



Level II Performance Review

**Bassett Creek
Watershed Management Commission**

Local Government Unit Review

Draft Report

June 17, 2021

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources

520 Lafayette Road North

St. Paul, MN 55155

651-296-0768

www.bwsr.state.mn.us

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| Findings | 4 |
| Findings Part 1: Planning | 4 |
| Findings Part 2: Performance Standards | 5 |
| Findings Part 3: Internal and External Surveys | 6 |
| Internal Survey: Self-Assessment by BCWMC consultant staff and Board Members | 6 |
| External Survey: Assessment of BCWMC by Partners | 8 |
| Findings Part 4: Wetland Conservation Act Administrative Review | 9 |
| General Conclusions..... | 10 |
| Commendations | 10 |
| Action Items | 10 |
| Recommendations | 10 |
| LGU Comments and BWSR Responses | 12 |
| Appendix A. Plan Accomplishments | 13 |
| Appendix B. Performance Standards | 43 |
| Appendix C. Summary of External Survey Results..... | 45 |
| Appendix D. Wetland Conservation Act..... | 50 |
| Administrative Review Report | 50 |
| Appendix E. Comment Letter | 54 |
| Appendix F. Program Data | 55 |

This report has been prepared for **Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission** by the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 103B.102, Subd.3.

Prepared by Brett Arne (brett.arne@state.mn.us; 218-850-0934).

BWSR is reducing printing and mailing costs by using the Internet to distribute reports and information to wider audiences. This report is available in alternative formats upon request.

Introduction

This is an informational document prepared by the staff of the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) for the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission. It reports the results of a routine performance review of this organization's water management plan implementation and overall organizational effectiveness in delivery of conservation projects and programs. The findings and recommendations are intended to give local government units (LGUs) constructive feedback they can use to enhance their joint and individual delivery of conservation services.

For this review, BWSR has analyzed data submitted by Bassett Creek WMO's Administrative staff, including the reported accomplishments of their management plan action items, determined the organization's compliance with BWSR's Level I and II performance standards, surveyed members of the organization and their partner organizations for feedback, and conducted a routine spot check of Wetlands Conservation Act activities if applicable.

This routine evaluation is neither a financial audit nor an investigation and it does not replace or supersede other types of governmental review of local government unit operations.

While the performance review reported herein has been conducted under the authority granted to BWSR by Minnesota Statutes Chapter 103B.102, this is a staff report and has not been reviewed or approved by the BWSR board members.

What is PRAP?

PRAP is an acronym for BWSR's Performance Review and Assistance Program. Authorized by the 2007 Minnesota legislature, the purpose of PRAP is to support local delivery of conservation and water management by periodically reviewing and assessing the performance of local units of government that deliver those services. These include soil and water conservation districts, watershed districts, watershed management organizations, and the local water management functions of counties.

BWSR has developed four levels of review, from routine to specialized, depending on the program mandates and the needs of the local governmental unit. A Level I review annually tabulates all local governmental units' compliance with basic planning and reporting requirements. In Level II, conducted by BWSR once every ten years for each local government unit, the focus is on the degree to which the organization is accomplishing its water management plan. A Level II review includes determination of compliance with BWSR's Level I and II statewide performance standards, a tabulation of progress on planned goals and objectives, a survey of staff and board members of the factors affecting plan implementation, a survey of LGU partners about their impressions of working with the LGU, and a BWSR staff report to the organization with findings, conclusions and recommendations. BWSR's actions in Levels III and IV include elements of Levels I and II and then emphasize assistance to address the local governmental unit's specific needs. More details can be found on the BWSR PRAP webpage.

Executive Summary

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) staff met with the administrative consultants and the Bassett Creek WMC board to discuss an evaluation of the water management function of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission. The findings in this document represent the data collected over the course of 60 days of review and the recommendations are a result of the observations and conclusions we have made based on that data. There are four distinct parts of a Level II evaluation conducted via the BWSR Performance Review and Assistance Program (PRAP) as authorized by M.S. 103B.102.

Part 1: Evaluation of the progress made by water management entities toward goals stated in their approved and adopted local water management plans.

Part 2: Review of the entities' adherence to level I and II standards as directed by statutes, policies, and guidelines via a performance standards certification checklist.

Part 3: Board member and staff surveys as well as partner surveys to assess internal and external perceptions of performance, communication, partnerships, and delivery of conservation programs and customer service.

Part 4: Wetlands Conservation Act spot check to evaluate WCA program performance and delivery.

After thorough review of the data we develop a list of Actions and Recommendations to help guide the water management entities in their continued growth of program delivery. We do this to ensure they continue to meet basic standards as established in statutes and policy. We also develop a list of commendations for the great work these entities do as our partners in delivering conservation across the varied landscapes of Minnesota. Each of the above listed parts of the review are described in the findings section of this document, and the completed documents can be found in the notated appendices for further review. This report will be summarized in conjunction with other PRAP level II reports collected in 2021 to be used as the official BWSR PRAP report delivered to the legislature as part of our reporting requirement under M.S. 103B.102.

Key Findings and Conclusions

The Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission should be commended for their work in implementing core programs, rules, the Wetlands Conservation Act, planning efforts, and building partnerships. The board and administrative consultants are viewed very favorably by their partners and have made significant progress toward implementing their watershed management plan.

Ongoing water management challenges in the metro area have created the necessity to forge stronger working relationships among partners to improve local water management within the watershed, and the switch to comprehensive watershed management plans throughout the state means new opportunities for increased prioritization of projects and available funding.

The Bassett Creek WMC is commended for meeting all of the basic performance standards including having data practices policies, updated capital improvement program, and completing required annual reports. They are also commended for their effective administration of the Wetlands Conservation Act, and also for meeting several high performance standards, a testament to the quality of work they are recognized for by their partners.

Summary of Recommendations

There were several recommendations made by BWSR staff. These recommendations stem from the data we collected through the four parts of this review, as discussed previously. We rely heavily on our relationships with local government staff as well as the input of partners, staff, and board members to make sure we provide recommendations that are relevant, timely, and helpful for the LGUs to implement and improve their operations. The full text of the recommendations can be found in the conclusions section.

Recommendation 1 – Prioritize developing an education and outreach strategy for BCWMC constituents

Recommendation 2 – Conduct a review of the BCWMC capital improvement program (CIP)

Recommendation 3 – Develop clear, measurable goals and actions for future plan implementation

Recommendation 4 – Prioritize all training opportunities for staff implementing WCA

Recommendation 5 – Consider a WCA appeals fee and clarify the appeals process

Findings

This section describes what BWSR learned about the performance of the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission via the various collection methods as outlined below.

Findings Part 1: Planning

The findings in this section describe the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Plan and action items and the accomplishments to date.

As part of this review, the administrator for BCWMC prepared a table (See Appendix A) listing the accomplishments to-date for each of the action items for which they are responsible. The table contains a progress rating applied by BWSR to each item indicating whether it has been completed or its target was met, whether progress has been made and work is continuing, or whether it was dropped or not started yet.

In reviewing the Watershed Management Plan for BCWMC, it was noted that there were 122 action items listed. These action items were actually called “policies” within the plan, but denote the ongoing plan items with which the BCWMC is making progress. These 122 action items were separated by 10 specific objectives or “policy” groupings:

- Water quality
- Flooding and rate control
- Groundwater management
- Erosion and sediment control
- Stream restoration and protection
- Wetland management
- Public ditches
- Recreation, shoreland, and habitat management
- Education and outreach
- Administration

Typically, fewer action items in a long-range plan denote more broad, continuous activities and fewer specific goals. Conversely plans with too many action items may be too specific to be achievable within a reasonable timeframe. The BCWMC watershed management plan falls toward the middle of the scale in regards to metro watershed management plans and is a moderately aggressive plan. What we found in our review was that just over the halfway point of plan implementation there was identifiable progress made toward 115 of the actions. 15 of the identified actions had been completed or the target has been met, and we found that seven action items had not been started or they were dropped – although a few of these items were denoted as the responsibility of other agency partners as well. Typical of plans with numerous action items, much of the work completed by the BCWMC is part of ongoing programs.

The BWSR rated version of the Plan Progress Evaluation Table submitted by Bassett Creek staff is contained in Appendix A, pages 13-42.

Findings Part 2: Performance Standards

BWSR has developed a set of performance standards that describe both basic requirements and high-performance best management practices related to the overall operation of the organization. These standards are different depending on the type of LGU. Nevertheless, each set of standards addresses four areas of operation: administration, planning, execution, and communication/coordination. The basic standards describe practices that are either legally required and defined by state statute or fundamental to watershed management organization operations as determined by BWSR board policies. Each year BWSR tracks all of Minnesota's water management LGUs' compliance with a few of the basic standards to make sure our partners stay in compliance with statutory or other legislative requirements. These typically include annual report submittals for BWSR grant activities, website reporting requirements, and financial reporting requirements as well.

The high-performance standards describe practices that reflect a level of performance that exceeds the required practices and may be items found within BWSR guidance materials. While all local government water management entities should be meeting the basic standards, only the more ambitious ones will meet many high-performance standards. The performance standards checklists submitted and reviewed for Bassett Creek WMC are contained in Appendix B, pages 43-44.

For this Level II review, BCWMC reports compliance with all of 17 applicable basic standards, and 8 of 11 high performance standards. The high achievements noted include:

- BCWMC has a consultant administrator on retainer
- Certified wetland delineator on staff or retainer
- Tracking water quality trends for specific waterbodies
- Tracking watershed hydrologic trends
- Track progress toward information and education objectives within the watershed management plan
- Operational partnerships/cooperative projects accomplished with neighboring organizations
- Coordination with cities, townships, county and SWCD boards
- Current operation guidelines for fiscal procedures and conflicts of interest

Findings Part 3: Internal and External Surveys

Part 3 of this performance assessment is based on responses to an on-line survey of LGUs’ staff and board and an online survey to partner organizations. The board and staff were asked different survey questions than the partners. The survey questions are designed to elicit information about LGU successes and difficulties in implementing plan goals and objectives and assessing the extent and quality of partnerships with other related organizations.

Internal Survey: Self-Assessment by BCWMC consultant staff and Board Members

A total of 18 staff and board members of the BCWMC were invited to take the online survey, and 11 responses were provided (61%).

Please note: Information in this section has been analyzed and paraphrased to keep responses anonymous.

