

DRAFT
Second Generation Plan CAG Meeting Minutes
Bassett Creek Water Management Commission
May 21, 2001

A. Attendance: John O'Toole (chair), Rita Nystrom, Alan Kuentz, Karen Cheseborough, Ron Struss, Al Lundstrom, Lynn Schwartz, Sue Weinberg, Mark Oestreich, Margie Vigoren (attended for Helen LaFave), Karen Chandler

B. Agenda

1. Primary Responsibilities of the Citizens Advisory Group
2. Preliminaries
3. Discussion of Major Issues (restated)
4. Next Month's Agenda

C. Meeting Handouts

- Revised Meeting Agenda
- CAG Questions and Answers (from April 23, 2001 meeting)
- Eco-Yard Demonstration Site (information taken from Hennepin County Environmental Services website)

D. Primary Responsibilities of the Citizens Advisory Group

Overall primary responsibilities:

1. Develop a program to involve citizens in BCWMC activities and inform the public of BCWMC programs, goals, and activities.
 2. Review and comment on the Technical Advisory Group's proposed method to measure the success/progress of the BCWMC and the member cities in meeting the goals of the BCWMC plan (annual review/report).
- *At this meeting* we will discuss the issues that are most important for the BCWMC to communicate and the desired behavior changes, which will form the basis for the CAG's development of the public involvement/education program.

E. Preliminaries

- CAG Chair O'Toole convened the meeting at 4:30 p.m. with a brief overview of the agenda and primary responsibilities and goals for today's meeting. Mr. O'Toole asked for comments or corrections to the April 23, 2001 CAG meeting minutes. The group offered none.
- Ms. Nystrom distributed a letter to Chair O'Toole and the group from Jan Olfe, President of South Rice Lake Association, for consideration by the Bassett Creek Water Management Commission. The South Rice Lake Association is concerned that the South Rice Pond area is not as high a priority in the Commission's capital improvement program as the association would like. South Rice Pond is shared between Golden Valley and Robbinsdale. Ms. Nystrom also distributed a recent newspaper article called "Making a Plea for the Sake of the Lake." Mr. O'Toole sympathizes with the association; however, the consensus of the Commission reached at its May 17th meeting was to not contribute toward this project at this time. The Commission currently does not have guidelines to authorize funds toward projects such as this. South Rice Pond is also one of the capital improvement projects that will be discussed during the

Second Generation Plan process. A consequence of this fund request was at a subsequent Commission 2002 budget meeting, a line item called Demonstration Projects was created and criteria will be developed in how to appropriate those funds before 2002.

- Ms. Nystrom also discussed a video created by the Master Gardners from the University of Minnesota Extension Services called, “Every Curb is a Shoreline.” Ms. Nystrom will bring copies to the next CAG meeting. Golden Valley would like a copy to show at its open house in June.
- Ms. Chandler pointed out information retrieved from the Hennepin County Environmental Services website describing its Eco-Yard Demonstration Site located in Brooklyn Park.
- Q&A (answers to questions from the April 23rd meeting). Ms. Chandler gave an oral discussion of Barr’s involvement in the General Mills, Inc. proposed continuation of their once-through cooling system and a possible conflict of interest between General Mills, Inc., the BCWMC, the City of Golden Valley, and Barr Engineering Company. After review and discussion by the Steering Committee, the committee concluded there was not a conflict of interest and decided to direct the BCWMC attorney to prepare a statement defining conflicts of interest and an ethics statement to be included in the BCWMC joint powers agreement and bylaws.

F. Discussion of Major Issues (restated)

At a previous meeting, some CAG members thought the Major Issues needed more time for discussion to help define the communication necessary for the target audiences. The members attending today’s meeting were willing to accept the Technical Advisory Group’s ranking of the issues. The TAG ranked the following issues in order of importance: water quality, wetlands/natural resources, and erosion and sediment control. The agencies represented on the TAG had similar rankings in that they saw water quality and WMO and city responsibility as equal in importance, and wetlands/natural resources as being next in importance.

The group agreed the focus of the CAG is to educate the public on the major issues and unless there was disagreement with how the TAG ranked the issues, they would move ahead. The group dialogued about their role in developing a public education and involvement plan using the Major Issues.

Comment: Does the group assume that the major issues selected by the TAG constitute the Commission’s programs, goals, and activities, or does the Commission determine something different than the TAG?

Comment [Karen Chandler]: The TAG has the charge to address the technical issues and part of that will be goal setting; however, the Commission may add to the process.

The CAG began with the water quality and recreation, fish and wildlife issues. What behavior changes are necessary and what is most important affecting those issues?

An average citizen might ask: “Who’s Responsible?” “What are they doing?” “What have they done?” “Where’s the trends?” “Have they done nothing and intend to do less in the future?” “Who is ‘they’?”

Comment [Alan Kuentz]: I’m an average citizen and I just care about keeping the water clean. I want to know “what can I do to impact the resources.” I think this group needs to change those attitudes and emphasize the issue of what can a citizen do versus how BCWMC works, etc.

