

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review							
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
1	BWSR	General			The Plan is written in plain language, concise, and easy to navigate	No	Thank you.
2	BWSR	General			Through the course of the review, typographic errors were noted. These will be provided as supplemental, unofficial comments for the Commission's use as they see fit. (see next page/tab)	Yes	These will be addressed in 90-day draft.
3	BWSR	General			Where there are website links, consider stating the website name in the Plan, as links can be subject to change.	Yes	We will include more information on website names and addresses, where appropriate.
4	BWSR	General			It would be nice to have a comprehensive list of goals.	Yes	A table listing all 55 goals and their abbreviations tying them to Table 4-5 will be added to the beginning of Section 3.0
5	MDH	General			MDH SWP staff have appreciated the opportunity to be involved in this watershed planning process through participation in various TAC meetings. We remain available for technical assistance and look forward to continuing to work together in the future!	No	Thank you for your continued support and cooperation.
6	MPRB	General	Accessibility		Alt text is not present for all of the figures, where alt text is present, it is not descriptive, this may be something that was planned to add before final publication, but I thought I would mention. You may want to add more specificity to the BCWMC to the alt text for better context for readers using accessibility tools.	Yes	The final plan will incorporate ADA accessible tools and alt text, wherever possible.
7	City of Minneapolis	General	Accessibility		If it has not already been done I highly recommend utilizing resources from the State Office of Accessibility or other tools to ensure that the Plan is accessible for everyone. For example, adding more specificity to the alt text for readers using accessibility tools.	Yes	The final plan will incorporate ADA accessible tools and alt text, wherever possible.
8	Hennepin County	General	AIS		Continued support for preventing the introduction of new aquatic invasive species (AIS) into lakes and creeks. The county, watershed, and partners have worked hard to minimize new infestations, notably including the rapid response to the Eurasian Watermilfoil infestation discovered at Sweeney Lake which was noted on page 44 of the plan.	No	Thank you for highlighting this item. We look forward to continuing these activities and working with partners.
9	Hennepin County	General	Chloride		The Commission including chloride reduction as a high priority with goals to address chloride loading across the watershed and to decrease average chloride concentrations in Bassett Creek by 10% during the plan period. The inclusion of a requirement for development projects to have a chloride management plan is novel but necessary to begin addressing chloride runoff at scale	No	Thank you for highlighting this item. We look forward to making strides in chloride reduction through these activities.
10	Hennepin County	General	Climate Resilience		We're excited to see the Commission better consider the carbon footprint of their projects. We'd also encourage that, when making this assessment, the Commission consider the climate resilience co-benefits of your projects, such as but not necessarily limited to: stormwater management, supporting biodiversity, flood mitigation, air quality improvements, and reduction of the urban heat island. An understanding of these benefits will help the Commission and its partners better determine and communicate their contribution to climate impacts and our progress building long-term climate resilience.	Yes	Table 4-5 includes Activity S-6: Develop climate resilience study/plan that evaluates climate adaptation strategies (e.g., tree planting to increase canopy, incorporating native plantings, etc.) and potential impacts to priority waterbodies.  Goal CF1 will be reworded to: <u>Consider Evaluate</u> the use of available tools to assess the impact and mitigate the effects of BCWMC activities on greenhouse gas emissions.  Further, Section 4.1.8 Capital Improvement Program will be revised to include acknowledgement that BCWMC CIP projects can help build climate resilience.
11	Hennepin County	General	DEIA		The Commission's development of a Land and Water Acknowledgement and goals and actions listed throughout the plan including incorporating Dakota names, history, and knowledge into programming and working more earnestly to establish relationships with underrepresented communities to better enrich environmental outcomes for those communities. This aligns very well with the county's goal of eliminating disparities and actions the county has recently taken since declaring racism a public health crisis in 2020.	No	Thank you for highlighting this item. We look forward to continuing these activities and working with partners.
12	Hennepin County	General	Education		Continued support for education and community engagement and our partnership with the West Metro Water Alliance (WMWA), which was noted as part of several goals throughout the plan, reflecting well the value the partnership brings in addressing many of the Commission's plan goals.	No	Thank you for highlighting this item. We look forward to continuing these activities and working with partners.

**BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review**

Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion	Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment	
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
13	Dave Stack, resident	General	Floodplain		I would like to hear from the experts about the idea of sporadic vegetated wetland floodplain areas adjacent to the flowing stream and with a water connection to the flowing stream. I am thinking this would be good for flood control, filtration of pollutants, habitat, and a refuge area for fish and minnows during torrential high flow events.	No	Wetland restoration in riparian areas could be a strategy to address flood risk and will be evaluated as an option, where applicable, during identification and feasibility studies for CIP projects. Additionally, the inventory of wetlands across the watershed (Activity S-12 in Table 4-5) will automatically include identification and assessment of riparian wetlands.
14	Dave Stack, resident	General	Floodplain		I am wondering if additional flood plain could be constructed between Fruen Mill and Hwy 55? If so, could this new flood plain area be traded off against existing flood plain in the rough path area across the creek from the mill? And then could it be feasible to raise that path across from the mill a foot or two? I am wondering if this could be a way to construct a nice path there?	??	Thank you for identifying a potential project to improve floodplain storage. This concept may be evaluated through existing or future assessments such as activities S-3 and S-5 in Table 4-5.
15	Dave Stack, resident	General	Habitat		I like the idea of keeping disturbance of the flowing creek bed to a minimum. This is to maintain long term establishment of habitat for fish, minnows, mussels, macroinvertebrates, etc.	No	In-stream habitat is improved or maintained during stream restoration CIP projects. Policy 27 (Section 4.1.8) includes intent to improve ecological health of waterbodies through CIP project implementation. Also see CIP #28 Streambank restoration and channel/habitat improvements on priority streams; various segments.
16	Dave Stack, resident	General	Habitat		I would like to hear from the experts about the possibility of planning and constructing sporadic self-scouring habitat pools. I am thinking these could occur on the down-stream side of culverts and rock cross-vanes	No	See response to coment #15.
17	Friends of EB Wildflower Garden	General	Hydrology		We believe a hydrology study would be of significant value to understand the water budget for all of South Wirth Park. The results of such a study could be the basis for restoration, education and interpretation of what we believe is an important "hydrologic reserve"--in addition to it's premiere status as an urban nature preserve.	Yes	Table 4-5 will be revised to include a hydrology study of the Eloise Butler Wildflower Garden area in Theodore Wirth Regional Park in 2027 with estimated budget of \$70,000. BCWMC will continue to work with partners to refine scope and budget fo the study.
18	MPCA	General	Indigenous name use		Nice job of incorporating the Native American stream name into the Plan.	No	Thank you.
19	City of Minneapolis	General	Indigenous name use		The co-naming of places with native Dakota names is appreciated. This acknowledgement of the history of Ĥaĥá Wakpádan / Basset Creek is, as is stated in the Commissions land and water acknowledgement, "a step toward healing for the land, watershed, and peoples who live in the watershed today."	No	Thank you.
20	City of Minneapolis	General	Readability		Acronyms and abbreviations are not well defined, including the naming rubric for the goal abbreviation. Please consider adding more comprehensive definitions and explanations.	Yes	A table listing all 55 goals and their abbreviations tying them to Table 4-5 will be added to the beginning of Section 3.0. The acronymn list will be reviewed to ensure its completeness. Abbreviations throughout the document will be reviewed and explained, where needed.
21	Dave Stack, resident	General	Recreation		I like the idea of having the thalweg of the main stem as kayak friendly as possible: kayak friendly culverts, rock cross-vanes, etc.	No	Section 3.16 recognizes that BCWMC project have the potential to enhance or maintain recreational opportunites in streams and lakes.

**BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review**

Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion	Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment	
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
22	Dave Stack, resident	General	Stream Integrity		I am not a fan of dams that no longer serve a good purpose such as electricity generation, or with a lock for navigation, etc. I am thinking that a scenic rocky kayak friendly rapids chute could replace the little dam at the [Fruen] mill. Please correct me if I am wrong on this, but I am thinking this would be beneficial in a few ways. (1) this could lower the water level a few inches above the dam which would make the rough path across the creek higher and dryer. (2) this would remove the un-natural impoundment above the dam which would improve the natural stream habitat. (3) lowering the creek above the dam would add to flood water holding capacity. (4) lowering the water level above of the creek may lower the nearby groundwater level, which might be beneficial for commercial activity in the mill, Utepils area. (5) This would make the creek more kayak friendly in this area. And would give kayakers a little fun thrill floating down the chute. (6) This would improve fish passage in this area. I am thinking that native fish and minnows will thrive better if they have more connected stream habitat to swim up and down in. This would improve the mussel population because mussels need fish to survive.	No	These ideas may be explored in the future. Results of current project to update the 2019 study of the Bassett Creek Valley and updates to the hydrologic and hydraulic model may also provide data and information to better address these ideas. There may be constraints to potential activities in this area due to State Historical Preservation Office and adjacent property owners.
23	Hennepin County	General	Wetlands		Development of a watershed-wide wetland inventory and assessment and identification of priority wetlands. The county is also focusing on the importance of wetlands for water quality, habitat value, and climate resiliency and we look forward to partnering with the watershed on opportunities to further protect and restore our critical wetland resources.	Yes	The description for Activity S-12 in Table 4-5 will be revised to emphasize that this is a BCWMC-wide inventory based on watershed-wide methodology versus a collection of local inventories. The BCWMC appreciates the county's offer to partner on wetland protection and restoration activities. The BCWMC may wish to partner with the county on the development of a wetland inventory framework.
24	Friends of EB Wildflower Garden	General	Wetlands		The [EB Wildflower Garden and] Sanctuary once included the wetlands north and west of today's Garden boundaries, referred to as "The North Meadow" and "Gentian Meadow." They were likely a complex mix of some or all of the following: open water, emergent marsh, sedge meadow, shrub carr, rich spring fen, forested swamp and wet prairie. Today these wetlands are heavily degraded, with common and glossy buckthorn dominating much of the area. Most of the peat has decayed. Groundwater flow has dropped over the years, and the powerful springs that drew water-gatherers throughout history are dry. However, significant groundwater seeps and springs still flow along the edges of the surrounding hills. This means to us that actions to preserve this resource are urgently needed, and that restoration of this historic and inspiring landscape is still possible. We encourage the BCWD add the restoration of these wetlands to its ten-year plan.	Yes	See response to comment #17.  A potential wetland restoration CIP project will be considered in the future pending results of the hydrology study in #17 and may be added through a minor plan amendment.
25	MPRB	Exec Summary		3	Table on Page 3 is critical to the plan, consider adding a column with page # references to the plan sections that address the goals or links in the pdf version. Consider adding a table with the naming rubric of the goal abbreviations.	Yes	The Plan will be revised to include internal hyperlinks to the section related to each issue and each goal listed in the table.
26	MPRB	Exec Summary		4	Is the bulleted list of medium and low priority issues in an order? It is not alphabetized, so it appears to be in an order. If there is a reason behind the order, can a sentence be added to state this?	Yes	The Plan will be revised to list the low and medium priority issues alphabetically.
27	MPRB	Exec Summary		6	Table that refers to policy numbers - May want a table in the appendix or elsewhere that clearly states the policy numbers and names and the goal abbreviations and titles to make the document more useful for a casual user or for use at-a-glance.	Yes	The Plan will be revised to include internal hyperlinks to the section related to each policy.
28	BWSR	Exec Summary			Excellent use of the executive summary. Great overview, succinct, and easy to read	No	Thank you.
29	MPCA	Exec Summary	Tool graphic		Several areas nicely demonstrate past projects and completed work. The Executive Summary's Implementation Tools graphic was helpful to see what is new and what has been happening.	No	Thank you.
30	MDH	Exec Summary			The Executive Summary is very helpful and is a great overview of the plan.	No	Thank you.
31	City of Minneapolis	Exec Summary		3	The table on this page contains significant information on the prioritization of goals within the plan. Please consider a page # references to the plan sections that address the goals or links in the pdf version.	Yes	The Plan will be revised to include internal hyperlinks to the section related to each issue and each goal listed in the table.
32	MDH	1	Figure 1-2	15	Consider adding to MDH's list of responsibilities: well permitting and fish consumption guidance. The MDH SWP Metro Planner, Abby Shea, can assist with a reword of this blurb if necessary.	Yes	The graphic will be updated to include "well permitting" and "fish consumption guidance" under list of MDH responsibilities
33	MPRB	1.4	History & governance	13	MPRB supports the Commission's desire to ensure that the governance structure best meets the goals of the organization.	No	Thank you.

**BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review**

Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion	Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment	
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
34	City of Minneapolis	1.4	Organizational capacity	13	The City of Minneapolis fully supports the Commission's plans for an organizational assessment to evaluate options for changing governance structures and/or funding options.	No	Thank you.
35	MPRB	1.7	Plan development	16	Thank you to BCWMC and the Plan Steering committee for a robust process to gather feedback and ideas on the next generation plan.	No	Thank you.
36	MPRB	2	Land & Water Resource Inventory	18	Thank you for the detailing the effects of climate and precipitation on water resources and the additional stressor that extreme weather events and climate change poses to natural water systems in addition to the effects of climate change on flood control systems.	No	Thank you.
37	BWSR	2	Land & Water Resource Inventory	22	Figure 2-1 Is there a way to have the subwatersheds/priority waters stand out more? Maybe this means two maps instead of one so that details don't get lost.	Yes	Plan will be revised to include two maps in Section 2.0 including maps from Appendix A: A-6: Major Subwatersheds and A-7: Public Waters and Priority Waterbodies.
38	Met Council	2.1	Climate & Precip		This section could benefit from added discussion focusing on increased freeze/thaw cycles which influences use of chloride use for de-icing.	Yes	Section 2.1 will be revised as recommended.
39	MDH	2.4	Geology & Groundwater	20	The Tunnel City Group should be included in the list of the major bedrock aquifers, resulting in five major bedrock aquifers.	Yes	Section 2.4 and Appendix A will be revised as recommended.
40	MDH	2.4	Geology & Groundwater	20	The way that the third full paragraph on this page is worded is a bit off. MDH's responsibility is to ensure safe and adequate drinking water to protect human health, including both groundwater and surface water sources of drinking water. In order to clearly distinguish between MDH and MPCA responsibilities, we suggest the following reword starting with the second sentence: "The Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) protects sources of drinking water by defining the protection areas managed by public water suppliers (called drinking water supply management areas, or DWSMAs), developing protection strategies through creation of source water protection plans, and supporting protection activities through technical and financial assistance. Additional drinking water programs focus on well permitting, water operator training, monitoring, testing, and treatment. Public water suppliers with their own groundwater source of drinking water are required by MDH to develop Wellhead Protection Plans (WHPPs) to manage their DWSMAs. In addition, stormwater management..."	Yes	Section 2.4 will be revised as recommended.
41	MPRB	2.9	Pollutant Sources	26	Final paragraph, do you want to specify that grit is for traction and not deicing? Statement could read, using traction products rather than chloride-based deicers and/or sweeping up salt .....	Yes	Section 2.9 will be revised as recommended.
42	Met Council	2.9	Pollutant Sources		The Plan makes reference to contaminated land and sites enrolled in the Voluntary Investigation Cleanup (VIC) program. The Council encourages BCWMC to work with its partner cities, when appropriate, to support applications for Met Council Tax Base Revitalization Account grants for funding site cleanup to enhance surface and groundwater quality within the watershed.	No	Thank you for the recommendation.
43	BWSR	3	Goals		Many of your goals state reduce or improve. A question that comes to mind is, 'By how much'? How will you measure reductions or improvements over the life of the Plan? How will you know if you have been successful? For example, CHL1, how much do you hope to reduce chloride loading/concentrations by? Where do you want to be in 10-years? 8410.0080	Yes	Many goal statements will be revised to improve measurability. See attached "revisions to goals" document. Some goals are already measurable (even when they don't include a quantity or numeric outcome) simply through the ability to say whether or not an activity occurred and/or to what degree an activity occurred. Several goals in the Impaired Waters section will be revised to add "statistically significant trends."
44	Met Council	3	Goals		The Met Council encourages the BCWMC to review the goal language within the Plan to add specificity to goals where appropriate. For example, goal language in BCV1 is specific and therefore measurable because it applies to a given geography. The Met Council recognizes that goals that are watershed-wide are more difficult to ascribe measured outcomes to, given different characteristics across watershed projects. Goals focused on specific lakes, like goal WQ2 could be strengthened by adding specificity to the term 'statistically significant improvement'.	Yes	See response to comment #43.

