

Section 6

Implementation

Table of Contents

6.0	Implementation	6-1
6.1	Setting Priorities.....	6-1
6.2	LMRWD Administration	6-2
6.2.1	Floodplain Regulations.....	6-2
6.2.2	Project Review	6-3
6.2.3	Joint Resolutions/Joint Powers Agreements	6-4
6.3	Funding Sources.....	6-5
6.3.1	Watershed Districts and Water Management Organizations.....	6-5
6.3.2	Statutes Governing Watershed Districts Only.....	6-6
6.3.3	Statutes Governing Watershed Districts and Joint Powers Water Management Organizations (WMO's) in the Twin City Metropolitan Area.....	6-6
6.3.4	State Funding Sources	6-7
6.3.5	Federal Funding Sources	6-8
6.3.6	Private Funding Sources.....	6-8
6.3.7	LMRWD Past and Proposed Funding Mechanisms.....	6-9
6.4	Impact on Local Governments	6-11
6.4.1	Existing Local Controls.....	6-12
6.4.2	Financial Impact on Local Government	6-12
6.5	Local Planning	6-13
6.5.1	Requirements for Local Water Management Plans.....	6-14
6.5.2	LMRWD Review of Local Water Management Plans.....	6-16

List of Tables

Table 6-1	Planned Implementation Activities
Table 6-2	Status of Local Water Management Planning
Table 6-3	Prioritization for Assessing the District's Resources

6.0 Implementation

6.1 Setting Priorities

The LMRWD Board of Managers' proposed implementation program addresses the water resource issues addressed in this plan according to the Board's preferred focus. LMRWD's proposed implementation program separates activities into three categories: projects, programs, and special studies. Distinctions between these categories may not always be clear and there may be some overlap. Each category is described below:

- **Projects**—Typically one time efforts, probably structural, usually involving a contractor, done either as an LMRWD project or as a cooperative project with another unit of government. The LMRWD managers will undertake cooperative projects only in response to a petition from a municipality. Projects would be funded according to the provisions of applicable law (see Section 6.3).
- **Programs**—Mostly nonstructural, likely to be ongoing year after year. Examples would include education/information, data collection and management, project reviews, and project inspections. Programs are most likely funded with an annual ad valorem levy over the entire watershed district.
- **Special Studies**—One time technical or data collection efforts directed at acquiring specific information or achieving a specific goal. Examples include assessment of the current and potential future conditions of LMRWD's resources and the development of resource protection plans. Special studies might be considered an extension of the 'programs' category described above. LMRWD will most likely fund the special studies listed in its implementation program through the annual ad valorem levy. In some cases the requester of the special study, be it public or private, might be required to pay the cost of the study.

Table 6-1 is a comprehensive list of the proposed projects, programs, and special studies that comprise the implementation program. LMRWD developed Table 6-1 through reviewing existing information (see Section 3), identifying potential or existing problems (see Section 4), developing goals and policies (see Section 5), and then assessing the need for capital improvement projects, programs, or studies. These needs were reviewed by the communities and public as part of LMRWD's plan revision process. LMRWD defined the conceptual scope of work involved in each program, study or capital improvement. LMRWD evaluated the total costs and funding sources and developed a rationale to prioritize the program elements (see also Table 6-3). Table 6-1 shows the cost estimates, priorities, schedule and recommended funding sources (see Section 6.3) for the proposed implementation program.

LMRWD's priority system reflects its focus on the following: commercial navigation; resource evaluation and management; project review and inspection; and public information. As discussed in Section 5.0, LMRWD will emphasize the following roles, in descending order:

1. Project facilitator .
2. Project proposer.
3. Regulator.

In the absence of immediate local needs, the priorities listed in Table 6-3 dictate the order in which LMRWD will assess the condition of the District's resources. For example, Dean Lake and Assumption Creek are listed as priority 1 and priority 2 in Table 6-3 and they are the first ones slated for data collection, data analysis, watershed analysis, developing goals, policies, and resources plans, and implementation projects in Table 6-1. LMRWD will change these priorities in response to local priorities. Monitoring will be undertaken at each resource, according to the priority given in Table 6-3. LMRWD anticipates that specific standards will be developed for each priority resource as part of the use attainability analysis.

The LMRWD Managers will not initiate capital projects not included in this plan except in response to a petition. Such a project would likely require an amendment or minor amendment to the plan. Projects would be funded according to the provisions of applicable law (see Section 6.3), such as: special assessment, which requires that special benefit be shown to the assessed properties; special taxing districts; ad valorem taxing over the entire watershed district; or a combination of these methods (see Section 6.3.2).

Projects that benefit commercial navigation, such as acquisition of dredge material disposal sites, will be paid for using funds available in LMRWD's 9-Foot Channel Fund, which was created by special assessment to commercially benefited properties. The monies in this fund can only be used for the benefit of commercial navigation. The LMRWD Managers do not anticipate the need to increase funding for commercial navigation purposes. However, if the 9-Foot Channel Fund were to become depleted and additional funding were required, the District will likely allocate the cost of such projects and activities to commercial benefitted properties that would, presumably, pass on those costs to the benefitted users of commercial navigation (i.e. agriculture, shippers, etc.).

In summary, the mix of programs, studies and projects for each year listed in Table 6-1 collectively represents a balanced approach to the preventive, corrective, and management efforts required by LMRWD. The goal of the planning and management studies is to add to the general knowledge available to LMRWD for long-term planning and management. This proposed prioritization and budget will be updated annually to reflect completion of specific projects and other changes in the LMRWD.

6.2 LMRWD Administration

The LMRWD administers floodplain regulations and reviews project proposals. LMRWD relies on local governments to forward proposals for review and comment.

If the project lies within the Minnesota River floodplain, then LMRWD reviews the project for conformance with its floodplain regulations.

Currently, LMRWD provides technical review of project proposals but does not issue permits. After approval of this plan, LMRWD will continue such review, but will seek a joint resolution with each governmental unit to formalize the services and expectations of each party, as described below.

6.2.1 Floodplain Regulations

Most of the governmental units within LMRWD have MDNR-approved floodplain ordinances (see Table 3-6). LMRWD's regulations are advisory only in those communities that already have a MDNR-approved floodplain ordinance. LMRWD's regulations apply to those areas of land that are below an elevation that is three (3) feet above the maximum known flood level (1965 flood). This increased freeboard is intended to allow for the effect of a significant spring rainfall superimposed on the 1965 flood event. Section 4.6.3 presents information about this analysis.