Comment [Alan Kuentz ??]: Going back to the primary responsibility of the CAG where we are to develop a program to involve citizens in BCWMC activities. Are the activities of the BCWMC to do projects and spend money?

Comment [Chair O’Toole]: In addition to those things, the Commission reviews projects within the watershed and its effects on the water quality and makes recommendations that will either improve and/or secure the water quality resources.

In regard to the water quality issue, Chair O'Toole suggested the group consider the effect phosphorus and sedimentation have on the quality of water.

Comment [Rita Nystrom]: We need to determine where we are effective.

Ms. Chandler referred to Ron Struss's comment made at the last CAG meeting that education does not necessarily mean more information, but modeling the message and face-to-face education along with the information is effective.

Comment [Al Lundstrom]: Educating the public about the Commission could be effective by informing them that the WMO is spending money on improving the lakes and streams where they live.

Comment: Many of the member communities of BCWMC have stormwater and surface water management plans that contain their own capital improvement programs. What will the Commission do that is different from the recommendations by the cities?

Comment [Al Lundstrom, employee with City of Golden Valley]: Golden Valley is watching the decisions made concerning the Commission's prioritization of the capital improvement program and how those improvements will be funded.

Comment [Ron Struss]: Possible issues talked about today are phosphorus, sediment, toxics, and bacteria. Should these water quality issues be brought back to the TAG? What are the problems so that the education program can be built around them? Is this the CAG's responsibility to identify the problems? Do we go back to the TAG and ask them to identify the hot issues for lakes and the hot issues for streams?

Comment [Karen Chandler]: These problems have been identified in the lake management plans completed by the Commission. For example, phosphorus was identified because it affects a whole water body. Bacteria tend to be localized with a more temporary effect and not something considered in the plans. Erosion problems were addressed because it can occur as part of the natural process or accelerated through development practices.

Comment [Al Lundstrom]: Most cities have some type of grading, drainage, and erosion control ordinance in place. Shoreline stabilization is addressed with individual property owners.

Comment: One thing I heard over and over again at a recent water quality conference regarding education was to establish focus groups (i.e., interviews) making sure that the plan does not only contain the Commission's ideas.

Comment [Al Lundstrom]: I propose that this group recommend to the Commission that a liaison group or person be established that works with the nine cities and combine water resources and communication.

The CAG agreed on the following:

- The CAG agreed the issues ranked most important by the TAG (water quality; recreation, fish & wildlife; wetlands/natural resources; and erosion and sediment control) are the issues to begin with.
- Determine the problems and sources of problems needed to communicate to the public. The public needs to be convinced there is a problem before moving toward solution. They need to know what they need to care about. Determine key messages.
- Determine interest groups or audience types being communicated to (i.e., businesses, residents living on lakeshore or wetlands, townhouse owners, etc.).
- Determine how education efforts will be coordinated by the member cities and the Commission. May need to consider the use of a communications coordinator to deliver the message coming from the Commission and local sources.

- Determine local and federal requirements and possible changes to be considered to accomplish end solutions.
- Consider repeating a theme of education throughout the member cities.
- The CAG is the group that goes back to the Commission with the recommendation to establish an education plan and how that plan will look.
- The Second Generation Plan will include quantifiable goals.

Questions and concerns brought up by the CAG:

- The CAG is looking for clearer definition from the Commission concerning what it wants the CAG to accomplish. Is it to develop an education program and messages to communicate or is the CAG expected to communicate the process to the Commission?
- What is the message the education plan is to communicate? Is it to tell people about what the Commission is doing or to inform people what they can do to clean up water?
- Are there good examples of plans that include an education component that the CAG can review?
- Has the Commission identified citizen behavior that is seen as a problem that the Commission would like to change or does this group come up with the behaviors that need to be changed?
- What is the budget? The amount of budget earmarked for public education and involvement will determine the extent of effort for a comprehensive education plan. Where will the funds come from?
- Will the education plan be used as a boiler plate for the member cities to communicate to their citizens or is this something the Commission will use?

Action items:

- The CAG requested examples of education plans included in similar reports. Ms. Chandler will provide to the CAG at their next meeting.
- Ms. Chandler will bring examples and associated costs (Clean Water Partnership Chain of Lakes and the City of Minneapolis prepared in 1997 or 1998).
- Ms. Chandler will bring back concrete, technical information in relation to the water quality issues (i.e., where are the pollution sources that are in the watershed) to help the group understand how to communicate the behavior change.
- Ms. Chandler will bring “Getting in Step” forms to the next meeting.

Mr. Struss distributed handouts of “Water Education Resource,” social marketing, and examples of Como Lake public education signs (“Our storm sewers drain to Como Lake” and encouraging leaf pickup).

G. Next Meeting and Agenda

- June 25, 2001, 4:30 p.m., City of Golden Valley, City Council Conference Room
- Begin developing public education/involvement program

Note: Agenda will be somewhat open to discuss questions raised by group members at today’s meeting.