



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Watershed Plan Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday June 4, 2025

8:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Wirth Lake Room, Brookview

AGENDA

1. WELCOME

2. **REVIEW MAY 7 MEETING NOTES** – included with meeting materials

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

4. **REVIEW COMMISSION WORKSHOP FEEDBACK**

At the May 15th workshop, staff presented PSC-recommended content on implementation programs and activities, the 10-year CIP, and changes to development requirements. The following notes were collected during the small group discussions. Staff does not recommend any changes to the draft plan based on these comments.

- a. Table of contents looks good. Make sure the executive summary is written in plain language as a public facing document. The first paragraph should sum up the work and purpose of the commission in plain language. While there are requirements for exec summary content in MN Rules, BWSR staff noted they are discussing the exec summary requirements and may be open to more flexibility so that the exec summary can be the public facing document. Noted that PSC has considered having an even more succinct document summarizing the plan for public use. Be sure to note the commission works on surface waters rather than groundwater. When speaking with the public they often assume the commission deals with drinking water.
- b. When asked about concerns: There was a comment that the plan IS aggressive and it will be interesting to see city's appetites for higher budgets and assessments that will ultimately be needed.
- c. Lost and Northwood Lakes are specifically called out for studies. What if something comes up in another lake and/or in another city? Staff shared the Activities Table and noted the placeholder for subwatershed analyses in other areas of the watershed.
- d. Interesting to see the public-private partnership line item. We will need to be careful about that. How will we be sure that developers aren't just taking advantage and using as another funding mechanism? How will we ensure that it's actually providing real benefits? Staff responded: this is less hard than you might think. City of Plymouth already does this through agreements. And, other watershed organizations (e.g., Shingle Creek WMC) are doing this so there are good examples out there. Staff also noted the first steps and work of the Commission would be to have those types of conversations and think through the necessary policies and practices associated with a new program.
- e. When asked how folks are feeling about the draft plan, is it too much? Are we overcommitting? Commissioners (and a TAC member) noted plans are meant to be aspirational, the activities seem appropriate, and that it's better to be aggressive than just staying status quo.

5. REVISIT VISION STATEMENT

In December 2023, as the PSC was starting its work, a vision statement for the plan was approved by the Committee: *Stewardship of water resources to reduce flood risk and improve watershed ecosystem health.*

Since then, the Commission adopted a land and water acknowledgement statement and approved a new BCWMC letterhead. The acknowledgement statement is found [here](#). The following statement is now at the bottom of the letterhead (in addition to the list of member cities): *Protecting and improving the Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ / Bassett Creek watershed, homeland of the Dakota people.*

When the PSC reviewed the slides for outreach to cities/groups on the draft plan, the group agreed the following language should be shown on the first slide: *Protecting and enhancing lakes and streams in the Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ / Bassett Creek Watershed.*

Staff wonders if the PSC wants to reconsider its vision statement for the plan, stick with the original vision statement, or remove the vision statement altogether. (The Commission has not been asked to formerly approve a vision statement.)

6. DISCUSS CREEK NAMING CONVENTION

At their meeting in December, the Commission approved the following creek co-naming practices:

- a. For simplicity right now use both the Dakota and English names only for the creek and only on the main stem of the creek. (Some lakes or other streams have Dakota names and others either don't have Dakota names or they are unknown.)
- b. Be consistent with format. Place the Dakota name first, then use a slash (rather than a hyphen), and then list the English name: Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ / Bassett Creek.
- c. Use co-naming wherever possible, particularly on public facing documents and places including signs at road crossings; signs at project sites, in parks, and at Utepils; on the BCWMC website; on the BCWMC letterhead.
- d. Consider using Dakota artwork (in addition to the name) on signs, on website, and other appropriate places.
- e. Consider where both creek names should be used in the Watershed Management Plan.

The PSC should discuss how and where to use the Dakota name in the Plan. There are three primary uses of the term "Bassett Creek" (aside from the *Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission* which will not include the Dakota name):

- a. Bassett Creek
- b. Main Stem of Bassett Creek
- c. Bassett Creek Watershed (as a geographic feature, not the organization)

Should "Ĥaĥá Wakpádaŋ" be added in all three of these cases? Should there be a space on either side of the "/"?

7. REVIEW MAIN BODY of DRAFT PLAN - included with meeting materials with some new sections not previously reviewed

Main sections of the draft plan are attached with meeting materials and ready for PSC review. Please note the following:

- Table of Contents – Should accurately reflect sections but does not yet include a list of tables and figures
- Acronym List – **New section**, never reviewed; will be updated to include acronyms found in appendices
- Executive Summary – **New section**, never reviewed – formatting will be updated for more stylized, graphic appearance.

- Section 1.0 – Some minor edits were made to improve readability and accuracy
- Section 2.0 – **New section**, never reviewed; summary of Land and Water Resource Inventory (App A)
- Section 3.0 - Updated to incorporate PSC recommendations from the May meeting. Still needs some figures and sidebars with examples of projects or success stories.
- Section 4.0 - Narrative content has not changed since May 15th Commission workshop. No changes pending.
- Table 4.5 Activities and Programs Implementation Schedule – Some activities in the Education and Engagement category were updated to better align with the Education and Engagement Plan (Appendix C) and budgets were adjusted slightly.
- Section 5.0 – References section is not included here; not yet complete

8. REVIEW REVISED EDUCATION & ENGAGEMENT PLAN (APPENDIX C) – included with meeting materials

The E&E plan was further revised to better align with and reference activities in Table 4.5. Changes are tracked.

9. REVIEW DRAFT APPENDIX F: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT & INPUT – included with meeting materials

This is a new, never reviewed appendix of the Plan that is required by MN Rules. The appendix outlines the various ways the BCWMC received input on the plan and a summary of the input received.

10. DISCUSS OUTREACH IN CITIES AND MPLS NEIGHBORHOODS

To date the cities of Plymouth, Golden Valley, and Minneapolis are hosting a review of the draft plan with a city commission. Staff is seeking assistance with reaching out to other groups, particularly Minneapolis neighborhoods.

11. ADJOURN – Next meeting: MONDAY July 7, 8:30 a.m.