Survey participants were asked which programs or projects they consider to be particularly successful over the past few years. Examples given for Bassett Creek WMC were:

- Capital Improvement Program
- DeCola Ponds project
- Harrison neighborhood outreach
- Aquatic invasive species rapid response
- Plymouth Creek restoration
- Sweeney Lake water quality improvements

When asked why these projects and programs were successful, the following examples were given:

- Efficiency and competency of the BCWMC
- Coordination and collaboration with city staff
- Successful grant writing
- Good planning
-

The BCWMC staff and Board were asked to provide examples of areas where the agencies’ work has been difficult to implement, as well as potential explanations for the difficulties. Answers provided are summarized below.

| Identified Difficulty | Examples/Causes provided in survey (<i>paraphrased</i>) |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory program • Some CIP projects • Chlorides • Jevne Park stormwater improvement project • Water monitoring • Flooding • Schaper Pond baffle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Regulatory program hampered by joint-powers limitations, disagreement on thresholds and criteria</i> • <i>CIP projects on hold for changing timelines due to market forces, also unwillingness to partner</i> • <i>Defunct lake association</i> • <i>High costs for projects</i> • <i>Carp causing problems</i> • <i>Finding space and funding for flood management projects</i> |

Participants for the BCWMC survey were asked to list partners they had good working relationships with:

- All nine member cities
- Three Rivers Park District
- Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
- Metro Blooms
- Metropolitan Council
- FEMA
- Government partners
- Barr Engineering
- Westwood Hills Nature Center
- West Metro Water Alliance

The survey also asked participants to identify organizations with whom they would like to collaborate with more often:

- Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
- Non-profits
- Developers
- Twin West chamber of commerce
- Business owners
- Real estate/property management communities
- FEMA

Finally, the BCWMC staff and board were also asked to identify ways to improve the effectiveness of their organizations. Responses are summarized below:

- *Reduce the number of commissioners and compensate commissioners*
- *Contract with or hire more staff*
- *More funding for education*
- *Continue building support for state-wide chloride legislation*
- *Increase competition for engineering services*
- *Significantly more funding*

The full content of internal and external survey responses can be found in Appendix C, pages 45-49.

External Survey: Assessment of BCWMC by Partners

Bassett Creek WMC Partners Survey: BWSR was provided a list of 33 partners by BCWMC staff. 18 partners responded to the survey for a better-than 50% response rate which is excellent. These partners reported a wide range of interaction with the BCWMC over the past 2-3 years: 50% of the respondents reported they interacted with BCWMC in some way several times a year, 31% reported monthly interaction and 19% said almost every week. 94% of the respondents indicated that the amount of interaction they had with the BCWMC overall was about right.

The partners also assessed their interactions with the BCWMC in five operational areas within the survey. The partners’ rating of the commission’s work in these areas was overwhelmingly “strong” or “good” indicating a very strong working relationship between the partners and BCWMC. 100% of the partners rated the district’s communications as strong or good which is excellent. Quality of work, again was mostly strong to good as well with a combined rating of 94% between those two categories with the remaining 6% rated as “I don’t know”.

| Performance Area | BCWMC Partner Ratings (percent) | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| | Strong | Good | Acceptable | Poor | Don't Know |
| Communication | 44% | 56% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Quality of Work | 63% | 31% | 0% | 0% | 6% |
| Customer Relations | 50% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 25% |
| Initiative | 63% | 19% | 6% | 0% | 12% |
| Timelines/ Follow through | 75% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Relationships with customers were judged to be strong by 50% of the partners while 25% rated it good with 25% of respondents indicating they didn’t know.

Partner ratings for the BCWMC’s initiative and timelines were rated strong and good as well, again with no ratings below the acceptable level.

The partners’ overall rating of their working relationship with the BCWMC was Strong (44%), and Powerful (38%). There were three ratings that indicated their working relationship was good, but it could be better. It should be noted that there were no ratings of “poor” in any category which indicates the BCWMC maintains strong relationships with partners and should be commended for their efforts.

A couple of partners chose to make comments about their working relationship with the BCWMC:

- *Would be good to have more collaborative opportunities related to education and outreach*
- *The staff and board are very supportive of our partnership and willing to try new projects and rely on our expertise*

When partners were asked for additional thoughts about how the BCWMC could be more effective, they mostly indicated that they are already very effective and provided the following summarized comments:

- *The BCWMC is doing a great job with its partners and I think that continuing on the path they are currently on will serve them well.*
- *They do quite a bit with the investment they make in projects and staff. They invest less than some of the surrounding watersheds, though and they could make an even bigger impact with even small increases in revenue.*
- *BCWMC and Laura Jester, specifically, are phenomenal advocates for our lake and improving water quality.*
- *They would benefit from full time staff and a bigger budget.*

Findings Part 4: Wetland Conservation Act Administrative Review

BWSR uses the administrative review process to evaluate LGU and SWCD performance related to their responsibilities under the WCA rules, Chapter 8420. The review is intended to determine if an LGU or SWCD is fulfilling their responsibilities under WCA and to provide recommendations for improvement as applicable.

Data for this section of our report was collected via interview(s) with staff, a review of an appropriate number and type of project files, a review of existing documentation on file (i.e. annual reporting/resolutions), and through prior BWSR staff experience/interaction with the LGU or SWCD. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic interviews with staff were conducted virtually.

The review focused on nine performance standards in both the administration and execution of the local WCA program. Compliance with Performance Standards are ranked from “Does not meet minimum requirements”, “Meets minimum requirements but needs improvement”, to “Effectively implementing the program”. If necessary, recommendations to further improve implementation are listed. Several of these standards can also be found as part of the “Performance Standards” checklist that the BCWMC staff completed as part of the overall PRAP report.

The Bassett Creek WMC adopted WCA administration in 2016. The BCWMC has administered WCA on behalf of some member cities since the early 1990s. The BCWMC currently administers WCA on behalf of the cities of Medicine Lake, Robbinsdale, and St. Louis Park. Bassett Creek WMC has delegated WCA decision-making authority in regards to exemptions, no loss, wetland boundary and type applications to staff including the WMC engineer and contracted Administrator. The WMC board serves as the appeals board.

Overall BWSR commends the Bassett Creek WMC and its Staff, especially Karen Wold, for exemplary administration of the Wetland Conservation Act. Although the watershed is highly developed and WCA workload volume is low, Bassett Creek staff do an exceptional job noticing applications on time and making decisions based on rule in a timely manner. Despite some minor administrative or procedural recommendations that if implemented would further strengthen the program, Bassett Creek WMC is effectively and fairly implementing WCA.

Full details regarding the Wetland Conservation Action review can be found in Appendix D, pages 50-53 of this report.

General Conclusions

After a thorough review of the provided information including water plan progress, Wetlands Conservation Act, performance standards, and reviewing the survey inputs we have developed some recommendations for both the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission.

In brief review, the BCWMC reports compliance with all of 17 applicable basic performance standards, and 8 of 11 high performance standards. In addition, the BCWMC is meeting all 4 applicable basic WCA Administrative Review performance standards. The BCWMC has demonstrated effectiveness in implementation of core programs and their partners believe they are doing great work and have been generally good to work with. The BCWMC should continue to build strong working relationships with partners to meet the water management and conservation challenges in the watershed.

The Bassett Creek watershed management plan is a moderately aggressive plan with 122 stated actions that were reviewed and progress on plan goals and actions has been excellent with most actions having some progress started and the majority of the actions considered ongoing. We found that the plan however did not have stated measurable resource outcomes for most of the actions so we were unable to judge resource outcomes in general and will be recommended for future planning efforts.

Commendations

Commendations are based on achievement of BWSR's high performance standards (see Findings, Part 2 and Appendix B, pages 43-44). These practices reflect above average operational effectiveness and level of effort.

The Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission is commended for:

- Maintaining an adequate watershed management plan
- Contracting with and retaining qualified consulting administrative and engineering staff
- Water quality data collected and trends tracked for priority water bodies
- Website contains additional content beyond minimum required
- Coordination with state watershed-based initiatives
- Convening an active technical advisory committee
- Developing a communication piece within the last 12 months

Action Items

Action items are based on compliance with BWSR's basic practice performance standards (see Findings, Part 2 and Appendix B pages 35-38). Action Item address lack of compliance with one or more basic standards.

The BCWMC has no action items to address at this time due to their successful implementation of all applicable basic standards.

Recommendations

This section contains recommendations offered by BWSR to the commissioners and staff of the BCWMC. The intention of these recommendations is to enhance the organization's delivery of effective water and related land resource management and service to the residents of the watershed. BWSR financial assistance may be available to support the implementation of some of these recommendations. See BWSR website for more information:

<https://bwsr.state.mn.us/prap-grants>

Recommendation 1 – Prioritize developing an education and outreach strategy for BCWMC constituents

There were several survey respondents that indicated there were potential roadblocks to implementing education and outreach activities – specifically staff capacity and funding were identified several times as barriers to doing more outreach activities. BWSR recommends that the BCWMC cultivate an education and outreach strategy for their constituents taking into account some of the limitations to make sure education and outreach remains a top priority for the commission. City staff should be included in this discussion on a parallel track through the TAC. Options for implementing the strategy may include annual events, more communication pieces sent to residents, or creating a citizen advisory board for special projects etc.. The comments received on education also seemed to tie into other issues the Commission may face in implementing the CIP program.

Recommendation 2 – Conduct a review of the BCWMC capital improvement program (CIP)

There were numerous barriers to successful completion of BCWMC CIPs identified within the survey. Among them were standard barriers like funding, regulatory constraints, etc. However, landowner willingness was also mentioned specifically for one project, and additional education and outreach efforts may also be helpful. BWSR recommends the BCWMC review the CIP program to identify specific barriers limiting implementation of some large projects, and develop a strategy for addressing those issues, which can be tied to education and outreach strategies as listed in our first recommendation. The strategy could also include a process for implementation which could define a role for neighborhood/community meetings while in the project development phase to build local support.

Recommendation 3 – Develop clear, measurable goals and actions for future plan implementation

After reviewing the BCWMC plan, it is clear that there are numerous activities in an ongoing basis within the Bassett Creek watershed. However, one issue that arose was in identifying clear actions that tie back to specific goals for assessing progress toward goals, and there are no measurable numerical goals for water quality improvement. It is highly recommended as BCWMC embarks on future planning efforts that the next generation plan define a strategy to identify the top resource priorities, identify clear measurable goals and actions, and develop metrics to measure progress. Ensuring that highly prioritized projects are targeted would make it easier to show how the BCWMC impacts its constituents directly and make it easier to communicate the need for projects in terms of achievable water quality improvements.

Recommendation 4 – Prioritize all training opportunities for staff implementing WCA

Continuing education is important for regulatory programs. It was recommended by BWSR WCA staff that any BCWMC staff involved in WCA regulation continue to attend trainings such as BWSR academy, WDCP, WPA and any other training opportunities that arise.

Recommendation 5 – Consider a WCA appeals fee and clarify the appeals process

It was noted by BWSR WCA staff that the appeals process for BCWMC WCA issues was not entirely clear. Appeals are handled by the BCWMC, but on forms such as the Notice of Decision (NOD) it was indicated that BWSR handled the appeals. It was also recommended that BCWMC implement an appeals fee for handling appeals locally.

