

**Second Generation Plan Committee Meeting Minutes  
Bassett Creek Water Management Commission  
November 15, 1999**

**A. Attendance:** Ron Quanbeck (chair), Mike Rardin, Bill Deblon, Charlie LeFevere, Jim Herbert, Karen Chandler

**B. Agenda:**

1. Committee Responsibilities and Today's Objectives
2. Committee membership/Continuity
3. Report on Facilitators - Charlie LeFever
4. Plan Requirements/Public Input Process
5. BWSR Letter
6. Timeline/Tasks
7. Status of Water Quality Planning
8. Planning Process: How it has worked with other WMOs?

**C. Committee Responsibilities and Today's Objectives**

This subcommittee was formed by the Bassett Creek Water Management Commission to put together a public information program, suggest means to manage the Water Quality Management Plan and the Second Generation Plan, and provide a method of prioritizing the capital improvement process. To date, the majority of the Water Quality Management Plan is complete. The second generation plan deadline is 2001.

The committee will proceed to set up a plan time table and look at the type of facilitator(s) needed to help implement the process. The Commission may want facilitator recommendations and facilitator responsibilities decided by this committee.

**D. Committee Membership/Continuity**

The group discussed the continuity of the group with respect to the new law requiring nonstaff members be appointed to the Commission and how this will affect the group? If the Commission agrees, the committee can continue to meet with the current members. The commissioners and alternate commissioners of Plymouth and St. Louis Park will continue to serve until their terms are ended in 2002.

After the planning process starts, the plan will take on a life of its own. The committee will meet as necessary or directed by the Commission. The engineering staff will continue to be involved as the process begins.

**E. Report on Facilitators**

The Commission must decide what role will a facilitator play in the process?

?? Organize certain aspects of the process

?? Personal qualifications will drive facilitator's responsibilities (project manager? mediator?)

?? Arrange for, prepare, and convene public meetings

?? Bring credibility to the process

?? The Commission may want a facilitator to suggest meeting times, etc.

BWSR provided Charlie with names of individuals who have experience in this type of process.

Karen's experience includes working on second generation plans for other WMOs and Karen has facilitated citizen advisory committee meetings for two JPAs. She just finished work on the second generation plan for the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District. Karen said the facilitator does not need to be involved in the entire process and suggests the Commission decide the path the plan process will take early (i.e., what stage to include citizen involvement).

As part of the preparation of the City of Robbinsdale's local plan, Robbinsdale hired a facilitator and invited city residents to attend a large vision meeting. After the citizens meeting, Robbinsdale staff worked with a citizens task force using the vision statement.

A good facilitator will draw out the people at the meeting and a facilitator may be helpful to the Commission when deciding prioritization of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Ron thought it would be helpful to have a facilitator in the visionary process.

#### **F. Plan Requirements/Public Input Process**

The second-generation plan will include the water quality management plan.

Key issues in the process are dollars available to spend and prioritization of the capital improvements program.

Karen said it is helpful to develop a vision statement early in the process and present concrete recommendations to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to help formulate realistic expectations and give the CAC direction in discussions. An example was given regarding one watershed district that started the process by setting up a citizens advisory committee, but did not have a vision for the plan established at the beginning which delayed the planning process.

The Citizens Advisory Committee is just one methodology to use. In some cases, it will not be appropriate to involve citizens for input. After the interested stakeholders are identified, the Commission can decide where and when to solicit their input in the process. It is not efficient for a citizens advisory committee to redo what has already been accomplished

BWSR is looking for public participation, which could include a meeting or some type of forum for citizens to voice their concerns. BWSR is looking to work with WMOs to do something meaningful in the area of citizen involvement versus just doing what is required according to the law. BWSR is looking for more citizen participation to be added to the staff and engineering input to embellish the process.

Stakeholder involvement will depend on what method is best suited for the process (identify stakeholders and how to involve those stakeholders following the CAC model).

Mike has worksheets that can be used as a tool to determine quickly a stakeholder's fit in the process.

## **G. BWSR Timeline**

The BWSR timeline consists of seven tasks:

Task 1 Work Plan, Roles and Budget

Task 2 Public Involvement

Task 3 Inventory and Assessment

Task 4 Identify Problems and Opportunities and Develop Goals and Policies

Task 5 Develop Implementation Program

Task 6 Draft Watershed Management Plan

Task 7 Plan Review Process

On BWSR's timeline, item 2.1.6 under Task 2, public involvement extends through the entire process. More subtasks may be identified as the process continues. The committee agrees the timeline is too generic to define public involvement at this time.

The BWSR timeline does not include problems identified along the way. The committee agrees the plan product may not come out of the first few meetings and that the vision process may go on for months. A timeline can then be set up with identifiable work products necessary.

