

Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

BCWMC Second Generation Plan

March 12, 2002

Attendance: Lee Gustafson (chair), Ron Quanbeck, John O'Toole, Mike Rardin, Bill Deblon, Fred Moore, Mike Welch, Karen Chandler, and Commission staff Len Kremer and Charlie LeFevere

Agenda

- Steering Committee 2/04/02 Minutes
- Capital Improvements Program (table dated March 12, 2002)
- Advisory Groups Recommendations table
- BCWMC 2003 Budget Recommendations

Steering Committee 2/04/02 Meeting Minutes

Steering Committee meeting minutes for February 4, 2002 were presented and accepted with no comments.

Miscellaneous Handouts (as a result of 2/4/02 Steering Committee meeting)

In response to the February 4, 2002 Steering Committee meeting, Mr. LeFevere prepared two documents for discussion. The first is a letter addressing the Second Generation Plan Capital Improvements Program Amendment Procedure and the second is a memo to the BCWMC commissioners and alternates describing the Capital Improvements Program and Budget.

CIP Amendment Procedure. This letter describes the amendment process as required by Minnesota Statutes and the flexibility allowed should the Commission need to reorder the improvements in its CIP (i.e., changing the year an improvement is scheduled to be constructed). The letter describes the process for both major and minor amendments to the plan. As referenced in the letter, Mr. LeFevere recommends that the Second Generation Plan specify that reordering of listed improvements into another year will be considered to be plan amendments that may be approved by the Commission following the minor plan amendment procedures required by the regulations of the Board of Water and Soil Resources. Mr. LeFevere discussed this approach with Jim Haertl of BWSR and Mr. Haertl indicated that BWSR would accept this approach.

Mr. Rardin asked what happens if a project is begun, but because of unexpected circumstances does not allow that project to be completed in the year proposed? Mr. LeFevere said if the improvement is initiated and unexpected delays take place, it would not require a plan amendment. However, if the CIP is reordered, such as moving a project forward that is scheduled for a later year, a minor plan amendment would be required.

Memorandum to the Commission concerning Capital Improvements Program and Budget. This memo was prepared as a result of the committee's concern for the Commissioners when presenting the CIP to their member cities. The idea was to prepare a memo to accompany the CIP that would address the CIP and budget issues. The memo would emphasize the intent of the CIP and the ramping up process of the assessments in an effort to help city staff members formulate their comments back to the Commission.

The committee discussed what will be included the packet for the Commissioners to present to their member city staff. After discussion, the committee agreed on the following modifications to the memorandum:

- Clarify that the memo is coming from Lee Gustafson, chair for the Second Generation Plan Steering Committee.
- Page 1, last paragraph, clarify the discussion that transpired from the November 27, 2001 Commission special meeting concerning the 80/20 cost share ratio where 20% of the capital project cost will be paid by the city in which the project is built.
- Add a statement saying that at a later date, the Commission will decide on a CIP that will be a 0-5-year; 5-10-year, and 10 plus-year program and those projects will be taken from the extended CIP table. Request city staff to comment on the first 10 years of the extended CIP table.
- Create an attachment from the January 23, 2002 memo where Mr. LeFevere describes budgeting and financing options.
- Add grant options to attachment. Grants could change the priority/funding of projects.
- Note in the memo that the flood proofing of the homes is not included in the CIP. The flood proofing of homes is part of the original Flood Control Project and those expenses will not be part of the assessments. Direct the commissioners to the Budget Ramp-Up table to see details of those items that will be funded from the remaining Flood Control Project funds.
- Request comments to be submitted to the Commission recorder by April 18.

The following information will be included in the packet to the commissioners with a notation requesting the commissioners to review for discussion at the March 21 Commission meeting:

- Memorandum to the Commission outlining the Capital Improvements Program and Budget (with attachment).
- Capital Improvements Program table (extended version). Add a statement saying that the Commission will decide on a CIP which will be a 0-5-year; 5-10-year, and 10 plus-year program and those projects will be taken from the extended CIP table.
- Budget Ramp-Up for Water Quality Improvements Project / Summary of Funding Items Proposed from Flood Control Project Funds.
- Letter from Mr. Gustafson describing the Second Generation Plan CIP Amendment Process.