The 1965 flood is considered to be very close to the 100-year flood event for the Minnesota River. The communities along the Minnesota River are using the 1965 flood as the elevation for the 100-year floodplain. The differences between the community floodplain ordinances and the LMRWD floodplain regulations are as follows:

- LMRWD advises the community of the “warning zone” between the 100-year flood elevation and three (3) feet above the 100-year floodplain elevation. There are no restrictions on building or filling in the warning zone.
- LMRWD enforces “equal encroachment” which requires that the effect of the proposed project be considered for both sides of the Minnesota River. For example, if the criteria is that the cumulative effect of all projects is to not raise the flood level more than 0.1 foot, then each side of the river would only be allowed to raise the flood level by half that much (0.05 foot). Most communities’ floodplain regulations do not enforce equal encroachment.

LMRWD encourages that if fill is placed in the floodplain (not including the warning zone), an equal amount of excavation should take place within the same cross section.

At the time LMRWD is negotiating joint resolutions/agreements with the communities, LMRWD will review each community’s floodplain ordinance to determine the differences between the LMRWD and community regulations. Until the community’s regulations are revised to conform with LMRWD’s regulations, or are MDNR-approved, LMRWD will continue to apply its floodplain program.

6.2.2 Project Review

The District will provide technical review of project proposals for their impact on the District’s resources and navigation. *The District’s review and comment process is not intended to create a permit or constitute any other type of approval.* The District Engineer/Administrator will perform the reviews on behalf of the District, bringing proposals before the Board only when there is a policy issue which requires Board comment (i.e. proposal is not in conformance with District standards). This will allow LMRWD to provide timely, useful input to local units of government.

The District will review proposals (a) whenever requested to do so by the local government, or (b) whenever the proposal meets the District’s criteria which require review. MN Statutes 103D.335, subd. 23 and 103B.211, subd. 1 (3) address the powers of metro-area watershed districts relating to regulating the use and development of land. Generally, watershed districts can have permit programs (a) when local governments do not have an approved water management plan; (b) if the local government unit gives the authority over to the watershed district; or (c) if the proposed land use requires an amendment or variance from the approved local water management plan. Accordingly, the District requirements for review will change as the relationship changes between the District and the local government:

Until the District and the local government have passed Joint Resolutions (see Section 6.2.3), local units of government shall submit project proposals to LMRWD for review and comment whenever the project meets any of the criteria listed in Section 5.13, policy 2. Local units of government shall submit project proposals to LMRWD *prior to* approval by the local government.

If LMRWD finds that the local unit of government has failed to enforce the standards and policies of LMRWD, then LMRWD will adopt regulations after a public hearing, and begin operating a permit program in the local unit of government to enforce the LMRWD standards and policies.

When the District and the local government have passed Joint Resolutions, but prior to the time when local government water management plans are approved, review of projects will be in accordance with the conditions of the Joint Resolutions or joint powers agreements LMRWD will enter into with each local unit of government (see Section 6.2.3). Presumably, these requirements will be similar to those for the period prior to passage of the joint resolutions. If a joint resolution is rescinded, or if LMRWD finds that the local unit of government has failed to enforce the standards and policies of LMRWD, then LMRWD will adopt regulations after a public hearing, and begin operating a permit program in the local unit of government to enforce the LMRWD standards and policies.

After the local units of government implement approved water management plans, LMRWD intends for their review and comment role to *continue* in accordance with the provisions of the approved water management plan. Joint Resolutions will be rewritten as necessary to establish the changed roles of each party.

In the “2000 Boundary Change area,” the LMRWD will seek to enter into *cooperative agreements* with the government agencies affected by the boundary change order. LMRWD has and will continue to implement a permit program. This area is not under the jurisdiction of a local unit of government. Projects proposed in this area are subject to the policies laid out in this plan.

LMRWD will follow up its technical review and comment process with an inspections program to verify that the projects are meeting the mutually-agreed upon standards listed or referenced in the Joint Resolution/Agreement. In the event that District standards are not implemented by the local government, the District may choose to impose rules and regulations (as permitted by Minnesota Statutes 103D.335, Subd. 23 and 103B.211, Subd. 3), to require conformance to District standards.

6.2.3 Joint Resolutions/Joint Powers Agreements

Within six months after plan adoption, LMRWD will seek to enter into a joint resolution or joint powers agreement with each local unit of government within LMRWD. The joint resolution/ agreement will address the respective roles of LMRWD and the local unit of government in water management. Appendix C contains a model joint resolution. The model joint resolution states that the local unit of government agrees to:

- Implement water management standards and policies at least as strict as those in Sections 5.4, 5.5, 5.9, 5.10, 5.11 and 5.13 of the LMRWD Plan through development review and permit programs (the policies, standards and criteria will be attached to the joint resolution).
- Submit project proposals to LMRWD for review and comment whenever the project meets any of the criteria listed in Section 5.13, policy 2.
- Where the LMRWD review identifies areas where the local permits are less strict than the standards in the LMRWD plan, the local government will incorporate the provisions of LMRWD comments into local permits.
- Submit city comprehensive plan amendments/revisions to LMRWD for review and comment.
- Inspect projects under construction and enforce local permit provisions intended to implement the policies, standards and criteria of the LMRWD.

- Administer their own MDNR-approved floodplain regulations for the LMRWD after approval of the local plan, unless the local unit of government gives the authority to LMRWD.
- Be the designated local government unit (LGU) for the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) and rules.

The model joint resolution states that the LMRWD agrees to:

- Review project plans and city comprehensive plan amendments/revisions for conformance with LMRWD policies and standards and provide review comments to the local unit of government at no cost to the local government and within a mutually-agreed upon time (two weeks, for example).
- Conduct regular inspections to monitor local enforcement of LMRWD policies and standards, and to work cooperatively to resolve conflicts over the implementation of LMRWD standards and policies.
- Continue to administer its Minnesota River Floodplain Regulations (see Appendix B) in the community until the community adopts a MDNR-approved floodplain ordinance and until the local government's water management plan is approved.

