



# Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Meeting Notes of the  
Watershed Plan Steering Committee  
March 19, 2025 @ 11:00 a.m.  
Brookview, Golden Valley

## Meeting Attendees:

Committee Chair Kennedy, Commissioners Cesnik, Polzin and Twiford; TAC Member Eckman; Administrator Jester; Commission Engineers Johnson and Williams

### 1. WELCOME

Committee Chair Kennedy opened the meeting at 8:32 a.m.

### 2. REVIEW FEBRUARY 5 MEETING NOTES

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

### 3. REVIEW PLAN PROGRESS TRACKER

The group reviewed the plan progress tracker, noting that another workshop with the Commission should be scheduled soon, preferably before summer months.

### 4. REVIEW PLAN TAC INPUT

Administrator Jester reviewed input from the Plan TAC on the issues, goals, and potential activities for the Education and Engagement category and Organizational Effectiveness category. She noted that overall, the Plan TAC members liked the draft Plan and the direction of the Commission. She reviewed some recommended additions to help track education outcomes and some minor rewording changes to the a few 10-year goals in for organizational effectiveness. Committee members agreed with the recommended changes except for some additional minor wording updates. Staff will incorporate the changes and will review them with the Commission at an upcoming meeting or workshop.

### 5. DISCUSS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Administrator Jester led a review and discussion about how the Commission implements its capital improvement program (CIP). She noted that, for the most part, the CIP is working well and staff doesn't have many recommended changes to how projects are selected and implemented.

The group discussed the current "gatekeeper" criteria that determine whether a project can even be considered for the CIP. For the criteria related to "project addresses a flooding concern," the group agreed to add "and other water quantity issues." It was noted this additional phrase may help climate change issues (but which are not primarily related to vegetation, heat islands, or other non-water related stressors).

There was a discussion on the components required in a feasibility study. It was decided the list of required elements would be maintained as a guidance document outside the plan so that it could be updated periodically.

There was a discussion on eligible project costs (which includes those that could be reimbursed to the project implementer such as a member city). The committee reviewed the table from the current plan which has a column for eligible costs and another column for *potential* costs. There was consensus that potential project costs (e.g., property acquisition, public art, etc.) should be at least mentioned in the feasibility study. Committee Member Polzin noted that significant project costs should be known at the

time of the feasibility study even if exact estimates aren't known such that commissioners are fully aware of the whole project and related estimated costs. There was brief discussion about the possibility of the Commission only implementing projects with a certain cost/pound pollutant removal. In the end, committee members agreed that each project should be judged on its own merits because they are each unique and pollutant removal cost benefit is not the only factor to consider.

There was further discussion on eligible project costs. Committee Member Polzin noted that the list of "potential eligible costs" seems arbitrary. Commission Engineer Johnson voiced her opinion that the potential costs list is valuable to retain noting that the "potential costs" offer a negotiation point with cities or others and that conditions (including funding availability) will vary from project to project. There was general consensus that the eligible costs table could be reworded so that potential costs are more directly tied to Commission goals. There was also consensus that educational signage should be added as a potentially eligible cost.

There was consensus that the Commission should continue being flexible in assigning entities responsible for implementation, like design and construction. The Commission itself can do this work, or it could enter agreements with member cities or other partners (such as park districts) to implement.

Regarding long term maintenance, it was agreed the plan should acknowledge that maintenance of actual structures will typically be the responsibility of the city where the project is located but that the Plan should also acknowledge that a maintenance levy through Hennepin County may also be established. Some CIP-related project maintenance performed by cities can also be funded through the Commission's Channel Maintenance Fund.

The committee discussed the idea of creating a cost share program to help fund best practices on private properties that go above and beyond regulations for pollutant removal or flood reduction as space for BMPs on public property is becoming more and more limited. There was discussion of creating public-private partnerships and also allowing cost share to cities for smaller projects that are not on the BCWMC CIP and which the longer CIP timeline does not work. It was acknowledged that smaller, residential projects (like shoreline buffers or raingardens) would not fit into this cost share program – only larger projects. The program could be modeled after the MWMO cost share program. It was noted the 10-year CIP should include a line item for this potential cost share program.

Commission Engineer Williams then reviewed the CIP prioritization matrix noting that it generates a quantitative score used to rank and prioritize projects. He reviewed the broad categories of prioritization and the proposed changes to the existing matrix. It was noted there are likely some additional adjustments needed (such as a possible metric for addressing drought and more thought given to the metric regarding social vulnerability). It was agreed that CIP prioritization would be described broadly in the Plan and the matrix itself would be an appendix or referenced guidance document.

The committee did not have time to fully review the list of potential projects for the 10-year CIP. They did request that the table be reorganized by waterbody or subwatershed and include estimated costs and timing of projects.

## **6. REVIEW DRAFT NON-CIP IMPLEMENTATION TABLE**

Tabled to a future meeting due to lack of time.

- 7. REVIEW REVISED IMPLEMENTATION SECTION 4.1 (formerly Section 5.1)**  
Tabled to a future meeting due to lack of time.
- 8. REVIEW DRAFT INTRODUCTION SECTION 1.0**  
This item was tabled to a future meeting due to lack of time.
- 9. ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 a.m.