LGU Comments and BWSR Responses

Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission board members and staff were invited to comment on the findings, conclusions and joint recommendations in the draft version of this report. The BCWMC provided a comment letter which can be found in Appendix E and is summarized below.

Appendix A. Plan Accomplishments

Indicator symbol for Progress Rating: □=not started/dropped ○=on-going progress ✦=completed/target met

LGU Name: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Date of This Assessment: April/May 2021

Type of Management Plan: Watershed Management Plan

Date of Last Plan Revision: September 2015 (with minor amendments 2017, 2018, 2020)

Objective: WATER QUALITY POLICIES, page 4-2

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|--|---|--------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| 1. The BCWMC will classify priority waterbodies based on desired water quality standards and other uses of the waterbodies. Table 2-6 lists the management classifications of the priority waterbodies | Classifications were assigned within Plan | | Classifications assigned within Plan adopted Sept 2015 | ✦ | Re-evaluate classifications during next plan development |
| 2. The BCWMC adopts MPCA water quality standards (Minnesota Rules 7050, as amended) for BCWMC priority waterbodies (see Table 2-7). | MPCA standards adopted as part of this Plan | | Standards adopted with Plan, Sept 2015 | ✦ | Re-evaluate standards during next plan development |
| 3. Member cities shall classify other waterbodies according to the BCWMC classification system and include this information in their local water management plans. | With LWMP adoption | With LWMP adoption | All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019 | ✦ | None needed |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|---|----------|---|
| <p>4. The BCWMC will work with stakeholders to manage its priority waterbodies to meet the applicable water quality goals of the BCWMC.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>BCWMC does nearly all its work in partnership with member cities including development reviews, CIP project implementation, education, AIS management, modeling and monitoring.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue existing activities</p> |
| <p>5. The BCWMC and the member cities will implement the improvement options listed in the BCWMC's CIP (Table 5-3) to address the water quality of priority waterbodies based on feasibility, prioritization, and available funding (see policy 110 regarding CIP prioritization criteria).</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>See attached table with CIP project implementation status</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue annually implementing CIP program</p> |
| <p>6. The BCWMC will prioritize water quality improvement projects that are most effective at achieving water quality goals, including non-structural BMPs and education.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Done annually through development of our 5-year CIP in collaboration with our TAC. In 2018, in an effort to better target CIP projects where they would have the most benefit, we created the CIP Prioritization Committee which developed a CIP scoring matrix to assess potential projects starting in 2019.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue using CIP pollutant hot spot maps, flood risk maps, and scoring matrix to target projects</p> |
| <p>7. The BCWMC will cooperate with member cities, the MPCA and other stakeholders in the preparation of total maximum daily load (TMDL) studies for waterbodies on the MPCA's current or future impaired waters 303(d) list, including Northwood Lake and Bassett Creek. The BCWMC will work to align TMDL implementation items into its Watershed Management Plan to achieve efficiency. The BCWMC will work with the cities to evaluate funding options for the TMDL studies.</p> | <p>Dependent on MPCA timeline</p> | <p>None</p> | <p>We continue to collect extensive monitoring data to assess waterbodies and update our P8 and XPSWMM models to target implementation. However, the MPCA has not initiated TMDL studies for Northwood Lake nor Bassett Creek. All other impairments in the watershed have completed TMDLs.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Will work on new TMDLs as opportunities arise. Will continue monitoring and modeling program</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|---|----------|---|
| <p>8. The BCWMC will continue to identify opportunities to achieve and maintain excellent water quality in priority waterbodies.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Twin Lake has the best water quality of our waterbodies. We continue to monitor the lake (including supporting a CAMP volunteer for years when we're not actively monitoring there). We are currently holding funds for a second alum treatment in the lake if conditions warrant.(First treatment in spring 2015). Other unimpaired waterbodies are regularly monitored and trends closely tracked.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue monitoring program to track trends and assess needs</p> |
| <p>9. The BCWMC will continue to monitor its priority waterbodies on a rotating schedule as described in the BCWMC Monitoring Plan</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Monitoring program closely follows schedule laid out in monitoring plan. In 2020, the TAC performed a detailed review of the monitoring program to ensure goals were being met and State protocols being followed to adequately assess conditions. The monitoring program changed slightly as a result.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue implementing monitoring program</p> |
| <p>10. For every year sampling is conducted for the BCWMC's lakes and/or streams, the BCWMC will compile the available monitoring data, include the data in an annual report available on the BCWMC website, and submit the data to the MPCA in an appropriate format</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>All applicable monitoring data are submitted to EQIS. User friendly monitoring reports are developed, presented to the Commission and posted online (see individual waterbody webpages). Quick-view water quality graphs are also maintained and available online.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue existing reporting practices</p> |
| <p>11. The BCWMC will coordinate monitoring efforts with other programs</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>In an effort to augment data and utilize existing monitoring efforts, the BCWMC coordinates monitoring with multiple entities including cities, Met Council (WOMP), volunteers (CAMP), MPRB, and TRPD</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue existing coordination efforts</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------|---|---|--|
| 12. The BCWMC requires all stormwater to be treated in accordance with the MPCA's Minimal Impact Design Standards (MIDS) performance goal for new development, redevelopment, and linear projects. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Ongoing through development review process. Requirements for linear projects were revised in 2017. | ○ | Continue implementing development review program |
| 13. The BCWMC will review projects and developments to evaluate compliance with the MPCA's Minimal Impact Design Standards (MIDS) performance goals, triggers, and flexible treatment options | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Ongoing through development review process. | ○ | Continue implementing development review program |
| 14. The BCWMC requires public agencies to comply with water quality management standards and policies presented in this Plan in order to maintain or improve water quality of stormwater runoff. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Ongoing through development review process. | ○ | Continue implementing development review program |
| 15. Member cities shall not allow the drainage of sanitary sewage or non-permitted industrial wastes onto any land or into any watercourse or storm sewer discharging into Bassett Creek | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Included in LWMPs | ○ | None needed |
| 16. The BCWMC will maintain a water quality model (e.g., P8) for the watershed. Each year, member cities shall provide the BCWMC with plans for BMPs constructed within their city. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | BCWMC regularly asks cities for data and information in order to update the model. The BCWMC also incorporates its own CIP projects into the model. | ○ | Continue regular model updates |
| 17. The BCWMC encourages member cities to implement best management and good housekeeping practices to minimize chloride loading to surface water and groundwater resources, utilizing emerging technology, as appropriate | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | The BCWMC and cities are continually working to find ways to reduce chlorides including training winter maintenance staff (MPCAs Smart Salt Certification), education materials, and CIP implementation | ○ | Implement Parkers Lake Chloride Reduction Project; provide education; seek additional chloride reduction opportunities |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|---|----------|--|
| <p>18. The BCWMC will assist and cooperate with member cities, MPCA, MDNR, MnDOT, other watersheds and other stakeholders in implementing projects or other management actions resulting from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency’s Twin Cities Metro Chloride Project or future chloride TMDL.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>BCWMC is a partner (and now coordinator) of the Hennepin County Chloride Initiative. The BCWMC is implementing the Parkers Lake Chloride Reduction Project and is currently instrumental in the development of a chloride management plan template for property managers. The BCWMC has hosted and co-hosted multiple Smart Salting Certification Trainings.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to coordinate Hennepin Co. Chloride Initiative and other chloride reduction projects</p> |
|--|------------------|----------------|---|----------|--|

