

Bassett Creek Water Management Commission Work Session – Second Generation Plan Thursday, September 7, 2000

The Bassett Creek Water Management Commission held a work session to discuss the Second Generation Planning Process Handbook. The meeting began at 12:15 p.m. and was conducted by Ron Quanbeck, chair of the Second Generation Plan Committee.

Although a roll call was not taken, the following Commissioners/Alternate Commissioners and staff were present:

Crystal	Tom Mathisen	Counsel:	Charlie LeFevere
Golden Valley:	David Hanson	Engineer:	Len Kremer
	Bob Mayeron	Recorder:	Pat Schutrop
Medicine Lake	John O'Toole		
Minneapolis:	Not represented		
Minnetonka:	Lee Gustafson		
New Hope:	Guy Johnson		
Plymouth:	Ron Quanbeck		
Robbinsdale:	Bill Deblon		
St. Louis Park:	Mike Rardin		

Also present:

Karen Chandler, Barr Engineering Company
Judy Sventek, Metropolitan Council
Doug Snyder, MN Board of Water and Soil Resources

Workshop Agenda

- Handbook concept and general format. Does the Commission agree it is on track with what the Commission envisioned?
- Review of individual sections for consistency with the Commission initiatives for the plan.
- Identify any needed revisions to the handbook. Revised handbook will be presented to the Commission for adoption at its September 21, 2000 meeting. If the Commission adopts the draft handbook, it will be sent to the stakeholders for review and comment.

Introduction

The handbook outlines the process for the Second Generation Plan and public involvement. The Second Generation Plan Committee involved commissioners Ron Quanbeck (chair), Mike Rardin, Bill Deblon, Mike Welch, and Lee Gustafson. The handbook consists of: an Introduction (summarizes what, why, and how the Commission is going to prepare its Second Generation Water Management Plan), the Notice of Watershed Planning, Major Issues, Draft Purpose and Strategy, Work Plan, Shareholder Involvement Process and Appendices consisting of background information (i.e., historical roles and responsibilities, joint powers agreement, statutes and rules, and agency correspondence). Most sections include a one-page summary. The handbook also includes a version date in the footer of the document. To facilitate pages added or replaced, periodic updates will be distributed to handbook recipients.

Below is a discussion of the plan by the commissioners, representatives of BWSR and the Met Council, and the Second Generation Plan Committee.

Overall Concept

The Commission agreed that handbook is helpful in understanding the direction of the process. Mr. Snyder agreed that the handbook will help organize how BWSR can help the Commission put together a plan that will be acceptable to all parties. The Work Plan is helpful in knowing what is occurring now and in the next year. Ms. Sventek added that the handbook will be useful information for the advisory groups.

Mr. Snyder was not sure who the stakeholder list included and would like to see that information presented early in the process for the agencies' information. Although the list needs further definition, especially with stakeholders identified by the member cities, a copy of the notification list can be added to the Stakeholder section of the handbook.

Organizations that Mr. Snyder has worked with and have had successful advisory committees, have solicited people they know will participate. He used Carver County as an example where they established a Water and Natural Environment Committee and the County identified those individuals as the citizens advisory committee. Ms. Sventek also said there are people in the communities and agencies that may be interested in participating, but they need to know which advisory group to be involved in.

As a new commissioner, Mr. Johnson thought the handbook was very informational and educational. The outline format made it understandable and easy to grasp. Commissioners O'Toole, Mathisen, and Hanson thought the handbook was good. Mr. Hanson expressed concern about the use of the information from the lake and watershed management plans already prepared by the Commission and how that information will be used in the second generation plan. Mr. Kremer pointed out that the second generation plan work tasks calls for reviewing the lake and watershed management plans.

Notice of Watershed Planning

This notice was the first mailing and was sent out in March 2000. The Notice was used to inform the public of the beginning process of the Commission's Second Generation Plan and to solicit participation. The initial stakeholder list was formed from responses to that notice. Member cities and agencies were automatically considered stakeholders. The list of stakeholders will most likely change throughout the process.

Major Issues

The list of Major Issues is a draft list and is viewed as an ongoing and evolving document through the entire process. As a starting point, a summary of major issues was identified. The issues are further identified according to three areas: regulatory requirements; recommendations from other agencies; and issues identified by citizens, commissioners, and cities. The list of issues will continue to grow as the process proceeds. The member communities may identify additional issues from their local water management plans that are considered local or regional for discussion in the planning process.

Draft Purpose and Strategy

The Draft Purpose and Strategy is the goal and foundation to the process. The committee tried to develop a basic statement of what has changed since the Commission began, what the Commission is about now, and how the Commission will look in the future. This section is helpful for those unfamiliar with the Commission. Commissioners are encouraged to show the draft purpose and strategy to their city's planning commission, city councils, etc. The statement is viewed as the guiding light in defining the process.

The committee anticipated some issues that affect the policies and the past roles and responsibilities (i.e., maintenance issue).

Specifically, Mr. Snyder asked how the assessment of wetlands (wetland management, page 8) will be done. Wetlands have both a local and a regional function. If wetland assessments are done at a municipal level, what will the value or function provide to the whole system? Mr. Snyder agrees with the Commission's stand to not permit or enforce, but the Commission should set the standard based on the watershed-wide analysis with the expectations that the set standards be kept. Mr. Snyder also agrees that enforcement be carried out by the local municipality. Overall, the current wording for Wetland Management meets BWSR's concerns; however, Mr. Snyder suggested clarifying roles and responsibilities identified with the issues.

Although the wetland function and value assessment is recommended on the Major Issues section, page 4, item #10, Mr. Snyder will provide a bulleted response concerning his assessment of the wetland management to help clarify the recommendation.

