



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

MEMO

To: BCWMC Commissioners and Alternates
From: Administrator Jester on behalf of the Technical Advisory Committee
Date: January 8, 2026

RE: BCWMC Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation to Officially Adopt the Updated BCWMC Requirements Document

The TAC met on January 7th to review the final version of the BCWMC Requirements for Development and Improvement Projects (Requirements Document) (posted with meeting materials), discuss the effective date for and communication about the new requirements, and review an analysis of project review fees.

TAC member Scharenbroich was reappointed as TAC Chair.

Meeting attendees included:

City/Partner	Technical Advisory Committee Member
Crystal	Jesse Struve
Golden Valley	Emma Rakestraw
Medicine Lake	Susan Weise
Minneapolis	--
Minnetonka	--
New Hope	Nick Macklem
Plymouth	Ben Scharenbroich
Robbinsdale	Jenna Wolf
St. Louis Park	Erick Francis
Minneapolis Park & Rec Board	Rachael Crabb
Others: Commissioner Hauer, Administrator Jester, Commission Engineers Johnson and Herbert	

As part of the 2026-2035 Watershed Management Plan update, the BCWMC also reviewed and updated the BCWMC's Requirements Document. The TAC reviewed and discussed recommended changes to the Requirements Document at their February, March, and May, 2025 meetings and the Commission reviewed it at their workshop

in May 2025. [A memorandum to the BCWMC Board of Commissioners](#) summarized the history of the BCWMC project requirements and recommended changes. The most significant changes to BCWMC requirements are related to linear projects, wetland and stream buffers, and chloride management plans.

The TAC reviewed and discussed additional minor edits to the Requirements Document since the May 2025 version that were made to clarify language and ensure consistent terminology. The TAC also reviewed the updated BCWMC Design Sequence Flow Chart (or “flexible treatment options”) which is an appendix to the Requirements Document. The flow chart was updated to align it with new requirements.

The TAC also discussed the timing of the effective date of the new requirements and methods for communicating about the new requirements to cities and potential developers.

Finally, the TAC reviewed the Commission Engineer’s analysis of review fees collected vs. review expenses. Based on the analysis of project review fees for 2024–2025, Commission Engineer Herbert recommended that the Commission maintain the [current project review fee schedule](#). He noted that most reviews were completed within or close to the project review fee, and for those projects where review costs exceeded \$5,000, the Commission captured the expenses through reimbursement from the applicants. He noted that while non-fee reviews (such as MnDOT projects) resulted in some unreimbursed costs, they represent a small portion of overall review activity. (The Commission Engineer’s memo and analysis is posted with TAC meeting materials [here](#).)

TAC RECOMMENDS:

1. That the Commission officially adopt the updated BCWMC Requirements for Development and Improvement Projects and Design Sequence Flow Chart (posted with meeting materials) with an effective date of May 1, 2026. (Projects submitted to the BCWMC before May 1st would be subject to existing requirements while projects submitted after May 1st would be subject to updated requirements.)
2. That the Commission maintain the existing review fee schedule.
3. That BCWMC staff communicate about the updated Requirements Document immediately following official adopting by
 - a. Posting a notice on the BCWMC website (including on the ‘Standards and Requirements’ webpage) about the new Requirements Document and key changes going into effect on May 1, 2026. The notice should include a summary of the major changes.
 - b. Posting the updated Requirements Document with watermarks, headers, and/or other text noting the effective date of May 1st.
 - c. Communicating with member cities and asking them to appropriately inform project applicants about the new requirements and effective date.
 - d. Sending email communication announcing the change to other potentially impacted local / state agencies.

Following the discussion on the Requirements Document, the TAC discussed the use of Commission Engineer time by city staff and concluded that the current practice is appropriate and generally equitable among cities. They noted that coordination between cities and the Commission Engineer is a good, efficient use of resources and, when pertaining to pending developments, often results in better applications and less time reviewing poor applications.