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review							
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
45	Met Council	3	Goals		The Plan would be strengthened if conditional language was revised to more active and concise verbs across some goals, like REC2, WQ24, CF1.	Yes	Many goal statements will be revised to improve measurability. The action of "consider" in some goals conveys the desire to be active on a particular issue rather than "staying silent." These goals often address lower priority issues where the BCWMC is a partner or collaborator rather than a leader.  The numbering for goal WQ24 was found to be incorrect and will be revised to UP1 as it addresses upland habitats.
46	MPCA	3	Goals		Review the goals and assess opportunities to include numerical goals that will help evaluate success. Several goals could have numerical targets. Example – LK2: How much of a percent increase and what depth of buffer?	Yes	See response to comment #43.  Specifically for goal LK2: The goal will be revised to "Increase the percentage of properties with native buffers on nutrient-impaired lakes through education activities and partnerships, relative to baseline conditions." Activity S-10 in Table 4-5 includes a shoreline inventory of priority lakes which will help establish baseline conditions. From there, the change in percentage of properties with native buffers can be measured over time. Because there is not currently a baseline of conditions, the BCWMC feels it is not appropriate to arbitrarily assign a numeric goal.
47	MDH	3	Goals		Ensure all goals in the plan are specific and measurable. If the watershed would like any assistance with this regarding the groundwater-related goals, please reach out to the MDH SWP Metro Planner, Abby Shea, and we will be happy to brainstorm.	Yes	See response to comment #43.
48	MDH	3	Goals		Really like how this chapter is organized. It is easy to follow, has all the important info, and is visually appealing. Great work!	No	Thank you!
49	City of Minneapolis	3	Table 3-1	27	The City appreciates the clear prioritization of issues as high/med/low. The Commission will need to ensure that these prioritizations will be reflected in future work and funding allocation over the life of the plan.	No	Thank you for the reminder.
50	City of Minneapolis	3	Goals		The City appreciates having clear and measurable goals such as reducing average chloride concentrations by 10%. Please explore setting more numeric, measurable goals like this for other part of the plan implementation.	Yes	See response to comment #43.
51	MPCA	3.1	Impaired waters	Table 3-3 and 3-4	Adjust descriptor of months that were averaged. Not everyone may be aware of what "summer" months means in reference to the standards.	Yes	Revision will be made as recommended.
52	City of Minneapolis	3.1	Prioritization	34	While studies and monitoring have their place as tools to address Impaired Waters, capital projects that actually improve water quality should be a higher priority on the list.	No	Tools are not listed in a priority order but rather in the same sequence as in Section 4.0
53	BWSR	3.2	Chloride	37	Because chloride impairments are based on long-term monitoring, Table 3-7 may be confusing for the general reader. Consider more explanation as to how chloride data is used to determine impairments.	Yes	Table 3-7, footnote 3 will be revised to include the acute and chronic standards
54	MDH	3.2	Chloride	38	Other sections of the plan note that there are some private well users in the watershed. If any of these users are also on a septic system, consider rewording the top of the second column on this page, as this discharge would not enter a municipal wastewater treatment plant. The "tools to address chloride loading" section lists studies to evaluate sources of chloride pollution. Is there more to be done regarding these studies? If so, should that be a goal in the plan, to evaluate sources of chloride pollution? Currently, the issue statement implies only road salt is an issue.	No	The BCWMC monitoring data and the impaired waters list already provide enough information to help target activities. Further, Activity S-9 in Table 4-5 includes a chloride study and development of management plans to further refine targets chloride reduction work.
55	MDH	3.2	Chloride	35	Consider mentioning that chloride is also an issue in groundwater. Chloride in groundwater is explicitly called out in the Groundwater Atlas of Hennepin County. They do state that elevated and anthropogenic chloride in groundwater in the county appears to coincide with dense road networks, but also consider the studies mentioned in the previous comment.	Yes	Thank you for the reminder. Section 3.2 will be revised to acknowledge chloride pollution in ground water. Chloride will also be added to the list of groundwater contaminants in Section 3.10.

