

City of Edina Comprehensive Plan Incomplete Comment Tracker as of 4/15/20

Wastewater			
Incomplete Comments			
Number	Comment	Response	Edit Location in the Plan (Document pg #, paragraph, etc.)
1.	Provide copies of intercommunity service agreements entered with an adjoining community, or language that confirms the Council's understanding that the communities reimburse each other for the municipal wastewater charges that each will incur by receiving flow from the adjacent community. Include maps of areas covered by the agreement. The Plan should identify how intercommunity connections being billed for wastewater service, whether by the community receiving the flow or whether the Council should adjust wastewater flow billing for each community.	As noted on page 7-19, Edina has no intercommunity service agreements, only repayment agreements with Eden Prairie, Minneapolis, Richfield and Saint Louis Park. A map of intercommunity agreements and five agreements have been added to Appendix D.	Page 7-19 and Appendix D4
2.	Capacity and design flows for existing trunk sewers and lift stations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For local sanitary sewer lines 12" and larger that connect to a Metropolitan Interceptor, provide the 2040 design flow and pipe capacity for each connecting trunk sewer and lift station. The Plan needs to identify what percentage of the total capacity each pipe will be used by 2040. Table 7.3: Capacity and Design Flow for Existing Trunk Sewer provides "Existing Conditions Daily Mean Flow" but not 2040 projected design flow. It appears that this table was a product of the City's referenced wastewater system model. This table needs to be updated to include the 2040 design flows. • Assignment of 2040 household and employment forecasts by Metropolitan interceptor facility. 	Two maps have been added to the chapter: (1) all pipes >12" and (2) assignments of forecasts by interceptor. A table of existing line capacity and design flows has been added to the appendix. This replaces the former Table 7.3 – since the table was becoming so large, it was decided to move it to the appendix. 2040 design flow and capacity utilization figures are not analogous to the existing and proposed future system because decisions on pipe capacity will be made with ultimate development in mind to align with the life of the infrastructure, not an arbitrary planning date. Planned relief lines and changes to system configuration discussed in the reference documents are still in development.	Figure 7.4 page 7-13, Figure 7.5 page 7-18, and Appendix D1
3.	Describe the requirements and standards in the City 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, 	Added city code language regarding prohibition of discharges and removal of existing connections.	Page 7-27

	<p>and/or rain leaders to the sanitary sewer system or summarize the ordinance restrictions in narrative form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, or provide a narrative in the Plan. 		
4.	<p>Describe the sources, extent, and significance of existing inflow and infiltration (I/I) in both the municipal and private sewer systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a description of the existing sources of I/I in the municipal and private sewer infrastructure. • Include a summary of the extent of the systems that contribute to I/I such as locations, quantities of piping or maintenance holes, quantity of service laterals, or other measures. If an analysis has not been completed, include a schedule and scope of future system analysis. • Identify the percentage of pre-1970 era private services that have been evaluated for I/I susceptibility and repair. • Include the measured or estimated amount of clearwater flow generated from the public municipal and private sewer systems. • Include a cost summary for remediating the I/I sources identified in the City. If previous I/I mitigation work has occurred in the City, include a summary of flow reductions and investments completed. If costs for mitigating I/I have not been analyzed, include the anticipated wastewater service rates or other costs attributed to inflow and infiltration. 	<p>Infiltration and inflow reduction are described in chapter 7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See page 7-26 • See 2013 Infiltration Study reference document added to appendix. Language has been added: We focus on managing sanitary collection system assets to keep them in good repair through our neighborhood reconstruction, and MSA street reconstruction programs. Components of the system are assessed for condition, and appropriate maintenance and repair is conducted. • Added language on page 7-26 and Table 7.4 regarding prevalence of pre 1970 residential properties in the city, referencing map in chapter 3. • Added language on page 7-26 to state that 2016 model recalibration estimates approximately 25% of flow is from infiltration and inflow sources. • Plan page 7-26 mentions 2012, 14, 17 MCEs I&I reduction grant projects. MCEs has data and is available on request. Added language that these estimates demonstrate the pace of implementation for sanitary 	Page 7-26, Table 7.4, Appendix D5

