



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Next Generation Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes

4:30 p.m. ~ Monday August 25, 2014
Golden Valley City Hall

Attendees: Committee Chair Linda Loomis; Alternate Commissioners Pat Crough and Dave Tobelmann; Engineers Karen Chandler and Greg Williams; Administrator Laura Jester

1. Call Meeting to Order

Chair Loomis called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

2. Approve Meeting Notes from July 28, 2014 Plan Steering Committee Meetings

There were no changes suggested for these meeting notes. Consensus to approve as presented.

3. Review Revised Policies Revised per 8/11/14 Commission Workshop

The only policy that was recommended for a slight change was #95. Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann noted the word "cubic" should be used to describe how many "yards of cut or fill." All policies that were revised at the workshop will be noted as such at the bottom of the policy so staff and Commissioners can keep track of where they were discussed and where decisions were made.

4. Review Education and Information Policies Revised from 7/28/14 PSC Meeting

Engineer Chandler noted that much consolidation was done with these policies and details were moved into the Education and Outreach Plan (EOP) as decided at the 7/28/14 meeting. There were comments on the following policies:

#123: Administrator Jester asked to remove the phrase "practices to relay" language in the policy. Alternatively, language from the executive summary of the EOP may be used in this policy.

#128: Noted it was general but decided okay as written.

#133: Okay as written.

#144: Okay as written.

#146: There was discussion about what constitutes a citizen advisory committee (CAC) and whether or not the Commission should work towards having a standing CAC. It was noted that watershed districts MUST have a CAC, but for watershed organizations, they are optional. There was discussion about how it's difficult to get volunteers and that CAC's take staff time to coordinate. Administrator Jester noted that CAC's can be useful if there is a specific task to complete. She noted that it's sometimes difficult to even get Commissioners to committee meetings. The group talked about how cities find volunteers for different committees and commissions. Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann noted that existing groups such as Master Gardeners and Master Naturalists may be good places to look for volunteers. Ultimately, the group decided to leave the policy as written.

#150: Okay as written.

#140: Administrator Jester wondered if this policy was needed or if the policy should include ALL key messages. She wondered why it singled out just one key message. The group decided it would be okay to move the policy to the EOP and re-word, as needed.

5. Review Administration Policies Revised from 7/28/14 PSC Meeting

#166: The group discussed the need for evaluation of implementation of Commission policies by member cities but wondered about the most effective and efficient way to accomplish this evaluation. They reviewed the Rice Creek WD evaluation policy as suggested by BWSR (as an example). The group agreed some oversight of member city policy implementation was needed, but did not want to burden Commission or city staff with extra work. Administrator Jester noted that cities have two years after the watershed plan is adopted to amend their local controls. She said the Commission would be reviewing city's local water plan (LWP) to make sure they comply with the new watershed plan. Engineer Chandler noted, however, that local ordinances that enforce the revised LWPs are not reviewed by the Commission. The group wondered if local ordinances should be reviewed by the Commission and/or if cities somehow tally when and how their ordinances are being enforced. The group agreed it would be best to use data that is already being collected to evaluate local implementation of Commission policies.

The group also discussed possibly reviewing cities' MS4 annual reports or developing a simple checklist for cities to complete (perhaps each year) that indicates which Commission policies were implemented in their city. It was decided that a draft checklist should be brought to the next Commission workshop for review and then perhaps to the TAC for comment.

For now, the policy will be revised to include "annually" and the detail of how to evaluate will be included in the Implementation Section of the plan. The policy will also be revised to include "The Commission will take appropriate administrative or legal action in the event of non-compliance."

#175: Okay as written.

#180: The policy will be revised to read:

"The BCWMC requires member cities to acquire and maintain easements, ~~or~~ right-of-way, or interest in land necessary to implement and maintain ~~BCWMC projects upon order of~~ ordered by the BCWMC ~~Board of Commissioners~~ (the cost of land acquisition may be eligible for Commission reimbursement, see Table X)

#190: Okay as written.

6. Review Draft Education and Outreach Plan

Administrator Jester reported that there was an existing Education and Outreach Plan (EOP) that specifically planned for various activities from February 2011 – December 2015. However, she noted that the driving force behind the EOP and carrying out the plan was former Commissioner Hoshal. She noted that she has not been given too much direction to perform education-related activities and that the Commission primarily helps to fund other organizations' education efforts. She noted the EOP she developed for this watershed plan is not as detailed as the existing EOP in that it does not include a timeline nor budget for implementation. Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann recognized that it would be difficult to include budget and timeline details for education and outreach in a 10-year plan. He indicated that the Commission's Education Committee could use this more general EOP to annually details and budgets in timeline for the subsequent year's budget. He noted that specifics are needed at some point.

There was discussion about the format of the EOP. Engineer Williams provided a matrix format that could work. The group noted the repetition in the current draft of the EOP. Administrator Jester indicated she would revise the EOP and bring it to the next PSC meeting.

7. Discuss Process for Addressing Commission's Role in Recreation

Engineer Chandler reported that currently, the Commission has very few policies regarding recreation. Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann noted that recreation means different things to different people. The group agreed that "recreation" needed to be defined as well as the Commission's role in recreation. The also discussed how the Commission's goals and actions to improve water quality impacts recreation and that the "impairment status" of a waterbody is, in part, based on recreation. Engineer Chandler noted that previous Commission projects involving the control of invasive species (like curly leaf pondweed) were based on improving water quality, not on improving recreation. The group wondered how other watershed organizations approach recreation and how the roles of recreation could or should be divided among the Commission, cities, and park districts.

Alternate Commissioner Tobelmann recommended that a matrix be developed depicting the different aspects of recreation and the different entities that could take on different roles. He thought it would be good to include current practices and perhaps staff recommendations for future roles. The group agreed this would be a good starting point. A draft matrix will be brought to the next PSC meeting and then the discussion would go to the next Commission Workshop. Current policies regarding recreation would also be brought to the next PSC meeting.

8. Discuss Process to Develop Implementation Plan

Engineer Williams noted the Implementation Plan is a large table that includes large capital projects as well as programs and projects of the Commission. It lays out the work of the Commission over the life of the plan including timelines and budgets. Administrator Jester recommended that staff get ideas for projects to include in the Implementation Plan from both Commissioners and TAC members. The group agreed ideas could be solicited via email.

9. Discuss Plans for Next Commission Workshop

Administrator Jester indicated she was given direction at the last Commission meeting to send a Doodle Poll for dates for the next Commission Workshop. The workshop will include reviewing Education and Administration policies, a discussion of the Commission's role in recreation and a quick overview of the EOP and Implementation Plan.

10. Set Next Meeting and Adjourn

This meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for September 22nd at 4:30 p.m.