



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Watershed Plan Steering Committee Meeting

Monday, July 7, 2025

8:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Wirth Lake Room, Brookview

AGENDA

1. WELCOME

2. **REVIEW JUNE 4 MEETING NOTES** – included with meeting materials

3. **REVIEW PLAN PROGRESS TRACKER** - included with meeting materials

4. **REVIEW PLAN TAC INPUT AND RECOMMENDED REVISIONS**

The Planning Technical Advisory Committee met on June 10th via Zoom. There was good representation among agencies, partners, and cities including: Golden Valley, Minneapolis, Minnetonka, New Hope, Plymouth, BWSR, DNR, PCA, MDH, Met Council, Hennepin County, and MPRB. PSC member Loomis, Administrator Jester, and Engineers Johnson and Williams also attended. TRPD was unable to attend but sent comments ahead of the meeting. The group reviewed the Implementation Program of the draft plan. Specific comments and recommended revisions are noted below:

BWSR: Plan is well organized and implementation does a good job of tying back to goals. Page 83 should include in-stream habitat. *(Staff is working to better understand this comment.)*

Met Council: Met Council appreciates the references to climate resiliency; Met Council can assist with some of the studies listed in the Program and Activity Table. And, Plan should include language regarding local water plan approval process and timelines. *(See recommended revisions in Section 4.4.)*

MPRB: Already have strong relationship for collaborating on implementation. May wish to add a project to the CIP schedule regarding wetland restoration project south of Wirth Lake. *(Staff is following up with MPRB on this item.)*

Hennepin County: No big red flags/concerns at this point. Table 4.4 (policies impacting cities) should include a definition or delineation for “responsibility” vs. “requirement.” *(See recommended revisions in Section 4.4.)*

BWSR: Table 4.4 subject area column is confusing because it doesn’t align exactly with issue statements, goals, or tools. *(No change recommended. Subject areas help orient cities to particular topics. Policy numbers can be referenced throughout the preceding section.)*

MDH: Happy with direction of the Plan; groundwater-surface water interaction studies would be very valuable; infiltration policies are aligned with MDH guidance. Reminder that MDH has grant opportunities. *(MDH grants added to Section 4.3)* New vulnerability maps should be incorporated into Land and Water Resources inventory. *(Staff has incorporated new maps into Appendix A.)*

TRPD: Recommends noting that AIS management will be an adaptive management approach that will be consistent with the Rapid Response Plan *(see revisions in Section 4.1.6.)*. Recommends that CIP implementation priority ranking should be considered for projects impacting diverse and under-represented

communities (*no change recommended – already indicated in Section 4.1.8*). Consider moving shoreline restoration projects and Crane Lake improvements earlier in the 10-year schedule to better reflect the timing of the Medicine Lake alum treatment as well as improve the longevity and effectiveness of the alum treatment. (*Can consider adjusting timing during implementation.*) Consider timing of cost share program related to timing of implementation of shoreline restoration projects. (*Staff is considering the timing of some activities in Table 4.4 and 4.5 and/or may need to provide more context on the intent of some activities.*)

Following review of the Implementation Program, Engineer Johnson reviewed the proposed significant updates to the development requirements including linear project standards, stream and wetland buffer standards, and chloride management plan requirements. MPCA recommended creating a map showing where buffers are required. MDH recommended defining “sensitive areas” within the chloride management plan requirements (where deicers should not be stored and plowed snow should not be piled). There was also discussion on the challenges associated with implementing the chloride management requirement and that more discussion with cities is likely before actually putting into practice.

5. REVIEW COMPLETE DRAFT PLAN & CONSIDER RECOMMENDATION TO COMMISSION

Staff received suggested edits from some PSC members since the last meeting. Most of these suggestions, along with recommended changes resulting from the Plan TAC meeting, and updates to the Executive Summary are included in the complete draft plan attached with meeting materials. Changes are tracked. Appendices are included separately. Aside from Appendix A: Land and Water Resources Inventory, they have not been updated.

The plan and appendices are not perfect. There is considerable formatting that needs to be completed and a few more updates and figures that should be included. The reference section has not been developed, nor acronym lists for each appendix. Staff feels these are minor items – most of which can be completed in time for the July 17th Commission meeting, and certainly before the 60-day review.

IF the PSC feels comfortable with the draft Plan, the committee should consider making a recommendation to the Commission to submit the draft plan for the formal 60-day comment period at its July 17th meeting. During the 60-day comment period, staff can continue making minor edits and formatting adjustments. No significant changes to content, budgets, or schedules should be made during the 60-day period. Updates can be made after the 60-day period and before the 90-day review period.

6. DISCUSS PROCESS FOR OUTREACH DURING COMMENT PERIOD

Staff will draft a press release, newsletter articles, and other content for outreach to various groups informing them of the comment period and inviting their feedback on the draft plan. Staff is seeking guidance and recommendations on this activity. Would PSC members like to review outreach materials before they are submitted to the press and various groups? What recommendations do PSC members have regarding communication avenues for various groups?

7. ADJOURN