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review							
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
56	MPRB	3.3	Lakeshore erosion	39	MPRB agrees with the idea that there should be a baseline expectation of lake shore conditions, and that it makes sense for lakes in a watershed to be assessed similarly. Will there be a BCWMC fund to assist in restoration?	No	Table 4-5 includes activity #EE-7 includes development of a cost share program for projects such as shoreline restoration Table 4-6 includes CIP project #27 Shoreline improvement projects on priority lakes
57	MPRB	3.4	Wetlands	41	MPRB agrees with the idea that watershed-wide assessment of wetlands is important. MPRB parkland may have areas that could be priority for restoration, like South of Glenwood, where volunteer efforts could assist in long term upkeep. The former Gention Meadow site outside of Eloise Butler Wildflower Garden is one area where collaboration on a restoration project could be possible.	Yes	See response to comment #24
58	MPRB	3.5	AIS		MPRB agrees with prioritizing Aquatic Invasive Species detection and management due to these species impacts on water quality and ecological integrity. One suggestion would be to include species that could impact wetland and waterway function and integrity like invasive phragmites, or other potential invaders like water soldier or water chestnut.	No	Thank you for the information. The BCWMC will continue to evaluate emerging AIS and threats and may tailor AIS policies as needed. Further, policy 20 (Section 4.1.6) requires member cities to inspect high priority inventory wetlands for terrestrial and aquatic invasive species.
59	BWSR	3.5	AIS	42	This is the first time the AIS Rapid Response Plan is mentioned. More information could be provided here, or you could direct the reader to page 85 in the Implementation section, for more on the AIS plan.	Yes	A better reference to the AIS policies and rapid response plan will be added to Section 3.5.
60	City of Minneapolis	3.5	AIS	43	The BCWMC's AIS Rapid Response Plan is an effective tool for addressing early AIS infestations. Please consider providing a link in the Watershed Management Plan to make it more easily accessible.	Yes	A link will be added as recommended.
61	MPRB	3.6	Steambank & gully erosion	45	MPRB appreciates BCWMC's attention to the issue of streambank integrity and gullying. We appreciate the past partnership on capital projects addressing Bassett Creek bank stabilization along MPRB lands in both Golden Valley and Minneapolis and look forward to future partnership. Additionally, it is appreciated that the issue is tackled watershed-wide and prioritized in projects and programs as sediment eroded upstream causes environmental degradation downstream.	No	Thank you.
62	Met Council	3.7	Groundwater-Surface Water Interaction		The Met Council is performing studies and research on the topic and would welcome collaboration with BCWMC.	No	Thank you.
63	MDH	3.7	Groundwater-Surface Water Interaction	48	There are no goals related to the second part of the desired future condition of Hennepin County developing and implementing a county groundwater plan. Can a goal be created for this, even if focused on advocacy for the plan?	Yes	Under the tools to address this the groundwater-surface water interaction issue in Section 3.7, the "Inter-agency Planning" tool will be added with context regarding advocacy for Hennepin County to develop a county groundwater plan.
64	MDH	3.7	Groundwater-Surface Water Interaction	48	Consider if it may be useful to mention the surface water contribution areas (SWCAs) within the watershed that are part of the new West Metro Multi-Community DWSMA. In these areas, data indicates a direct connection between surface water and municipal well water, which is an example of an important groundwater-surface water interaction in the watershed. If you would like to discuss this or would like assistance with wording this, please reach out to the MDH SWP Metro Planner, Abby Shea.	Yes	The Plan will be updated to include this content, as recommended.
65	MPRB	3.8 - 3-9	Riparian and upland degradation		Degradation of riparian and Upland areas: MPRB appreciates the acknowledgement in the plan of the importance of both upland and wetland riparian areas in the watershed. MPRB's Natural Areas Plan will be guiding the park system's priorities for management and restoration and could assist in determining where MPRB and BCWMC can partner to meet common goals. <a href="https://www.minneapolis-sparks.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/MPRB-Natural-Areas-Plan_Phase2_FINAL.pdf">https://www.minneapolis-sparks.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/MPRB-Natural-Areas-Plan_Phase2_FINAL.pdf</a>	No	Thank you.

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review							
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
66	Met Council	3.9	Degradation of Upland Areas		The Met Council is developing a tool that will assist local governments in meeting their natural systems requirements in the 2050 planning cycle which will include identification of areas for natural systems protection or enhancement. This tool should be available for stakeholder use in early 2026. The Met Council recommends that BCWMC work with partner cities to identify natural systems opportunities, both territorial and aquatic, with city 2050 comprehensive plans.	No	Thank you.
67	MDH	3.10	Groundwater Quality	52	Consider adding unused, unsealed wells to the middle paragraph when listing potential sources of contamination. This is one of the biggest sources and is a source that is relatively straightforward to address with education and outreach, along with cost-share dollars (Hennepin County has a cost-share program already established to refer property owners to). Acknowledging this in the plan may allow for additional funding opportunities.	Yes	This content will be added to Section 3.10 as recommended.
68	MDH	3.10	Groundwater Quality	52	In the last paragraph in the left column, suggest changing "To limit groundwater contamination" to "To limit contamination of drinking water sources" in order to more accurately convey MDH's roles and responsibilities.	Yes	The Plan will be revised with the recommended text.
69	MPRB	3.11	Impact of Climate Change		MPRB appreciates the BCWMC's attention to the impacts of climate change on hydrology, as MPRB park and natural assets are also impacted by this issue. For example, more frequent floodplain utilization impacts playability in certain areas of Wirth Golf, as well as path/riparian corridor use along the creek itself. We look forward to continuing partnerships in the area of adaptation within the watershed.	No	Thank you.
70	BWSR	3.11	Impact of Climate Change	55	The Plan must contain specific measurable goals. Many of the goals and strategies in this plan are general actions and are not considered measurable. Making the goals more quantifiable will aid in assessing your progress toward implementing the Plan. For example, FLD1 & FLD4 could be combined into "Do a study to evaluate and identify...". A complete study will be the measure of success. 8410.0080	Yes	Many goal statements will be revised to improve measurability. See attached "revisions to goals" document. FLD1 and FLD4 will be revised to reference completion of related studies (Activities S-5 and S-6 in Table 4-5).
71	BWSR	3.11	Impact of Climate Change	55	Similarly, goals FLD2 and FLD 5, for example, may be difficult to measure. For FLD5, what does "enhance" mean? How much is "the majority"? Could you include specifics such as Atlas 15, policy updates, new development requirements, or other to make this goal measurable?	Yes	Many goal statements will be revised to improve measurability. Goal FLD2 focuses on non-capital activities like development review, education, Flood Control Project management, and modeling. Progress reporting will list activities and outcomes that address this goal. Goal FLD5 is measurable, via the incorporation of adaptation functions (however small) into the majority (>50%) of projects
72	MPCA	3.11	Impact of Climate Change	53	Source NOAA, 2013 – there are newer sources that you could reference, including the UMN. <a href="https://climate.umn.edu/climate-change-east-central-minnesota">https://climate.umn.edu/climate-change-east-central-minnesota</a> .	Yes	The Plan will be revised to reference more recent climate studies, including: <i>Coffman, D., Black, K., Boyd, K., Clark, S., Farris, A., Greene, B., Leon, A., Saravana, D., Weske, C. 2024. Climate Change in Minnesota. Prepared for the University of Minnesota Climate Adaptation Partnership. Version 1; September 2024. <a href="http://www.climate.umn.edu/climate-change-in-minnesota">www.climate.umn.edu/climate-change-in-minnesota</a></i>
73	MDH	3.11	Impact of Climate Change	53	When discussing what can be damaged due to flooding from increased precipitation, consider also explicitly including water wells. Or explicitly including wells in "infrastructure" if that is defined.	Yes	The narrative in Section 3.11 will be revised to note that flooding contributes to public health risks including contamination and other damage to water wells.
74	City of Minneapolis	3.11	Impact of Climate Change	54	The Plan lists Atlas 14 as an additional resource. There is currently an Atlas 15 under development. The Commission should commit to using the most up to date climate data for modeling and floodplain management when that new standard is adopted.	Yes	Section 3.11 will be revised to note that the BCWMC will use the most current adopted precipitation data for flood risk and floodplain management actions. Page 84 of the Plan also notes that "The BCWMC will also update the SWMM model to incorporate the most current precipitation data when it is published."
75	MPRB	3.12	Bassett Creek Valley	56	MPRB agrees that coordination between the agencies is needed to best guide the development and redevelopment along the Bassett Creek Corridor. High-quality and well-maintained riparian parks could be one of the multiple benefits achieved via close coordination.	No	The BCWMC appreciates MPRB's input during Plan development and looks forward to cooperating with MPRB during implementation to achieve complimentary goals.

**BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review**

Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion	Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment	
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
76	MPRB	3.12	Bassett Creek Valley	56	MPRB wholeheartedly supports the categorization of the Bassett Creek Valley Flood Risk Reduction item as high priority. MPRB has collaborated with partners for years on improving development potential, recreational access, water quality, and habitat improvements throughout the Valley. We are interested in expanding and enhancing parkland in the context of this collaborative vision. Specific mentions of MPRB might be included in this section, particularly on page 57: Inter-agency planning	Yes	The BCWMC recognizes MPRB as a valuable partner in potential projects in the Bassett Creek Valley (and elsewhere). The tools on page 57 will be revised to include MPRB as a potential partner along with Hennepin County and City of Minneapolis.
77	MDH	3.12	Multiple		Really like to see the call out of multiple benefits projects! (Also in Section 3.18 and Table 4-5)	No	Thank you. The BCWMC will continue to consider multiple benefits in its project prioritization framework.
78	City of Minneapolis	3.12	Bassett Creek Valley	56	The Bassett Creek Valley Area is a high priority for the City of Minneapolis, and we appreciate seeing that priority reflected in the BCWMC's Plan.	No	Thank you. The BCWMC looks forward to collaborating with the City of Minneapolis in pursuit of shared goals in the Bassett Creek Valley.
79	MDH	3.13	Groundwater Quantity	58	Consider noting that some residents get their drinking water from private wells here like in other sections	Yes	The narrative in Section 3.13 will be revised to note that some residents also get their drinking water from private wells.
80	MPRB	3.14	Education	60	The goals listed in this section have reference numbers listed, which is helpful when reading the table 4-5. But table 4-5 also uses the Activity ID codes that can only be found in the Appendix C of a separate document. Also, as far as getting any direction to complete educational activities to fulfill the goals, having 22 goals listed in a clump of 6 different activities would make that very difficult. Is there a possibility of breaking out the educational goals in a smaller spreadsheet or table to help make connections more clear?	Yes	The Education and Engagement Plan (Appendix C) will be revised to provide clear correlation between the education and engagement goals in the main Plan document, the goals and strategies in Appendix C, and the line item activities listed in Table 4-5.
81	MDH	3.14	Education	60	For these goals, do you have the baseline data to know if you have increased knowledge? If not, is there a metric metric to use than just an increase?	Yes	Education and engagement goals will be revised to reference the evaluation metrics included in Appendix C (Education and Engagement Plan).
82	City of Minneapolis	3.14	Education	60	The BCWMC should continue to support clear and consistent public education and engagement. A better-informed public generally leads to better water quality outcomes and more support for future capital funding for project implementation.	No	The BCWMC will continue to support clear and consistent public education and engagement through the strategies outlined in its Education and Engagement Plan (Appendix C).
83	MPRB	3.15	DIEA	62	MPRB commends BCWMC on making equity and engagement of diverse communities a priority in this plan. To serve the entire commission population, all groups must be engaged. Co-naming the resource with Dakota place-names is a good first step toward educating residents on the long history of the landscape and stewardship of its resources.	No	Thank you. The BCWMC hopes that prioritizing engagement of diverse communities in this Plan will lead to greater engagement during implementation.
84	MPRB	3.16	Recreation	63	MPRB Environmental Education provides free introductions to water recreation along with stormwater education via free canoeing sessions at Wirth Lake. This and other events could be an opportunity to partner on the shared goal of providing recreational opportunities to watershed residents. It should also be noted that proximity of a waterbody is important to its recreational use and desirability to the surrounding community. The commission may want to create a separate ranking method to assess recreational desirability and opportunity to use when ranking restoration projects.	No	The BCWMC will consider further articulating recreational benefits if and when it updates its project prioritization framework. Recreational access opportunities as element of project prioritization may also be addressed through the incorporation of equity considerations into the prioritization framework (included in Plan implementation). The BCWMC will keep MPRB recreational programs in mind as it considers projects and engagement opportunities.
85	MDH	3.16	Recreation	63	Consider noting that the Lakefinder website referenced in this section also includes any fish consumption guidance that may differ from the statewide guidance for a particular lake. More information is available on the MDH website: <a href="https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/fish">https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/fish</a> .	No	The resources listed in the subsections of Section 3 are presented in brief and without additional detail.
86	MPRB	3.17	Organizational capacity	65	Historically BCWMC has been able to carry out its mission in its current format; however, this structure has limitations. MPRB supports the goal of right-sizing the organization and ensuring that the structure is capable of meeting future needs. With better information, the Commission can determine what structure is best to meet goals and better understand the level of prioritization needed if the structure cannot meet all goals.	No	Thank you.
87	BWSR	3.17	Organizational capacity	66	Consider using the Evaluation and Assessment tool as the goal for ORG1. Producing an assessment to understand options, benefits, and challenges in the first year of the plan is a more measurable goal.	No	Goal ORG1 will be achieved through the completion of a dedicated assessment (Activity EA-4 in Table 4-5). The BCWMC recognizes that the ongoing implementation of its Evaluation and Assessment tools/activities (Activities EA-1, EA-2, and EA-3 in Table 4-5) will also be useful in gauging progress towards goals ORG1 and ORG2.

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review								
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment	
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment	
88	City of Minneapolis	3.17	Organizational capacity	65	The City of Minneapolis strongly supports the assessment of the current BCWMC governance structure. The plan has very aggressive goals and to meet those goals changes may be needed in the operation and organization of the BCWMC. The BCWMC should work to develop a clear timeline for this assessment and for making any possible future changes well ahead of the next JPA cycle.	Yes	<p>The assessments of structure and funding mechanisms are scheduled early in Plan implementation (see activities EA-4 and EA-5 in Table 4-5). This schedule is intended to provide as much time as possible to implement changes, if pursued, prior to the next JPA cycle. The BCWMC anticipates that a Plan amendment may be needed depending upon the outcomes of the assessments, at which point the schedule could be further defined.</p> <p>Section 4.1.1 will be revised to more clearly state that implementation of potential recommendations from the assessments will depend on the scope of those recommendations and discussions with commissioners and member cities. Organizational and/or structural changes may be implemented via an accelerated JPA update and/or Plan amendment, or could be deferred to the next planned update.</p> <p>Sections 4.1.1 (Administration) and 4.1.10 (Evaluation and Assessment) will be revised to acknowledge potential impacts of a change to the structure resulting from the organizational assessment.</p>	
89	MPRB	3.19	Progress assessment	69	The BCWMC plan goals are ambitious and many projects are front loaded in the 10-year plan period. Planned reassessment and recalibration of goals will be important to stay on track and ensure progress is made in priority areas. Writing reassessment directly into the plan is a smart way to ensure that reassessment is timely and used to adapt management strategies.	No	The BCWMC will use its biennial assessment (Activity EA-2 in Table 4-5) to evaluate progress towards goals. It is also possible the assessments of organizational structure and funding mechanisms scheduled for the first year of implementation may identify actions that would require a Plan amendment. Because of this uncertainty, the BCWMC prefers not to include a planned/scheduled amendment in Table 4-5 at this time.	
90	City of Minneapolis	3.19	Progress assessment	69	With such aggressive goals program assessment will be a critical component of keeping the BCWMC's work moving forward. The cycle of assessment, recalibration, and trying amended approaches will be important to keeping a 10-year plan relevant for the long term.	No	The BCWMC will use its biennial assessment (Activity EA-2 in Table 4-5) to evaluate progress towards goals. The BCWMC recognizes that the Plan's goals an implementation program are ambitious and have included assessments of organizational structure and funding within the first year of implementation to determine if changes to the organization are needed to better achieve its goals.	
91	MPRB	3.20	DEIA	70	Ensuring that projects and programs are equitably driven will serve BCWMC into the future as this will ensure that that the residents who fund the commission are educated on the benefits of BCWMC's mission. As the Commission makes progress towards this goal, the progress assessment step may be utilized to adapt to changing conditions and better knowledge of needs and desires of the communities within the Commission boundaries. The outcome would be a more effective, greener, and more equitable watershed.	No	The BCWMC intends to use its biennial assessment (Activity EA-2 in Table 4-5) to evaluate progress relative to its goals regarding equity and adapt its strategies based on that progress (or lack of progress).	
92	City of Minneapolis	3.20	DEIA	70	The City of Minneapolis commends the BCWMC in recognizing that equity and diversity are important goals for achieving watershed protection. As the BCWMC begins to implement and make progress towards this goal ongoing assessment of successes and barriers will need to be implemented to further this work.	No	Thank you. The BCWMC intends to use its biennial assessment (Activity EA-2 in Table 4-5) to evaluate progress relative to its goals regarding equity and adapt its strategies based on that progress (or lack of progress).	
93	MPRB	3.21	Ditches	72	From Page 72, and Figure A-7, it was unclear how many County ditches there are that the Commission is responsible for. A table with the ditch segments, current ownership, and number could clarify this. The description of ditches on Page 78, within implementation, is more clear and could be referenced.	Yes	Section 3.21 will be update to include the description of the public ditch segments already included on page 78. Public ditch segments are distinguished by different symbology on Figure A-7.	
94	MPRB	4	Implementation	Table 4-5	Given the scope of the new plan it is prudent to assume administrative costs will increase.	No	The administrative costs included in Table 4-5 are an estimate based on the scope of implementation and the existing organizational structure. It is possible that outcomes of the organizational assessment scheduled for the first year of implementation may warrant updates to planned administrative costs.	