Capital Improvements Program (dated March 12, 2002)

The CIP table does not include the flood proofing of the homes originally in the Flood Control Project. The funding proposed will be drawn from the remaining funds from the Flood Control Project. The City of Golden Valley has started the flood proofing process. To avoid confusion by adding the flood proofing to the CIP table, the committee decided to add another table to the Budget Ramp-Up table that will be included in the packet to the commissioners.

Advisory Groups Recommendations Table

The committee continued their discussion of the Steering Committee recommendations and the Commission's actions to advisory group recommendations.

The following changes are proposed:

Water Quality (continued)

- C2. The committee decided this needed more discussion because of the differing scenarios (redevelopment, fully-developed, etc.).
- C3. Change Steering Committee recommendations to: See the Citizen Advisory Group’s recommendations.
- C4. Change Commission’s action to: Include statement in the draft Plan that the Commission will study, evaluate, and establish appropriate and reasonable standards and requirements for vegetative buffers adjacent to water resources.
Include same comment in Steering Committee recommendations.
- C5. No change.
- C6. No change.
- C7. No change.
- C8. Add the following Commission’s action: The Plan will include a statement that the Commission will attempt to take advantage of opportunities to maintain or improve water quality in Twin Lake.
- C9. No change
- C10. Change Commission’s action to: Include a statement in the draft Plan that the Commission will add, when appropriate, chloride monitoring when establishing stream water quality testing programs.
- C11. Change Commission’s action to: Include appropriate summary of historical water quality data in the draft Plan appendix.
- C12. Add Commission’s action: Refer to CAG Public Information Plan.
Repeat in Steering Committee recommendations.
- C13. Replace Commission’s action with Steering Committee’s recommendations.

Fish and Wildlife

- D1. Repeat Steering Committee recommendations in Commission’s action.
- D2. Repeat Steering Committee recommendations in Commission’s action.
- D3. The Commission’s action will be changed to: The Plan will include a statement that in future projects, the Commission will consider the effect of stream/ditch structures on natural and “people/pedestrian” habitat.

Administration

- E1. Correct the Commission’s action as follows: The Plan will include a statement that appropriate model ordinances will be collected and disseminated following adoption by member cities.
- E2. Replace Commission’s action and Steering Committee recommendations with the following: The Commission should continue its inspection program and will develop an annual information list of items for cities to report actions.
- E3. Add the following Commission’s action: The Plan will indirectly and directly addresses these issues throughout the Plan.

Wetlands

- F1. The Commission’s action will be changed to the following: The Plan will include a statement that the Commission should encourage member cities to develop wetland inventories and draft proposed guidelines for inventories.

Public Ditches

- G1. Repeat the Steering Committee recommendation in the Commission’s action column.

Stream Restoration Sites

H3. Replace and repeat Commission's action in the Steering Committee recommendation column.

Citizens Advisory Group Public Information Plan

The Steering Committee discussed the additional recommendations made by the CAG. The following will be added in the Commission's action column:

1. The Plan addresses the Commission's mission.
2. The Policy Advisory Group addressed financial commitment of the public involvement process.
3. Focus B of the Public Information Plan addresses determination of the future role for a citizens advisory committee.

The Steering Committee agreed that the cover letter for the Public Information Plan was not necessary.

The following schedule is proposed for the Commission to submit comments requested for the CIP and the Advisory Groups Recommendations table:

- April 18 - The Advisory Groups Recommendation table will be discussed and adopted by the Commission. The table will be sent to the commissioners/alternates in the March 21 meeting packet along with a cover memo prepared by Barr explaining the intent of the table and directing the commissioners/alternates to review the table.
- April 18 – Submit member cities' comments regarding the Capital Improvements Program to Commission recorder, Ms. Schutrop. The CIP packet will be included in the March 21 meeting packet to the commissioners/alternates.
- May 16 – Commission adoption of the CIP.
- End of April or early May – The Steering Committee will meet to review the draft Plan before the first formal review by the member cities. Ms. Chandler will put together a review process timeline for the Steering Committee. Mr. Kremer recommended that excerpts from a paper prepared by Ed Silberman be included in the draft Plan.
- June 2002 – Distribution of preliminary draft Plan for member cities' review.
- July-August 2002 – Agencies' review. Ms. Chandler anticipates a month for the member cities to review and comment before a second draft incorporating changes made by the member cities can be prepared for submittal to the agencies for review.

Next Steering Committee Meeting

End of April or early May - to be determined.

Agenda: CIP Comments
 Draft Plan review

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.