



# Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Meeting Notes of the  
Watershed Plan Steering Committee  
January 3, 2024 @ 8:30 a.m.  
Brookview, Golden Valley

## Meeting Attendees:

Committee Chair Kennedy; Commissioners Cesnik, Welch, and Twiford; Alternate Commissioner Polzin; TAC Members Eckman and Scharenbroich; Administrator Jester; Commission Engineers Chandler, Williams, and Johnson

### 1. WELCOME

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

### 2. REVIEW DECEMBER 6 MEETING NOTES

Committee Member Welch noted that although no changes are needed for the meeting notes, this committee and the Commission should be more involved in wetland management.

The December 6, 2023 Plan Steering Committee meeting notes were approved by consensus.

### 3. REVIEW DECEMBER 15 PLAN TAC MEETING NOTES

Committee members reviewed meeting notes from the Plan TAC meeting. Commission staff and Committee Chair Kennedy reported that the Plan TAC meeting went well and was a good opportunity to get feedback from partners, cities, and review agencies on the draft issue statements and measurable goals drafted to date. Committee member Welch asked if the meeting was actually helpful. He noted that the meeting notes indicated comments on draft language rather than gathering input on what activities or goals are working in other areas of the Metro. He noted that future Plan TAC meetings should be held in conjunction with a PSC meeting. Chair Kennedy agreed that the Plan TAC meeting, while valuable, did not seem to concentrate on the big picture enough and "got in the weeds" of wordsmithing too much. Engineer Chandler noted that it's helpful to get feedback at this stage to confirm that the plan goals and issues are on the right track. Administrator Jester noted that meeting with review agencies at this point helps streamline the review process. Committee member Polzin indicated her hope that review agencies would provide more big picture assistance and less micromanaging. There was a discussion about how best to gather and record Plan TAC input in the future (e.g., major vs minor comments). It was noted that Commission staff or the PSC should set expectations for what type/level of feedback is being sought.

### 4. RE-REVIEW ISSUE STATEMENTS AND DRAFT GOALS FOR IMPAIRED WATERS AND CHLORIDE ISSUES CONSIDERING PLAN TAC INPUT

BCWMC staff presented some potential revisions to the goals and issues statements to reflect Plan TAC comments including adding the word "statistically" to better define "significant" improvement in water quality. Engineer Williams noted that the narrative of the plan should specify a process to indicate that "statistically significant" change is defined by a 95% confidence in the trend. Committee members also agreed that goals shouldn't be too narrow and should allow some level of flexibility.

There was discussion about how storytelling and providing examples in the body of the plan would help readers better understand some concepts and can illustrate adaptive management. (For instance, the example of implementing an alum treatment on Twin Lake when phosphorus levels started to rise is a good example of protecting resources with good water quality and using adaptive management.)

There was discussion about the goal related to bacteria noting that it is difficult to address but that the

Commission can't stay silent on it because there is a bacteria impairment and a bacteria TMDL. The committee agreed to change the goal to reduce "sources" instead of the bacteria level itself.

**5. RE-REVIEW ISSUE STATEMENTS AND DRAFT GOALS FOR STREAMBANK & GULLY EROSION, LAKESHORE EROSION, AND WETLAND HEALTH & RESTORATION ISSUES CONSIDERING PLAN TAC INPUT**

Regarding the lakeshore management goal, the committee indicated both linear feet and percentage of shoreline could be in the goal statement. Engineer Chandler noted that she'll be reviewing new information that might assign pollutant reductions to lakeshore buffers. She will share it with the group after she learns more.

Regarding wetland health and restoration, Committee member Eckman noted that Golden Valley has sequencing requirements that are stricter than the MN Wetland Conservation Act (WCA). Committee member Welch noted that it's a good goal to assess wetland conditions in the watershed and then develop appropriate policies.

**6. DISCUSS PRESENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO COMMISSION IN JANUARY**

The group noted that commissioners should understand the importance of the workshop and their role in helping craft and implement the 10-year plan. They developed an outline for a 90- minute workshop including an introduction and background information (which will be presented by Chair Kennedy); breaking into 4 small groups for discussion about issue statements, desired future conditions, and measurable goals; and coming back together for whole group discussion. Chair Kennedy asked that committee members Eckman and Scharenbroich each lead a small group and two Commission staff lead the other two small groups.

There was discussion about possibly indicating a prioritization of goals within the impaired waters issue. There was no firm decision on this. The group also briefly discussed how commissioners could perhaps anonymously indicate priority for certain goals.

**7. REVIEW ISSUE STATEMENTS AND DRAFT GOALS FOR REMAINING WATERBODY AND WATERSHED QUALITY CATEGORY**

Tabled until the next meeting.

**8. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 10:38 a.m.