



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Next Generation Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes

4:30 p.m ~ Monday May 19, 2014
Golden Valley City Hall

Attendees: Committee Chair Linda Loomis; Commissioners Clint Carlson, Alternate Commissioners Dave Tobelmann and Lisa Goddard; TAC member Joe Fox; Engineer Karen Chandler; Administrator Laura Jester

1. Call Meeting to Order

Chair Loomis called the meeting to order at 4:37 p.m.

2. Approve Meeting Notes from March 24, 2014 and April 21, 2014 Plan Steering Committee Meetings

There was consensus to approve the meeting notes with no changes.

3. Discuss Updated Plan Development Timeline

Engineer Chandler distributed an updated schedule (timeline) for Plan completion with the goal of having an approved and adopted Plan by October 1, 2015 so the Commission will be eligible to apply for Clean Water Fund grants in 2015. She noted the Commission will not be eligible for Clean Water Funds this year because the Plan expires in September and a watershed organization must have a current Plan on October 1 of each year for eligibility. She noted that detailed and lengthy discussions among various committees on certain policies have resulted in a longer process than anticipated and that the plan is at least 5 months behind schedule.

There was discussion about whether the Commission could apply for an extension to the Plan in order to keep it "current" while the new Plan is being developed. Administrator Jester said she would ask BWSR about that. There was also discussion about how much discussion is needed in the remaining policy areas. Commissioner Carlson wondered if the Commission Engineer and the Administrator should simply draft the remaining policies and forego lengthy discussions. Administrator Jester noted it was important to fully examine the policies and to get input from all those involved as the Plan sets the stage for Commission activities over the next 10-years and has budget and policy implications for all member cities.

There was consensus that the committee, the Commission, and its consultants should do everything possible to get the plan adopted by October 1st of next year, even if more frequent committee meetings were needed. The group also agreed at least two more Commission workshops were needed: one to discuss the remaining policies and one to discuss the 10-year CIP.

Administrator Jester noted the TAC wasn't scheduled to meet until late June and that it still needed to discuss the draft buffer policies. She said she would work on scheduling a TAC meeting in early June.

4. Review Policy Revisions from Discussions/Decisions at 4/14/14 Commission Workshop, 4/21/14 Plan Steering Committee Meeting and 5/1/14 TAC Meeting

The group reviewed the revised priority water bodies and water quality standards table. They agreed with all the changes but asked that the table note that the Secchi disk parameter is a minimum measurement (which is different from the other parameters which are maximum measurements).

The following revised policies were discussed by the group.

Policy #1: Okay as written.

Policy #4: There was much discussion on the wording of this policy. Commissioner Carlson noted that the language, as written, would not be acceptable to the City of Medicine Lake – especially if the goal is to work together with that community on issues that are important to them. There was agreement that a policy should not be written in negative terms. It was suggested that the statement on recreational boating could perhaps be moved to policies regarding recreation. There was discussion about perhaps better defining Commission priorities regarding water quality that is “swimmable and fishable.” The group did agree to leave the language stating the Commission would not manage increased aquatic plant growth that was a result of improved water quality. The policy will be reworded and brought back to the committee.

Policy #6: There was much discussion about eligible project costs and how current ineligible project costs are usually unknown and could be extremely high. There was discussion about a cost-benefit analysis for each project to determine merits of projects with complete costs accounted – and then that information would be used by the Commission to decide if a project was cost effective and/or what parts of the project the Commission could afford. The analysis may be “self-correcting” if the cost per pound of pollutant removal is too high.

There was also discussion about the term “city betterment.” It was decided that term is too broad and should be better defined. The Commission Engineer and Administrator will further wordsmith the language in the policy for review at a future committee meeting.

Policy #13: Policy should reference the current MIDS (as of 2013) language for clarity.

Policy #25: Okay as written.

Flooding and Rate Control Policies: Engineer Chandler reported the results of the TAC meeting and their discussion on the roles and responsibilities regarding the Flood Control Project maintenance and replacement.

Policies #31 - #36 Engineer Chandler noted these policies reflect the TAC recommendations which were already accepted by the Commission at their 5/14/14 meeting. Accept for the comment below for #34, the other policies are accepted as written.

Policy #34: May need to better define “major” in the top bullet.

Policy #37: Okay as written.

Policy #45: Okay as written.

Policy #47: Expand MIDS reference; add flexible treatment options and different treatment of linear projects.

5. Discuss Revised Groundwater Policy #72

Policy #72: Delete “entities.”

6. Review Stream Restoration Policies

Due to the time, these policies were held for a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:50 p.m. Two committee meetings were scheduled for June: June 9th and June 23rd; 4:30 p.m.