Objective FLOODING AND RATE CONTROL POLICIES, page 4-5

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|--|--------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>19. The BCWMC will maintain a Flood Control Emergency Repair Fund for funding emergency repairs of the BCWMC Flood Control Project features.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Fund maintained. No expenses to date; \$500,000 balance</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Maintain fund; utilize as needed</p> |
| <p>20. The BCWMC will maintain a Long-Term Maintenance Fund with annual assessments. The BCWMC will use the Long-Term Maintenance Fund to fund major repairs and major maintenance of the BCWMC Flood Control Project features</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Fund maintained. Up to \$25,000 added to the fund each year from the annual operating budget. Funds are used for inspections and minor maintenance</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Maintain fund; annually contribute to fund; reassess fund balance vs. contributions vs. expenses</p> |
| <p>21. The BCWMC will regularly inspect the BCWMC Flood Control Project system, including water level control and conveyance structures, and perform the follow-up reporting.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Inspections and reporting happen annually on minor FCP features. Reports are sent to member cities. Cities must report back on their maintenance and repairs. The Bassett Creek tunnel components are inspected every 5 years (double box culvert) and 10 years (deep tunnel to Mississippi River).</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue inspections program</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|--|----------|---|
| <p>22. During the first five years of Plan implementation, the BCWMC will work with the member cities to determine responsibilities for major rehabilitation and replacement of the BCWMC Flood Control Project features and establish the associated funding mechanisms</p> | <p>2016</p> | <p>2016</p> | <p>TAC, Commission, engineers, and legal counsel collaborated on development of the Flood Control Project Policies to assign inspection, maintenance and repair responsibilities and estimated future costs.</p> | <p>✦</p> | <p>Continue to implement policies</p> |
| <p>23. The BCWMC will finance major maintenance and repair of water level control and conveyance structures that were part of the original BCWMC Flood Control Project on the same basis as the original project.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Codified in Flood Control Project Policies</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to follow policies</p> |
| <p>24. Member cities shall be responsible for routine maintenance and repair of BCWMC Flood Control Project structures located within each city</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Codified in Flood Control Project Policies. Annual inspection report is sent from BCWMC to cities. Cities are required to perform maintenance/repairs and report back to BCWMC</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Review city reports to ensure routine maintenance and repairs</p> |
| <p>25. The BCWMC will reevaluate flood elevations and flood risk to affected properties based on the most recent NOAA precipitation data (e.g., Atlas 14) and will determine actions for protection, including partnering with and applying for grants from Federal and State agencies</p> | <p>2015-2017</p> | <p>2015 – 2017 + 2021</p> | <p>Hydrologic & hydraulic model (XP-SWMM) was updated through a Phase II project using Atlas 14 figures (2017). Floodplain and floodway mapping was updated through FEMA-DNR grant (2021). Multiple BCWMC CIP projects address localized flooding and flood risk.</p> | <p>✦</p> | <p>Adopt new floodplain maps after 2021 mapping update. (Planned for late 2021)</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|--|----------|--|
| <p>26. When implementing BCWMC flood risk reduction projects, the BCWMC will identify properties prone to flooding. The most effective and reasonable solutions as approved by the member city will be evaluated. Solutions to be considered may include purchase of the properties, with attention to impact on tax base and other community factors</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Evaluated with appropriate BCWMC CIP project feasibility studies</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue evaluating with CIP projects</p> |
| <p>27. The BCWMC will develop criteria for the allocation of funding for flood risk reduction projects, which may include the purchase of property prone to flooding.</p> | <p>2019</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>Instead of allocating funding, thus far the BCWMC has funded flood risk reduction projects through its CIP. Also, the Flood Control Project repairs, etc. will be funded through the CIP.</p> | <p>□</p> | <p>No criteria development planned to date</p> |
| <p>28. The BCWMC will monitor or coordinate with other entities to monitor water levels on the primary lakes in the watershed.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Accomplished annually through lake level monitoring program, WOMP station, and stream monitoring program</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue lake level and WOMP monitoring</p> |
| <p>29. The member cities must implement the BCWMC's development policies, including minimum building elevations of at least 2 feet above the 100-year flood level for new and redeveloped structures, as outlined in the BCWMC's <i>Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals</i> document</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented through development review process and local controls</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue through development review process</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------------|---|----------|--|
| <p>30. The BCWMC encourages property owners to implement best management practices to reduce the volume of stormwater runoff beyond the minimum requirements</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Encouraged through checklist of proposed BMPs on the development review application. The intent of the checklist is to help developers/applicants think about other BMPs that could be incorporated in the site plans. Also included in BCWMC educational materials (see "10 Things" brochure)</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue utilizing checklist and educating public</p> |
| <p>31. The BCWMC and member cities must require rate control in conformance with the Flood Control Project system design and this Plan</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented through development review process and local controls</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue through development review process</p> |
| <p>32. The BCWMC requires cities to manage stormwater runoff so that future peak flow rates leaving development and redevelopment sites are equal to or less than existing rates for the 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year events.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented through development review process and local controls</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue through development review process</p> |
| <p>33. The BCWMC will revise floodplain elevations along the trunk system as necessary to reflect channel improvement, storage site development, or requirements established by appropriate state or federal governmental agencies</p> | <p>As needed</p> | <p>2017 and 2021</p> | <p>Hydrologic & hydraulic model (XP-SWMM) was updated through a Phase II project using Atlas 14 figures (2017). Updated floodplain maps were adopted. Floodplain and floodway mapping was updated through FEMA-DNR grant (completed March 2021). Adoption of updated floodways is expected later 2021.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Adopt new floodplain elevations after 2021 mapping effort (late 2021)</p> |
| <p>34. The BCWMC will allow only those land uses in the BCWMC-established floodplain that will not be damaged by floodwaters and will not increase flooding</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented through development review process.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue through development review process</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---|---|---|
| 35. The BCWMC prohibits the construction of basements in the floodplain; construction of all other infrastructure within the floodplain is subject to BCWMC review and approval | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Implemented through development review process. | ○ | Continue through development review process |
| 36. The BCWMC prohibits permanent storage piles, fences and other obstructions in the floodplain that would collect debris or restrict flood flows. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Implemented through development review process and local controls. | ○ | Continue through development review process |
| 37. Where streets, utilities, and structures currently exist below the 100-year floodplain, the BCWMC encourages the member cities to remove these features from the floodplain as development or redevelopment allows | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Encouraged through review of city projects if review thresholds are triggered | ○ | Continue through development review process |
| 38. The BCMWC requires that projects within the floodplain maintain no net loss in floodplain storage and no increase in flood level any point along the trunk system. The BCWMC prohibits expansion of existing non-conforming land uses within the floodplain unless they are fully flood-proofed in accordance with codes and regulations. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Implemented through development review process and local controls. | ○ | Continue through development review process |
| 39. The BCWMC requires member cities to maintain ordinances that are consistent with BCMWC floodplain standards. | With LWMP adoption | With LWMP adoption | All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019 | ✧ | None needed |
| 40. The BCWMC will review changes in local water management plans, comprehensive land use plans, and other plans, for their effect on the adopted floodplain and Flood Control Project, when such plans are submitted to BCWMC | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Reviews performed when submitted. | ○ | Review as needed |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------------|--|----------|---|
| <p>41. The BCWMC will update, as necessary, the existing flood profile to reflect any increases resulting from modifications to a flood storage site or the Flood Control Project system, following the approval of those modifications by the BCWMC, local and state agencies, and after a public hearing on the modification plan has been held.</p> | <p>As needed</p> | <p>2017 and 2021</p> | <p>Hydrologic & hydraulic model (XP-SWMM) was updated through a Phase II project using Atlas 14 figures (2017). Updated floodplain maps were adopted. Floodplain and floodway mapping was updated through FEMA-DNR grant (completed March 2021). Adoption of updated floodways is expected later 2021.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Adopt new floodplain elevations after 2021 mapping effort (late 2021)</p> |
| <p>42. BCWMC will review diversion plans to determine the effect of the proposal on the Bassett Creek watershed and such plans will be subject to BCWMC approval.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Reviews performed when submitted.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Review as needed</p> |
| <p>43. The BCWMC will pursue opportunities to collaborate with state agencies and other entities in the development of action plans (or similar management tools) related to the response of surface water and groundwater resources to long-term changes in precipitation and hydrology.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>In 2020 and 2021, staff participated in input meetings for the Hennepin County Climate Action Plan; reviewed and commented on draft plan</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Seek opportunities to collaborate with Hennepin County and other entities on Climate Actions; consider presentation of Climate Action Plan at future meeting</p> |
| <p>44. The BCWMC will continue to monitor water quantity and quality in the watershed and will seek opportunities to contribute BCWMC data to other datasets, for the purpose of assessing the response of surface water and groundwater resources to long-term changes in precipitation and hydrology</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Ongoing work through water quality and quantity monitoring program. Report and provide data as required, requested, and warranted.</p> <p>Floodplain and floodway mapping was updated through FEMA-DNR grant (completed March 2021). Adoption of updated floodways is expected later 2021.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue monitoring programs and providing data where requested or beneficial</p> |

Objective: GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT POLICIES page 4-8

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|--|----------------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 45. The BCMWC will review all MDNR groundwater appropriation permit applications in the BCWMC excluding applications for temporary appropriations permits | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Annually reviewed permit applications | ○ | Continue to review MDNR appropriations permits applications |
| 46. The BCWMC will work with member cities to consider a program to review development or redevelopment projects which include long-term dewatering within 1,000 feet of priority waterbodies | 2015-2025 | Limited Progress | No actual program considered to date. BCWMC reviews MDNR appropriations permits and comments as needed. In 2020, we reviewed a MDNR appropriations permit city of Plymouth for increasing pumping capacity from one a municipal well. We recommended the DNR perform adequate review to ensure the increased pumping rate does not impact surface water elevations of Medicine Lake, local wetlands, and creek flows. We also recommended additional groundwater monitoring. | □ | Continue to review MDNR appropriations permits applications |
| 47. The BCWMC will collaborate with local and state agencies if/when these agencies develop a groundwater action plan in an effort to gain a better understanding of groundwater-surface water interaction and develop management strategies that consider the protection of both resources. | 2015-2025, when applicable | NA | No groundwater action plan developed by local or state agencies | □ | Will collaborate if/when local or state groundwater action plan is developed |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------|---|---|---|
| 48. To protect groundwater quality, the BCWMC requires infiltration practices to be implemented in accordance with the following guidance for determining the feasibility of infiltration (NPDES, MDH, MIDS) | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Review development and redevelopment projects for consistency with BCWMC standards and requirements | ○ | Continue through development review process |
| 49. The BCWMC encourages member cities to educate residents regarding the importance of implementing BMPs to protect groundwater quality and quantity | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | BCWMC partners with cities on a variety of education topics including this one. | ○ | Continue through collaborative education activities |
| 50. Member cities shall share groundwater elevation data, where available, with the BCWMC. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Groundwater elevation data has not been requested from cities to date | ○ | Request data as needed |

Objective: EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL POLICIES, page 4-9

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|---|--------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 51. Member cities shall continue managing erosion and sediment control permitting programs and ordinances as required by their NPDES MS4 permit and the NDPEs Construction Stormwater General Permit. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Each member city has active permitting and management via ordinances for NPDES MS4 and general permits. All criteria listed are being met. | ○ | Investigate erosion control issues and/or city enforcement as warranted or needed. |
| 52. The BCWMC will review projects and developments to evaluate compliance with BCWMC erosion and sediment control standards. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Implemented through BCWMC development review process | ○ | Continue through development review process |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|----------|--|
| <p>53. The BCWMC requires preparation of erosion control plans for construction projects meeting the applicable BCWMC threshold. Erosion control plans shall meet the standards given in the NPDES Construction Stormwater General Permit (as amended), and shall show proposed methods of retaining waterborne sediments onsite during the construction period, and shall specify methods and schedules for restoring, covering, or re-vegetating the site after construction</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented through BCWMC development review process</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue through development review process</p> |
| <p>54. Member cities shall perform regular erosion and sediment control inspections for projects triggering BCWMC review and subject to BCWMC erosion and sediment control standards. The member cities will annually report to the BCWMC regarding compliance with BCWMC standards as part of annual MS4 reporting or as requested by the Commission</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented through city controls. BCWMC reviews inspection reports from cities, as submitted. Inspection reports from cities are not annually requested by BCWMC.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to review reports as received.</p> |
| <p>55. The BCWMC requires local water management plans to describe existing and proposed city ordinances, permits, and procedures addressing erosion and sediment control</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019</p> | <p>✦</p> | <p>None needed</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|---|----------|---|
| <p>56. The BCWMC will work with member cities to evaluate end-of-pipe sediment sources and controls. Following adequate source control, the BCWMC may fund removal of end-of-pipe sediment deltas downstream of intercommunity watersheds, or facilitate collaboration among responsible parties to remove these deltas</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Policy allows for BCWMC CIP to implement projects that address sediment downstream of pipes. Projects include: Winnetka Pond Dredging Project, Briarwood/Dawnview WQ Improvements, Crane Lake Improvement Project, Northwood Lake Improvement Project, Main Stem Lagoon Dredging Project</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue implementing policy as current practice</p> |
|---|------------------|----------------|---|----------|---|