		collection system renewal and I/I reduction work	
5.	Describe the implementation plan for preventing and eliminating excessive inflow and infiltration from entering both the municipal and private sewer systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the strategy for implementing projects, activities, or programs planned to mitigate excessive I/I from entering the municipal and private sewer systems. 	Page 7-26 has specific information on I/I implementation.	Page 7-39
6.	Community Wastewater Treatment and Individual Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan needs to be revised to incorporate text clarifying which party is responsible for SSTS maintenance management program oversight in the City. Hennepin County's 2040 Plan indicates that it oversees SSTS in Edina. • The Plan needs to include a map depicting the parcel location of the properties served solely by SSTS in the City. The Plan indicates that there are "less than 10" individual SSTS and no public or privately-owned Community Wastewater Treatment Systems in operation in the City. However, Hennepin County's 2040 Plan indicates that there are at least 12 SSTS in operation in the City. The Plan needs to reconcile this information with the County and incorporate the correct information in the Plan. Please contact Steve Hack, MCES GIS System Administrator at 651-602-1469 or Steven.Hack@metc.state.mn.us for assistance. 	Added reference to the fact that Hennepin County is responsible for SSTS M&M program. We have reviewed the data with Hennepin County, and our count is revised. Hennepin 12 SSTS count is outdated. A map has been added to the chapter showing the locations	Page 7-24, Figure 7.6

Transportation			
Incomplete Comments			
Number	Comment	Response	Edit Location in the Plan (Document pg #, paragraph, etc.)
1.	The Plan needs to identify the future number of lanes for Principal Arterials and A-Minor Arterials. This could be done in a table or stated in the text.	Additional lanes could possibly be constructed along TH 62 between US 169 and Penn Avenue and along I-494	See the second paragraph under Trunk Highway System Congestion on page 5-47.

		<p>between US 169 and the western abutment of the I-494 Bridge over the Minnesota River. Both of these lane addition projects are currently under study, and no decisions have been made at this time.</p>	
2.	<p>The Plan needs to identify needs for future right-of-way or state that there are no needs.</p>	<p>As stated above, additional lanes may possibly be constructed along TH 62 and I-494. These capacity enhancements are currently under study, and right-of-way requirements for these two projects will be determined as the studies progress.</p> <p>No right of way acquisitions are planned for City streets. As development occurs, however, in the City's Neighborhood Nodes (44th/France, 50th/France, Wooddale/Valley View, 70th/Cahill, and the Southdale District) there may be project-specific roadway improvements that require right of way acquisitions. None of these project-specific improvements (and possible right-of-way acquisitions) would affect Arterials or A-Minor Arterials.</p> <p>Future roadway capacity enhancements (a surrogate for future right of way needs) are discussed on page 5-35 in the first paragraph under Future</p>	<p>This issue has already been addressed on page 5-35 in the first paragraph under Future Roadways and in the first paragraph on page 5-51.</p>

		Roadways. As discussed, the City is not planning to add lanes to any streets at this point. More directly, it is stated in the first paragraph on page 5-51 that the City does not anticipate needing additional right of way.	
Advisory Comments			
1.	<p>Please consider updating the information in Table 5.1 on page 5-9, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace “Eden Prairie” with “Minnetonka” in the description to the right of Route 46. Metro Transit does not operate bus routes into Eden Prairie. • Remove reference to evening service in the description to the right of Route 537, as this route stops running at 6:30 pm. 	Text was updated as requested.	See revised Table 5.1 on page 5-10
2.	<p>Please consider updating the transit map shown in Figure 5.4 on page 5-11, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no park-and-ride near Tracy Avenue and Highway 62. The only park- and-ride facility in the City of Edina is at Southdale. • As of 2019, there is no bus service on Lincoln Drive north of Bren Road/Londonderry just east of Highway 169. Please remove this segment of Route 146 on the map. 	The map was updated as requested.	See revised Figure 5.4 on page 5-11.
3.	<p>Please describe the levels of transit service that are associated with the transit market areas that cover Edina. The Plan can incorporate the following language from the System Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit Market Area II has high to moderately high population and employment densities and typically has a traditional street grid comparable to Market Area 1. Much of Market Area II is also categorized as an Urban Center and it can support many of the same types of fixed-route transit as Market Area I, although usually at lower frequencies or shorter service spans. • Transit Market Area III has moderate density but tends to have a less traditional street grid that can limit the effectiveness of transit. It is typically Urban with large portions of Suburban and Suburban Edge communities. Transit service in this area is primarily commuter express bus service with some fixed-route local service providing basic coverage. General public dial-a-ride services are available where fixed-route service is not viable. 	The text was updated as requested.	See where this language has been inserted on page 5-9 in the second and third paragraphs under Transit.