The joint resolution may be rewritten from time to time to reflect revisions to the agreed-upon roles of the District and the local governmental unit. As resource assessments and plans are completed, LMRWD will seek to amend the joint resolutions to set specific limits and/or require special resource protection methods/strategies in the watershed.

If a city either does not enter into a joint powers resolution with LMRWD, does not abide by the joint resolution, or LMRWD finds that the local unit of government has failed to enforce the standards and policies of LMRWD, then LMRWD will adopt regulations after a public hearing, and begin operating a permit program in the local unit of government to enforce the LMRWD standards and policies.

Cooperative Agreements

In the 2000 Boundary Change Area, the LMRWD will seek to enter into cooperative agreements with the affected governmental agencies. The cooperative agreement defines the roles of the LMRWD as a project review and permitting agencies. The cooperative agreement also defines the expectations of the agency or other entity proposing a project in the 2000 Boundary Change Area.

6.3 Funding Sources

This section provides a brief summary of the many funding sources available to LMRWD, followed by a discussion of LMRWD's proposed method(s) of funding the various items in its implementation program (Table 6-1).

6.3.1 Watershed Districts and Water Management Organizations

The laws regarding funding of projects are different between metropolitan watershed districts/WMOs and out-state watershed districts. Minnesota Statutes (M.S.) Chapter 103D applies to all watershed districts, while Chapter 103B applies only to the Twin Cities metropolitan area watershed districts and WMOs. Since LMRWD is both a watershed district and in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, both sets of statutes apply. How a project/study is initiated will dictate which taxing methods can be used.

Statutes Governing Watershed Districts Only

Special Assessments

M.S. 103D.701 requires that in order to initiate projects, WDs must first have a BWSR-approved plan. Projects that are to be paid for by assessment of benefited property must be initiated by a petition, unanimous resolution of the managers, or some other method.

M.S. 103D.705 provides for cities or residents to petition a watershed district (WD) for a project. The petitioners must guarantee the fund used to pay for the preliminary feasibility studies.

M.S. 103D.601 allows a project to be instituted by resolution of a majority of the WD managers, but the project must be financed by one or more grants totaling at least 50 percent of the estimated cost and the total estimated cost to the WD may not be more than \$750,000. Projects initiated using this procedure must be paid for by special assessments against benefitting properties.

Ad Valorem Taxes

M.S. 103D.905 allows WD managers to use a portion of their Administrative Fund for construction and maintenance of projects of common benefit to the WD. The upper limit of this fund is \$200,000 per year for LMRWD. The levy limit is \$125,000 per year for most WDs; special legislation is required to raise a watershed district's levy limit for their Administrative Fund. Since this fund is normally used for the basic organizational needs of WDs, it is difficult to fund large projects using this source.

M.S. 103D.905 also authorizes WD managers to levy a tax over the entire WD (an ad-valorem tax) to pay the cost attributable to the basic water management features of projects initiated by petition of a municipality of the WD. The levy may not exceed 0.00798 percent of the taxable market value for a period of time not to exceed 15 consecutive years. For LMRWD, this levy could generate \$235,000 per year.

Utility/Fees

Similar to stormwater utilities for cities, **M.S. 103D.729** allows WDs to establish a water management district for the purpose of collecting revenues and paying costs of projects initiated under M.S. 103B.231, M.S. 103D.601, 605, 611, or 730. For LMRWD to use this funding mechanism, it must be included in its water management plan, or the plan must be amended to include this funding mechanism.

Emergency Projects

M.S. 103D.615 allows WD managers to declare an emergency and order work to be done without a contract. The cost of work can be paid for either by special assessment or an ad valorem tax levy, if the cost is not more than 25 percent of the most recent administrative ad valorem levy.

6.3.3 Statutes Governing Watershed Districts and Joint Powers Water Management Organizations (WMO's) in the Twin City Metropolitan Area

Ad Valorem Tax

M.S. 103B.231, previously known as "Chapter 509," requires WDs and WMOs within the metropolitan area to prepare a water management plan. The statute requires that a capital

improvement plan be part of the water management plan. For those improvements included in the water management plan, M.S. 103B.231, Subd. 10 (and M.S. 103D.605 for WDs) allows WDs and WMOs to implement projects without a petition. According to these statutes, WDs and WMOs may levy ad-valorem taxes to pay for capital improvements (including maintenance of improvements) either over the entire WD/WMO (**M.S. 103B.241**), or over all property within a portion or **subwatershed** of the WD/WMO (**M.S. 103B.251**). M.S. 103B.241, similar to M.S. 103D.729, also allows WDs and WMOs to accumulate funds to finance improvements as an alternative to issuing bonds. In order for LMRWD to use either funding mechanism, LMRWD must adequately describe the projects, studies, and project maintenance in the water management plan. The water management plan must also specify that the source of funding will be in accordance with these statutes. Currently there is no levy limit.

The advantage of using M.S. 103B.231 (subd. 10) and 103B.241 is that a hearing is not required for each individual project. As long as the capital improvement program is specified in the water management plan, the WD/WMO only needs to conduct an annual hearing on the entire capital improvement program, in accordance with M.S. 103B.241. Under M.S. 103B.241, projects are paid for by ad valorem tax over the entire WD/WMO. **M.S. 103B.251**, on the other hand, allows the WD/WMO to set up a special taxing district or subwatershed over which funds are raised by an ad valorem tax. M.S. 103B.251 requires (a) that a copy of the water management plan be filed with the county, (b) a special improvement hearing be held for the capital improvement projects, and (c) the county raises the funds by selling bonds paid for by an ad valorem tax over the subwatershed/special tax district.

Minnesota Rules Chapter 8410.0140 allows for minor amendments to a WD or WMO capital improvement program. A minor amendment (including minor amendments to a capital improvement program) must be submitted to the affected local units of government, the Metropolitan Council, and the state review agencies for review and comment, and to BWSR and the affected counties for review and approval. In addition, the WD/WMO must hold a public meeting to explain the amendments. The public meeting could also be the hearing on the capital improvement program required by M.S. 103B.251. If the WD/WMO plan states that the capital improvement program will be reviewed and updated every year, a certain amount of revision may be allowed without the WD/WMO going through the minor amendment process.