Objective: STREAM RESTORATION AND PROTECTION POLICIES, page 4-10

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|--|--------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>57. The BCWMC will continue to maintain a Channel Maintenance Fund through an annual assessment. This fund will be used to help finance minor stream maintenance, repair, stabilization and restoration projects and/or portions of larger stream restoration projects.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Fund is maintained; contributions of \$25,000 are made to the fund from the annual operating budget. Funds are allocated to cities based on their percentage of Trunk System for channel maintenance activities (that aren't large enough to be consider for CIP)</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue maintenance of and contributions to the fund; continue allocating funding to cities</p> |
| <p>58. The Channel Maintenance Fund may also be used to finance the BCWMC's share of maintenance projects that have a regional benefit, or to partially fund smaller, localized projects that cities wish to undertake.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>The fund has not yet been utilized for this purpose</p> | <p>□</p> | <p>Continue implementing policy as needed</p> |
| <p>59. Major stream and streambank stabilization and restoration projects will be considered and prioritized by the BCWMC for inclusion in its annual CIP.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Streambank restoration projects that have been implemented through the CIP since 2015 include 2015CR-M, 2017CR-M, 2017 CR-P (see CIP project list and status)</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue implementing stream restoration projects through the CIP</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|----------|--|
| <p>60. Recognizing their benefits to biodiversity and more natural appearance, the BCWMC will strive to implement stream and streambank restoration and stabilization projects that use soft armoring techniques (e.g., plants, logs, vegetative mats) as much as possible and wherever feasible.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>The BCWMC prepares feasibility studies for stream restoration projects that focus on the use of bioengineering techniques whenever possible. The BCWMC designs project with these techniques or recommends these techniques when others design.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement policy through CIP implementation</p> |
| <p>61. The BCWMC will consider improving natural habitat and navigability, and will consider the needs of pedestrians when planning and implementing near-stream and in-stream projects, and when rehabilitating existing projects</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Aquatic, riparian, wetland, and/or upland habitat improvements are always incorporated into CIP projects. Stream navigability and waterbody access are also considered during CIP design</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement policy through CIP implementation</p> |
| <p>62. The member cities are responsible for funding maintenance and repairs that are primarily aesthetic improvements</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>BCWMC CIP projects are implemented through agreements with member cities. Agreements require ongoing project maintenance by cities.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement policy through CIP implementation</p> |
| <p>63. The BCWMC will take into account aesthetic and habitat values of future flood control and stabilization/restoration projects</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Aesthetics and habitats (including tree loss) are always considered during CIP design</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement policy through CIP implementation</p> |
| <p>64. Member cities shall maintain and enforce buffer requirements adjacent to priority streams for projects that will result in more than 200 yards of cut or fill, or more than 10,000 square feet of land disturbance. Buffer widths adjacent to priority streams must be at least 10 feet or 25 percent of the distance between the ordinary high water level and the nearest existing structure, whichever is less.</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019</p> | <p>✧</p> | <p>None needed</p> |

Objective: WETLAND MANAGEMENT POLICIES, page 4-11

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------|-------------|
| 65. The BCWMC requires member cities to inventory, classify and determine the functions and values of wetlands, either through a comprehensive wetland management plan or as required by the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA). | With LWMP adoption | With LWMP adoption | All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019 | ✧ | None needed |
| 66. The BCWMC requires member cities to develop and implement wetland protection ordinances that consider the results of wetland functions and values assessments, and are based on comprehensive wetland management plans, if available. For wetlands classified as Preserve or Manage 1 (or comparable classification if BWSR's Minnesota Rapid Assessment Method (MnRAM) is not used), member cities are encouraged to implement standards for bounce, inundation, and runout control that are similar to MnRAM; member cities are encouraged to apply standards for other wetland classifications | With LWMP adoption | With LWMP adoption | All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019 | ✧ | None needed |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|----------|--|
| <p>67. The BCWMC recommends that cities use the Minnesota Rapid Assessment Method (MnRAM) (or similar) wetland assessment method and wetland management classification system. Member cities are encouraged to use such a method for all wetland assessment and classification, but are not required to perform reassessments for wetlands already assessed</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019</p> | <p>✦</p> | <p>None needed</p> |
| <p>68. Member cities shall maintain and enforce buffer requirements for projects containing more than one acre of new or redeveloped impervious area. Average minimum buffer widths are required according to the MnRAM classification (or similar classification system):</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019</p> | <p>✦</p> | <p>None needed</p> |
| <p>69. The member cities are required to manage wetlands in accordance with the WCA.</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>With LWMP adoption</p> | <p>All nine LWMPs were approved between Sept 2018 and March 2019</p> | <p>✦</p> | <p>None needed</p> |
| <p>70. The BCWMC will serve as the local governmental unit (LGU) responsible for administering the WCA for member cities, as requested (currently Medicine Lake, Robbinsdale, and St. Louis Park).</p> | <p>2015-205</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>WCA related tasks are completed for Medicine Lake, Robbinsdale, and St. Louis Park as needed</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to serve as LGU for 3 cities</p> |
| <p>71. The BCWMC prefers any wetland mitigation to be performed within the same subwatershed as the impacted wetland</p> | <p>2015-205</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>No activity</p> | <p>□</p> | <p>None planned</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------|---|---|--|
| 72. The BCWMC requires that member cities annually inspect wetlands classified as Preserve for terrestrial and emergent aquatic invasive vegetation, such as buckthorn and purple loosestrife, and attempt to control or treat invasive species, where feasible. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Assume cities are performing this task but haven't checked with them | ○ | Will poll cities with regards to this activity |
| 73. The BCWMC encourages member cities to pursue wetland restoration projects, as opportunities allow. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Assume cities are performing this task but haven't checked with them. BCWMC incorporates wetland habitat improvements into most CIP projects. | ○ | Continue to seek wetland restoration opportunities with BCWMC CIP projects |
| 74. The BCWMC encourages member cities to participate in wetland monitoring programs (e.g., Wetland Health Evaluation Program). | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Unknown progress within cities | ○ | Will poll cities and reiterate encouragement |

Objective: PUBLIC DITCH POLICIES, page 4-13

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|--|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 75. The BCWMC encourages member cities to petition Hennepin County to transfer authority over public ditches in the BCWMC to the member cities (per MN Statute 383B.61). | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Unknown progress within cities | ○ | Will poll cities and reiterate encouragement |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------|--|---|--------------|
| 76. In consideration for the original function of public ditches to provide drainage of agricultural lands, the BCWMC will support the efforts of other entities to pursue legislation abandoning public ditches on land zoned non-agricultural. | As applicable | None | No known efforts to date to pursue legislation | ☐ | None planned |
| 77. The BCWMC will manage abandoned or transferred public ditches that are part of the trunk system consistent with the policies of this Plan. Member cities will be responsible for management of abandoned or transferred public ditches that are not on the trunk system, but are currently part of their municipal drainage system. | 2015-2025 | None | No abandoned or transferred public ditches. | ☐ | None planned |

Objective: RECREATION, SHORELAND, AND HABITAT MANAGEMENT POLICIES, page 4-13

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|--|--------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|------------------------|
| 78. The BCWMC will consider developing and implementing a shoreland habitat monitoring program for its Priority 1 lakes to monitor biological and physical indicators and to recommend management actions (to cities or for the Commission's consideration) based upon monitoring results. | 2016 | 2016-2017 | TAC review in 2016 Commission approved TAC recommendation not to pursue program 2017 | ✦ | None, project complete |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|--|----------|--|
| <p>79. The BCWMC will support and collaborate with other entities (e.g., agencies, lake association, cities, counties) to manage and prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species</p> | <p>2015-2015</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>On-going work through routine aquatic vegetation surveys and lake monitoring program including analyzing for possible AIS; work of AIS/APM Committee June 2016 – June 2017 and their approved recommendations (July 2017). AIS budget line created, AIS Prevention Grants received from Hennepin County (2018, 2019, 2021), annual treatment of CLP on Medicine Lake in partnership with TRPD, financial contributions to boat access inspections annually to TPRD.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement APM/AIS committee recommendations, continue CLP treatment on Medicine Lake, continue partnering with TRPD, pursue development of APM Plan for Medicine Lake</p> |
| <p>80. The member cities are responsible for shoreland regulation and are required to adopt MDNR-approved shoreland ordinances, in accordance with the MDNR’s priority phasing list.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented through local controls</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>None planned</p> |
| <p>81. The BCWMC will promote the protection of natural and native shoreland areas, including the preservation of lakeshore and streambank vegetation during and after construction projects, and the establishment and maintenance of buffers adjacent to priority waterbodies</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Promotion through BCWMC education materials. Implementation during our own CIP projects</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Disseminate lakeshore restoration information specifically to Medicine Lake homeowners.</p> |
| <p>82. The BCWMC encourages cities to develop and maintain water-related recreational features (such as trails adjacent to waterbodies and water access points), with consideration for buffers, use of pervious surfaces, and other best management practices to reduce runoff.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented locally by cities. Also, BCWMC CIP projects often incorporate trails, piers, and other access points adjacent to waterbodies</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement through CIP program</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|--|----------|--|
| <p>83. The BCWMC will take into account aesthetics, habitat, and recreation benefits during CIP project selection and prioritization, and when considering how a project might address multiple Commission goals (see policy 110).</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>BCWMC CIP projects always improve habitat and aesthetics; and often improve access to waterbodies. Potential CIP projects are always evaluated for possibly meeting multiple goals</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement through CIP program</p> |
| <p>84. The BCWMC will encourage public and private landowners to maintain, preserve or restore open space and native habitats such as wetlands, uplands, forests, shoreland, streambanks, and prairies for the benefit of wildlife through education and by providing information on grant programs</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Promotion through BCWMC education materials. Implementation during our own CIP projects. Although BCWMC doesn't have a grant program, when asked by residents about grants I forward information about county grants.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to disseminate educational materials</p> |
| <p>85. Member cities shall consider opportunities to maintain, enhance, or provide new open spaces and/or habitat as part of wetland creation or restoration, stormwater facility construction, development, redevelopment, or other appropriate projects</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Implemented locally.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>None planned</p> |
| <p>86. The BCWMC will cooperate with the MDNR and other entities, as requested, to protect rare and endangered species under the State's Endangered Species Statute. The BCWMC will review the Natural Heritage Information System during the design phase of Commission projects</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>CIP project feasibility studies and designs always account for and plan for the protection of rare and endangered species</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement through CIP program</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------|--|---|--|
| 87. The BCWMC will submit data, as available, and encourages others to submit data regarding occurrences of rare and endangered species and native plant communities to the State's Natural Heritage Information System | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | In 2015, the BCWMC reported the first record of <i>Lynchnothamnus barbaratus</i> (bearded stonewort), a native plant found first in Westwood Lake through our regular monitoring program. | ○ | Will continue to report as current practice |
| 88. The BCWMC will consider implementing a grant or cost-share program to fund the establishment of buffers adjacent to priority waterbodies | None specified | 2021 | A grant program specific to buffer establishment has not been considered. A grant program for private developers/redevelopers to provide water quality treatment above requirements was discussed by the TAC and Commission in early 2021. | ○ | BCWMC plans to reconsider various grant programs during development of its next watershed plan |
| 89. Member cities shall adopt State buffer and/or shoreland management requirements for public waters in incorporated areas, if and when they are promulgated | None specified | NA | Implemented locally, as applicable | ○ | None needed |