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review							
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
95	MPRB	4	Implementation	Table 4-5	The new focus areas in Planning and Collaboration may include new opportunities to collaborate on water resources issues and opportunities on and adjacent to MPRB parkland.	No	The BCWMC recognizes the critical role of partnerships in achieving its goals. The BCWMC appreciates the consideration and input from the MPRB during the Plan update and looks forward to collaborating with MPRB in all relevant capacities during Plan implementation.
96	MPRB	4	Implementation	Table 4-5	MPRB is excited for the outcomes of the high priority studies the Commission may undertake, particularly around the subjects of groundwater, wetlands, and lakeshores.	No	The BCWMC appreciates the input on these topics from the MPRB during the Plan update and look forward to collaborating with MPRB on these issues.
97	MPRB	4	Implementation	Table 4-5; AIS-1 FCP-2	minor comment: typo in Description column of AIS 1 and FCP-1 and 2, add the section reference	Yes	Table 4-5 will be updated to correct this error.
98	MPRB	4	Implementation	Table 4-5; EE-7	Once cost share programs are developed per EE-7, it seems there would be opportunities for partnership to enhance MPRB efforts in many of these areas	No	The BCWMC recognizes the critical role of partnerships in achieving its goals and looks forward to collaborating with MPRB in all relevant capacities during Plan implementation, including Activity EE-7.
99	MPRB	4	CIP	Table 4-6	It should be noted there is potential for wetland restoration in the Wirth Lake watershed, on example is the wetland South of Glenwood and North of Eloise Butler Wildflower Garden. As of Fall 2025, MPRB staff are currently exploring options with the Friends of Eloise Butler, and U of M. This area was termed "Gentian Meadow" in the time of Eloise Butler, and has altered hydrology since the construction of Glenwood Avenue. The area has potential for high quality and sustainable restoration.	Yes	See response to comment #24.
100	MPRB	4	CIP	Table 4-6 #28	MPRB could also be a partner in streambank restoration in portions of the Creek in Minneapolis where there is parkland.	Yes	The BCWMC looks forward to collaborating with MPRB in all relevant capacities during Plan implementation. Table 4-6 #28 will be revised to note MPRB as a partner.
101	MPRB	4	CIP	Table 4-6 #32	MPRB is also a potential partner in chloride reduction as a multi-site landowner.	Yes	The BCWMC looks forward to collaborating with MPRB in all relevant capacities during Plan implementation. Table 4-6 #32 will be revised to note MPRB as a partner.
102	BWSR	4.1	Roles	75	Could you provide more discussion about the BCWMC policies? These seem very closely aligned with future desired conditions/goals/other actions. How are they different? How were they developed? Are they still necessary?	Yes	The 2015 BCWMC Plan has 122 policies, many of which were better stated as goals or actions (and updated as such in this plan). The BCWMC removed policies redundant to the BCWMC Requirements document, MPCA permits, and other regulatory documents. Some policy statements are needed to underscore the importance of BCWMC expectations, operations, or positions. Policies clearly state the responsible party and thus helps member cities understand expected actions. It is also helpful to proactively state positions rather than to "stay silent," even where the BCWMC is not taking the lead in addressing an issue. This can be helpful in grant applications or letters of support for partners' grant applications.  Section 4.1 will be revised to include some of the content further describing the need for policies and differences from the 2015 plan. References to goals will be added to each policy throughout Section 4, where appropriate.

**BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review**

Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion	Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment	
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
103	MDH	4.1.1	Inter-agency planning	78	It is unclear what kind of "groundwater action plan" the watershed is looking for here, as it is not mentioned elsewhere in the plan. Is this referring to a county groundwater plan? Or other types of plans? If the latter, there are other plans such as source water protection plans and the Met Council Water Supply Plan (within the new Water Policy Plan within Imagine 2050) that already exist and can be implemented with assistance from the watershed.	Yes	Policy 1 in Section 4.1.2 refers to a range of potential groundwater-related plans that may be developed and/or updated. This could include an updated County groundwater plan, but may also include updates to regional plans. Policy 1 recognizes that BCWMC is not the primary groundwater authority, but is interested in assisting others in implementing relevant groundwater-related actions. The language of Policy 1 will be updated to more clearly acknowledge existing plans.  Policy 1 will be revised to: <i>"The BCWMC supports local, regional, and state agencies in the development of groundwater management plans and studies and will collaborate on the implementation of relevant actions and measures to protect and improve groundwater resources."</i>
104	City of Minneapolis	4.1.1	JPA	77	While describing the timeline for the necessary organizational structure and staff capacity assessment the Plan should also acknowledge that changes to the JPA and buy-in from member cities will likely be necessary to implement change.	Yes	See response to comment #88.
105	BWSR	4.1.2	Inter-agency planning	77	Throughout the Plan you mention the role/responsibilities of other entities in carrying out the Plan. Have you considered clearly, but succinctly, showing that in the document? This could be called out in Section 4.4 or Figure 1-2 could be amended to reflect agencies roles per the Plan. 8410.0105 Subp1.B.	No	The roles and responsibilities of member cities are organized in Table 4-4. The potential partnership roles for other local, regional, and state agencies in capital improvements are identified in Table 4-6. The activity descriptions of non-capital activities included in Table 4-5 also note partners, where applicable.
106	MDH	4.1.3.1	Project Review & Permitting	81	Consider briefly explaining what the BCWMC will look for when reviewing applications to the MDNR.	Yes	The BCWMC reviews applications sent from the MDNR. The Commission reviews the applications for compliance with BCWMC requirements and for potential environmental impacts that the BCWMC may be in a unique position to identify and that might not otherwise be recognized by the MDNR or applicant.  Policy 14 in Section 4.1.3.1 will be revised to note that the Commission reviews applications <i>"to identify potential negative impacts and for compliance with BCWMC requirements."</i>
107	BWSR	4.1.3.2	Wetlands	82	It is noted that the BCWMC encourages member cities to pursue wetland restoration projects based on local prioritization. Are there plans for watershed-wide wetland prioritization and restoration opportunities? 8410.0060 Subp1.M.	Yes	Activity S-12 in Table 4-5 includes the development of a watershed-wide wetland inventory and restoration prioritization. The activity description will be revised to emphasize that this is a BCWMC-wide inventory based on watershed-wide methodology versus a collection of local inventories.
108	MPRB	4.1.5.1	Monitoring	83	MPRB values the monitoring partnership with BCWMC, and will continue Wirth and Spring Lake Monitoring on the MPRB's regular schedule. MPRB also conducts beach monitoring at the Wirth Lake Public Beach, AIS monitoring in all MPRB waterbodies, and in some years MPRB's regular stormwater monitoring evaluates stormwater within the BCWMC boundaries. We look forward to the continued partnership that has been productive in meeting both organizations' shared goals to protect and enhance natural resources.	No	The BCWMC recognizes the critical role of partnerships in achieving its goals and looks forward to collaborating with MPRB in all relevant capacities during Plan implementation, including monitoring.
109	MPRB	4.1.5.1	Monitoring		MPRB also values water quality monitoring and looks forward to continued monitoring, partnerships, and data sharing in the Bassett Creek Watershed. New Streambank monitoring efforts may inform future projects or changes in management practices.	No	The BCWMC recognizes the critical role of partnerships in achieving its goals and looks forward to collaborating with MPRB in all relevant capacities during Plan implementation.
110	MPRB	4.1.6	AIS	84	MPRB supports the Commissions AIS management strategies. MPRB conducts a robust AIS management and early detection program, and values the partnership of the BCWMC. Expanding surveillance to include species that may impact free flow of water or riparian quality may be an area the Commission would consider in the future.	No	The BCWMC values this input and will engage MPRB if and when the BCWMC reviews and updates its AIS management strategies and rapid response plan.

