



## Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

### Commission Workshop to Finalize Goals and Discuss Policies Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 11:40 a.m.

Thursday October 17, 2013

Golden Valley City Hall Council Conference Room; 7800 Golden Valley Rd; Golden Valley MN 55427

**Attendees:** Chair Ginny Black, Commissioner Jim de Lambert, Commissioner Michael Welch, Commissioner Stacy Hoschka, Commissioner Clint Carlson, Commissioner John Elder, Alternate Commissioner Lisa Goddard, Alternate Commissioner Pat Crough, Alternate Commissioner Guy Mueller, Alternate Commissioner John Hanson, Alternate Commissioner Justin Riss, Alternate Commissioner Dave Tobelmann, Alternate Commissioner John O'Toole, TAC members Jeff Oliver, Bob Paschke, Perry Edman, Tom Mathisen, Chris Long, Lois Eberhart, Liz Stout and Joe Fox; Administrator Laura Jester, Recording Secretary Amy Herbert, Engineer Karen Chandler, Greg Williams (Barr Engineering), Rich Brasch (Three Rivers Park District), Brad Wozney (BWSR), Kate Drewry (MDNR)

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Next Generation Plan Steering Committee Chair Loomis was not able to attend the workshop. Therefore, Chair Black opened the meeting at 10:07 a.m. immediately following the regular Commission meeting and welcomed attendees. Introductions were made around the table.

#### 2. Review of Outcomes from Watershed Summit and Commission/TAC/Agency Prioritization

Administrator Jester reminded the group about the prioritization of issues by watershed residents and the Commission/TAC/Agency stakeholders earlier in the year. She indicated it was important to keep these items in mind when approving goals and setting policies.

#### 3. Final Approval of Watershed Goals

Administrator Jester reminded the group that three goals had not yet received final approval from the Commission and more discussion was necessary. The subject of these goals includes flooding, ditches, and groundwater. Commissioner Welch reminded the group that goals, although broad, communicate internally and externally about issues the Commission will and will not address through its Plan.

Regarding flooding: Chair Black noted that flooding still occurs in the watershed and advocated to keep a goal regarding flooding. Mr. Oliver noted some homes that still regularly flood but also noted the Commission should not concentrate on flooding of backyards. After some discussion, the group agreed on the following goal: "Protect against flood risks along the Bassett Creek trunk system."

Regarding ditches: Ms. Drewry asked if the Commission could manage ditches without ditch authority and whether ditches impact other Commission goals. It was noted that only remnants of ditches remain in the watershed. There was consensus that the Commission is not interested in taking on ditch jurisdiction. Some Commissioners wondered if they could stay silent on ditches in the Plan. It was decided that more work and background was needed on this goal.

After a brief discussion, the Commission agreed the proposed language for the groundwater goal was appropriate (which is the same goal as the current 2004 Plan): “Protect the quantity and quality of groundwater resources.”

**MOTION** by Commissioner Welch, second by Commissioner Hoschka to approve goals regarding groundwater and flooding (as stated above) and to keep working on the goal regarding ditches. Motion passed unanimously.

#### 4. Discussion of Watershed Policies

##### a. Flood Control Project Maintenance and Flood-proofing Program

The group was asked if the Commission should consider purchasing properties (rather than funding flood proofing projects). There was consensus that purchase of property should be considered and should be the first remedial option when a home is flooded. Ms. Drewry noted the MDNR offers grants for flood proofing or purchase. Staff was given direction to develop a policy regarding the purchase of property as a flood-proofing option and its funding. Later in the discussion, the group indicated that the Commission should evaluate the number of properties in the floodplain. And, as the Commission considers expenditures to reduce flood risks, the purchase of property would be the preferred option; that “sequencing” within the decision-making process should be considered.

The discussion then turned to long term maintenance and eventual replacement of flood control project components. Engineer Chandler noted that the Commission should be looking ahead at costs and schedules and that replacement of structures could be part of the CIP. Mr. Oliver suggested that the existing long-term maintenance fund should continue as a reserve fund in case of catastrophic failure, similar to the emergency fund. There was discussion that little is known about future needs and possible costs. But there was general consensus that permanent replacement of flood control project features would be funded through the levy. Commissioner Welch noted that in order to appropriately set aside funds, there should be a plan as to how to spend those funds. Administrator Jester indicated that ideally, a plan for funding and possible scheduling of future maintenance would be part of the Watershed Plan so the CIP could be as complete as possible. The group indicated that such a plan could be developed using existing long-term maintenance funds. Engineer Chandler speculated that such an endeavor might cost \$10,000 - \$15,000.

**MOTION** by Commissioner Welch, second by Commissioner Elder for Barr Engineering to bring a proposal to the Commission’s November meeting for the development of a fund management plan for the flood control project to address the long term maintenance, replacement, and emergency needs of the flood control project. Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Welch also noted the study should include recommendations on restrictions/rules for use of the flood control project funds.

##### b. Funding Water Quality Projects

A list of costs eligible and ineligible for Commission funding was provided with meeting materials. The group discussed the possible need to include property acquisition in the list of costs eligible for Commission funding. There were questions about whether or not the Commission is allowed to own property. This led to a discussion about the how projects are implemented and managed. The group agreed the roles and responsibilities between cities and the Commission with regards to Commission-

funded projects are unclear. Commissioner Welch noted he doesn't always understand what the Commission is "buying" and doesn't know all the project details. Alternate Commissioner O'Toole indicated he would like to see more information on projects during and after construction and implementation. It was suggested that an "after-action" report be completed after each project to evaluate project execution and whether the project is achieving the intended purpose.

The questions regarding Commission-funded projects came down to: 1) How is the CIP developed? 2) What issues are addressed by each proposed project? 3) What are the roles and responsibilities of the cities and Commission with regards to project implementation and maintenance? 4) Are there potential improvements to the feasibility study process? (These questions are also closely related to item 4d of this meeting agenda: CIP Process.)

As the meeting time was running short, the group asked that the Plan Steering Committee work on items 4b and 4d from this meeting's agenda and bring recommendations back to the Commission for further discussion.

4c. Triggers and Standards – this was not discussed at this meeting due to lack of time

4d. CIP Process – to be considered by the Plan Steering Committee

4e. Pursuit of Taxing Authority – Chair Black asked that this be brought to the Commission at their November meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.