Objective: EDUCATION AND OUTREACH POLICIES, page 4-14

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|---|---|------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| 90. The BCWMC will develop an education and outreach plan | Education Plan developed for watershed plan, Appendix B | | Education Plan developed for watershed plan. Education Committee meets annually to develop an annual education work plan and budget with guidance from the overall education plan. | ○ | Re-evaluate education plan during next watershed plan development |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|---|----------|--|
| <p>91. The BCWMC will develop and maintain standard BCWMC messaging items to increase awareness of the BCWMC and its role.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Educational messaging is developed and considered through annual Education Work Plan.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement through education program</p> |
| <p>92. The BCWMC will evaluate the success of its education and public involvement plan.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Educational programming success is difficult to measure. Our current metric include number of participants at events or trainings + website and social media engagements, followers, etc.</p> <p>BCWMC includes education program results in its annual report and through letters of understanding to each member city.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement through education program</p> |
| <p>93. The BCWMC will recruit volunteers to conduct monitoring and participate in activities sponsored or promoted by the BCWMC and will provide training as needed</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>BCWMC staff recruit and coordinate volunteers for the Met Council’s CAMP. We annually have 8 – 10 volunteers collecting water samples. Training is provided through Met Council.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement through education program</p> |
| <p>94. The BCWMC will support cooperative educational and volunteer programs, such as the West Metro Water Alliance, Blue Thumb, River Watch, Metro Blooms, Metro Watershed Partners, Citizen Assisted Monitoring Program, Wetland Health Evaluation Program, etc.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>BCWMC annually provides financial support to multiple educational programs and organizations and is actively involved as a West Metro Water Alliance member. See annual report for specifics</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue to implement through education program</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 95. The BCWMC will develop and implement a recognition program (certificates, letters of appreciation, events, thank you ads, etc.) for BCWMC volunteers. | 2015-2025 | Intermittent implementation | Volunteers are sometimes recognized through press releases. Thank you cards were sent to volunteers, for a few years, but not consistently. No formal recognition program developed | ○ | None planned |
| 96. The BCWMC will update and maintain its website and use it to communicate with and provide information to the public | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | BCWMC's new website launched in 2016. The site is continually updated with meeting information, reports, finances, contact information, water quality data, educational materials, meeting materials and minutes, CIP information, etc. | ○ | Continue to regularly maintain website. |
| 97. The BCWMC will seek opportunities to incorporate education and public involvement efforts into all of its proposed projects. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | BCWMC CIP projects often incorporate education components including signage (e.g., Northwood Lake Improvement Project) or interactive components (e.g., Westwood Lake Improvement Project) | ○ | Continue to implement through CIP program |
| 98. The BCWMC will seek opportunities to use a citizen advisory committee to complete tasks meaningful to the Commission. | 2015-2025 | None | BCWMC does not utilize a CAC. However, committee members may include members of the public. In the past, the Education Committee has members of the public. | ○ | A CAC will be utilized during development of the next watershed management plan |
| 99. The BCWMC will distribute BCWMC meeting notices and agendas to city officials and key staff. The meeting notice and/or agenda will include a description of the key discussion item(s). | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Meeting notices and a link to materials are emailed to all TAC members (city staff), and other city staff upon request. All materials are posted online one week before the meeting. | ○ | Continue current practice |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|----------|--|
| <p>100. The BCWMC will post informational signs at BCWMC projects during construction.</p> <p>The BCWMC will consider installing permanent informational signs at BCWMC watershed projects, major BCWMC waterbodies, monitoring sites, demonstration projects, adopt-a-stream/wetland sites, etc.</p> <p>The BCWMC will work with cities and other road authorities to install stream identification signs along roads at stream crossings.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>A temporary sign is erected on site during CIP construction informing visitors about the BCWMC project and how its funded.</p> <p>As noted above, many CIP projects incorporate permanent educational signs.</p> <p>BCWMC and cities have installed stream crossing signs at 7 crossings throughout the watershed. Three on Plymouth Creek and four on Bassett Creek.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue current practice</p> |
| <p>101. The BCWMC will regularly hold watershed tours for the Commission and the public.</p> | <p>Every other year</p> | <p>2014, 2016, 2019</p> | <p>Watershed tours via coach bus were given in 2014 and 2016, and as part of the 50th anniversary celebration in 2019. Invitees include commissioners, TAC members, local officials, county commissioners, partners, volunteers</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>A watershed tour is likely in fall 2021</p> |
| <p>102. The BCWMC will tailor its communications and educational strategies to present complex and/or technical issues in a manner that is appropriate for the audience.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>BCWMC strives to make watershed information accessible and understandable to a wide audience. One example is the change in water monitoring reports from 60-page highly technical reports to 4-8 pages public-friendly document with color graphs, photos, and non-technical text. (e.g., Northwood Lake 2019 report)</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue current practice</p> |

Objective: ADMINISTRATION, page 4-15

| Planned Actions or Activities | Proposed Timeframe | Actual Timeframe | Accomplishments to Date | Progress Rating | Next Steps |
|---|--------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 103. The BCWMC will fund 100 percent of eligible project costs for those projects listed in the 10-year CIP (Table 5-3). Eligible project costs are listed in Table 5-1. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Implemented through CIP program | ○ | Continue to implement CIP program |
| 104. The Commission will review projects that trigger BCWMC review. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Implemented through project review program. Number and titles of projects reviewed are reported in the annual report. The BCWMC requirements document is posted online and updated/revised on occasion after TAC discussion and approval of their recommendations by the Commission. | ○ | Continue to implement project review program |
| 105. At the request of the member cities, the BCWMC will review projects that would not otherwise trigger review per the BCWMC's <i>Requirements for Improvements and Development Proposals</i> | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Implemented as needed. In 2015, the Commission created a new budget line for expenses related to reviewing/discussing projects (often with city staff and sometimes with developers) before a formal project application and fee is submitted. This allows for earlier coordination for complicated or controversial projects. | ○ | Continue current practice |
| 106. The BCWMC will review local water management plans for compliance with this Plan's goals and policies | 2015 - 2025 | As needed | Each member city has LWMP reviewed and approved through resolution by the BCWMC. (9/2018 – 3/2019) See annual report for listing and years of approval. | ○ | Will review LWMP revisions, as needed |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 107. The BCWMC will annually evaluate member cities' compliance with the goals and policies of this Plan (see Section 5.1.1.6). The BCWMC will take appropriate administrative or legal action in response to non-compliance. | 2015 - 2025 | Ongoing | BCWMC does not evaluate compliance of member cities with specific policies but maintain close relationships with city staff and partner regularly on water-related activities and programs | ○ | Continue current practice |
| 108. The BCWMC will review applications for MDNR Work in Public Waters Permits. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Commission engineers review all public waters permits and provide comments, as needed. | ○ | Continue current implementation |
| 109. The BCWMC will annually review and update its 10-year CIP. The BCWMC will re-evaluate new or proposed additions to the CIP annually or as new data or opportunities develop, with consideration for the criteria outlined in policy 110. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | The TAC and Commission annual update the rolling 5-year CIP by adding, removing, or shifting CIP projects, as needs, opportunities, and priorities shift. Minor Plan amendments were approved for CIP changes in 2017, 2018, and 2020. | ○ | Continue current implementation |
| 110. The BCWMC will consider including projects in the CIP that meet one or more of the following "gatekeeper" criteria. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Gatekeeper criteria listed in the policy are strictly followed when considering adding new projects to the CIP | ○ | Continue current implementation |
| 111. The BCWMC defines the trunk system as the collection of waterbodies and natural or constructed conveyances listed in Table 2-9 of this Plan | Established in the 2015 Plan | Ongoing | Trunk system definition has not changed. Definition is used to delineate BCWMC floodplain jurisdiction, channel maintenance activities, etc. | ○ | None needed |
| 112. The BCWMC may review proposed changes to member city development regulations (e.g., zoning and subdivision ordinances) at its discretion or the request of the member cities. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | BCWMC reviews member city ordinances at their request (e.g., Crystal, Golden Valley, Medicine Lake) or as part of reviewing their local water management plans. | ○ | Continue current practice |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|---|----------|---|
| <p>113. Member cities must inform the BCWMC regarding updates to city ordinances or comprehensive plans that will affect stormwater management. Stormwater management elements of the member cities' comprehensive plans must conform to the BCWMC Plan</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Changes to comp plans and ordinances are reviewed when submitted by cities.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue current practice</p> |
| <p>114. The BCWMC will annually assess its progress towards the goals presented in this plan, using quantitative metrics where appropriate. The BCMWC will provide this analysis, or a summary, to BWSR, as part of its annual reporting.</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Progress and activities are annually reported in the BCWMC Annual Report, and through water quality reports and graphs presented online.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue current implementation</p> |
| <p>115. The BCWMC will work with member cities to assess the financial impact of regulatory controls and identify areas where the BCWMC may assist member cities in meeting the requirements of their MS4 permits</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>BCWMC has not assessed financial impact of regulatory controls. However, BCWMC assists cities with meeting MS4 permit requirements for education activities. (Annual Letter of Understanding submitted to each city outlining previous year's education activities). Regular updates to BCWMC P8 model helps cities determine progress toward meeting TMDLs. The BCWMC XPSWMM model is also useful/helpful in meeting MS4 permit requirements.</p> | <p>○</p> | |
| <p>116. The BCWMC will periodically review its capital improvement program (CIP) process and revise the process, as necessary</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>2018</p> | <p>In 2018, in an effort to better target CIP projects where they would have the most benefit, we created the CIP Prioritization Committee which developed a CIP scoring matrix to assess potential projects starting in 2019.</p> | <p>✦</p> | <p>None planned until development of next watershed management plan</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 117. The BCWMC will assist in calculating or calculate when necessary, the apportionment of costs between adjoining communities for water resource projects with intercommunity participation | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Done upon request and inconjunction with certain project (e.g., DeCola Ponds B&C Improvement Project) | ○ | Nothing specific planned |
| 118. The BCWMC will assist member cities in resolving watershed management disputes, as requested. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | In 2013 a BCWMC Dispute Resolution Committee worked with the cities of New Hope, Crystal, and Golden Valley to make recommendations regarding the distribution of cost for a Phase II study evaluating flooding issues in the DeCola ponds area. | ○ | Continue current implementation |
| 119. The BCWMC will maintain a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to promote communication and cooperation between the BCWMC and member cities. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | TAC meets several times a year on an as-needed basis or at the request of the Commission to review, study, make recommendations on specific topics. See annual reports for more information on # of meetings and topics | ○ | Continue current implementation |
| 120. The BCWMC will continue to rely on member cities to implement the BCWMC's policies at the time of development and redevelopment. Member cities shall inform developers and other project applicants regarding BCWMC requirements | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Continually implemented through BCWMC project review program. | ○ | Continue current implementation |
| 121. The BCWMC will continue to rely on member cities to issue permits. Member cities shall permit only those projects that conform to the policies and standards of the BCWMC. | 2015-2025 | Ongoing | Continually implemented through BCWMC project review program. | ○ | Continue current implementation |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|---|----------|--|
| <p>122. For CIP projects that have been ordered by the Commission, the BCWMC requires member cities to acquire and maintain easements, right-of-way, or interest in land necessary to implement and maintain projects upon order of the BCWMC</p> | <p>2015-2025</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>CIP projects are implemented through an agreement with the member city where the project is located. On-going maintenance of the project is a requirement with in the agreement.</p> | <p>○</p> | <p>Continue current implementation</p> |
|---|------------------|----------------|---|----------|--|