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review							
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
111	BWSR	4.1.6	AIS	84	In the 3rd paragraph, you could make a plan goal from, ..."recruiting and training volunteers to detect zebra mussels on all Priority Lakes, aiming for at least 1 volunteer in each lake quadrant."	No	The BCWMC prefers to keep the AIS goals (AIS 1 and AIS 2) more broad in scope such that they apply to all BCWMC-managed AIS and allow the use of multiple strategies, versus goals specific to a single species (e.g., zebra mussels) and strategy (volunteer detection). This recommendation may be used as an objective for tracking goal achievement outside of the Plan document itself.
112	MPRB	4.1.7	Flood control	85	Management of the Flood Control Project is central to the mission of the WMC. Although the flood control project is outlined in the implementation section, there was no corresponding flood control goal. Is this a missed opportunity to ensure that programs are supported by clear organizational goals? Education of the public on the presence and importance of the flood control project may also be necessary to ensure that the public understands the importance of funding the Commission's programs that are central to maintenance of the flood control project.	No	The implementation section details the BCWMC's and cities' responsibilities regarding the Flood Control Project. Operation of the Flood Control Project is implicitly included in goal FLD2: <i>Reduce flood risk for structures and infrastructure within the floodplain</i> . Strategies used to achieve Goal FLD2 include non-capital activities like development review, education, Flood Control Project inspection and maintenance, and hydrologic modeling. While these strategies are too many to list in the goal, the BCWMC's reporting will list activities and outcomes that address this goal, including those related to the Flood Control Project.
113	City of Minneapolis	4.1.7	Flood Control	87	Management of the Flood Control Project is central to the mission of the BCWMC. Although the flood control project is outlined in the implementation section, there was no corresponding flood control goal. Is this a missed opportunity to ensure that programs are supported by clear organizational goals? Education of the public on the presence and importance of the flood control project may also be necessary to ensure that the public understands the importance of funding programs that are central to maintenance of the flood control project.	No	See response to comment #112.
114	MDH	4.1.8	CIP	91	Really like to see groundwater improvements included as a "secondary benefit" for the CIP prioritization matrix. This helps elevate multiple benefit projects. If we can ever be of assistance in this determination, please do not hesitate to reach out.	No	Thank you. The BCWMC looks forward to collaborating with the MDH on relevant implementation tasks.
115	MPRB	4.1.9	Education		Fully agree with statements of augmenting but not duplicating activities - we would all benefit from this! Also, would definitely want to partner with Watershed tours on MPRB parklands and have MPRB educators involved as appropriate.	No	Thank you. The BCWMC looks forward to collaborating with the MPRB on tours and other engagement activities.
116	BWSR	4.1.10	Evaluation	95	An annual communication is required. If you plan to use your annual report, or the 2-page executive summary contained within the annual report, as this communication tool, how will you ensure that it reaches your Watershed residents? 8410.0105 Subp4.	Yes	Section 4.1.9 will be updated to note that the BCWMC will work with its member cities and other local partners to share the annual report summary with their audiences via social media, electronic newsletters, and other avenues, to satisfy the BCWMC's annual communication requirement. (Dissemination of the annual plan's executive summary is also listed in Appendix C Section 5.0.)
117	MPRB	4.3	Funding		Commission funding is complex. Section 4.3 is a good overview with details of all of the funding sources. Is there a way to put all of the sources in a table so they can be seen at a glance? This may make it easier to ingest the details.	Yes	Section 4.3 will be revised to include a simple matrix, table, or graphic that lists/shows the different funding sources and what the BCWMC typically uses those funds for, broadly (e.g., operations, non-capital projects, CIP).  In addition, Section 4.3.1 will be revised to combine the content on ad valorem tax funding and CIP project funding as they describe the same funding source, keeping in mind that ad valorem taxing can be used for CIP project construction and CIP maintenance.
118	BWSR	4.3.1	Funding	98	Last paragraph. It is suggested to be more general when describing the Clean Water Fund grants. Perhaps just stating competitive and non-competitive grants through the CWF.	Yes	The Plan will be revised to more generally reference competitive and non-competitive grants.
119	MDH	4.3.1	Funding	98	Consider calling out MDH's Groundwater Protection Initiative-Accelerated Implementation Grant ( <a href="https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/water/groundwater/accimpgrant.html">https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/water/groundwater/accimpgrant.html</a> ) as an example of an MDH grant program applicable to the watershed's work. Cities with a source water protection plan are also eligible for Source Water Protection Grants ( <a href="https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/water/swp/grants.html">https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/water/swp/grants.html</a> ) that can be used to complete common objectives between their plan(s) and the watershed plan.	Yes	The BCWMC appreciates the MDH providing this specific reference. The Plan section on grant funding sources is being revised to be more general and will not include references to specific programs, as they may change during the life of the Plan.