Referencing her letter addressed to Mr. Peter Enck dated December 9, 1999, Ms. Sventek said it addressed the wetland management issue; however, the complete letter concerning this discussion was not included in the Agency Correspondence section of the handbook. The complete letter will be mailed out with other additional or replacement pages for the handbook.

Work Plan

The work plan consists of:

- A summary page, including plan emphasis and the Work Plan outline
- Two charts (Planning Process Organizational Structure and Planning Process Flowchart)
- The Work Tasks

The draft Work Plan is the structure of the plan. It defines how we will proceed and the responsibilities that help guide the plan. Included in the Work Plan are two flowcharts. The Planning Process Organizational Structure and the Planning Process Flowchart are the structure the committee is recommending the process follow. A Steering Committee would act as a project manager to direct the process and report back to the Commission. The Steering Committee would also guide and set the agenda for the three advisory groups (Citizens Advisory Group, Technical Advisory Group, and Policy Advisory Group). The organizational structure also shows the primary focus for each group and suggested members. The Planning Process Flowchart maps out specific responsibilities for each of the group and shows the relationship between the groups. The Work Tasks and subsequent subtasks correspond to the Organizational Structure and Major Issues.

Mr. Mathisen asked about the Steering Committee being chaired by the Commission chair and the advisory groups that are recommended to be chaired by commissioners/alternate commissioners. What will happen when Commission terms are complete (terms for Minneapolis, Minnetonka, and New Hope end in January 2001) and those commissioners/alternate commissioners are assigned to chair positions on the advisory groups? Mr. Quanbeck thought even though a commissioner/alternate is selected to chair an advisory group while their term ends, the Commission may want to consider retaining them in the advisory group chair position. The idea is that the members on the Steering Committee would be familiar with the planning process and could maintain some continuity of the advisory groups back to the Commission. Mr. Gustafson expressed interest in being considered to participate in the Policy Advisory Group after his term ends in January 2001.

To encourage participation by both the commissioner and alternate commissioner, "Commissioners or Alternates" will be added to the Planning Process Organizational Structure flowchart.

Ms. Clancy asked if the Commission will have operating guidelines for each advisory group (i.e., recording minutes, complying with open meeting law, etc.). This was discussed later at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Clancy asked if the capital improvement program referred to in subtask 8.1 is where the financial obligations of the cities will be discussed or is it a discussion of a capital improvement program for projects fully funded by the Commission? Task 8.0 refers to capital improvement program affecting both the Commission and the cities and the funding issues with the program.

Mr. Snyder said the use of a Policy Advisory Group proposed by the Commission is the first time he has seen this type of group proposed. He thinks it's a good idea to help bring definition to the Commission's future role and in completing the plan process. Ms. Sventek also liked the idea of the three groups proposed and suggested that the group chairs keep the other groups updated with their activities. The meeting minutes from each advisory group could serve this purpose.

Work Tasks

The Commission discussed the need for operating guidelines for the advisory groups. Should the guidelines be a task or should they be included in one of the tasks shown? Mr. LeFevre suggested that the Steering Committee direct the advisory groups with any instructions or guidelines for operation. The Commission agreed that, as part of their charge, the Steering Committee would develop and administer the operating procedures for the advisory groups.

Mr. Gustafson read through the main tasks and noted public involvement is a subtask under tasks 3.0 through 8.0. The advisory groups may decide to expand some of the tasks.

Stakeholder Involvement Process

The Stakeholder Involvement document is a direct outgrowth of the Work Plan. At the beginning of the process, a number of stakeholders were identified. Those groups or individuals responding to the Notice of Watershed Planning are also included on the list of stakeholders. The stakeholder process is broken down in seven sections: Commission Workshops, Public Meetings/Hearings with Stakeholders, Citizens Advisory Group, Policy Advisory Group, Technical Advisory Group, Information to Stakeholders (list of mailings, website), and Agency Involvement. Also attached is a public involvement calendar.

A number of Commission workshops are identified with outcomes proposed. Mr. Deblon asked about adding key dates September 21 (adoption of handbook and chair nominations for the advisory groups) and November 16 (ratify chair appointments for the advisory groups). Although these dates are where action will be taken, they do not fit for the purpose of scheduling Commission workshops.

There will be three groups (Policy Advisory Group, Technical Advisory Group, and Citizens Advisory Group) where a number of initiatives (i.e., water quality improvements identified) will be accomplished simultaneously. Mr. LeFevre noted that the Policy Advisory Group is where the cities will mainly be involved. The cities should carefully consider who they would like to be on this group. A number of CAG meetings are projected with the first Public Notice of Open Forum is scheduled for November 1.

Upcoming Action Dates:

- September 8 Public Notice of Open Forum mailing
- September 21 Adoption of Draft Planning Process Handbook and formal motion to send the handbook out to the stakeholders identified. Nominate advisory group chairs [This is the Commission’s regular monthly meeting and it will also be a watershed tour. The Commission will hold a 15-minute business meeting at the start of the tour.]
- September 22 Draft Planning Process Handbook (with cover letter) mailed to city managers and stakeholders.
- October 19 Regular Commission meeting. Ratify advisory group chairs.
- November 1 First Open Public Forum at the City of Golden Valley
- Week of November 6 Steering Committee will make recommendations on advisory group members.
- November 16 Ratify the advisory group members and distribute tasks to the group chairs so that the groups can move forward.

Mr. LeFevere will prepare a cover letter to be included with the handbook when it is submitted to the cities that will include specific timeframes for information requested by the Commission.

Public Notice of Open Forum

A draft Public Notice of Open Forum was presented for comment to the commissioners. The open forum is scheduled for November 1, 2000, at the City of Golden Valley. The Commission was in agreement with the November 1 public meeting date. With no further comments received, the notice will be mailed out on September 8, 2000.

Meeting adjourned: 2:20 p.m.