Emergency Projects

M.S. 103B.252 allows LGUs or WD/WMOs to declare an emergency and order work to be done without a contract. M.S. 103B.252 is similar to M.S. 103D.615 except it does not contain levy limits.

6.3.4 State Funding Sources

Other than taxes and assessments, LMRWD could receive funding from various state sources, such as grant and loan programs. LMRWD could use loans for projects instead of county-issued bonds. Following are various state-funded sources grouped by the state agency that administers the various funding programs.

BWSR administers several grant programs, some of which could be applied to WDs and WMOs. Applicable BWSR grant programs include challenge grants (M.S. 103B.3369), cost-share grants, special projects/“turn-back” monies, and the Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) Reserve Program.

The **MPCA** administers the Clean Water Partnership (CWP) grant and loan program, Watershed Resource Restoration grants (EPA-funded Section 319 program), and the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Revolving Loan Fund.

The **DNR** administers many grant programs which could be applicable to LMRWD, including the Flood Hazard Mitigation Grant Assistance program, local grants program, trail grants program, cooperative water recreation program, and dam safety program. Funding for many of these programs changes after each legislative session. The DNR prepares individual fact sheets for each of the grant programs.

Other state funding programs include the **Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources** (LCMR) funds for non-urgent demonstration and research projects, the **Minnesota Department of Trade and Economic Development's** Contaminant Cleanup Development Grant Program, the **Metropolitan Council's** Twin Cities Water Quality Initiative (TCQI) grant program, the **Minnesota Department of Agriculture's** Agriculture Best Management Practices (Ag BMP) Loan Program, **Mn/DOT** State Aid Funds, and **ISTEA** funds.

6.3.5 Federal Funding Sources

LMRWD could also receive funding from various federal sources, a few of which are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)** has Discretionary Funds available through each division and program area of the EPA, and administers the Clean Lakes Program (CLP) established by Section 314 of the Clean Water Act; the CLP is similar to the MPCA's CWP program.

The **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers** administers the Planning Assistance to States (Section 22) program, the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) program, also known as the LCA (Local Cooperation Agreement) program for construction of flood control projects, the Section 14 bank protection program, the Flood Plain Management Services Program, the Aquatic Plant Control Program, and provides many GIS products through its GIS Center.

The **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service** administers the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund, as part of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA).

The **Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)** has funds available for technical assistance on various surface water projects, operations and maintenance, inspections and repairs. The NRCS also administers the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) which was established through the 1996 Farm Bill Program.

The **Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)** has funds available to restore areas (including water resources) damaged or destroyed by a disaster.

6.3.6 Private Funding Sources

The **McKnight Foundation** is administering their Mississippi River Program, an environmental initiative for the Mississippi River watershed. Grant funds will be available until 2002.

The **Minnesota Environmental Initiative** administers the Contaminant Cleanup Development Grant Program which was created by the state legislature to provide financial incentives.

Ducks Unlimited and ***Pheasants Forever*** funds are available for projects which enhance, create, or protect waterfowl or pheasant habitat.

Individual entities needing to provide wetland mitigation in compliance with the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) may have funds and/or technical resources available to restore or create wetland function and values lost or intended to be destroyed as part of a project.

Other private funding sources include service organizations (i.e., Lions Club and Elks), youth groups (i.e., Boy/Girl Scouts), Adopt-a-Highway/River cleanup groups, and sportsman clubs.

6.3.7 LMRWD Past and Proposed Funding Mechanisms

LMRWD has financed its past administrative, program and project costs through its annual administrative fund ad valorem tax levies under the authority of the Watershed Act (M.S. 103D.905). LMRWD's administrative fund levy limit is \$200,000. LMRWD has not levied any other ad valorem taxes in the past. LMRWD's administrative fund is used only for initiatives that benefit the water resources of the District; it is not used for projects that benefit commercial navigation. The majority of LMRWD's efforts and funding have been put towards activities that address water quality, runoff management or flood control problems and issues. LMRWD maintains a capital reserves fund, which is the unused portion of previous administrative levies. This results when LMRWD's actual expenditures are less than the projected expenditures in the LMRWD budget.

A one-time special assessment was done to support the Corps of Engineer's initial dredging work for the 9-foot channel. The balance from that initial assessment is kept in a special fund (9-Foot Channel Fund). LMRWD can use this fund only for implementation activities that address commercial navigation purposes, such as the purchase or management of dredge material disposal sites. If the 9-Foot Channel Fund is depleted, LMRWD will fund projects that benefit commercial navigation through special assessment of benefitted properties. Such projects will be initiated in accordance with applicable statutes.

The implementation program of this plan includes both non-structural and structural activities. The chosen funding method depends on the activity. A short term goal for LMRWD is to reduce the District's capital reserves fund to about \$100,000 within the next five years by using the reserves to fund many of the implementation activities listed in Table 6-1, including the priority resource assessment and management initiatives.

Once the capital reserves fund is reduced to about \$100,000, LMRWD will have much less administrative fund monies available for cooperative projects, although the Managers believe there will be enough funding available to continue the priority resource assessment and planning activities. If the capital reserves are depleted before the resource assessments are completed, the District may consider using other ad valorem funding mechanisms (such as 103D.905, Subd. 8 - survey and data acquisition fund) to fund the resource assessment work.

Without the capital reserves fund available for projects, LMRWD anticipates undertaking only *petitioned* projects (either independently or jointly with other entities) that will develop, protect, enhance, and/or restore the District's resources. LMRWD will place a higher priority on undertaking petitioned projects that are identified as implementation projects in future resource plans. The advantages of going through a petition process are: 1) the statute sets forth a definite process for the petition and subsequent actions; 2) the Managers are required to make a decision whether to order the project or not; and 3) if additional funding is needed, the statute allows for ad valorem funding of these petitioned projects. The disadvantage of the petition process is that it may require more lead time to approve a project than the

current LMRWD process. M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 3 allows LMRWD to levy an additional ad valorem tax over the entire District to pay for the basic water management features of projects which have been initiated by a petition of a municipality within LMRWD. Such a levy would generate approximately \$235,000 in LMRWD. The Managers anticipate funding projects using this authority, except projects that benefit navigation, which LMRWD will fund through special assessment of benefitted properties. If no city petitions LMRWD for a project which LMRWD believes is a priority, LMRWD may consider initiating the project under the provisions of Chapter 103.

