

**Second Generation Plan Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**Bassett Creek Water Management Commission**  
**December 13, 1999**

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

**B. Agenda:**

1. Today's Objectives
2. Stakeholder Discussion
3. Facilitator Discussion (continued)
4. Plan Requirements/Public Input Process
5. BWSR Letter (continued)
6. Time Line/Tasks (revised)
7. Planning Process: How it has worked with other WMOs

**C. Meeting Handouts**

1. Revised Draft Time Line (dated 12/7/99)
2. Lower Minnesota River Watershed District Statement of Vision and Purpose
3. Black Dog Watershed Management Commission Statement of Vision and Purpose
4. Lower Mississippi River Watershed Management Organization Statement of Vision and Purpose
5. Minutes of 11/15/99 Committee Meeting
6. Potential Stakeholders: City of Golden Valley
7. 10-Step Approach to Public Involvement (used by the City of St. Louis Park)
8. City of Robbinsdale Comprehensive Plan Vision 20/20
9. Lower Minnesota River, Nine Mile Creek, and Riley-Purgatory Creek Bluff Creek watershed districts' watershed management plans

**D. Today's Objectives**

Comments on the November 15 committee minutes: Peter Enck arranged a meeting with Lee Gustafson, Fred Moore, and Len Kremer to discuss the prioritization of capital improvements in the planning process and the prioritization table prepared by Barr that was included in the Commission's November 18, 1999 meeting packet. After reviewing the draft table, the group decided it did not include enough background information to justify conclusions reached. They also decided the prioritization issue needs to be worked on separately and to move ahead with the projects started by some of the member cities as a result of their local plans and their alignment with the Commission's individual watershed plans. One of the reasons for moving ahead is because of citizen involvement in some of the projects and expectations for completion as a result of those meetings.

Mike added one drawback to moving ahead with the prioritization process prior to member city involvement is the funding issue. Ron believes that the prioritization process can move ahead, but the funding process will need more feedback. It's possible that the Commission's relationship with Dean Barkley may help to identify funding sources.

The committee consensus is that this is a discussion item for the entire Commission and it will be brought up for discussion at the December 16 Commission meeting. A new draft of the prioritization table including more background data was included in the meeting packet for the commissioners to review for the December 16 meeting.

## **E. Stakeholder Discussion**

Discussion is ongoing concerning identifying stakeholders and evaluating when to involve them in the process. Barr prepared a memo categorizing groups who may be interested in being involved in the process. The groups identified are WMOs, municipalities, neighborhood and lake organizations, nature centers, and other agencies. Karen asked if groups like the Friends of the Mississippi River or the National Mississippi River Recreational Area should be included. Although their interest is not to a specific area in the watershed, they may have interests specific to the water draining into the Mississippi River or bluff areas.

Additional groups discussed:

- ?? Business groups (chamber of commerce, etc.)
- ?? Foundations and/or charitable organizations (McKnight, General Mills ?)
- ?? Hennepin Conservation District
- ?? Minneapolis Park Board (add to Other Agencies group)
- ?? County officials (add to Other Agencies group)
- ?? City officials (add to Municipalities group)
- ?? District representatives

The committee discussed the initial mailing consist of sending out information on the process to a wide range of possible stakeholders and include information that will be helpful to them in deciding their level of involvement, if any, in the process.

## **F. Facilitator Discussion (continued)**

The committee restated the importance of using a facilitator to give the process credibility and to avoid the appearance of a specific group or staff as the entity driving the process.

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

Mike noted the sample document of the Black Dog WMO vision and purpose statement appeared to be similar to how Bassett Creek could approach the process. A vision statement needs to be created from the first plan prepared and based on what we are currently doing. The main issues need to be identified to help fit the proper stakeholders to the appropriate step(s) of the process.

The different water bodies in the watershed will need to be identified as either regional or local significance. Should that be in the vision piece? It will be necessary to identify and

update the current vision, identify the projects for the second generation plan, and identify the constraints.

The State planning rules say WMOs have to go through a public involvement process periodically. It's to the Commission's benefit to find out current philosophies, get resident input, evaluate the Commission's direction, and evaluate improvements that need to be made.

The public input process gives citizens opportunity to bring up issues and discuss them with the Commission (i.e., the recent suspended solids issue). Citizen involvement increases awareness about the Commission. Omitting this process will keep the Commission from experiencing the opportunity to educate the public about the accomplishments of the Commission and establishing consensus for future activities.

