



Item 4Ai.
BCWMC 11-19-14

Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Commission Workshop on Next Generation Watershed Management Plan Meeting Minutes

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Wednesday October 8, 2014
Golden Valley City Hall

Attendees: Plan Steering Committee (PSC) Chair Linda Loomis, Commission Chair Jim de Lambert, Commissioner Stacy Hoschka, Commissioner Clint Carlson, Alternate Commissioner Pat Crough, Alternate Commissioner Jane McDonald Black; TAC members Eric Eckman, Chris Long, Lois Eberhart; Administrator Laura Jester, Engineers Karen Chandler and Greg Williams, Steve Christopher (BWSR), Rachel Olmanson (MPCA), Karen Jensen and Emily Resseger (Met Council), Kate Drewry (DNR)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Plan Steering Committee Chair Loomis opened the meeting at 4:06 p.m., welcomed the group, and thanked them for their attendance and participation. Introductions were made around the table.

2. Review Progress of Plan Development

Administrator Jester gave an overview of progress made to date during previous workshops. She noted that this workshop should be the final workshop prior to the beginning of the 60-day review period which is slated to begin in late November. She reminded the group that only policies highlighted in orange would be discussed at the meeting unless someone “pulled” a different policy for discussion (similar to a consent agenda).

3. Review Draft Education and Outreach Policies #123 – 161 and Draft Education and Outreach Plan

Administrator Jester noted that many of the education policies in the 2004 Plan have been moved to the more detailed Education and Outreach Plan (EOP) which will be included as an Appendix in the watershed plan. She noted that the Commission’s education activities could go in many different directions and that sometimes specific activities are a result of the interests and passions of the Commissioners, committee members or volunteers. She reported the EOP would be reviewed annually by the Commission to budget and plan for specific education and outreach activities each year.

Policy #123: In the second sentence, the “education and public involvement plan” will be changed to “education and outreach plan.”

No other policies were discussed. In turning to the draft Education and Outreach Plan (EOP), Mr. Eckman wondered if a formal partnership would be needed if cities wanted to take credit in their MS4 permits for education activities of the Commission. Ms. Olmanson said she would look into that and get back to Administrator Jester. Ms. Drewry noted the EOP seemed very comprehensive. There were no other comments on the draft EOP.

4. Review Draft Administration Policies #162 - 190

Engineer Williams noted that many of these policies were approved in previous policy sections and were moved here. There were no comments on policies with minor revisions from the 2004 plan (noted in green). Discussion ensued regarding the following policies:

Policy #166: Ms. Drewry asked for examples of administrative or legal actions the Commission would take if an evaluation of a member city noted it was not complying with the goals and policies of the Plan. Engineer Chandler noted the Commission could consider taking on the permitting role for that city. The group wondered if there were options laid out in the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA). Ms. Drewry said she would like to see the options for action identified in another document, if not included in the Plan. Mr. Christopher noted the Commission could withhold cost sharing for a non-implementing city. Administrator Jester reported the language in this policy was taken from the approved Rice Creek Watershed District watershed plan which BWSR used as a good example for an evaluation policy. The group acknowledged that the Commission would not take legal action as a first step but would negotiate and work with the city to become compliant.

Policy #169: Ms. Olmanson recommended adding “improves and protects water quality...” within the second gatekeeper question bullets in this policy. She noted the MPCA is focusing new plans not only on improving or restoring waters but also protecting good water quality. Along those same lines, the group decided to add “approved TMDL and WRAPS” to the end of the third gatekeeper question bullet. (WRAPS, or Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy, is the new way of incorporating a TMDL with a plan for protection.)

The group also agreed to remove bullets in the bottom section of the policy that are duplicates of the gatekeeper question bullets. And, the group agreed to add “education opportunities” to the list of examples of multiple Commission goals in the lower bulleted items.

There was a discussion about whether the cost/benefit of a project should be used in prioritization process and added to the list of items to consider. Engineer Chandler noted that there is not enough known about the costs of the project and the pollutant removal when the project is added to the CIP. She said these items are calculated during the feasibility study. She noted the Commission has feasibility study criteria that include a calculation of the costs and pollutant removals.

