



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Next Generation Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes

4:30 p.m. ~ Monday June 9, 2014
Golden Valley City Hall

Attendees: Committee Chair Linda Loomis; Commissioner Ginny Black; Alternate Commissioner Crough; TAC member Joe Fox; Engineers Karen Chandler and Greg Williams; Administrator Laura Jester

1. Call Meeting to Order

Chair Loomis called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

2. Approve Meeting Notes from May 19, 2014 Plan Steering Committee Meeting

This item was tabled as there were not enough Commissioners at this meeting that were also present at the May 19th meeting.

3. Review Revised Eligible Project Costs Table

There was discussion of earlier projects where easement acquisition was reimbursed as well as costs of utility relocation. The group also discussed how TMDLs and corresponding wasteload allocations might impact what parts of a project would be reimbursed. There was recognition that in such a developed watershed, projects will get more and more expensive as there become fewer and fewer locations for water quality treatment projects. The following changes were made to the table presented:

Under "Costs eligible for reimbursement" column: 1) "1-year inspection" under warranty period monitoring costs was changed to "post construction inspection," and 2) "2.5% transfer to BCWMC administrative fund..." was changed to "Transfer to BCWMC administrative fund for CIP administrative expenses, as designated by the Commission."

Under "Other project costs that will be considered for whole or partial reimbursement on a project by project basis" column: 1) in the list of examples under city improvements – "park benches" was removed and "pedestrian bridges, trails, etc." was added, and 2) "GW" will be spelled out as "groundwater."

There was consensus that the revised table was complete and ready for Commission consideration in the draft Plan.

4. Review Revised Policy #4

The group discussed the revised policy and the fact that a negative statement (such as listing items the Commission would not do) should be avoided within the Plan. After some discussion, the group agreed to revise the policy to state: "The BCWMC and the member cities will implement the improvement options listed in the BCWMC's CIP (Table X) to meet applicable water quality standards or maintain excellent water quality in priority water bodies based on feasibility, prioritization, and available funding (see CIP prioritization criteria in Table X)." The last sentence

in the draft policy regarding management of aquatic plants will be moved to a section with a policy on managing aquatic invasive species. That policy will read something like this: “The BCWMC will collaborate with other entities (e.g., agencies, lake association, cities) to manage and prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species. This may include assistance such as point-intercept surveys of aquatic vegetation, feasibility studies, technical analysis, and education. The BCWMC will not manage increased growths of native aquatic vegetation resulting from improved water quality.”

5. Review Stream Restoration Policies

The group reviewed policies related to stream restoration and made the following changes:

Policy #81: Delete highlighted section that refers to Table 12-4.

Policy #82: Change “imminent” to “likely.”

Policy #83: The group thought the policy was too specific and should not list specific types of restoration techniques. The policy will be changed to “The BCWMC will strive to implement stream and streambank restoration projects that use soft armoring techniques as much as possible and where feasible.” The last two bullets of the policy will be deleted.

Policies 84 – 87: The group agreed that these should be deleted or moved, as shown.

Policy #88: Engineer Chandler gave the background on why this policy was included in the 2004 Plan – that Friends of Bassett Creek and others wanted the BCWMC to consider access and navigability of the stream when doing projects. The group agreed to add “navigability” to the list of considerations within the policy.

Policy #89: Will be deleted as “navigability” was added to the policy above.

Policy #90: Okay to delete as suggested.

Policy #91: Okay as written.

Policy #92: Will be reworded.

Policy #93: The group decided to delete this policy as it was repetitive with other policies.

Policy #94: Okay to delete as suggested.

Policy #95: This policy will be deleted here as a similar statement covering all policies in the Plan will be included in the Administrative Policy section.

Policy #96: Administrator Jester acknowledged this policy does not belong in this section and should be moved to policies regarding shoreland. The group discussed the idea of shoreland habitat monitoring program, in general. Administrator Jester and Engineer Chandler reported that this type of program was working well in the Black Dog WMO. Chandler noted the data that was collected through the program was valuable because it indicated where problems in shoreland existed. But she noted it was difficult to prioritize these areas with other needs of the watershed. It may be helpful in targeting education to landowners in addition to knowing where potential projects exist.

Commissioner Black thought it would be a good discussion for the whole Commission. She noted that the benefits of such a program would have to be presented.

6. Discuss TAC Recommendations for Buffer Policies

Engineer Williams distributed and Engineer Chandler presented the buffer policies for wetlands and streams, as recommended by the TAC at their meeting on June 5th. There was some discussion about how and where they would be implemented and the fact that buffer requirements on lakes were not recommended. The group agreed with the TAC recommendations. However, they would like further information on what is already required in shoreland areas by the MDNR and which cities have already adopted these requirements into ordinances. There may be some confusion over shoreland setback

requirements which are already enforced and potential buffer requirements. Administrator Jester indicated she had emailed the MDNR and would follow up with them.

In discussing what type of activities would be allowed in buffer areas, the group agreed that occasional mowing or burning to maintain native vegetation should be allowed, along with removal of exotic vegetation to replace with native species. Some further guidance/requirement will be drafted by staff.

7. Discuss Draft Ditch Policies

Engineer Williams distributed and Engineer Chandler presented draft policies on ditches. Chandler indicated that Counsel LeFevere, in the past, has not agreed that the BCWMC should assume ditch authority. However, she noted that more discuss is needed with Counsel to discuss using State Statute 383B.61 rather than 104D.

Policy #104: The group asked that if Counsel LeFevere recommended changes to the policy, to bring it back to the committee.

Policy #105: Commissioner Black relayed a story from Plymouth regarding ditch maintenance. She wanted further clarification on what is expected and allowed within ditches if they are abandoned and turned over to the BCWMC.

Policy #106: Okay as written.

8. Review Timeline for Completion of Policy Review

The group reviewed the timeline of policy discussion at future committee meetings as presented in the meeting agenda and agreed with the timeline. The committee should discuss possible Commission workshop dates at their next meeting.

9. Set Next PSC Meeting and Adjourn

The next Plan Steering Committee meetings were set for Monday June 23, 2014 at 4:30 p.m. Subsequent meetings are planned for July 7 and July 28.

This meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.