Mike believes the Commission should develop the initial vision since the Commission has an idea of what it wants to accomplish. Charlie added that at the various stages in the process, a reality check with the Commission would be necessary. Karen suggested the planning process be an ongoing agenda item for the Commission to discuss at their monthly meetings.

The communication to the public could include the initial vision, along with historical information and other supporting documentation to lay a foundation to build from. A work plan also needs to be developed discussing elements from beginning to end to direct the process.

From his experience, Bill said the residents will generally want much the same as the Commission wants. The committee will need to identify and transform the guiding principles into policy and decide the types of issues brought to a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) or Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). When defining stakeholders' interest in certain topics, the decision will be on a city or regional basis. Bill suggests including some of the outspoken residents on committees allowing them a place to air their feelings. Mike suggested an open house forum for input. Karen added the Commission would need to approve the selection of the stakeholders.

#### **What needs to be done?**

- ?? Develop a draft vision for the Commission to review
- ?? Develop a Work Plan (inventory and assessment)
- ?? Draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
- ?? Build the history and supporting documentation
- ?? Decide how to involve the stakeholders throughout the process and select stakeholders that will be committed to the process.

#### **H. BWSR Letter (continued)**

No specific comments.

## I. Time Line/Tasks (Revised)

The committee decided it would be more helpful if the time line were streamlined and centered on the major tasks and public involvement was added under the appropriate task(s).

The Commission has completed some of the tasks shown on the time line. The tasks yet to be accomplished need to be identified. Task #4 (Identify Problems and Opportunities and Develop Goals and Policies) may need larger group involvement. Mike suggests taking task #2 (Public Involvement) out of the outline and add as a subtask where needed.

A draft work plan should be ready by the next committee meeting. The committee can then discuss the work plan before bringing it to the Commission for review. The vision statement could change after public input and the work plan will need to be flexible to change with the vision. The stakeholders involved may also change if tasks are added or changed.

Len restated the first contact with the stakeholders could be a large mailing that includes the Commission's vision along with a summary of the work plan. Interested stakeholders can then respond to the Commission informing their interest in being involved and in what areas they would like to be involved. If the stakeholder has questions, they can be directed to the member city staff person. A database can also be created listing the stakeholders and their interests (i.e., water quality, etc.) so that future mailings can be sent to stakeholders in specific interest groups. News releases in local city newsletters or local Sun/Sailor papers may be a good way of getting information out to the wider public sector. Other ways of communicating progress to the public can be by updating the Bassett Creek website. Some groups will have limited interests (i.e., lake homeowners associations, etc.) and the process will need to have a place for them to give their input. Using surveys and questionnaires can help to gather information and to get to a common denominator.

Mike suggested educating the public before adding the CAC piece to the process and build a regional perspective.

Bill asked if there is an idea of what the costs will be that are associated with the process. The cost elements will be unknown until the work plan is developed and how the public information is implemented. At this point, it is unclear how much involvement will be necessary by the Commission staff. Bill added that special interest public involvement could take a lot of time.

The plan will need to be crosschecked with the rules and the outline included in BWSR's letter. The plan will also need to describe the public involvement in the process.

Karen said the committee should not think that the BWSR letter is a statement of what the other agencies would like to see in the plan. Len suggested a letter be prepared and sent to the agencies copied on BWSR's letter informing them that the Commission is beginning this process and ask if they have additional items they would like to see included in the plan.

## **J. Planning Process? How it has worked with other WMOs?**

Karen brought copies of three plans for the committee to review. Barr prepared second generation plans for the Riley-Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District, the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District, and the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District.

Organizationally, the plans were prepared according to the following:

?? The Riley-Purgatory plan was organized around water resources

?? The Nine Mile Creek and the Lower Minnesota River plans were organized around the BWSR rules

The Riley-Purgatory plan was one of the first Second Generation Plans approved in the state.

The first water management plan prepared for Bassett Creek was the flood control plan, which was prepared long before the BWSR rules were enacted.

The plan layout for the Commission should include an introduction that gives historical information and the vision statement should be included in the executive summary.

## **K. Action Items:**

?? Prepare a draft work plan

?? Barr will prepare a letter to other agencies for Ron to review and distribute at the Commission's December 16 meeting.

?? Identify who on Barr team will act as project manager for the Commission in this process.

## **Future Meeting: Tuesday, January 18, 2000; 11:00 to 2:00 p.m. at Barr's office**

Agenda:

?? Review the draft work plan and discuss tying in the public process with the various components of the work plan.

?? Vision and history.