## **H. General Discussion**

The vision process is important and the public needs to be involved. The committee agrees something needs to be provided for the public to give the group focus (water quality, stormwater runoff water quality, flooding issues, etc.). Karen added that in a typical 2-hour meeting involving citizens, it is easier to organize around a topic.

Bill emphasized the importance of establishing guiding principles (vision) to help give the citizens group direction. A facilitator will be helpful in the visionary process.

The committee will first identify the stakeholders before deciding the public participation in the overall plan process. The role of the stakeholders may change as the process unfolds and the different areas to address are identified (i.e., lake homeowners associations, regulatory agencies, etc.). The committee agreed to invite the member cities to suggest stakeholders and compile the list from those suggestions.

What should be done first? The vision or work plan? Are these parallel? The BWSR time line does not identify enough detail. A work plan may take out some of the complexity of the process. The work plan would tie into the vision of what is being done, and identify what the Commission and stakeholders would do.

The Minnesota Rules (Chapter 8410) list the plan requirements. An outline of the rules will help focus on what needs to be done.

Because of how a Joint Powers organization is set up, the cities will eventually pay for the improvements. Charlie said the deliverable in this case would be the financing of the

capital improvement plan. He suggests this process include a facilitator with mediator skills to work with the cities to produce buy-in of the overall prioritization process.

Mike agrees the facilitator needs to have dispute-mediation skills. Mike thinks a facilitator will be necessary to attend the Commission meeting when the prioritization process begins so that Peter Enck can be freed from his responsibilities as chair of the Commission to participate in his capacity as commissioner representing the City of New Hope.

Bill added that the message be cleared stated to the stakeholders that government can't do it all. The facts (including amount of money available) need to be presented to the stakeholders as well as communicating that the prioritization of the CIP is according to importance and benefit to the entire watershed.

Barr prepared a first cut of the prioritization process for the capital improvements plan with estimated costs and included the memo in the meeting packet for discussion at the Commission November 18, 1999 meeting. Mike suggests that action taken by the Commission at the November 18 meeting be to accept the draft CIP prepared by Barr and ask that it be filed for future reference. Jim added the CIP memo is only a draft and agrees the Commission needs to continue the course and refine the vision statement with where the process is heading.

To make the process manageable, Charlie suggests telling the story of Bassett Creek watershed by summarizing what the Commission has accomplished and present to the CAC with the qualifying statement that what is presented is subject to evaluation and not all improvements will be done. Ron added this would be an opportunity to educate the public with the Commission's process.

Once the stakeholders are identified, where will the meetings be held?

The water quality plans and their CIP will be discussed at a later date. Projects can continue and do not need to decide on the CIP at this time.

## **I. BWSR Letter**

BWSR's letter dated September 24, 1999, regarding Second Generation Bassett Creek Watershed Management Plan gives plan requirements and suggested items that BWSR would also like to be see included in second generation plans. The group needs to go through the letter item-by-item. Karen said she is not sure it needs a formal response from the Commission. The group agreed it needs discussion and will be tabled until the next meeting.

## **J. Summary**

- ?? Identify the stakeholders and determine the scope of stakeholder involvement. Look at different ways to connect with all stakeholders and include involvement during entire process.
- ?? Prepare an outline of BWSR rules
- ?? Prepare Timeline-specific to the Commission
- ?? Determine visionary process that the Commission should go through

- ?? Determine the need and, if necessary, identify the facilitator (if desired the facilitator can assist with the visionary process).
- ?? Finalize the CIP and determine how to pay for it.

**K. Action items:**

**November 18, 1999 Commission Meeting**

- ?? Barr will prepare preliminary list of know stakeholders for distribution at Commission meeting.
- ?? Commission shall discuss identification of stakeholders.
- ?? Mike will circulate the stakeholder worksheets with the members of the committee to look at before the November 18 Commission meeting.

**December 13, 1999 Committee Meeting:**

- ?? Barr will provide examples of vision statements from previous second generation plan processes to view.
- ?? Discuss identity of stakeholders with the cities
- ?? Provide a sample second generation plan to look at by the group and maybe provide at a later date for the Commissioners to look at to get a feel for how much work goes into this type of plan.
- ?? Revise timeline for review
- ?? Prepare a summary or schedule of concerns to help identify what role the facilitator will be or who it will be.

**Future Meeting**

- ?? Review of BWSR preliminary rules and coordinate with time line.
- ?? A more detailed work plan will be prepared to tie the deliverables with the time line and stakeholders and how to plug them into the whole process.
- ?? Identify facilitator roles with different facilitator

The following agenda items will be carried over to the next committee meeting set for Monday, December 13, at 11:00 a.m., at Barr's office:

- ?? BWSR Letter (continued)
- ?? Timeline/Tasks
- ?? Status of Water Quality Planning
- ?? Planning Process: How it has worked with other WMOs?