

Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
BCWMC Second Generation Plan
May 29, 2001

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

Meeting handouts:

Revised Steering Committee Agenda
Advisory Group Meetings & Topics
Public Ditch information

Steering Committee 5/1/01 Meeting Minutes

The 5/1/01 Steering Committee minutes were presented and accepted with no comments.

PAG 5/21/01 Meeting Report (Lee Gustafson)

- The PAG reviewed the Funding Recommendations list. This list is an ongoing summary of recommendations agreed on during the PAG meetings. Mr. Kremer suggested a similar list be prepared for the TAG recording conclusions reached at the TAG meetings.

Action: Update PAG Funding Recommendations. The summaries will always be included with the PAG meeting agendas and provided to the Steering Committee.

- Mr. Kremer prepared a map for the PAG to review that illustrated areas of the main stem and north branch of the creek where erosion of the banks has occurred or where significant deposits of sediment are affecting the flow in the channel. The map helped them focus on where the minor and major problem areas are located. The group looked at funding responsibility for volume and non-volume flow interruption as a result of erosion and sediment. The PAG agreed that locations where meandering occurs and the ability to convey flows is not reduced would be considered an aesthetic non-volume issue. The group decided maintenance responsibilities lie with the local city where the capacity of the channel (volume) is not affected. The group also concluded that where channel capacity (volume) is reduced and flood damage increases, that the Commission be responsible for the project as it relates to restoring the capacity of the channel.
- Special consideration will be given to those erosion problems that could affect wider public benefit (such as a failing bridge). The PAG concluded that if a regional public benefit can be demonstrated, that portion of the project should be funded by the Commission and the remainder of the project funded by the property owner or city where the project is located.
- Mr. Quanbeck asked if the Commission would get involved if a sediment or erosion problem affects the water quality? Mr. Kremer said issues with water quality might cause the Commission to get involved in sediment/erosion projects in the future.
- Mr. Gustafson informed the PAG that the Commission included \$10,000 for Demonstration Projects in its 2002 budget. The group suggested the member city act as the applicant/co-applicant where the project takes place.

- Mr. Gustafson will introduce the Capital Improvements Program at the next meeting. He will use Medicine Lake and a low priority project as examples to explain the Commission's method. He will try to get feedback on what the PAG sees as the Commission's role in the water quality improvements (e.g., Medicine Lake). Mr. Gustafson is hopeful that general policy direction will be developed as a result of these discussions.

Proposed June 11th PAG agenda

- Water quality improvement projects
- Water bodies that are the funding responsibility of BCWMC versus water bodies that are the funding responsibility of the cities
- Review PAG's ongoing Funding Recommendations list

TAG 5/21/01 Meeting Report (Fred Moore)

- The TAG spent most of the meeting discussing the groundwater goals, policies, and issues.
- Four questions came out of the discussion on the Minnesota Rules addressing groundwater:
 1. Should the Commission encourage cities to implement a wellhead protection program? Yes.
 2. Should the Commission restrict stormwater storage sites in sensitive areas? Yes, and require a storage site be properly engineered.
 3. Should the Commission encourage agencies to manage groundwater data collection? Should the Commission facilitate aquifer yield protection? Only the DNR is doing this now.
Conclusion: the Commission should continue to review DNR appropriation permits only.
 4. Should the Commission encourage communities to participate in the County well abandonment program? Yes.
- The group then looked at the water quality goals, policies and issues. They examined the classifications of the water bodies in the watershed. Should they be changed? Currently, the lake classification and treatment standards are linked together. Should the two be viewed separately and should we try to attain the greatest water quality possible?
- The TAG's recommendation to the Commission is to require new developments and redevelopment projects to treat stormwater to the Level I standards.
- The group recommended that the goals not be lowered, and look at new technology that could help improve water quality in the future.
- Mr. Gustafson added that the TAG water quality recommendations would be in conflict with the City of Minnetonka's stormwater plan.
- Water quality treatment will continue to be done according to NURP standards.
- The TAG did not have time to discuss the cost benefit ratio or changes in acreage standards. Details like these will be addressed at the next meeting.
- Agency input during this discussion was limited.

Action: Prepare a summary of TAG conclusions and recommendations (similar to PAG). Also include conflicts with member cities' ordinances. The summaries will accompany the TAG meeting agendas and will be provided to the Steering Committee.

