



## Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

### Next Generation Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes

4:30 p.m. ~ Monday November 18, 2013  
Golden Valley City Hall

**Attendees:** Committee Chair Linda Loomis; Commission Chair Ginny Black; Commissioner Clint Carlson (partial attendance) Alternate Commissioners David Tobelmann and Pat Crough; TAC members Jeff Oliver and Joe Fox,; Engineer Karen Chandler; Administrator Laura Jester

#### 1. Call Meeting to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Loomis at 4:32 p.m.

#### 2. Approve Meeting Notes from October 18, 2013 Plan Steering Committee Meetings

There were no suggested changes to the notes from the October 18, 2013 meeting. Consensus to accept the notes as presented.

#### 3. Plan Development Budget

Administrator Jester and Engineer Chandler updated the group on the status of the budget for the Plan. They indicated a possible \$8,000 budget shortfall in the policy development task. The savings realized from tasks completed earlier under budget have already been utilized. The scope of discussions continues to be more involved and detailed than initially budgeted. They are trying to defray some costs by having Administrator Jester assist more with drafting policies. They will continue to monitor the budget.

The group accepted this information and indicated this information should be reported to the Commission at their November meeting.

#### 4. Determine Commission Priority Waterbodies

The group reviewed the staff-recommended highest priority, secondary priority waterbodies, and lower priority waterbodies. There was discussion about what the priority levels meant and if constructed ponds should be included in the table at all. Administrator Jester noted the highest priority waterbodies would be those monitored by the Commission and those where the Commission would put the most effort and funds for improvement. The group was concerned that the public's expectations for management of lower priority waterbodies (like constructed stormwater ponds) might be unrealistic. It was decided this waterbody priority table would not be included in the Watershed Plan. Rather, the Plan would include a list of priority 1 (highest) and priority 2 (secondary) waterbodies. All other waterbodies would not be the focus of the Commission. There was discussion about whether the priority waterbodies should be further classified or ranked with more criteria. The group decided the process for ranking CIP projects would automatically create another layer of ranking.

After discussion, the group agreed with staff's recommended rankings for the highest priority waterbodies. The group asked that the TAC review the list of secondary priority waterbodies.

There was also discussion about maps in the Watershed Plan. The group agreed the map should note all public waters and wetlands for informational and inventory purposes.

## **5. Discuss CIP Project Selection Criteria and Possible Weighted Ranking System**

The group discussed the pros and cons of the possible CIP project selection criteria included on the agenda. There was discussion about the possible need for a "gatekeeper" question such as "Is the project part of the trunk system?" There was some explanation of past CIP projects that only focused on the trunk system but that some good projects were excluded from Commission funding due to this policy.

The group agreed that the "estimated costs per pound of pollutant removal" would not work as a criterion because those details are developed at the feasibility study point in the process. (CIP project selection is too early to know that level of detail.) The group also agreed that the "subwatershed draining to project is XX acres" should be removed from the list of criteria. Other changes were discussed and suggested for the list of criteria, including addition of "addresses significant infrastructure or property damage concerns" to the list. The group also agreed that in general, proposed CIP projects that address water quality and flooding concerns should rank the highest.

The group agreed on four "gatekeeper" criteria; one would have to answer yes to one of the four criteria (questions) before the project could be considered for BCWMC funding. The four gatekeeper criteria are:

- Project is part of the BCWMC trunk system
- Project improves water quality in a priority waterbody
- Project addresses an approved TMDL
- Project addresses flooding concern

The other remaining criteria would be used to weigh the merits of the proposed CIP projects.

There was discussion about the possibility of the Commission cost sharing (rather than fully funding) some smaller projects or those that rank lower in the criteria. Mr. Oliver noted he thought it was more cost-effective to fully fund a few large projects than partially fund many smaller projects. He noted it might be difficult for a city to spread the money over multiple projects. There was further discussion about possibly using a different funding formula for lower ranked projects or for secondary priority waterbodies.

In the end there was consensus to not utilize a cost sharing formula, but to only fully fund projects as is current practice.

Suggested changes to the CIP selection criteria will be incorporated into a final proposed list and could be re-reviewed by the TAC, if desired.

## **6. Discuss BCWMC Standards, Triggers, and Review Process**

Engineer Chandler walked through the tables showing standards and triggers for the MS4 permit, NPDES general stormwater permit, minimal impact design standards (MIDS) (guidelines), and the

current BCWMC water quality requirements for improvements and development proposals. There was discussion about the merits of the various requirements. Mr. Oliver noted that the current BCWMC process of administrative review works well for most projects and is very helpful in certain cases. The group noted that the current BCWMC standards and triggers are fair and equitable and they do not put undue pressure on developers. It was noted that higher standards would be more difficult for redevelopers to meet so they may not undertake a project at all and thus losing an opportunity to improve water quality. The point was also made that it is less expensive to perform water quality treatment now rather than waiting for a larger, more difficult problem in need of fixing in the future.

There was some discussion about including a volume standard. Mr. Oliver noted that infiltration is very difficult within Golden Valley and also involves issues of inflow and infiltration which are difficult to manage. Engineer Chandler noted there are “off ramps” in the MIDS that offer caveats when infiltration is not possible. Chair Loomis also suggested that projects in different soils could have different volume standards.

There was acknowledgement that small “in-fill” developments are difficult to get water quality/quantity benefits. And, developers of larger projects might do smaller pieces incrementally to avoid triggers.

Engineer Chandler noted the Commission is in a difficult spot with regards to updating its standards and triggers due to the large changes in State requirements.

There was a general feeling that either lower thresholds or some volume standard may be appropriate for the Commission. The group agreed that improving water quality/quantity during redevelopment was the key in this watershed, especially in larger commercial and industrial areas.

The group agreed to send the issue to the TAC to discuss and make recommendations to the Plan Steering Committee. Specifically, the committee wants to know if a ½-acre development is too small to review. Other ideas included using the  $\geq 1$  acre land disturbance trigger from the MS4 permit (rather than the 1 acre new impervious trigger from the construction permit) and the volume control standard from the construction permit (1.0 in) or MIDS (1.1 in). Another idea discussed was for the BCWMC to use a lower trigger that would require adherence to BCWMC standards, but a higher trigger could be required for a BCWMC review. The group also wondered what other watersheds or communities are doing for standards and criteria.

## **7. Discuss Schedule and Agenda for Next Plan Steering Committee Meeting**

The committee will discuss the schedule for the next Commission workshop at the next meeting.

The next meeting of the Plan Steering Committee is scheduled for Monday December 16<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:30 p.m.