



## Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

### Next Generation Plan Steering Committee

#### DRAFT Meeting Notes

4:30 p.m. ~ Monday October 28, 2013  
Golden Valley City Hall

**Attendees:** Committee Chair Linda Loomis; Commission Chair Ginny Black; Commissioner Michael Welch; Commissioner Clint Carlson; Alternate Commissioners David Tobelmann and Lisa Goddard; TAC members Jeff Oliver, Joe Fox, Derek Asche and Bob Paschke; Engineer Karen Chandler; Administrator Laura Jester

#### 1. Call Meeting to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Loomis at 4:33 p.m.

#### 2. Approve Meeting Notes from September 16 and 23, 2013 Plan Steering Committee Meetings

There were no suggested changes to the notes from the September 16 and 23, 2013 meeting. Consensus to accept the notes as presented.

#### 3. Discuss Draft Policies

Engineer Chandler reminded the group that during the last Plan Steering Committee meeting and the 10/17/13 Commission Workshop, Barr was instructed to draft the following policies for consideration:

##### a. Evaluation of flood levels along the trunk system (policies 37 and 48)

There was discussion about the appropriate wording and actual intent of the policy. Group agreed to reword first bullet of policy 37 as "The Commission will re-evaluate flood elevations and risk to affected properties based on Atlas 14 precipitation data and will determine options for protection including partnering with and applying for grants from State and Federal agencies."

Policy 48 was determined to be appropriate as drafted.

##### b. Purchasing of property as an option for flood protection (policy 37)

The second bullet of policy 37 was determined to be appropriate as drafted.

##### c. Intercommunity flow rates (policy 46)

Engineer Chandler reminded the group that intercommunity drainage issues (aside from the trunk system) were not usually addressed by the Commission unless requested by the cities to provide dispute resolution or mediation (as in the recent DeCola Ponds issue).

Chair Black noted that with increasing precipitation and larger storms, flooding issues may increase. Oliver indicated that existing standards for rate control in development and redevelopment should keep stormwater runoff rates from increasing, but they may not reduce runoff rates. Engineer Chandler noted the Commission does not currently have rate control

standards. The group decided against regulating intercommunity runoff rates and recommended revising policy 46 to read: "The BCWMC requires cities to manage stormwater and snowmelt runoff rates so that future peak flow rates leaving development/redevelopment sites are equal to or less than existing rates."

After further discussion, it was decided that rate control and intercommunity drainage issues may be a component of many CIP projects. A discussion ensued about the need to prioritize or rank potential CIP projects against each other. A project's ability to control stormwater runoff rates and the degree to which a project addresses intercommunity drainage issues should be two of several criteria by which to prioritize CIP projects.

Staff was directed to bring a list of possible CIP project criteria to a future meeting for discussion by the Plan Steering Committee and ultimate inclusion in the Plan.

#### **4. Discuss lake characteristics and identification of priority waterbodies**

Engineer Chandler opened the discussion introducing the table that listed various characteristics of lakes and major ponds in the watershed. She asked the group what characteristics were important to consider in designating priority waterbodies. Administrator Jester noted that priority waterbodies would likely be monitored by the Commission and/or Commission projects that directly benefit priority waterbodies might be ranked higher in a prioritization exercise.

It was noted that streams and significant wetlands were missing from the table. Oliver noted that a few ponds should not be on the list at all (West Ring, East Ring, Cortlawn) – that these were rate control ponds constructed for 394 runoff. Asche similarly noted that Turtle Lake is actually a wetland and inclusion on the list might alter expectations of what the waterbody could be or how it should be managed. There was consensus that constructed stormwater ponds should not be on a list of Commission priority waterbodies.

There was discussion about which characteristics (criteria) were more important to consider in designating priority waterbodies and which characteristics simply offered information. Specifically, the following criteria should be considered for designating priority waterbodies: existence of swimming beach or public access, subwatershed drains multiple cities, important for recreation or wildlife, discharges directly to significant downstream resource, water quality is a concern (need improvement or protection), surface area greater than 50 acres, has active lake improvement organization, listed as impaired, size of subwatershed (needs to be added to the list of criteria). The other characteristics will be kept at the far end of the table for informational purposes.

Staff was directed to add high quality wetlands (Administrator Jester will poll TAC members for this information) and streams to the table and to make recommendations for priority waterbodies for committee discussion at the next meeting.

#### **5. Discuss CIP Project selection and implementation process**

Commissioner Welch indicated that a clear, transparent, and collaborative process among cities and the Commission for the selection of CIP projects is warranted. The process should include a listing of potential projects that are evaluated against criteria and ultimately selected by the Commission. Commissioner Welch commented that the process of Commission involvement in the CIP project implementation has improved in the last year but more improvement and transparency is needed.

There was discussion about the 25-year CIP project list initially presented in a draft of the 2004 Watershed Plan. Ultimately, the Plan included a 10-year CIP list. However, the original list should be reviewed for possible projects for this Plan. It was noted that current and previous CIP projects came from prior studies including TMDLs, erosion inventories, lake and watershed assessments, etc.

Staff was asked to look at criteria used in Shingle Creek WMO and to ask the TAC and Commissioners for input on possible criteria. Some possible criteria were suggested by the group including: project addresses a TMDL, subwatershed size, impacts priority waterbody, cost per pound of pollutant removal, addresses multiple Commission objectives, addresses intercommunity flooding issues, control stormwater runoff rates.

The group envisioned a table, possibly with color coding, so the Commission could visually see which criteria are being met.

6. Discuss BCWMC standards and triggers

The group did not get to this item as time ran out.

7. Schedule and next steps

Engineer Chandler noted the next Plan Steering Committee meeting agenda would include a re-visitation of the waterbody classification table to choose priority waterbodies, possible CIP project selection criteria, and discussion of BCWMC standards, triggers, and review process.

Staff will also begin drafting policies for areas not yet discussed; these will be discussed at a later committee meeting (not the next meeting).

The next meeting of the Plan Steering Committee is scheduled for Monday November 18<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:30 p.m.