Proposed June 25th TAG agenda

- Continue discussion of water quality goals and policies, and existing/potential water quality issues (stream water quality, prioritization of water quality projects, and costs of water quality improvement projects)
- Discuss wetland controls, issues and goals (respond to agency issues)
- Discuss public ditch issues

CAG 5/21/01 Meeting Report (John O'Toole)

- The CAG members who attended the meeting were not interested in discussing the Major Issues (restated) as anticipated. The group instead agreed to accept the TAG's recommended ranking of the issues and wanted to move ahead with development of the public education and involvement plan. This group sees itself as an executing group and not a decision-making group.
- The group concluded they need more direction and guidance concerning what the message(s) is that needs to be communicated.
- They requested more information on the causes of pollution in the watershed.
- They discussed the element of changing behavior in the context of who needs to change their behavior, what kind of behavior change is necessary, and how is that change measured?
- Questions raised by the CAG were:
 - What is the message(s) that needs to be communicated?
 - Will the Commission develop a recommendation on how the cities communicate? Will the Commission use a yearlong theme?
 - What budget is available to develop the plan? Depending on the amount of resources available will determine the depth of the education plan.
 - How is this effort going to be coordinated with the cities to keep from duplicating efforts?

The following discussion is in response to the questions raised by the CAG.

- The CAG's main task: identify, review, and develop an information program to inform the public of BCWMC programs, goals, and activities.
- Mr. Rardin added that a lot of the questions raised by the CAG are the answers: Does behavior need to change? Yes. What does the CAG think the Commission should communicate? Mr. Rardin's expectation is that they develop different communication methods to use in the future when interfacing with the member cities. Perhaps, a plan on how to partner with the cities on various issues over a specific period of time.
- The communication plan is developed partly to meet the expectations from BWSR. The second reason is to determine how to solicit public communication. How can we have a physical presence?
- In the future, the Commission may want to consider creating a citizens advisory committee.
- Mr. Gustafson suggested they discuss how the Commission solicits input now and in the future by asking themselves how they would like to receive communication.
- A smaller component to the education plan will be information about BCWMC.
- The CAG are ambassadors to their communities. Mr. Welch suggested putting to work the energy that made them want to participate on the CAG. The group may want to start by building on a simple message.

Action: Mr. Welch will send materials giving clear messages regarding water quality management to Mr. O'Toole.

- Examples of education components from other second generation plans may be helpful for the CAG to understand what the Commission is looking for in a public education/involvement plan. Mr. Gustafson would like to see the group give itself permission to brainstorm.
- Mr. Kremer suggested talking about different communication techniques (i.e., public meetings held by the City of Plymouth regarding Medicine Lake).
- The CAG needs to come up with a basic outline of resources the Commission can use to support the information the Commission wants to communicate and in a cost-effective way.
- Create a list of those things the Commission is involved in (CAMP, WOMP, etc.).
- Mr. Rardin would not like budget restraints to hinder the process.

- The Steering Committee agrees it is not premature to have the CAG going through the process at this time.

Proposed June 25th CAG agenda

- Begin developing public information program
- How should the BCWMC get their message out? BCWMC message likely to include:
 - General information about BCWMC; have the public understand where they are in the watershed and what the BCWMC does
 - Specific BCWMC project information – water quality improvement projects, monitoring, flood control projects
 - Specific methods for residents to use to improve water quality (household BMPs) – how to live “properly” within their watershed
- Public participation in BCWMC activities

Plan Outline

Deferred to next meeting.

Second Generation Plan Budget

Because of time constraints, the budget was not discussed.

Second Generation Plan Meeting Calendar

Mr. Gustafson was approached after the last Commission meeting by Don Maxwell asking why the Steering Committee meetings were not publicized. All meetings for the Second Generation Plan and the BCWMC are publicized on the website as well as posted at the City of Golden Valley on the day they occur. Mr. Gustafson asked that they also be included on the Commission’s monthly agendas distributed before the Commission meetings.

Miscellaneous

- Ms. Chandler handed out public ditch information. The TAG will address it at its next meeting.
- Mr. Rardin asked if the issue concerning the Golden Valley homes experiencing flooding that were not part of the Commission’s Flood Control Project, should be referred back to the PAG. Mr. Moore said the TAG has Golden Valley looking at it as a capital improvement project in the Commission’s plan and moved it into a funding issue. Mr. Gustafson will bring this issue up with the PAG at a later date.

Action: Talk to Mr. Gustafson about when to add this issue to a future PAG agenda. Mr. Kremer will also note it on the TAG summary list. This is already identified as an issue on the Major Issues document.

Next Steering Committee Meeting

- Tuesday, June 26, 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., at the offices of Barr Engineering Company.

Action: Add the June 26 Steering Committee meeting to the website calendar.