Appendix B. Performance Standards

METRO WATERSHED DISTRICT and WMO PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

LGU Name: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

| Performance Area | Performance Standard | | Level of Review | Rating | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--|--|-------------------|------------|----------------|
| | ★ | ■ | I Annual Compliance | Yes, No, or Value | | |
| | | ■ | II BWSR Staff Review & Assessment (1/10 yrs.) | YES | NO | |
| Administration | | ■ | Activity report: annual, on-time | I | X | |
| | | ■ | Financial report & audit completed on time | I | X | |
| | | ■ | Drainage authority buffer strip report submitted on time | I | NA | |
| | | ■ | eLINK Grant Report(s): submitted on time | I | X | |
| | | ■ | Rules: date of last revision or review | II | NA | |
| | | ■ | Personnel policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 years | II | NA | |
| | | ■ | Data practices policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 years | II | X | |
| | | ■ | Manager appointments: current and reported | II | X | |
| | | ■ | Consultant RFP: within 2 yrs. for professional services | II | X | |
| | | ■ | WD/WMO has resolution assuming WCA responsibilities and appropriate delegation resolutions as warranted (N/A if not LGU) | II | X | |
| | | ■ | WD/WMO has knowledgeable & trained staff that manages WCA program or has secured qualified delegate. (N/A if not LGU) | II | X | |
| | | ★ | Administrator on staff | II | Consultant | |
| | | ★ | Board training: orientation and continuing education plan, record for each board member | II | | X ¹ |
| | | ★ | Staff training: orientation and continuing education plan and record for each staff | II | NA | |
| | | ★ | Operational guidelines for fiscal procedures and conflicts of interest exist and current | II | X | |
| | ★ | Public drainage records: meet modernization guidelines | II | NA | | |
| Planning | | ■ | Watershed management plan: up-to-date | I | X | |
| | | ■ | City/twp. local water plans not yet approved | II | 0 | |
| | | ■ | Capital Improvement Program: reviewed every 2 years | II | X | |
| | | ★ | Strategic plan or self-assessment completed in last 5 years | II | | X |
| | | ★ | Strategic plan identifies short-term priorities | II | | X |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|-----------|--|--|
| Execution | ■ | Engineer Reports: submitted for DNR & BWSR review | II | NA | | |
| | ■ | WCA decisions and determinations are made in conformance with all WCA requirements. (if delegated WCA LGU) | II | X | | |
| | ■ | WCA TEP reviews & recommendations appropriately coordinated. (if delegated WCA LGU) | II | X | | |
| | ★ | Certified wetland delineator on staff or retainer | II | X | | |
| | ■ | Total expenditures per year (past 10 yrs.) | II | see below | | |
| | ★ | Water quality trends tracked for key water bodies | II | X | | |
| | ★ | Watershed hydrologic trends monitored / reported | II | X | | |
| Communication & Coordination | ■ | Website: contains information as required by MR 8410.0150 Subpart 3a, i.e. as board meeting, contact information, water plan, etc. | II | X | | |
| | ■ | Functioning advisory committee(s): recommendations on projects, reports, 2-way communication with Board | II | TAC only | | |
| | ■ | Communication piece: sent within last 12 months | II | X | | |
| | | Communication Target Audience: | | | | |
| | ★ | Track progress for Information and Education objectives in Plan | II | X | | |
| | ★ | Coordination with County Board, SWCD Board, City/Township officials | II | Partial | | |
| | ★ | Partnerships: cooperative projects/tasks with neighboring organizations, such as counties, SWCDs, WDs, Non-Government Organizations | II | X | | |

¹ New Commissioner orientation materials available online: <https://www.bassettcreekwmo.org/about/commissioner-orientation>; budget for commissioner training and attendance at conferences (rarely used)

| Year | Total Expenditures (CIP + operating funds from audit) |
|------|---|
| 2020 | \$2,422,197 |
| 2019 | \$2,752,663 |
| 2018 | \$2,251,061 |
| 2017 | \$1,055,069 |
| 2016 | \$3,540,517 |
| 2015 | \$1,676,859 |
| 2014 | \$668,563 |
| 2013 | \$1,951,599 |
| 2012 | \$900,674 |
| 2011 | \$1,602,286 |

Appendix C. Summary of External Survey Results

Bassett Creek WMC Board and Staff Questions and Responses

| How often does your organization use your current management plan to guide decisions about what you do? (response percent) | |
|---|-----|
| Always | 80% |
| Usually | 20% |
| Seldom | 0% |
| Never | 0% |

| List your organization's most successful programs and projects during the past 3-5 years. |
|---|
| <i>Capital Improvement Program</i> |
| <i>* DeCola Ponds project * Schaper Pond diversion project * XPSWMM watershed modeling * 2020 Deep tunnel inspection * Harrison neighborhood outreach/citizen engagement</i> |
| <i>Our success lies in the partnerships we've created and maintained over the years with our member cities, Three Rivers Park District, Minneapolis Park and Rec Board, Hennepin County, Met Council, state agencies, and others. We could not do our work without working collaboratively with these entities. I believe our single most successful program is our robust capital improvement program and our ability to utilize 103B.251 for capital funds. Since 2004, we've installed 35 capital projects resulting in 2,000 lbs of TP removed, 650 tons of sediment removed, 5.7 miles of streambanks restored, and 1 delisted lake.</i> |
| <i>- our administrator has been hugely successful in securing AIS management grants - excellent use of our AIS rapid response plan when starry stonewort was found in Medicine Lake - extensive ed to elementary age students through WMWA's traveling Watershed PREP class</i> |
| <i>CIP program and education about salting smart</i> |
| <i>Sweeney Lake water quality improvements Wirth Park dredging project</i> |
| <i>The Westwood Hills Nature Center educational efforts and water cycle project</i> |
| <i>plymouth creek restoration</i> |

| What helped make these projects and programs successful? |
|--|
| <i>The efficiency of the commission and the competency of all member cities</i> |
| <i>Staff coordination and collaboration with city water staff * (For project) sound engineering design, diligent development and professional implementation, strong water-quality and resource-improvement results. * Partnership with effective nonprofit organization. * Successful grantwriting</i> |
| <i>Partnerships with our member cities, the support of Hennepin County staff and commissioners for the levy funding, and grant funding. Since 2004, we've secured over \$3M in county, state, and federal grants..</i> |
| <i>Laura Jester and her ability to create partnerships</i> |
| <i>The CIP projects are carefully chosen to give the best cost-benefit. The salt education program is the first of its kind (that I'm aware of) to target residents about smart salting practices</i> |
| <i>Sweeney like project used an innovative approach to improve water quality issues created by using the lake to mitigate flooding in the watershed. The Wirth Park dredging project was almost 3 times our annual CIP project but also me of the most cost effective and provides benefits to North Minneapolis; a racially diverse and socio economic disadvantaged community. It required ingenuity to administer such a large project.</i> |
| <i>The collaboration of multiple parties to complete a successful project</i> |

good planning

During the past 3-5 years, which of your organization’s programs or projects have shown little progress or been on hold?

Now that I’m aware of

BCWMC's regulatory program is not clearly effective. Development and implementation of capital projects is not super well connected to goals or an overarching strategy in the plan..

We have a couple CIP projects on hold due to various conditions and constraints. We also have limited funding for watershed education

the chloride challenge is huge and needs more partnership from cities and local businesses

Jevne Park Stormwater Improvement Project. I believe this was put on hold due to resident concerns.

Reducing the costs of water monitoring

Flooding, the Commission has new storm water models, using ATLAS 14, and it's taken time to get a good understanding of the magnitude of the flooding and how to best address the issues.

Schaper Pond baffle

List the reasons why the organization has had difficulty with these projects and programs.

Regulatory program effectiveness is hampered by joint-powers agreement limitations on authority, city push for compromise on thresholds and criteria in the regulations. CIP approach is something of a pot luck of contribution of ideas from cities. Also, generally, there are too many commissioners (9) and they vary widely in their level of competence and contribution. Cities, to some degree through authority over commissioners, restrain effectiveness of commissioners as leading the commission's efforts

CIP projects on hold are due in one case to market forces changing the redevelopment timeline of the Four Seasons Mall in Plymouth. In another case, the city where the project would be located (Jevne Park Project in the city of Medicine Lake) is currently unwilling to cooperate on the project.

it's amazing how many positive actions laura and bassett creek have been able to accomplish for medicine lake given that the lake association is basically defunct

In general, I don't think BCWMC has

There is not a lot of competition in the industry. This is a significant portion of our budget and it should not cost this much.

Finding space in a fully developed watershed, funding, and general development of flood management of projects

Carp were causing additional problems

Regarding the various organizations and agencies with which you could cooperate on projects or programs...

List the ones with which you work well already

All member cities

Metro Blooms, city water-resources and public works staffs (sometimes)

All of our nine member cities, Hennepin County, Three Rivers Park District, Minneapolis Park and Rec Board, Met Council

Nearly all government partners

Three-Rivers Park District, all nine member cities, Barr Engineering, West Metro Water Alliance, Watershed Partners, Westwood Hills Nature Center

The Administrator, Laura Jester, Metro Blooms

| |
|---|
| FEMA |
| List the ones with which better collaboration would benefit your organization |
| <i>Minneapolis Park Board</i> |
| <i>Other nonprofits, private property (re)developers</i> |
| <i>We look forward to BWSR input and cooperation during the development of our next watershed management plan</i> |
| <i>twin west chamber of commerce, the real estate/real property management communities, business owners</i> |
| FEMA |
| If you don't know much about your organization's working relationships with partners, enter "I don't know" |
| <i>2 responses</i> |

| |
|---|
| What steps could your organization take to increase your effectiveness in accomplishing your plan goals and objectives? |
| <i>Over the last 15 years, I have been involved with many watershed organizations. This is the best-run organization that I have worked with</i> |
| <i>Find ways to increase competition for engineering services, legal services and water quality monitoring</i> |
| <i>Keep working together to improve upon our existing systems and significant more funding.</i> |
| <i>Not sure</i> |
| <i>None that I'm aware of</i> |
| <i>Reduce the number of commissioners and compensate commissioners. Contract with/hire more staff</i> |
| <i>I would really like more funding for education. We are members of the West Metro Water Alliance which works on education programming across four watersheds. We would like to emulate the East Metro Water Resource Education Program in Washington County but we don't have the funding</i> |
| <i>continue building support (within limits) for state-wide chloride legislation</i> |

| How long have you been with the organization? | (response percent) |
|--|---------------------------|
| Less than 5 years | 30% |
| 5 to 15 years | 60% |
| More than 15 years | 10% |