Projects for bank erosion control on the Minnesota River and its tributaries will need to be initiated by a petition from the city. Table 6-1 gives a range of proposed expenditures because the LMRWD Managers do not know the exact extent of the bank erosion control projects.

The LMRWD Managers believe that by addressing streambank erosion on the Minnesota River and its tributaries, they will benefit both the water quality and commercial navigation aspects of the Minnesota River.

The program elements listed in Table 6-1 related to data collection could also be funded through a survey and data acquisition fund levy under M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 8. Studies (such as those relating to water quality, water quantity, and habitat) and programs (such as the education program) would be more logically funded through an ad valorem tax over the entire District. Therefore, the District will fund these studies as much as possible through LMRWD's annual administrative fund levy. If the additional levy allowed under M.D. 103D.905, Subd. 3 is not sufficient for a particular project, LMRWD will consider levying an ad valorem tax over either the entire District (103B.241) or over a benefitted part of the District (103B.251). The exact funding mechanism will be determined every year and presented to the public at the District's annual budget hearing.

Hennepin County requests that watershed districts follow special procedures whenever a project or initiative will require a levy against Hennepin County taxpayers in excess of the authorized administrative fund levy. These procedures are to ensure that the scope of the project is understood when the levy is made. Only Hennepin County has requested these procedures. LMRWD will follow these procedures in other counties, if requested to do so by any other county. LMRWD intends to comply with the requested procedures until such time the request is rescinded by the county. The procedures are generally described below:

The procedure requests greater preliminary analysis to better determine the scope of a particular problem and to evaluate the feasibility and costs of alternative solutions prior to ordering an improvement project. Where appropriate, LMRWD will conduct such feasibility studies, after which LMRWD will conduct a public hearing pursuant to applicable statutes. Notices of this hearing will be sent to all counties and municipalities in LMRWD. Although not required by statute, LMRWD will also hold a public information meeting regarding the proposed improvement project in the city hall or other public space in the affected governmental unit.

Upon completion of the feasibility study and public hearing, and if LMRWD decides to proceed further with the proposed project, LMRWD will either follow an *informal* project information process or a *formal* minor plan amendment process, depending on the funding mechanism to be used. In either case, the project information or amendment will include information regarding project feasibility and costs, as reported in the feasibility study and at the public hearing.

Procedure for Projects to be Funded Using M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 3 (Basic Water Management Features Projects)

Formal minor plan amendments are *not* required for projects funded using the additional levy allowed under M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 3. Therefore, LMRWD will follow an informal proposed project information process to inform the local units of government about these proposed projects. LMRWD will distribute the proposed project information to the affected local units of government *in Hennepin County* for review and comment, but not to the state review agencies or the Metropolitan Council. BWSR will not be taking formal action, since it is not a formal amendment. The county will have 90 days from receipt of the proposed project information to either approve or disapprove the project, and to hold any public hearings regarding the proposed project. Other Hennepin County local units of government will have 60 days to review and comment on the proposed project. If the county fails to complete its review within the prescribed period, unless LMRWD agrees to an extension, the proposed project will be deemed approved by the county.

After approval by Hennepin County, LMRWD will distribute the proposed project information to all the affected local units of government.

Procedure for Projects to be Funded Using M.S. 103B.241 or M.S. 103B.251

Formal minor plan amendments will be required for projects funded under M.S. 103B.241 or M.S. 103B.251 that are not described in sufficient detail in the LMRWD plan. LMRWD will follow the formal minor plan amendment process of MN Rules 8410.0140 for these types of projects. The formal process requires that LMRWD distribute the plan amendment to the affected local units of government, the Metropolitan Council, and the state review agencies (including BWSR) for review and comment. The counties will have 90 days from receipt of the minor plan amendment to either approve or disapprove the amendment, and to hold any public hearings regarding the amendment. If a county fails to complete its review within the prescribed period, unless LMRWD agrees to an extension, the amendment will be deemed approved by that county. The proposed amendment will be deemed to be a minor amendment if either BWSR agrees that the amendment is a minor amendment or BWSR fails to act within 45 days of receipt of the minor plan amendment.

Procedure Following Approval of Proposed Project Information or Minor Amendment

Following approval of the proposed project information or minor amendment, and prior to advertising for bids to undertake the project, LMRWD will hold at least one additional public hearing to review the final design of the proposed project. At this point, LMRWD shall have completed all of the final design plans and specifications necessary for the contract bidding process and construction. Although this last stage of public hearings is not required by statute, the public and other interested parties will have an additional opportunity to review and comment on the details of the proposed project.

The request from Hennepin County is not intended to duplicate work required by applicable statutes, only to set a minimum requirement for public information and input. LMRWD will follow procedures that are consistent with applicable statutes, supplementing the statutory requirements as necessary to comply with the County's request.

6.4 Impact on Local Governments

This section discusses how LMRWD's implementation program will affect local government in terms of cost and administrative issues.

6.4.1 Existing Local Controls

LMRWD's intention in developing this plan was to limit additional requirements imposed upon local units of government. The impact of LMRWD's plan on each local government's controls is difficult to quantify, although general observations can be made. Most of the plan's implementation program elements are either solely LMRWD projects or voluntary projects/programs that call for cooperation and collaboration with local units of government. Many of the implementation program elements reflect the goals, policies and requirements of state and regional units of government that local units of government would need to address regardless.

One purpose of the joint resolutions (paragraph 6.2.3) is to minimize overlap of reviews and authorities. The joint resolution will permit the District and the local unit of government to agree and coordinate their activities, and will permit each unit to implement the District's goals in the best manner for that unit. As the governmental units develop approved water management plans, the joint resolutions can be modified to meet changing needs for resource management.

The standards for preparation and review of runoff management plans and erosion control plans (see Section 5.13) may require more work for local government, at least in the short term. These standards were developed in compliance with Minnesota Rules 8410.0090 Subp. 3.

Implementation of future resource plans may result in additional requirements for proposed projects in those watersheds. LMRWD recognizes the importance of keeping the financial burden low on the member municipalities and taxpayers.

