



# Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Meeting Notes of the  
Watershed Plan Steering Committee  
June 4, 2025 @ 8:30 a.m.  
Brookview, Golden Valley

## Meeting Attendees:

Committee Chair Kennedy, Commissioners Polzin, Pentel and Hauer; TAC Member Scharenbroich; Community member Loomis; Administrator Jester; Commission Engineers Johnson and Williams

### 1. WELCOME

Committee Chair Kennedy opened the meeting at approximately 8:30 a.m.

### 2. REVIEW MAY 7 MEETING NOTES

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

### 3. REVIEW PLAN PROGRESS TRACKER

The committee reviewed the work completed and work still needed to complete the plan. Administrator Jester noted they are still on track to bring the complete draft plan to the Commission for approval to submit for 60-day review in July.

### 4. REVIEW COMMISSION WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

Administrator Jester walked through the feedback gathered at the May Commission workshop. She noted that there were good discussions in the small groups including a reminder that the executive summary should be written in plain language for the general public, discussions on how public-private partnerships might work, an explanation on how implementation resulting from future subwatershed assessments is incorporated into the activities table, and an acknowledgement that the implementation plan is aggressive.

Committee Chair Kennedy noted that the language and “voice” throughout the Plan should be consistent. He suggested that he and Committee member Polzin do a full read-through of the draft plan.

Commissioner Polzin reported that she had presented on the Watershed Management Plan update to the Minneapolis Community Environmental Advisory Commission. She noted that group is likely to review the draft plan more thoroughly during the formal 60-day review period and that they had lots of questions about regulation enforcement.

Committee Chair Kennedy reported that he presented on the draft plan to the Medicine Lake City Council. He noted the council seemed happy with the holistic approach, they had questions about the city assessment formula, and they noted since the JPA was approved, the city had agreed to participate in watershed management.

### 5. REVISIT VISION STATEMENT

Administrator Jester reviewed the original vision statement set at the beginning of the planning process along with subsequent, similar statements that incorporate “*Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ*,” including on the recently approved letterhead. She asked if the committee would like to revisit the vision statement. After a brief discussion, there was consensus to revise the vision statement to:

*Stewardship of the Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ / Bassett Creek Watershed to reduce flood risk and improve ecosystem health.*

It was noted that the statement would need approval by the full Commission.

## **6. DISCUSS CREEK NAMING CONVENTION**

Administrator Jester asked the committee to decide on a naming convention for the creek within the plan. She noted that the creek is referred to in different ways in the plan including “Bassett Creek,” “Main Stem of Bassett Creek,” and “Bassett Creek Watershed.” There was consensus to add “Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ /” to all three instances, including a space before and after the “/” resulting in:

- a. Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ / Bassett Creek
- b. Main Stem of Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ /Bassett Creek
- c. Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ /Bassett Creek Watershed

## **7. REVIEW MAIN BODY of DRAFT PLAN**

Administrator Jester reported that the complete plan is ready for review including some new sections not previously reviewed including the acronym list, the executive summary, and the summary of the land and water resources inventory (Section 2). Committee members provided some editorial comments. There was discussion about how the issue of “equity” was shown as a medium priority in the executive summary and thus not listed in the table with high priority issues. It was noted that the term “equity” was used to capture the two equity-related issues (which are both assigned a medium priority). There was a suggestion that the intent to address environmental inequities be given additional context in the executive summary.

Committee member Polzin noted that the executive summary should include context on implementation schedule, budget, new programs, and the organizational and funding mechanism assessment. She noted that costs could be indicated by tools or by percentage.

There was discussion on the layout of the executive summary. Administrator Jester showed the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD’s executive summary which includes more graphics. Committee members liked that layout and indicated that something similar should be used for the BCWMC plan.

There were further suggestions for the executive summary including providing examples of Indigenous land and water care practices (or at least add them to the implementation section of the plan) and indicating which tools are new or expanded. There was also a suggestion to reword Policy 13 to read “For projects subject to BCWMC review ~~and~~ or erosion and sediment control standards...”

For Section 1.0, there were suggestions to update the logos in the graphic, add MPRB under ‘local’ agencies, and add the MS4 program to the MPCA’s responsibilities.

For Section 2.0, suggestions included moving maps closer to when they are referenced in the text, adding a map with impaired waters, adding a sidebar explaining delisting, and adding a paragraph on chloride and nutrients in section 2.9 to help indicate that residents can make a difference on those pollutants.

For Section 3.0, it was noted that numbering is needed throughout and that a photo of a nice riparian edge could be added.

There was consensus that the acronym list for the main body of the plan should not include acronyms specific to certain appendices. Each appendix will have its own acronym list.

## **8. REVIEW REVISED EDUCATION & ENGAGEMENT PLAN (APPENDIX C)**

Administrator Jester noted recent revisions to the appendix (and subsequently to the activities and

programs table) to better align the appendix with implementation activities. There was a suggestion to add “single family homeowners” to the list of partners in section 9 and to add the activities in section 9 to the list of tools in main body of the plan. Committee member Polzin indicated she may have additional comments on this appendix.

**9. REVIEW DRAFT APPENDIX F: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT & INPUT**

Administrator Jester noted that this is a new appendix, not previously reviewed. The appendix reports on the outreach efforts early in the planning process and the input received that helped inform the plan. There were editorial revisions suggested and a recommendation to rename the appendix so it explicitly explains the content. It was noted that current outreach efforts to city councils and commissions should be added to the table of outreach events. It was also noted the appendix should indicate how the draft plan incorporates the input gathered.

**10. DISCUSS OUTREACH IN CITIES AND MPLS NEIGHBORHOODS**

Administrator Jester asked about when and how outreach with neighborhoods and other stakeholder groups should happen. There was consensus to wait until the formal review period to do a press release and invite groups to review and weigh in.

**11. ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at 10:07 a.m.