



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Next Generation Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes

4:30 p.m ~ Monday January 27, 2014
Golden Valley City Hall

Attendees: Commissioners Michael Welch and Clint Carlson; Alternate Commissioners Pat Crough, Lisa Goddard and Dave Tobelmann; TAC members Jeff Oliver, Derek Asche and Joe Fox; Plymouth Councilman Jim Prom; Engineers Karen Chandler and Jim Herbert; Administrator Laura Jester

1. Call Meeting to Order

With the absence of Committee Chair Loomis, Alternate Commissioner Goddard agreed to chair the meeting. She called the meeting to order at approximately 4:35 p.m.

2. Approve Meeting Notes from December 16, 2013 Plan Steering Committee Meetings

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

3. Review of Final Draft Policies for Water Quality, Flooding and Rate Control, Erosion and Sediment Control and Groundwater

Engineer Chandler noted the draft policies were previously discussed at past committee meetings and were revised per discussion at those meetings. She noted the color coding of the policies which reflected the degree of revision from the previous draft. She recommended the group walk through each policy to make sure they are appropriate. The next step would be to take the final draft policies to the whole Commission at a workshop.

Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann asked if any of the draft policies included a statement about how the Commission prioritizes projects or programs that deal with recreation. The group noted that in previous discussions (especially during discussions on how to rank CIP projects), the committee agreed that projects that address water quality issues and/or flooding concerns would be given higher priority. The group also agreed the Commission would not block recreation-focused projects, however. The group agreed the policies should somehow state the main priorities of the Commission. Staff agreed to work that language into the policies.

Each of the draft policies were then discussed individually, as noted below.

#1 The group discussed the waterbody classification system and decided the Commission probably did not need a classification system different than the MPCA or DNR classifications. Commission Engineers will reword the policy and/or recommend a classification system along with appropriate water quality goals per classification. These goals would likely mirror State water quality standards.

#2 This policy could change depending on the final language for Policy #1.

- #3 Okay as presented.
- #4 Commissioner Welch noted this policy could change depending on possible revisions to State Rule 8410 regarding plan amendments.
- #5 Okay as presented.
- #6 Policy will move to Administration. Eligible project costs still need to be determined. Staff will figure out where this item was left off and will bring it to next committee meeting.
- #7 Commissioner Welch wondered if the watershed plan could be used as a "TMDL equivalent" or if there was a better way to incorporate TMDL studies and/or implementation plans into this watershed plan.
- #8 Okay as presented.
- #9 Monitoring by member cities will be added to the list of monitoring entities.
- #10 Policy will be deleted. Amendment process will be added to Implementation Section of the Plan.
- #11 Included with #9.
- #12 Will be included with #9 or moved into Administration policies
- #13 TBD as it is dependent on outcome of standards and triggers discussion
- #14 Deleted as noted.
- #15 Included with #9.
- #16 Moved to Education policies
- #17 Deleted as noted.
- #18 There was some discussion about including a buffer policy. Committee members wondered what cities are currently requiring for buffers. Staff will review current city rules and bring recommended buffer policy to this committee. The committee may also ask the TAC for their reaction to the recommended buffer policy.
- #19 Deleted as noted. Something similar will be included with habitat policy section.
- #20 Included with #9.
- #21 There was discussion about use of the terms "encourage" and "promote" in the policy. Administrator Jester noted that the Commission can't require everything but also does not want to stay silent on certain issues. The term "non-disturbed" in the policy will be changed to "natural" or "native."
- #22 Included in #21
- #23 Deleted as noted.
- #24 Okay as presented.
- #25 There was considerable discussion about whether or not the Commission should begin requiring Commission-issued permits, rather than simply requiring review of developments. Oliver and Engineer Herbert noted that often developers think they are being issued a permit by the Commission. Oliver noted the current system is working well and the Commission's water quality goals are appropriate and useful. Commissioner Welch wondered if the Commission is meeting its statutory obligations. He asked that after the Commission standards and triggers are set, the Commission should discuss how to implement the requirements – either through a permitting program or project reviews. He noted each city is likely using the Commission reviews differently and wondered if some consistency is warranted. The current policy, as drafted, may change pending these discussions and decisions.
- #26 Okay as presented.
- #27 Okay as presented; will move to Administration policies
- #28 The term "P8" will be changed to "water quality model."
- #29 Included in #28.
- #30 Included in #28.
- #31 - #34 Policies depend on outcome of Flood Control Project Study

#35 Deleted as noted.

#36 Okay, but could possibly change with outcome of Flood Control Project Study

#37 There was discussion about the possible need for criteria to determine when property acquisition is appropriate for flood protection projects. Asche worried that residents could read the policy and request the Commission purchase their property if it's prone to flooding. Commission Engineers will work on refining the language or adding criteria to the policy. Reworded policy will come back to this committee.

#38 Deleted as noted.

#39 - #41 Policies will be moved to an Implementation Section.

#42 Okay as presented.

#43 Okay as presented.

#44 Policy is dependent on outcome of standards and triggers and permitting discussions with the Commission.

#45 Policy is dependent on outcome of standards and triggers and permitting discussions with the Commission.

#46 Okay as presented. This standard should be included in a list of Commission standards.

#47 Policy is dependent on outcome of standards and triggers and permitting discussions with the Commission.

#48 Okay as presented.

#49 Combined with #37.

#49.1 Okay as presented, but could be revised based on standards, triggers and permitting discussions with the Commission.

#50 There was discussion about what uses and structures are or are not allowed in floodplains, particularly parking lots. There was a suggestion to include the term "temporary" when referring to excavation and storage piles. Commission Engineer was directed to review the DNR's model ordinance and bring revised language back to this committee.

#51 The word "existing" will be removed from the last sentence.

#52 Included in #51.

#53 The word "watershed" will be replaced with "water," the word "comprehensive" added before "land use plans", and the word "zoning" removed.

#54 Okay as presented.

#55 - #59 Okay as presented.

At this point, the group had discussed all of the water quality and flooding and rate control policies, and the meeting time was up. The group decided to review the remaining policies and to discuss standards and triggers at the next committee meeting.

The group agreed a workshop with the Commission was not possible until March at the earliest. The workshop would include all final draft policies color coded for priority of discussion. Most draft policies would be included on a "consent" list and would only be discussed if pulled off that list. A structured discussion about standards and triggers in the overall function of the Commission will be facilitated at the workshop and will include a review of the possible permitting vs. project review function of the Commission.

The next meeting of this committee was set for Tuesday February 11, 2014; 4:30 p.m. at a locale to be determined.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40 p.m.