Most local units of government already have ordinances in place which address many of the LMRWD requirements. Applicable ordinances address shorelands, floodplains, wetland protection, stormwater utilities, erosion control, and stormwater system maintenance. Table 3-6 and Table 3-8 list the DNR approval status of floodplain and shoreland ordinances, respectively, for local units of government in LMRWD. Local governments must adopt the DNR's shoreland regulations, if required by the DNR. See Section 5.5.1, Section 6.2.2 and Section 6.2.3 regarding role of local units of government and LMRWD in floodplain regulation.

Stormwater quality requirements of this plan are not expected to create additional cost or burden to local units of government. Cities in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area within the Minnesota River basin are already required to adopt the Metropolitan Council's *Interim Strategy to Reduce Nonpoint Source Pollution to the Minnesota River* in their stormwater plans, which requires local governments to adopt standards for new stormwater ponds using NURP or similar criteria. Local water management plans must also include the MPCA's best management practices as listed in *Protecting Water Quality in Urban Areas* (1989).

LMRWD is not increasing the wetland regulation burden for most local units of government; most of the cities and counties are already acting as the LGU for the Wetland Conservation Act and this will not change. Local units of government can take on an increased role in wetland management by preparing a wetland management plan that identifies and prioritizes all the wetlands in their community.

6.4.2 Financial Impact on Local Government

The LMRWD plan will not significantly change existing municipal, township and county financial obligations, since it is LMRWD's policy to not increase its tax levies. LMRWD will increase tax levies only in response to requests by the local units of government (i.e. project petitions). As a result, the financial impact of this water management plan on local government should be minimal. An exception

might be the maintenance and other management programs required by MN Rules 8410.0100, Subp. 6 (see Section 6.5.1), which may result in additional costs to local government.

6.5 Local Planning

According to MN Rules 8410.0160, local units of government must adopt local water management plans within two years of BWSR's approval of the last water management organization plan that affects the unit of government. BWSR approved this plan on August 25, 1999. Local units of government must therefore adopt local plans by August 25, 2001, or two years from the date of approval of the last WMO plan in the local unit of government, whichever is later. The likelihood of a long "interim period" between LMRWD plan adoption and local water management plan adoption is the impetus for LMRWD seeking to enter into joint resolutions/agreements with the local units of government regarding water management responsibilities.

Table 6-2 shows the status of local water management planning in each local unit of government within LMRWD. Many of the cities prepared local plans in conformance with other WMO plans. It is anticipated that most of the cities will need to revise their local plans to bring them into conformance with LMRWD's revised plan and MN Rules 8410. The following local units of government will be required to revise or prepare local plans that conform to the LMRWD plan, MN Statutes 103B and to MN Rules 8410:

- Bloomington (Hennepin County)
- Burnsville (Dakota County)
- Carver
- Carver County (for areas of Chaska Township within LMRWD)
- Chanhassen (Carver County)
- Chaska (Carver County)
- Eagan (Dakota County)
- Eden Prairie (Hennepin County)
- Lilydale (Dakota County)
- Mendota (Dakota County)
- Mendota Heights (Dakota County)
- Savage (Scott County)
- Scott County (for areas of Jackson and Louisville Townships within the LMRWD)
- Shakopee (Scott County)

(Note: Pike Island is the only part of Ramsey County and the city of St. Paul that lies within LMRWD. Since Pike Island is not expected to urbanize, St. Paul will not be required to prepare a plan that conforms to the LMRWD plan).

Within 30 days of the LMRWD board's adoption of the LMRWD plan, LMRWD will notify each local governmental unit of these requirements regarding local plan revision and adoption.

A local governmental unit can assume as much management control as it wishes through its approved local water management plan. LMRWD assumes that local government will continue to be the permitting authority for all land alteration activities. To continue as the permitting authority, the local government must outline its permitting process in its local water management plan, including the preliminary and final platting process. Even with local government assuming the permitting role, local governments must submit any proposed land alteration plans to LMRWD for review and comment, in accordance with the provisions of the proposed joint resolution. LMRWD may appeal the local

government's approval of a project if LMRWD believes the project is not consistent with the local water management plan.

Any proposed zoning changes in a local governmental unit with an approved local water management plan will be reviewed by LMRWD for conformance with the local plan. If the proposed zoning change will result in changes to the approved rates and volumes of stormwater runoff, the local plan will need to be amended.

6.5.1 Requirements for Local Water Management Plans

Local water management plans are required to conform to MS 103B.235, MN Rules 8410.0160, MN Rules 8410.0170 and LMRWD's plan. MN Rules 8410.0160 requires (in part) that:

“Each local plan must include sections containing a table of contents; executive summary; land and water resource inventory; establishment of goals and policies; relation of goals and policies to local, regional, state, and federal plans, goals, and programs; assessment of problems; corrective actions; financial considerations; implementation priorities; amendment procedures; implementation program; and an appendix. Each community should consider including its local plan as a chapter of its local comprehensive plan.”

MN Rules 8410.0170 explains in more detail the general requirements given above.

The policies and goals established by the local water management plan must be consistent with the LMRWD plan. The section of the local water management plan covering assessment of problems must include those problems identified in the LMRWD plan that affect the local unit of government. The corrective action proposed must be limited to those actions that can be carried out at the local government level and must be consistent with the LMRWD plan. A local unit of government may use all or part of the LMRWD plan when developing its local plan.

LMRWD encourages local units of government to maintain stormwater systems (storm sewers, ponding areas, ditches, water level control structures, etc.) in good working order to prevent flooding and water quality problems. Generally, municipalities and counties are more likely than townships to have staff available to undertake maintenance and repair of their stormwater and ponding systems. In accordance with MN Rules 8410.0100, Subp. 6, LMRWD requires that local plans “...assess the need for periodic maintenance of public works, facilities and natural conveyance systems and specify any new programs or revisions to existing programs needed to accomplish its goals and objectives.” The local plans must also assess, at a minimum, the following maintenance issues, taken from MN Rules 8410.0100, Subp. 6:

- The need and frequency for street sweeping of public and private streets and parking lots.
- The need and frequency for inspecting stormwater outfalls, skimmers, sumps, and ponds.
- The adequacy of maintenance programs for stormwater facilities and water level control structures owned by both the community and private parties.
- The need for other maintenance programs as considered necessary.