Bassett Creek WMC Partner Organization Questions and Responses

| Question: How often have you interacted with this organization during the past two to three years? Select the response closest to your experience. | (response percent) |
|---|---------------------------|
| Not at all | 0% |
| A few times | 0% |
| Several times a year | 50% |
| Monthly | 31.25% |
| Almost every week | 18.75% |
| Daily | 0% |

Comments:

- *None.*

| Is the amount of work you do in partnership with this organization... | (percent) |
|---|------------------|
| Not enough, there is potential for us to do more together | 6.25% |
| About right | 93.75% |
| Too much, they depend on us for work they should be doing for themselves | 0.0% |

| | |
|---|------|
| Too much, we depend on them for work we should be doing ourselves or with others | 0.0% |
|---|------|

| Based on your experience working with them, please rate the organization in the following areas: | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--------|------------|------|--------------|
| Performance Characteristic | Rating (percent of responses) | | | | |
| | Strong | Good | Acceptable | Poor | I don't know |
| Communication (they keep us informed; we know their activities; they seek our input) | 43.75% | 56.25% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Quality of work (they have good projects and programs; good service delivery) | 62.50% | 31.25% | 0% | 0% | 6.25% |
| Relationships with Customers (they work well with landowners and clients) | 50% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 25% |
| Initiative (they are willing to take on new projects, try new ideas) | 62.50% | 18.75% | 6.25% | 0% | 12.5% |
| Timelines/Follow-through (they are reliable and meet deadlines) | 75% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| How is your working relationship with this organization? (percent) | |
|---|--------|
| Powerful , we are more effective working together | 37.50% |
| Strong , we work well together most of the time | 43.75% |
| Good , but it could be better | 18.75% |
| Acceptable , but a struggle at times | 0% |
| Poor , there are almost always difficulties | 0% |
| Non-existent , we don't work with this organization | 0% |

Comments from Partners about their working relationship with the BCWMC:

- *Would be good to have more collaborative opportunities related to education and outreach*
- *The staff and board are very supportive of our partnership and willing to try new projects and rely on our expertise.*

| Do you have additional thought about how the "subject" organization could be more effective? |
|--|
| <i>The BCWMC is doing a great job with its partners and I think that continuing on the path they are currently on will serve them well. During the current plan cycle, they have also taken a more watershed-first approach (as opposed to city-submittal) to project identification which should benefit the resource and the system to a greater degree.</i> |
| <i>They do quite a bit with the investment they make in projects and staff. They invest less than some of the surrounding watersheds, though and they could make an even bigger impact with even small increases in revenue. Perhaps they could set a goal for a minimum percentage investment of the overall tax base. This would give them "cover" for increasing spending in the watershed if desired. They could also do a review of the metro watersheds and see where they fall.</i> |
| <i>Continuing to look at changing dynamics in land use in the watershed</i> |
| <i>BCWMC and Laura Jester, specifically, are phenomenal advocates for our lake and improving water quality. They have accomplished more in the past few years than I thought would be possible in the next ten</i> |

They would benefit from full time staff and bigger budget. When I compare what they produce to lets say 9 mile creek it is very small. However when I compare it to what Elm Creek produces it is quite high. I do not know the budget or constraints for any of these organizations.

Nope. I think they do a great job

| How long have you been with your current organization? | (response percent) |
|---|---------------------------|
| Less than 5 years | 25% |
| 5 to 15 years | 50% |
| More than 15 years | 25% |

Appendix D. Wetland Conservation Act Administrative Review Report

Wetland Conservation Act Administrative Review Report

Report Prepared for: Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission (BCWMC)

Report Date: May 17, 2021

Prepared by: Ben Carlson, BWSR Wetland Specialist
Ben Meyer, BWSR Wetland Specialist

Introduction

In 1991, the Legislature passed the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) in order to achieve a no-net loss in the quantity, quality, and biological diversity of Minnesota's wetlands. In doing so, they designated certain implementation responsibilities to local government units (LGUs) and soil and water conservation districts (SWCDs) with the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) to provide oversight. One oversight mechanism is an administrative review of how LGUs and SWCDs are carrying out their responsibilities.

BWSR uses the administrative review process to evaluate LGU and SWCD performance related to their responsibilities under the WCA. The review is intended to determine if an LGU or SWCD is fulfilling their responsibilities under WCA and to provide recommendations for improvement as applicable.

This review has been conducted in conjunction with the PRAP process, a summary of which is provided in the overall PRAP report.

Methods

Data for this report was collected via direct interview(s) with staff, a review of an appropriate number and type of project files, a review of existing documentation on file (i.e. annual reporting/resolutions), and through prior BWSR staff experience/interaction with the LGU or SWCD. In some cases, a project

site review may be necessary. Generally, interviews, project file reviews and site visits were done with two BWSR staff on agreed upon dates.

A copy of the questions and form(s) used during the data collection phase are available upon request.

Specific Methods

BWSR Staff interviewed Karen Wold and Laura Jester, Bassett Creek WMC (BCWMC) representatives on April 7, 2021. The interviews occurred remotely through a Microsoft Teams meeting and included Ben Carlson and Ben Meyer, BWSR Wetland Specialists. In addition to the data collection forms completed, seven project files were reviewed: 2 No Loss determinations, 1 Sequencing and Replacement Plan application, 2 Boundary and Type application, 1 Exemption determinations, and 1 Enforcement file. District staff also provided copies of the 2016 Bassett Creek WMC board resolution #16-04, with the Cities of Medicine Lake, Robbinsdale, and St. Louis Park designating the Bassett Creek WMC as the WCA LGU and identifying the local appeals board. No project site visits were required or conducted.

WCA Report Summary and Recommendations

A. Administration

Bassett Creek WMC is the LGU for Medicine Lake, Robbinsdale, and St. Louis Park within its jurisdictional boundaries. Bassett Creek WMC covers approximately 40 square miles of urban land located entirely within Hennepin County.

Trained and Knowledgeable Staff

Bassett Creek WMC has one staff (Karen Wold, Barr Engineering) that is trained in environment and natural resources and the 1987 Delineation Manual to meet MN Rule 8420.0240. Based solely on the interview and previous staff interaction, the watershed meets the requirement for being trained and knowledgeable. In addition, staff has attended trainings through BWSR and WDCP. The staff does an excellent job coordinating with other agencies (local, state, and federal). Additionally, the staff has a good rapport with landowners and effectively communicates WCA requirements to landowners. **This is effectively implementing the program.**

WCA Administrative Recommendation: The watershed staff implement WCA rule and wetland technical review at a high level of skill and performance, but should continue to make it a priority to have any staff involved with wetland regulation to attend BWSR Academy, WDCP, WPA and other trainings to keep current and further develop the skills and knowledge required to implement the WCA and technical review of delineations.

Delegation of WCA/Joint Powers Agreements

Bassett Creek WMC adopted WCA administration through Board Resolution #16-04 on February 18, 2016. The Watershed administers the WCA in all or portions of the following municipalities: Medicine Lake, Robbinsdale, and St. Louis Park. Resolutions designating WCA authority from Medicine Lake (1994), Robbinsdale (1993), and St. Louis Park (1993) to Bassett Creek WMC are retained in BWSR records. **This meets the requirement of the program.**

Delegation of Staff Decision-Making Authority

Bassett Creek WMC has designated decision making authority to staff, which includes the Commission Engineer, and the Commission Administrator for administering the WCA and making decisions related to exemption, no loss, wetland boundary and type applications. This decision was documented in Resolution 16-04 and provided to and retained in record by BWSR.

This meets the requirement of the program.

Appeals

Bassett Creek WMC does have a local appeal process per Resolution 16-04. Staff decisions may be appealed to the Bassett Creek WMC board. After reviewing multiple notice of decisions, it was noted that the local appeal process box was not checked, rather, appeal to BWSR was identified. **This meets minimum WCA requirements but needs improvement.**

WCA Administrative Recommendation: Bassett Creek WMC may want to consider an appeal fee be adopted by the board of managers and clarification of the appeal process identified on the NOD form.

B. Execution and Coordination

WCA Decisions and Determinations

WCA decisions appear to be made following the parameters of MN Rules Chapter 8420.0255 and MS 15.99. File review showed examples of good documentation and accurately completed forms. The LGU consistently includes rule citations and clearly describes the decision being made. Missing information on notices included appeal process information. **This is effectively implementing the program.**

Record Retention

8420.0200 Subp. 2. G requires the LGU to retain a record of all decisions for a minimum of ten years. The LGU currently has retained all project files and decisions since adopting the act. A hard copy is retained onsite or at an offsite storage, electronic copies are saved on a server. **This is effectively implementing the program.**

TEP Incorporation/Coordination

Bassett Creek WMC is the LGU per MN Rule 8420.0200 Subp. 1. B. and convenes TEPs when necessary. Members of the TEP include the BWSR Wetland Specialist, Hennepin Conservation District, and LGU Wetland Specialist. The Commission is proactive in inviting members of the TEP for all projects. Representatives from the Corps and DNR are involved when necessary. The TEP is utilized for projects that require TEP involvement as well as projects beyond what is required as necessary. **This is effectively implementing the program.**

Violation and Complaint Resolution

Bassett Creek WMC responds to and investigates actual and potential wetland violations as necessary. Due to the highly urbanized nature and limited aquatic resources, generally, violations are minimal within the watershed. One enforcement action occurred since 2010. Through its staff of wetland specialists and inspectors, the Commission worked with the TEP and landowner to comply with the WCA

as well as Watershed Rules. Bassett Creek WMC will inspect sites and elevate apparent violations to the Hennepin Conservation District, DNR and TEP as needed. **This is effectively implementing the program.**

C. Conclusion

BWSR commends the Bassett Creek WMC and its Staff, especially Karen Wold, for exemplary administration of the Wetland Conservation Act. Although the watershed is highly developed and WCA workload volume is low, Bassett Creek staff do an exceptional job noticing applications on time and make decision based on rule in a timely manner. Despite some minor administrative or procedural recommendations that if implemented would further strengthen the program, Bassett Creek WMC is effectively and fairly implementing WCA. Good job and keep up the good work.

Appendix E. Comment Letter

Appendix F. Program Data

Time required to complete this review

BCWMC Staff: Administrator: 11.25 hours; Commission Engineer: 11.0 hours; WCA Staff: 7.5 hours (29.75hrs)

BWSR Staff: 80 Hours

Schedule of Level II Review

BWSR PRAP Performance Review Key Dates

- March 18, 2021: Initial meeting with BCWMC Board
- March 1, 2021: Initial meeting with BCWMC staff
- March 23, 2021: Survey of board, staff, and partners
- June 17, 2021: Presentation of Draft Report
- July 15, 2021: Transmittal of Final Report to LGU (tentative)

NOTE: BWSR uses review time as a surrogate for tracking total program costs. Time required for PRAP performance reviews is aggregated and included in BWSR's annual PRAP report to the Minnesota Legislature.