Land Use			
Incomplete Comments			
Number	Comment	Response	Edit Location in the Plan (Document pg #, paragraph, etc.)
1.	The Plan needs to incorporate a higher resolution image for Figure 3.12: Future Land Use. Please contact your sector representative for guidance.	A higher resolution image has been added to the plan	Figure 3.12 page 3-26
2.	Table 3.6: Future Land Use Categories needs to identify an expected residential development percentage for Regional Medical. It appears from the calculations in Table 3.12 that this percentage should be 50%.	Added reference to mixed use % residential as requested	Table 3.6 page 3-31
3.	Table 3.6 needs to be revised to include minimum and maximum densities for each iteration of the Neighborhood Node designation. The designation at 70th/Cahill has a density range of 10-50 units/acre, which is used in calculations for Table 3.12: Staged Development or Redevelopment. However, the designation at Wooddale/Valley View has no minimum (up to 30 units/acre) while the designation at 44th & France has no maximum (12 units/acre and up). Upon revision, these designations need to be consistent with calculations in Table 3.6 and with legend notations in Figure 3.12.	Updated density ranges to 12-30 du/acre for Wooddale Valley View and 12-60 du/acre for 50 th & France. There is no need to redo calculations for development staging because minimum density for neighborhood nodes is unchanged at 10 du/acre.	Table 3.6 page 3-29
4.	The footnote in Table 3.12 related to mixed-use acreage needs to be more explicit. This can be done by making a reference to the percentages identified in Table 3.6 and the gross acreage identified in Table 3.7.	Added reference to the two tables as requested	Table 3.12 page 3-38
Advisory Comments			
1.	The existing land use of Railway (Canadian Pacific Railway) (described on page 3-12) is not represented on Figure 3.3: Existing Land Use.	The small amount of railway shown on the map extent is outside Edina city limits, running through Hopkins. The rail line in the city is not called out as a separate use on the map. To avoid confusion, it has been removed from the map and the text.	Figure 3.3 page 3-9 and page 3-12
2.	The legend of Figure 3.12: Future Land Use does not include the guiding land use of Limited Access Highway (LAH), which is included in Table 3.6.	For consistency, the reference to this category has been deleted from the table	Table 3.6 page 3-32

Housing			
Incomplete Comments			
Number	Comment	Proposed Response	Edit Location in the Plan (Document pg #, paragraph, etc.)
1.	The Plan needs to acknowledge the correct affordable housing need allocation. The correct Need, provided to the City at the time of a forecast change in late 2018, is 751 units affordable at or below 30% of area median income (AMI), 480 units affordable between 31 and 50% AMI, and 573 units affordable between 51 and 80% AMI for a total of 1,804. The information in Table 4.4 and text references on pages 4- 20 through 4-23 are outdated.	Updated affordable housing need allocation to reflect revised numbers	Table 4.4 and pages 4-20 to 4-23
2.	To be consistent with Council housing policy, the Plan needs to guide enough land expected to develop during the 2021-2030 timeframe to meet the City's allocation of affordable housing need. It appears that the Plan does this. However, the Plan needs to address incomplete items discussed above under Land Use related to density ranges and percentage residential.	The above-referenced items have been addressed	See Land Use section
3.	To be consistent with Council housing policy, the Plan needs to consider all widely accepted tools listed in the Local Planning Handbook to address their housing needs. The Plan does not address one widely accepted housing tool: Housing Improvement Areas.	Add housing improvement areas to tools described in the plan.	Table 4.7 page 4-30

Water Supply			
Incomplete Comments			
Number	Comment	Proposed Response	Edit Location in the Plan (Document pg #, paragraph, etc.)
1.	The Plan needs to incorporate the City's Local Water Supply Plan (LWSP) template as an attachment. The City prepared a Local Water Supply Plan (LWSP) that was submitted the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) in November 2018 and forwarded to the Council in December 2019. Please be advised that this LWSP needs to be revised to incorporate revised population forecasts for 2020, 2030, and 2040.	An updated water supply plan has been added to the appendix	Appendix D12