



## Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

### Next Generation Plan Steering Committee

#### DRAFT Meeting Notes

4:30 p.m ~ Monday July 29, 2013  
Golden Valley City Hall

**Attendees:** Committee Chair Linda Loomis; Commission Chair Ginny Black; Commissioners Ted Hoshal and Administrator Laura Jester; Greg Williams, Barr Engineering; TAC members Derek Asche and Jeff Oliver

1. Call Meeting to Order  
The meeting was called to order by Chair Loomis at 4:30 p.m.
2. Brief Recap of Plan Organization Discussion from April 2013 Plan Steering Committee Meeting

Williams reminded the group that at their meeting in April, they discussed possible formats for the Watershed Management Plan including leaving the format the same as the current Plan or formatting the Plan by subwatershed. At the time, no consensus was reached.

Williams indicated Barr was beginning to draft sections of the Plan and needed a format and general table of contents (TOC) developed at this point. He noted it would be much easier to decide on a format now rather than reformatting the entire document at a later date.

3. Presentation and Discussion of Examples of Plan Organization Styles

Williams presented the tables of contents (and whole Plan documents) of several watershed organizations including the current BCWMC Plan, Black Dog WMO, Valley Branch WD, and Ramsey-Washington WD.

He noted the current BCWMC Plan is organized by issue. Oliver and Asche indicated this format worked well for them although Asche wondered if the Plan should be formatted to reflect the list of required Plan elements in State Statute. The group noted the pros and cons of the current Plan's organization. Pros: 1) each "issue chapter" includes background information about that issue including data, the reasons that issue exists in the watershed, and the goals and policies to address that issue; 2) easy to follow if you're interested in a certain issue; 3) would probably follow the Summit topics nicely. Cons: 1) information on specific lakes is buried low in the hierarchy of topics; 2) differing Plan structures among various watersheds within one city make it cumbersome for that city to update its local water management Plan.

Commissioner Black noted that many items could be referenced in the Plan rather than explicitly existing in the document including land and water resource inventory information and information on regulatory agencies. She also wondered how TMDL information is being incorporated into the Plan. She indicated the preference for more graphs and figures rather than text.

The pros and cons of the other Plans' structures were discussed as well. The Ramsey Washington and Valley Branch Plans are organized by subwatershed. Pros = the ability to point someone directly to information on a particular water resource. Cons = duplication among subwatershed chapters, data in each subwatershed plan is outdated within a few years.

There was discussion about different waterbodies in the Bassett Creek watershed and which type (or level) of waterbody (ponds vs. wetlands vs. small lakes vs. large lakes) should receive associated discussion, policies, monitoring, etc. within the Plan. Expectations for the conditions of some waterbodies should be considered. There was discussion about identifying uses of the waterbody including wildlife use, stormwater retention, aesthetics, swimming, boating, etc. Some waterbodies will require strategies and policies and others may not. There was consensus that only 6 or 7 waterbodies in the watershed should be considered "significant," "strategic," or of "regional use." Future meetings will tackle this issue further.

There was discussion regarding the public's use of the Plan document. Some indicated the Plan is not utilized by the public. It's possible a fact sheet per "significant" waterbody could be developed to help relay pertinent information to the public. There was discussion about improved interaction of the public with the Commission website and electronic Plan including mapping features – although that would likely require additional funding.

There was consensus to keep the Plan organization/structure the same as the current Plan – with one chapter per issue. There was a suggestion to add pertinent lines from the Implementation Plan into each chapter than cross referencing.

#### 4. Consider Steps and Schedule for Policy Review by Steering Committee, Commission and TAC

The group decided to ask the Commission at their August meeting about how and when the Commission would like to review and discuss draft policies now that the goals are finalized. The Plan Steering Committee could draft policies and strategies for the Commission and TAC to review at future meetings or workshops (similar to the goals development). It was decided that whenever the TAC was involved with review and providing input of information for the Plan, the state review agencies and other stakeholders would be invited and encouraged to attend as well.

#### 5. Adjourn and Next Meeting

The Committee adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next Committee meeting will be held Monday August 19 at 4:30 p.m. at Golden Valley City Hall.