated to reflect suggestions. Pages 86-87. Cannon river water access concept and narrative refined.</p>
Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs)	
<p>Plans seem to be going in the right direction, no specific concerns at this time. Interest in continued involvement and a spring tour of the park.</p>	<p>No changes.</p>
Douglas Township Board of Supervisors	
<p>General support for the plan. Impression that there is appropriate level of needed improvements without changing the character of the park.</p>	<p>No changes.</p>
Metropolitan Council Staff Pre-review	
<p>Boundaries and Acquisition Section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update the Boundaries and Acquisition section to reflect the land additions and removal since the 2005 long-range plan. Add information that one inholding has a feedlot to parcel information to Table 7.2 Add a description of the agency ownership and management arrangement of the acquisitions in Table 7.2 or associated text. 	<p>Page ES9 and pages 113-114. Figures updated.</p> <p>Page 113. Feedlot noted in Table 7.2.</p> <p>Page 114. Description added to narrative.</p>
<p>Development concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify Figure 6.9 with a plain language key, explanation, and reference in the text. Provide a total development cost that summarizes all the costs per implementation time frame. Please also include the estimated capital costs of natural resource restoration projects. Provide a description of the conflicts between recreational and natural-resource management needs in developing the park/trail unit should be addressed and resolved. 	<p>Pages 85-86. Figure 6.9, plain language key and reference/explanation added.</p> <p>Pages 95. Reference to requested information, which is include Table 7.1 added.</p> <p>Page 118. Requested description added to Conflicts section.</p>

<p>Partner engagement: Describe the process undertaken to engage affected agencies, a list of agencies, and a summary of comments received that identifies issues raised and content resulting from engagement efforts.</p>	<p>Page 33. Chapter renamed to include partner engagement. Page 41. Partner engagement section added.</p>
<p>Public engagement and participation: Complete the public engagement for phase 2 and include an overall summary of input themes for the planning process.</p>	<p>Pages 38-40. Phase II engagement summary added. Overall input themes included in Table 3.1.</p>
<p>Equity Analysis: Please include the specific questions of the equity analysis requirement and answer each question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2a. Public Engagement and Participation, Participants: It appears that Dakota County engaged certain underrepresented groups in Table 3.1. Please describe who or what groups were engaged in the text of the plan. • 2b. Engagement: What engagement, outreach, and communication was conducted for stakeholders described in 2a? Please identify the level of public impact on the International Association for Public Participation’s Public Participation Spectrum and requisite engagement strategies for each stakeholder group. • 3a. Evaluation Summary, Transparency: Consider including reference to Table 3.1. • 3a. Evaluation Summary, Accountability: How will the planning effort create better outcomes? 	<p>Pages 41-44. Revised to address comments.</p>
<p>Natural resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please include the estimated capital costs of natural resource restoration projects in this section or in the development concept. • Please include a statement acknowledging the Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area (MRCCA) and stating that the park reserve is not within the MRCCA boundary. • Wild and Scenic Cannon River: Please include that the Wild and Scenic Rivers program is a MN DNR designation. Please provide a contact since I will need to send the plan to them for a review as part of the Council Committee Review process. 	<p>No change. Information included on page 111, Table 7.1. Page 95. MRCCA acknowledged. Page 15. MnDNR administration of the State of Minnesota Wild and Scenic Rivers Program is noted.</p>
<p>Executive Summary: Figure ES 7: move the key; so that it is not overlapping the boundary.</p> <p>Page 29. The 2020 update of the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan does not include an expanded list of activities that could be considered appropriate for inclusion in the Regional Parks System to include: mountain biking, night trail use, kayaking, stand-up paddle boarding, and boardsailing.</p>	<p>Page ES7. Key moved. Page 29. Text revised to remove incorrect reference to 2040 Parks Policy Plan.</p>

Dakota County Staff	
Corrections to formatting, spelling and punctuation errors, image quality. Note, staff will do another review and make minor corrections prior to plan finalization.	Throughout document. Minor corrections are not highlighted.
Updates to footers, table of contents, title page	Throughout document. Updates are not highlighted.
Addition of phase II community engagement comments and meeting summaries.	Pages AA22-AA33 Appendix A, additions are not highlighted.
Natural Resources Management Plan	
Comment(s)	Response/Revision
<u>Background and Introduction.</u> Clarify inholding acres, and total acres of the park without inholdings.	p vii, p. 1 MRPR is 1,847 acres, but there are 332 acres of inholdings, so the total acres, not county inholdings, are 1,515.
<u>2.5.3 Ecological Condition.</u> There is a large amount of duplicate text.	P 46 Deleted the duplicate text
<u>4.1.1 Vision</u> Add text addressing diversity and equity for parks users as part of the vision.	p. 77 Encourages a diverse and equitable usage of the parks in a safe setting for all.
<u>4.1.2 Park-Wide Goals</u> Add text addressing safety and equity as a goal.	p. 78 Work with Visitor Services and Park Patrol to make the park reserve open and safe to all types of people.
<u>4.2.1 Goals: Trout Brook and Tributaries</u> Add language addressing the goals of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1) working with DNR to encourage brook trout conservation and • 2) to utilize volunteers to help restore the stream and surrounding land. 	p. 81, 83 Work with DNR to encourage brook trout and reduce competition from brown trout. p. 83 Work with volunteers to control invasive species and improve habitat for game and non-game wildlife
<u>Appendices: Comments From Public Outreach</u> Add all comments received during the public comment period regarding the final draft of the NRMP, including via webpage, phone calls, emails, and from public meetings, stakeholder meetings, and from public surveys.	25 pages added to the Appendix, in Appendix G.