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review							
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion				Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment	
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
120	BWSR	4.4	Local plans, city responsibilities	100	It could be inferred, but would be helpful if it was clear, who was responsible for stormwater system inspection and operation 8410.0105 Subp3.	Yes	Section 4.4 will be revised to state: " <u>Local units of government must be responsible for maintain ing stormwater systems (storm sewers, ponding areas, ditches, water level control structures, etc.) under their jurisdiction in good working order to minimize flooding and water quality problems.</u> "
121	BWSR	4.4	Local plans, city responsibilities	100	How will you address the process for evaluating implementation of local water plans and the procedure to address an LGU failing to implement its local water plan or parts of its local water plan as part of 8410.0105 Subp1.C.?	Yes	Section 4.1.10 (Evaluation and Reporting) notes that the BCWMC will use: " <u>Self-reporting by member cities using criteria or checklist established by the BCWMC.</u> " This section also notes " <u>If review of member city practices reveals implementation inconsistent with the BCWMC Plan, the BCWMC will take administrative or legal action to ensure that BCWMC rules and policies are being implemented by the member cities.</u> "  Section 4.4 addressing local plans will be revised to briefly summarize the statement included in Section 4.1.10 and include a cross reference to Section 4.1.10.
122	MPRB	Appendix A	Acronyms		Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (no S on park)	Yes	The Plan will be revised to correct this throughout.
123	MPRB	Appendix A	Land & Water Resource Inventory	A5.2.2	Surficial aquifers: May want to point out the existance of multiple flowing springs in the lower watershed, as it is an interesting feature of this area, and the high mineral content of BCWMC groundwater which can be seen in iron floc in wetlands and lakes in at least the lower section of the district (and is visible during recreational access).	Yes	This section will be revised to note the presence of springs.
124	MPRB	Appendix A	Land & Water Resource Inventory	Table A-3	Should Birch Pond be included in this table? Birch is shown on some figures but not on others. At 2.6 acres it is similar in size to the smaller ponds on the list, 7M deep, and publicly accessible	Yes	Birch Pond will be added to Table A-3.
125	MPRB	Appendix A	Land & Water Resource Inventory	Figure A-8	It is difficult to discern the "moderate" from Wetland in this map on a screen	Yes	The figure will be revised to include clearer symbology.
126	MPRB	Appendix A	Land & Water Resource Inventory	A.6.4	May consider adding Birch Pond to the inventory, as it is on public land and accessible to the public.	Yes	Birch Pond will be added to Table A-3.
127	MPRB	Appendix A	Land & Water Resource Inventory	A.7.1.5	Please Add MPRB Water Resources website for additional information and reports. It may also be noted that MPRB conducts beach monitoring at Wirth lake within BCWMC, and MPRB's stormwater monitoring program in some years monitors withing BCWMC (example: Heritage Park) <a href="https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/park-care-improvements/water_resources/annual-water-resources-reports/">https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/park-care-improvements/water_resources/annual-water-resources-reports/</a> <a href="https://minneapolisparcs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=88319f73c7904adcbaccacdff38bbf1">https://minneapolisparcs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=88319f73c7904adcbaccacdff38bbf1</a>	Yes	Section A.7.1.5. will be revised to include a link to the MPRB website.
128	MPRB	Appendix A	Land & Water Resource Inventory	A.8.6.1	MPRB collects lake level data on Wirth Lake weekly, this level of data is the minimum needed to detect potential backflow events from Bassett Creek into Wirth Lake. This phenomenon occurs only in extreme events after the commission funded project at the outlet instead of regularly.	Yes	This detail will be added to Section A.8.6.1.
129	MPCA	Appendix A	Land & Water Resource Inventory	Table A-22	Including the MPCA ID numbers somewhere may be helpful - this may be the best place.	Yes	Public water IDs are included in Table A-3. A link to the impaired waters list will be added to the table.
130	MPCA	Appendix A	Land & Water Resource Inventory	Table A-22	The TMDL target completion date for Northwood is 2024; adjust to be 2027. Update Lost Lake information also.	Yes	Table A-22 will be updated to reflect this information.
131	MDH	Appendix A	Bedrock aquifers	A12	The Tunnel City Group should be included in the list of the major bedrock aquifers, resulting in five major bedrock aquifers.	Yes	The Tunnel City Group will be added to the list of aquifers.
132	MDH	Appendix A	Bedrock aquifers	A12	Check with each city to ensure their water supply information is correct, including number of wells and aquifers used.	No	The BCWMC will request member city staff review inventory data for their city, including water supply information.

BCWMC Plan Steering Committee Recommended Responses to Comments from 60-day Review							
Green - Low priority; little or no PSC discussion					Yellow - Medium priority; some PSC discussion		Orange - High priority; considerable PSC discussion of each high priority comment
#	Commenter	Plan Section	Subject	Page in Plan	Comment	Revision to Plan ?	Recommended Response to Comment
133	MDH	Appendix A	Wellhead Protection	A13	Suggest applying the language provided for Section 2.4 in this section of the plan as well regarding MDH responsibilities.	Yes	The summary text from Section 2.4 will be added to the discussion of wellhead and drinking water protection in Section A.5.3.
134	MDH	Appendix A	Wellhead Protection	A13	Really appreciate the inclusion of Figure A-5! Since these areas change over time, consider also linking to MDH's Source Water Protection Map Viewer in the text for future reference: <a href="https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/water/swp/mapviewer.html">https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/water/swp/mapviewer.html</a> . The map viewer also includes non-municipal DWSMAs and surface water DWSMAs (many currently in the progress of being updated). Note that there are two non-municipal groundwater systems with highly vulnerable DWSMAs in the watershed. This may be worth mentioning as these public water systems often need more partnerships and assistance to protect their source water.	Yes	The Plan will be revised to include a link to the MDH viewer.
135	MDH	Appendix A	Figure A-5	A14	Consider adding surface water contribution areas (SWCAs) to the map. These are important for groundwater-surface water interactions, as noted in comment 10 above. At this time, the only SWCAs would be those in the West Metro Multi-Community DWSMA. A shapefile can be sent upon request. You may request this from Abby Shea or the MDH SWP Metro Hydrologist, Aneka Munsell.	Yes	The BCWMC will request this data and add the SWCAs to Figure A-5.
136	MPRB	Appendix C	Education		The goals listed in section 3.14 have reference numbers listed, but not in Appendix C - would be nice to have the consistency. Like that the goals supported and Activity code are listed at the top of each section. Section 10.0 Program Evaluation lists measurable tasks for evaluation, but does not tie to specific activities or goals, which again I think would be helpful from a planning standpoint for how the educational activities are set up and run. Also, in the Overview paragraph (perhaps elsewhere in this appendix) the Table is listed as 4.5, but should be 4-5 as it is labeled in the Management Plan document.	Yes	See response to comment #80. The Plan will be revised to include consistent references to Table 4-5 versus Table 4.5.
137	MPRB	Appendix D	BWSR Performance Review		MPRB appreciates that the Level II performance review noted that there is a good working partnership between BCWMC and MPRB. The Review noted that increased collaboration was also desired with MPRB. As close collaboration between our organizations benefits MPRB park users, watershed residents, and residents of our region, and ecological resources we also wish to work towards even better collaboration in the next plan term.	No	The BCWMC thanks MPRB for the thoughtful input provided throughout the Plan development process. The BCWMC looks forward to collaborating with the MPRB on Plan implementation.
138	MPRB	Appendix F	Summary of plan engagement		MPRB appreciated the level of outreach and engagement to the public and with MPRB in the development of this plan, and appreciated the multiple opportunities to engage and comment. As the watershed plans are so detailed, and have a long life, the length of the engagement and writing process was appropriate.	No	The BCWMC thanks MPRB for its participation throughout the Plan development process.
139	MDH	BCWMC Requirements			MDH commends the watershed for their consideration of groundwater and drinking water quality impacts in their Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals. The flow chart is really helpful and is consistent with infiltration requirements and recommendations in the MPCA stormwater manual. Also, the first step is site review which includes reviewing the county geologic atlas, local groundwater levels, DWSMA/wellhead protection maps, potentially contaminated sites, etc.	No	Thank you.