

Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

BCWMC Second Generation Plan

April 3, 2001

Attendance: Lee Gustafson (chair), Ron Quanbeck, Mike Rardin, John O'Toole, Fred Moore, Bill Deblon, Mike Welch (conference call), Len Kremer, and Karen Chandler
Pat Schutrop, recorder

Meeting handouts:

- ?? A revised agenda
- ?? Proposed Agenda for April 23, 2001 CAG meeting
- ?? Four Revised Major Issues (Groundwater; Water Quality, Recreation, Fish & Wildlife; Flooding/Rate Control; and Wetlands/Natural Resources)
- ?? Issues Receiving Zero Votes by TAG Members
- ?? Top 12 TAG Member Issues
- ?? March 26, 2001 TAG Meeting Minutes
- ?? Draft March 26, 2001 CAG Meeting Minutes

PAG 3/19/01 Meeting Report (Lee Gustafson)

Some PAG members submitted comments on the Statement of Purpose and Strategy, the Bylaws, and the Joint Powers Agreement. The Steering Committee will discuss the comments after the Technical and Citizens advisory groups have reviewed the Statement of Purpose and Strategy. Charlie LeFevere is in the process of removing historical information in the Bylaws and the Joint Powers Agreement and adapting the documents to the current status of the watershed.

PAG member, Ginny Black, told the Plymouth City Council that she thought there may be enough changes proposed to the JPA to warrant a Plymouth City Council study session. Mr. Moore suggested the Bassett Creek JPA be compared for commonalties with other active WMOs.

Items discussed:

- ?? Mayors and Managers Meeting (November 2000) and Charlie LeFevere's written response to their questions.
- ?? The Commission forming a technical advisory group like Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission.
- ?? Funding options – levy taxes.
- ?? Capital Improvement Program funding. Also discussed maintenance responsibility and inspection of facilities.
- ?? Public education – the PAG will discuss after information is received from the CAG.
- ?? Enforcement procedures when a city is not doing what they should be doing.
- ?? The role of future advisory groups.
- ?? What is our role in groundwater management? Discussion tabled until the TAG has addressed it.
- ?? Buffer zones – what are the benefits to buffers?
- ?? Conflict of interest and ethics policy. Jodi Polzin would like this addressed in the JPA. Mr. Moore asked if BWSR addresses these two issues in the 8410 Rules. A citizen expressed concern about the Commission's role as proponent and regulator (i.e., General Mills cooling water project). Mr. Rardin said it may be beneficial to address these two issues in the JPA to avoid confusion of differing roles of commissioners who may represent a city on the

Commission, but work for a private company or are part of a special interest group. The voting issues need to be defined to clarify any confusion regarding voting on projects that are presented to the Commission and the ethical approach in that voting (i.e., John O'Toole, General Mills employee).

?? Proposed April 16th PAG meeting agenda

Group Exercise – Funding: Use two or three project examples (e.g., Medicine Lake and Crane Lake) to determine how they should be funded; and discuss maintenance and erosion issues. The lake studies and capital improvement priorities were introduced.

Comments: Doug Snyder, Board of Water & Soil Resources, can help talk about funding methods. The Steering Committee discussed the value that Mr. Snyder could add to the discussion. Barr Engineering will provide an information sheet on different types of funding that may be available (i.e., subwatershed-type funding).

Mr. Gustafson thought the Commission might want to participate in the education portion to help unify the decision-making process with the member cities when it is time to set priorities.

TAG 3/26/01 Meeting Report (Fred Moore)

?? The group reviewed and accepted the Statement of Purpose and Strategy as presented.

?? Major Issues: The following additional issues were defined:

1. Should the creek be canoe-able?
2. Mass balance on the application of sands and salts
3. Impervious portions of developments. Should city ordinances be modified to consider more impervious areas?
4. Buffers: should the Commission be setting standards for buffers along streams, lakes, etc.?

?? One common comment from the TAG and CAG was that the Major Issues were too general. After consulting with Ron Struss, Board of Water & Soil Resources, he recommended presenting background information and restating the issue. The four Major Issues presented today are a restatement of those issues.

?? The Steering Committee discussed how to respond to individuals who brought up new issues. Mr. Gustafson suggested that at the beginning of the meetings, the chairs announce that new issues will be brought back to the Steering Committee for discussion and then assigned to the appropriate group. The issues will be reflected in the Plan.

?? The TAG ranked the major issues according to importance. TAG members from the agencies ranked the issues separately. The results will be presented at the April 23rd TAG meeting. Issues receiving zero votes were also discussed. Mr. Rardin suggested the Plan include **all** the issues and the outcome of the issues.