Besides the above maintenance issues, local water management plans will be required to assess the following (taken from MN Rules 8410.0100, Subp. 6):

- The need to establish a water body classification system different from LMRWD's or to adopt the LMRWD water body classification system. If a different classification system is used, it must be correlated to the LMRWD classification system and approved by LMRWD.
- The need to establish local spill containment cleanup plans.
- The need for any other necessary management programs.

Local water management plans must identify clearly when the management programs will go into effect. All local plan controls and programs must be developed and in effect within two years of adoption of the last WMO plan in the local governmental unit.

LMRWD's general standards for local water management plans are as follows (taken from MN Statutes 103B.235, Subd. 2):

- Describe existing and proposed physical environment and land use.
- Define drainage areas and the volume rates and paths of stormwater runoff.
- Identify areas and elevations for stormwater storage adequate to meet performance standards established in the LMRWD plan.
- Define water quality and water quality protection methods adequate to meet performance standards established in the LMRWD plan.
- Identify regulated areas.
- Set forth an implementation program, including a description of official controls and, as appropriate, a capital improvement program.

LMRWD also requires that local units of government outline their permitting process for land and wetland alteration work in their local water management plans. LMRWD reserves the right to recommend to the local unit of government that a project that LMRWD considers to be inconsistent with the local management plan be denied. If the local unit of government proceeds to approve such a project, LMRWD will first appeal to the county and then to BWSR before taking legal action.

Previous sections of this plan describe other requirements for local water management plans, including:

- Section 5.2 requires amendment of local water management plans to incorporate limits and/or special protection methods/strategies identified in resource assessment plans. As local water management plans are revised, they will need to incorporate these changes.
- Section 5.3.2, policy 3, requires local plans to address disturbed shoreland issues.
- Section 5.3.4, policy 2, requires local plans to show the LMRWD existing and future dredge spoil sites located within their communities.
- Section 5.4, policy 6, requires local plans to address shoreland regulation issues; policy 7 requires local plans to require preparation of Runoff Management Plans (described in detail in Section 5.13); and policy 8 requires local plans to include design standards for new stormwater ponds to treat surface water runoff (see also Section 5.13).

- Section 5.5.1, policies 1, 2, and 3, describe the respective roles of LMRWD and local units of government pertaining to floodplain regulation. Generally, local units of government are responsible for floodplain regulation, unless they specifically give the authority to LMRWD.
- Section 5.5.2, policy 1, requires local plans to delineate subwatersheds and present detailed hydrologic information; policy 2 requires local plans to include maps showing the existing and proposed stormwater system, including ponds, pipes, drainageways and stormwater outfalls; policy 3 encourages the use of temporary surface storage and infiltration techniques; policy 4 places the responsibility for operation and maintenance of local government channels, drainageways and watercourses upon the local government; policy 5 requires plans to include an inventory of lake and stream outlets into the Minnesota River; policy 6 requires local plans to describe the local government's existing and/or proposed permit program; policy 7 requires local plans to set intercommunity flowrates; policy 8 encourages local plans to control flowrates crossing WMO boundaries and entering major water bodies; policy 9 requires 100-year level of protection; policy 10 requires a minimum of 5-year level of service.
- Section 5.6, policy 4, calls for coordination between local government and LMRWD in their education efforts.
- Section 5.8, policy 3, encourages land use and development practices that enhance groundwater infiltration without endangering water quality.
- Section 5.9, policy 1, states that LMRWD prefers local governments to be the LGUs for the Wetland Conservation Act; policy 5 requires that planning/zoning authorities maintain all wetland information and inventories; policy 6 calls for LMRWD to work with the LGUs to develop criteria for prioritizing wetlands; and policy 13 requires that local plans: consider the need for buffer zones, describe the wetland permitting process, address the need to develop ordinances requiring inspection and enforcement of replaced and restored wetlands, describe a wetland management classification system, identify high priority areas for wetland preservation and restoration, describe method for assessing functions and values, and describe any existing or proposed local wetland banking programs.
- Section 5.10, policy 1, calls for local governments to work with LMRWD and others to follow through with recommended actions for trout stream protection.
- Section 5.11, policy 1, requires local plans to include requirements for preparation of erosion control plans; policy 4 requires local government to fully undertake erosion control inspection and enforcement duties; policy 5 requires local plans to identify the Minnesota River bluffs, show areas of steep slopes, show areas of high erosion potential, and adopt policies to manage these areas; policy 8 requires local governments to adopt ordinances addressing erosion and sediment control.
- Section 5.13 requires that local plans incorporate the standards and criteria presented in that section.

6.5.2 LMRWD Review of Local Water Management Plans

Before the local unit of government adopts its plan, the plan must be submitted to all affected WMOs for review. The local government must also submit its plan to the Metropolitan Council, and to any counties with adopted groundwater plans, for a 45-day review. Within 60 days of receipt of the local plan, LMRWD will review the local plan for conformance with the LMRWD plan. As part of its review,

LMRWD will take into consideration any comments received from the Metropolitan Council and the counties. LMRWD will approve or disapprove all or part of the local plan within the 60-day time frame, unless an extension is agreed to by the local unit of government. If LMRWD does not complete its review, or fails to approve/disapprove the plan within the allotted time, and the local unit of government has not given an extension, the local plan will be considered approved (MN Rules 8410.0170, Subp. 12 and MN Statutes 103B.235, Subd. 3 and 3a).

Once LMRWD has approved the local plan, the local government must adopt and implement its plan within 120 days and amend its official controls within 180 days of plan approval. The local government must notify LMRWD (and the other affected WMOs) within 30 days of plan adoption and implementation, and adoption of necessary official controls.

Any amendments to the local plan must be submitted to LMRWD for review and approval prior to their adoption by the local government. The LMRWD review process is the same as for the original local plan.

