



Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission

Meeting Notes of the
Watershed Plan Steering Committee
September 4, 2024 @ 8:30 a.m.
Brookview, Golden Valley

Meeting Attendees:

Committee Chair Kennedy; Commissioner Welch; Alternate Commissioner Polzin; TAC Members Eckman and Scharenbroich; Administrator Jester; Commission Engineers Chandler, Williams, and Johnson

1. WELCOME

Committee Chair Kennedy opened the meeting at approximately 8:40 a.m.

2. REVIEW AUGUST 7 MEETING NOTES

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

3. REVIEW PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS TRACKER

Staff briefly reviewed the progress of plan development. Chair Kennedy noted the importance of discussing implementation items before the February 2025 PSC meeting for more significant goals to make sure goals don't need to be revised.

4. REVIEW COMMENTS & POTENTIAL ISSUES/GOALS REVISIONS FROM COMMISSION WORKSHOP

The committee reviewed and discussed staff-recommended revisions to some issues and goals in response to feedback received at the August 15th Commission Workshop. There was discussion on how the trigger for stream buffer requirements perhaps shouldn't be based on land disturbance. On the topic of measurability, Engineer Williams noted that if metrics can be linked back to goals, then the actual measurability doesn't necessarily need to be in the goal statement. Committee member Welch noted that measuring environmental progress is important, but it should not be arbitrary.

Final recommended revisions of issues and goals were captured in the goals table for presentation to the Commission at their September meeting.

5. DISCUSS NEXT STEPS FOR SPECIFIC TOPICS

Staff requested input on how and when some specific topics would be discussed.

Potential chloride reduction tools: the group briefly discussed some ideas including expanding street sweeping to capture salt, requiring chloride management plans for certain developments, requiring low salt design be considered in development. There was acknowledgement that cities and the TAC will have important input on potential activities, but the committee noted that the discussion should start at the PSC or Commission before getting TAC input. There was consensus that the same process (PSC/Commission and then TAC) should be used for discussions on buffer requirements and non-linear development requirements.

Committee member Scharenbroich noted that that TAC is good at being reactionary and that he and committee member Eckman can offer a good city perspective within the PSC.

There was a brief discussion about the street sweeping prioritization study that was proposed at the last Commission meeting. Administrator Jester apologized for not providing better context on the reasons and background for bringing the proposed study to the Commission. She noted that after hearing about how useful these studies are in other watersheds, she requested that the Commission Engineers bring information on a potential study to the TAC, who then requested a complete proposal. The TAC reviewed the proposal and made a recommendation that the Commission move forward with the study. Committee member Polzin noted that

analyses the Commission performs right now will help build the implementation plan so the Commission can “hit the ground running.” Committee member Welch wondered if street sweeping is the highest priority and best use of the engineer’s time. The PSC directed the Commission Engineer to bring the street sweeping prioritization study back to the PSC and to connect the study with the goals already established in the plan.

Regarding the Education and Engagement Plan – Committee members agreed that the term “engagement” rather than “outreach” better indicates the intent to build relationships in various communities and seek their input rather than simply providing education as a one-way endeavor. Committee member Polzin noted that the draft Education and Engagement Plan does not have a strong link to the plan and that more explicit connections should be made. There was consensus that the Education and Engagement Plan should be reviewed by the PSC first and then may be reviewed by the Education Committee.

6. FINALIZE GOALS FOR DEIA-RELATED ISSUES

The committee discussed the goals for DEI-related issues in the Education and Engagement and Organizational Effectiveness categories.

Under the Organizational Effectiveness category, the committee recommended moving the phrase “access to information and resources” in the issue statement to the Education and Engagement category. Committee member Polzin also suggested simplifying the desired future condition statement.

Under the Education and Engagement category, the committee members discussed the meaning of “native practices.” Committee member Polzin suggested adding learning about native practices as a task.

7. REVIEW DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION SECTION OUTLINE AND NARRATIVE EXCERPT

The committee ran out of time to discuss this item. It will be moved to a future agenda.

8. REVIEW DRAFT EDUCATION & ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Aside from the notes above, the committee ran out of time to discuss this item. It will be moved to a future agenda.

9. ADJOURN – The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 a.m.