

Second Generation Plan Committee Meeting Minutes
Bassett Creek Water Management Commission
January 18, 2000

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. Vision Statement
3. Work Plan
4. Public Input Process
5. Draft Letter for Notice of Public Meeting (if meeting is desired by Commission)
6. Facilitator Discussion (continued)

C. Meeting Handouts

1. December 13, 1999 Meeting Minutes
2. Draft Vision Statement
3. Draft Work Plan
4. Draft Notice of Public Meeting

D. Today's Objectives

1. Comments on the agenda: none
2. Comments on the minutes: Page 3, 5th paragraph, in reference to the discussion on the open house-type CAC, Mike corrected the statement to read: Mike suggested an open house forum for input.

E. Draft Vision Statement

The opening paragraph in the draft Statement of Vision and Purpose is organized around three bulleted areas: working with the cities in the management of surface and groundwater, working with the citizens to implement initiatives to manage the watershed, and collect and develop data regarding watershed surface and ground waters. The document then addresses water resource management, local water management activity assessment, and public education in water management. The committee would like to see the text tied in with the introduction of the three bulleted items.

The document title (Statement of Vision and Purpose) was discussed. Bill was looking for something with abstract guiding principles. The vision should state what the plan is trying to accomplish. Bill would like the document to indicate the purpose in forming the Commission was originally flood control and has evolved, today, to fix past problems and to improve the water quality. We are working toward protecting and enhancing water resources, and making water quality improvements. Bill would like the vision statement to leave the public with hope. Charlie said that wanting to protect the water is a statement of value and the mission of the Commission is to control flooding along the Bassett Creek. Charlie added that the Commission was originally formed for the purpose of flood control. The Metropolitan

Surface Water Management Act states what the Commission is required to do, but do we need to list those requirements in the statement? Karen stated the idea of the Statement of Vision and Purpose is to start with how the Commission views itself, what it wants to accomplish, and give definition to the roles of the Commission and the cities.

Bill suggested changing the title to Statement of Purpose and omitting vision.

Ron asked the group if they are looking for a vision statement beyond what is presented today? Do we need a meeting of the stakeholders to develop the guiding principals and the vision? The stakeholders will probably fine-tune what is presented to them. The committee would discuss the purpose statement, submit the statement for the Commissioners' review and comment, and then present to the public for comment.

Mike is not sure the public is the group to define the guiding principals and the vision. The Commission has been working together for 30 years and may be better qualified to answer those questions. The Statement of Purpose is currently laid out giving a regional and local perspective and how the stakeholders (the cities, the Commission, and the public) can work together as a partnering group toward a general consensus.

Len added that when the plan tasks are opened to public involvement, special interest groups will be pursuing areas of Bassett Creek they want prioritized first. For example, a group of Minneapolis residents exist that would like the lower reach that leads to the Mississippi River restored, and another group would like to see the old tunnel opened.

Mike asked the committee if Item #3 (Public Education in Water Management) should be the place to have a long-term Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Ron added that the use of a CAC would be purpose-driven. Mike sees a Technical Advisory Committee participating in the areas of Water Resource Management and Local Water Management Activity Assessment and a CAC group participating in the area of Public Education in Water Management.

After discussion, the committee suggested the following changes to the Statement of Vision and Purpose:

- ?? Merge the bulleted items with the three major headings. The new format would include a discussion on Water Resources Management, Assessment of Activities, and Education and Public Involvement.
- ?? Rewrite the last sentence of the opening paragraph to describe the bulleted items as the Commission's "strategies."
- ?? Change Statement of Vision and Purpose to Statement of Purpose and Strategy.
- ?? The Statement of Purpose and Strategy will include goals, but not suggested vision statement at this time.
- ?? Phase out "vision" on all the working documents.
- ?? Mention the communities' newsletters in the "passive training" paragraph on page 4.

- ?? Local Water Management Activity Assessment (#2): Define the responsibilities between the Commission and the cities. Regulatory agencies reviewing the plan will be looking for this element in the plan to establish accountability.
- ?? Suggest adding a paragraph under #3 (Public Education in Water Management) to discuss the role of a CAC.
- ?? The Statement of Purpose and Strategy will be redrafted and distributed at the Commission's January 20th meeting for review.
- ?? Request comments back from the Commissioners so that the committee can discuss again on February 9.

F. Draft Work Plan

The Draft Work Plan was presented for comment. The framework of the plan is an introductory paragraph, Plan Emphasis, and Work Tasks. Areas shaded will be answered in the purpose statement. The italicized text needs input from the Commission.

Task 2.0 Develop Vision. The public involvement portion has not yet been determined. How should this be addressed? Should a notice be sent out notifying the public that we are doing this step? The work plan can be sent out without including this statement on public involvement. Should a meeting be held to direct interested people after responses are received after the initial mailing goes out? Overall, the Work Plan is what we need and offers enough detail; however, Mike would like to see a condensed version to help develop the public information strategy.

