



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Meeting Notes of the
Watershed Plan Steering Committee
February 5, 2025 @ 8:30 a.m.
Brookview, Golden Valley

Meeting Attendees:

Committee Commissioners Polzin, Hauer, Harwell, and Pentel; TAC Members Eckman and Scharenbroich; Administrator Jester; Commission Engineers Johnson, and Williams

1. WELCOME

In the committee chair's absence, Committee Member Polzin opened the meeting at 8:34 a.m.

2. REVIEW JANUARY 3 MEETING NOTES

There was a consensus that the meeting notes were appropriate as presented.

3. REVIEW PLAN PROGRESS TRACKER

The group reviewed the plan progress tracker, noting topics that will be the focus of future discussions.

4. REVIEW DRAFT TABLE OF CONTENTS

Administrator Jester described the sections within the draft table of contents. There was consensus that the table looked good and a comment that the appendices should be listed in the order in which they appear in the text. It was noted that currently, appendices A, B, and C are more relevant to plan implementation but the group agreed they should be reorganized according to when they are referenced in the plan. It was noted that the section on funding sources should clearly identify federal vs. state vs. local funding. There was a recommendation to include a link to the table of contents on future PSC agendas for easy reference.

5. REVIEW REVISED IMPLEMENTATION SECTION 4.1

Administrator Jester noted that the section was revised from the January meeting to include a matrix of issues vs. tools and other changes (tracked) to more explicitly tie policies back to issues and goals. There was discussion about how the section is organized by tools despite having worked to this point creating content organized by issues and goals. There was acknowledgement that many tools and activities address multiple goals so that organizing the section by goal requires significant repetition of tools and activities. Commission Engineer Williams noted that some organizations use their non-CIP implementation table to directly connect activities to goals which also helps with annual reporting and tracking progress. Committee member Polzin wondered if an introduction to the section could be crafted to describe what is being implemented and when. Committee member Pentel suggested using links to referenced documents, plan sections, and appendices. There was also discussion about the need to discern which activities are on-going, existing activities and which are new activities.

Engineer Williams noted that sometimes the plan language should intentionally be broad narrative with details in tables that can be more easily amended, if needed. He noted the implementation section could start with the non-CIP implementation schedule that lists activities, the year of implementation, and the budget associated with the activity.

Administrator Jester noted the policies could be rolled up into one table after (or before) the narrative section for easier reading.

There was discussion on specific topics in the implementation section including potentially offering to provide erosion and sediment control (ESC) inspection services to member cities. Committee member Scharenbroich noted the BCWMC shouldn't perform functions required of cities, such as ESC inspections. Committee member Polzin noted that some cities have different priorities and staff capacity and that ESC inspections shouldn't fall through the cracks. She noted that there are many different ways to assist cities that the Commission should consider. She suggested a need to understand the scope of the issue first and to then consider the range of solutions. There were suggestions to revise the narrative to acknowledge the issue to make sure it is not lost in Plan implementation.

There was a discussion about an existing policy requiring cities to inspect high priority wetlands for invasive species. Administrator Jester noted she wasn't sure if cities were actually performing the inspections. Committee member Eckman noted Golden Valley does inspect high priority wetlands. Committee member Scharenbroich noted many wetlands are on private property and difficult to inspect. After more discussion there was consensus to keep the policy in the plan.

Regarding the activity of evaluating member city implementation: Committee member Polzin noted that the policy language needs more specific methods for checking on city implementation. It was noted that cities should invite BCWMC commissioners to annual MS4 meetings. There was also a comment that more time spent reporting on activities means less time actually implementing and that duplication should be avoided. If cities already report activities to the State, perhaps the BCWMC doesn't also need to gather and review the same information.

6. REVIEW DRAFT 10-YEAR CIP PROJECTS & DISCUSS PRIORITIZATION

While there wasn't time to thoroughly review and discuss prioritization of projects at this meeting, it was noted that the CIP prioritization matrix itself would not be in the Plan so that it could be updated more easily. Instead, elements of the matrix would be noted in the Plan within a discussion of CIP prioritization.

7. DISCUSS USE OF EQUITY METRICS

Commission Engineer Johnson reminded committee members of the DEIA-related issues and goals previously developed for the Plan along with potential actions already identified. She reviewed how there are many different agencies analyzing demographics to better understand the community and develop equity metrics including the CDC, Met Council, MPCA, and Hennepin County. She noted they all rely on census data but analyze the data in different ways. She reviewed how Nine Mile Creek Watershed District (NMCWD) used an approach similar to work completed for Hennepin County's Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment to develop their own equity metric. She noted the NMCWD metric overlays social vulnerability scores with areas of known flooding and/or lack of tree canopy.

Committee member Polzin wondered if the Shingle Creek WMO incorporated equity metrics or DEIA goals after attending the equity workshop co-hosted with BCWMC in 2022. She also noted that datasets should be gathered now in the event the Federal government deletes them.

There was a brief discussion of various metrics and how Golden Valley and Plymouth use them. Golden Valley uses more granular data than census data and has developed environmental justice priority areas. There was a question on whether the Commission should work on developing its own equity metric now (outside of the plan development scope) or develop a metric early in plan implementation.

Administrator Jester suggested that the current CIP prioritization matrix could include an equity metric and use city knowledge of socially vulnerable areas as a place holder for now. She advocated for development of a BCWMC equity metric during plan implementation. There was consensus this is a good approach.

8. REVIEW DRAFT INTRODUCTION SECTION 1.0

This item was tabled to a future meeting due to lack of time.

9. ADJOURN – The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 a.m.