?? Proposed April 23rd TAG meeting agenda

1. Water quality goals (how to present the water quality data will be presented at a later meeting)
2. Flood control policy
3. Present ranking of major issues and those issues that received a vote. Each issue will be discussed. Clarify those issues that received a lower ranking and what that means to the Commission.

CAG 3/26/01 Meeting Report (John O'Toole)

?? General observations:

- (1) The CAG needs the overall purpose and goal introduced at the start of each meeting to help focus and keep the group heading in the direction to accomplish those goals. Mr. Quanbeck suggested the overall purpose and goal be stated on the agenda and reinforcing at the start of the meetings. It may also be helpful to state what the role of the CAG is not. Some of the citizens participating may have their own agenda and that is why they are on the advisory group. The purpose needs to be made as clear as possible – a single statement (i.e., here is the role of the Commission concerning groundwater, etc.).
- (2) Voting and the CAG. The CAG was concerned about voting on issues and who should be allowed to vote. It was recommended that the CAG not vote on issues, but provide options on issues to the Steering Committee.
- (3) Mr. O'Toole sees his role as a moderator and Barr Engineering carrying the lead in most of the discussions.

?? Major Issues: The CAG discussed the Major Issues, but was unsure of their role in addressing the issues. There was concern about how new issues will be addressed and by whom. Is there some common ground between the meeting agenda and the Commission's agenda? As stated earlier, the CAG felt the Major Issues document did not include enough detail. Inform the CAG members that the issues added are being addressed.

?? New issues identified:

1. Accountability and enforcement (i.e., clear-cutting to a waterline, who do they call?)
2. Suggested telephone line to report problems.
3. Canoe-ability of the creek.
4. Water controls designed for operations that impede navigability of the streams. Is the stream navigable – understanding of the ordinances cited. Is there a substitute to portaging.
5. Riparian access – should there be a walkway or a corridor?
6. Groundwater – generally. Hennepin County will not be adopting a groundwater plan. Is there a need by the Commission to do something?
7. Groundwater appropriation (i.e., General Mills cooling water project). The appropriateness of the Commission acting as a proponent and as a regulator.
8. Substantial groundwater appropriation plume effect – who is responsible for this?

?? How should comments received from advisory group members be addressed?

Action: Add a Q&A section to the TAG and CAG agendas referring to a handout with topics raised at the previous meeting that need answers.

?? Many of the CAG members are willing to meet beyond the two hours scheduled. Ms. Chandler reminded the Steering Committee of the two-hour time commitment made to all the advisory groups at the start of the planning process.

?? CAG replacement for Terrie Christian, Association of Medicine Lake Area Citizens. No replacement has been found yet. The Steering Committee agreed that it is important to have an AMLAC member present on the CAG.

Action: A request (via e-mail) will be prepared for John O'Toole's review to Don Maxwell, Terrie Christian, and Bridget Jodell asking if a replacement has been found for Terrie.

Proposed April 23rd CAG Agenda

- ?? Mr. O'Toole suggested condensing the agenda by moving the Major Issues to another meeting and concentrating on public involvement and education only. If so, communicate at the start of the meeting that Major Issues will be discussed in detail at the May meeting.
- ?? Barb Peichel, Minnesota Sea Grant, will discuss education programs and what that will look like. She will be looking for feedback from the group. The Steering Committee reviewed the importance of this opportunity and sees it as a good resource in helping to develop the education program.
- ?? Ron Struss, a specialist in public education for BWSR, will define the purpose for developing the public involvement/public education piece.
- ?? Revised Proposed April 23rd CAG meeting agenda
 1. Present a Q&A segment, a discussion of the purpose of the CAG, and an explanation of expectations on how new issues will be handled.
 2. Ron Struss and Barb Peichel presentations (1 hour 15 minutes)
 3. Next meeting agenda (Major Issues, etc.)
- ?? Short discussion on how the education and public involvement portion of the planning process can help direct the Legislature's attention to BCWMC's grant application being considered in their upcoming budget discussions. Mr. Quanbeck suggested referring the Legislature to the Second Generation Plan portion of the BCMWC website.

Action: Next CAG Meeting – April 23, 2001. Reserve rooms at the City of Golden Valley.

Action: May 21st is recommended for the May CAG meeting because the fourth Monday is Memorial Day.

Next Steering Committee Meeting

- ?? Tuesday, May 1, 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., at the offices of Barr Engineering Company.

Action: Notify advisory group members via e-mail about May 1 meeting and add to calendar on the website.