The first CAC meeting could be a kick-off meeting where the work plan is discussed. We could provide something for the CAC to react to and then set up separate meetings to address specific areas. Len said that the work plan can be carried out without public involvement and include citizen input in other ways.

The kick-off meeting can be a general purpose meeting (see Notice of Public Meeting) to present the process, educate the public about the Commission, and offer opportunity for questions and comments. Karen added that sending out a notice gives people time to identify themselves as stakeholders and initiate their comments. If people are given an opportunity to give input, then the Commission does not have to defend the position that "no opportunity" was given.

Ron said that the public information and history aspect needs to be communicated early in the process, either by mailing or during a public meeting.

Mike asked where the determination of regional and local water bodies is addressed in the work plan? This would ultimately affect the CAC. Criteria was set up, but have the responsibilities been defined? This needs to be in the work plan. Can Task 3.6 include the respective roles of the cities in the organization? Can Task 3.5 be renamed to: Determine Regional and Local Significance of Water Bodies.

Task 3.11, concerning strategy for implementation will be driven by priorities. The public feedback will help make those determinations. Charlie would like a broader aspect to get the information out before the public hearing process either by using the website and/or a wider

mailing. The Minnesota statutes require one public hearing, but BWSR is looking for more citizen involvement. It would be helpful if the stakeholders involved are knowledgeable of the aspects of a CAC so that the capital improvements program is not refined over and over again by the Commission. Karen reminded the committee that there will be a learning curve for a group before it is ready to look at issues and suggests deciding early wherever CAC involvement is recommended for a certain task.

Data gathered from CACs will come back to the committee and the Commission and then go to the cities for agreement.

Mike said a CAC is only one way to get citizen involvement. Len asked if the public should be asked how they want to be involved. The committee needs to be mindful of expectations set, the cost allocations involved with stakeholder groups, and what portion of the process will need a facilitator. We need to ask what will cause them to want to be involved? When do we ask for their involvement? Who pays for it?

Suggestions for the Work Plan:

?? Prepare a condensed version.

?? Barr include views on how the tasks should be accomplished (i.e., no public involvement necessary, etc.) Clarify where the involvement will be coming from (i.e., “passive” or “no review” necessary) for each task. Some tasks will be local responsibility and the citizen involvement will be decided upon by the cities responsible for the task. When a city develops a strategy for getting input on certain tasks, the cities will decide if and how they want citizen involvement.

?? Draft public involvement plan that complements the work plan.

G. Draft Notice of Public Meeting

A Notice of Public Meeting was drafted for the committee to review. The group agreed that the notice would need to go out early so that it can be placed into community newspapers and newsletters. The notice will be distributed and discussed at the Commission’s 1/20/00 meeting. The feedback received after the notice of public meeting is published will help develop the citizen involvement plan. The notice will also be published on the Bassett Creek website with an e-mail address included for citizens to respond to.

Two separate mailings:

1. Notice of a planning meeting (after the Commission’s 1/20/00 meeting). Send to as many people as possible resulting in identification of stakeholders.
2. Transmit information about the purpose statement (after the committee’s February meeting).

Other paths to communicate the process:

- ?? Targeted mailings
- ?? City Web pages
- ?? Websites
- ?? Press releases
- ?? Cities

Jim asked for additional areas of interest to add to the notice.

- ?? Add “other” types of involvement.
- ?? Remove the last line regarding contact for advisory committee participation.
- ?? Add e-mail address, address, or a phone number for people to respond.
- ?? Consider including a map showing the boundaries to give citizens a perspective on where their location is to the creek.

Accomplishments or milestones to add:

- ?? In 1987, the construction of the Bassett Creek flood control project saved \$2 million in potential flood damages to the City of Minneapolis.
- ?? Water quality plans for each lake have been prepared.
- ?? Hennepin County’s monitoring program reported the water quality in Bassett Creek was higher than other lakes in the city
- ?? Other projects we have been active in concerning water quality?

H. Action Items:

- ?? Ready to distribute at the Commission’s January 20 meeting: a draft of the public notice and the purpose statement.
- ?? E-mail the purpose statement to the committee before the final stage.
- ?? Ready for the committee’s February 9 meeting: The public notice and the purpose and strategy statement targeted to be mailed after discussed at that meeting.
- ?? The mailings will be handled by the cities. PLS will coordinate the information submitted to the cities.

I. Future Meeting: Wednesday, February 9, 2000; 11:00 to 2:00 p.m. at Barr’s office

The Committee will meet on the alternate week of the Commission’s monthly meeting so that action items requiring Commission input can be included in the Commission’s meeting packet.