5. Review Draft Recreation, Habitat and Shoreland Management Policies #111 - 122

#111: Ms. Drewry noted that she liked the activity proposed in the policy but that it didn't seem like it belonged in the policy section. There was some discussion. The group agreed to remove “deep and shallow” from the first sentence of the policy and to leave it in the policy section unless a more appropriate place in the Plan is determined.

#112: Ms. Drewry wondered if staff looked at the activities of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District as examples of activities the Commission could consider – particularly monitoring, funding, research, etc. Staff indicated they had reviewed the MCWD policies with regards to aquatic plant management but that the Commission doesn't have the level of funding necessary for those activities. Rather, the Commission is dedicated to collaborating with other entities. “Counties” will be added to the list of examples entities in the first sentence. The group discussed adding the word “support and collaborate” but decided that indicated a funding activity the Commission is unlikely to provide.

#87: (from the Stream Restoration and Protection Policy Section) Administrator Jester noted she was asked by committee members at the last Plan Steering Committee meeting to check with Friends of Bassett Creek (FOBC)

to better understand their recommendations for Commission policies. She reported she has spoken with the FOBC leader, Dave Stack. He said he would like the Commission to allow for navigation of the creek by canoe or kayak when installing structures or doing projects in or near the creek AND when rehabilitating existing structures. There was some discussion about this. Staff was directed to wordsmith the policy to perhaps use the word “accommodate” or “attempt to accommodate” and bring revised language back to the Commission for review.

6. Discuss Recreation Matrix to Refine Commission’s Role in Recreation

Administrator Jester presented a large version of the matrix on a display board. The group discussed various areas where the Commission is already performing some activity related to recreation (either directly or indirectly) and where current draft policies indicate future Commission activity. The group discussed some nuances within the matrix, noting the “non-curly leaf pondweed” should be changed to “native vegetation.” They agreed to add an “X” (indicating activity) to feasibility studies/studies and BCWMC projects related to boating due to the previous discussion to attempt to allow for canoe/kayak navigability with CIP projects. The group also agreed an “X” belonged in the column for partnering/collaboration for water level management for non-flood control due to the possibility of a temporary water level drawdown to curly leaf pondweed control. Additionally, the group agreed that “streams” should be added to the list of projects with relation to sediment removal.

Administrator Jester reported that although Commissioner Welch couldn’t attend the meeting, he had emailed his thoughts and recommendations. She reported that Commissioner Welch wrote that “the Commission should be clear in the Plan and with constituents and member cities that while recreational needs and interests must be considered in design of capital projects, recreation as a primary driver for investment of capital resources is better left to partner parks organization and the Commission will not undertake a capital project solely or primarily to provide or enhance recreational opportunities except to the degree improving water quality serves such purposes.” Ms. Eberhart indicated that language would make a good policy within the Plan. Ms. Hoschka agreed. There was discussion about whether or not this type of language can or should be added to the CIP project prioritization policy #169. Commission Chair de Lambert noted that he would rather see policies stating what the Commission *will do* not what the Commission *won’t do*. Commissioner Carlson noted the City of Medicine Lake was looking to improve all conditions in the lake and to continue the goodwill generated by recent meetings between the Medicine Lake mayor and the Golden Valley mayor. He noted such language is unnecessary. Commission Chair de Lambert noted there is definitely consensus that the Commission will not implement recreation-base projects. After further discussion, the group asked staff to consider language that could be added to policy #169 or elsewhere in the Plan noting the Commission’s desire to leave recreation-base projects to other entities.

7. Review Draft Implementation Section

There was not time in the meeting to discuss this section. Administrator Jester asked if comments on this section could be received via email rather than holding another workshop. Engineer Chandler noted some areas of the section had changed since its inclusion in the workshop meeting packet due to TAC input at their meeting the previous week. Staff agreed to send the revised section out to all Commissioners, TAC and review agencies to receive comments by October 17th.

8. Next Steps and Adjourn

Administrator Jester noted this was the final workshop scheduled before the 60-day review period and thanked those who participated. The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:30 p.m.