Table 6-1. Planned Implementation Activities

ID Number	Planned Activity	Whose Project/ Who Pays	Proposed Expenditures 1999 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2000 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2001 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2002 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2003 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2004 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2005 - 2009 ¹
1	Acquire dredge material disposal sites	LMRWD	\$5,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$5,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$5,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$5,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$5,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$5,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$5,000/year (9-Foot Fund)
2	Acquire permanent road access to dredge material disposal sites.	LMRWD & Municipalities	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000/year (9-Foot Fund)
3	Manage LMRWD's dredge material disposal sites.	LMRWD	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000/year (9-Foot Fund)
4	Develop and implement public/private dredge material management plan.	LMRWD & COE	\$0	\$5,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)	\$2,000 (9-Foot Fund)
5	Complete and revise joint resolutions with local governments regarding water management responsibilities.	LMRWD & local units of govt.	\$2,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$500	\$500/year
6	Maintain active citizen and technical advisory committees.	LMRWD	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000/year
7	Participate in discussions regarding possible expansion/contraction of the District boundaries.	LMRWD	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
8	Project/plan review.	LMRWD	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000/year
9	Inspect projects.	LMRWD	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000/year
10	Administer LMRWD's floodplain regulations during interim period between LMRWD plan approval and local plan/ordinance approval.	LMRWD	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$1,000/year
11	Publish and distribute annual newsletter.	LMRWD	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500/year
12	Identify and inventory the District's resources, distribute map to local units of government.	LMRWD	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	Collect existing water quality, biological and physical data for priority resources.	LMRWD	\$0	\$6,000	\$5,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000/year
14	Assess priority resources & report results - Phase 1: data collection.	LMRWD & other units of government	\$0	\$10,000 Dean Lk. & Assumption Cr.	\$10,000 Courthouse Lk. & Credit R.	\$10,000 Nine Mile Cr. & Purgatory Cr.	\$10,000 Riley Cr. & Bluff Cr.	\$10,000 Bavaria (East Chaska) Cr. & Chaska Cr.	\$10,000/year Carver Cr., other trout streams, other named lakes & minor tributary streams
15	Assess priority resources & report results - Phase 2: data and watershed analysis.	LMRWD & other units of government	\$0	\$0	\$30,000 Dean Lk. & Assumption Cr.	\$30,000 Courthouse Lk. & Credit R.	\$30,000 Nine Mile Cr. & Purgatory Cr.	\$30,000 Nine Mile Cr. & Purgatory Cr.	\$30,000/year Follow priority list
16	Lead consensus effort to develop goals for priority resources; assist (technically and financially) with development of resource plan for priority resources; publish plan.	LMRWD & other units of government	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000 Dean Lk. & Assumption Cr.	\$15,000 Courthouse Lk. & Credit R.	\$15,000 Nine Mile Cr. & Purgatory Cr.	\$15,000/year Follow priority list

Table 6-1 (cont). Planned Implementation Activities

ID Number	Planned Activity	Whose Project/ Who Pays	Proposed Expenditures 1999 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2000 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2001 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2002 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2003 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2004 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2005 - 2009 ¹
17	Implement resource plan: undertake petitioned projects, provide financial support for capital projects, and public information efforts.	LMRWD & other units of government	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²
18	Review local water management plans for conformance with LMRWD plan.	LMRWD	\$500	\$1,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$4,000	\$4,000/year
19	Minnesota River floodplain redefinition study	LMRWD, DNR, COE & USGS	\$0	\$50,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
20	Collect and distribute hydrologic information pertaining to the Minnesota River and needed by communities for planning and resource management.	LMRWD	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000/year
21	Identify, inventory, and map gully erosion and resultant siltation sites in LMRWD. Add information to database.	LMRWD & local units of govt.	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,000	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500/year
22	Participate in Metropolitan Council's Watershed Outlet Monitoring Program to monitor stream outlets into the Minnesota River.	LMRWD, Met Council, & other WMOs	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000/year
23	Undertake petitioned bank erosion control projects for bank control measures on the Minnesota River.	LMRWD	\$125,000 ³	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²
24	Undertake petitioned bank erosion control projects for bank control measures on tributaries of the Minnesota River.	LMRWD	\$0	\$0	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²	\$25,000 to \$200,000 (to be funded through MS 103D.905) ²
25	Greenbelts - acquire conservation easements for stream buffers, shorelands, and other sensitive natural areas.	LMRWD & local/ state units of govt.	\$0	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$5,000/year
26	Develop public access to, and facilitate public enjoyment of, the District's resources.	LMRWD, DNR & local units of government	\$30,000 ⁴	\$15,000 ⁴	\$15,000 ⁴	\$15,000 ⁴	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000/year
Add Already Committed Projects			\$70,000⁵						
			\$35,000⁶	\$15,000⁶					
			\$50,000⁷	\$14,500⁸					
TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION COSTS			\$376,000	\$273,500 to \$448,500	\$219,500 to \$369,500	\$201,000 to \$351,000	\$221,000 to \$346,000	\$216,500 to \$341,500	\$211,000 to \$336,000
FUNDING SOURCES									

Table 6-1 (cont). Planned Implementation Activities

ID Number	Planned Activity	Whose Project/ Who Pays	Proposed Expenditures 1999 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2000 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2001 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2002 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2003 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2004 ¹	Proposed Expenditures 2005 - 2009 ¹
	Funds Assumed to be Available from Remainder of \$200,000 Annual Administrative Fund Levy (M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 3)		\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000
	Existing Funds Available in Dedicated 9-Foot Channel Fund Created by Prior Special Assessment (Fund Balance Approx. \$369,000 on 1/1/99)		\$11,000	\$14,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000
	Funds to be Obtained from Annual Levy for <i>Petitioned</i> Basic Water Management Features Projects (M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 3) or <i>Non-petitioned</i> Watershed/Sub-watershed Projects (103B.241/ 103B.251)		\$0	\$25,000 to \$200,000 ²	\$50,000 to \$200,000 ²	\$50,000 to \$200,000 ²	\$75,000 to \$200,000 ²	\$75,000 to \$200,000 ²	\$75,000 to \$200,000 ²
	Funds Possibly Obtained from Survey and Data Acquisition Fund Levy (M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 8 - funding limited to \$50,000 levy every 5 years)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
	Funds from Administration Fund Reserves (Fund Balance Approx. \$651,000 on 1/1/99)		\$285,000	\$154,500	\$78,500	\$50,000	\$45,000	\$40,500	\$35,000
	Projected Administrative Fund Reserve Balance, End of Year (Including Interest)		\$388,000	\$248,000	\$180,000	\$138,000	\$99,000	\$62,000	\$29,000

¹ All figures in 1999 dollars.
² Assumes project funding using MS 103D.905, Subd. 3, which limits annual LMRWD levies to approximately \$235,000 (0.00798% of taxable market value).
³ LMRWD Minnesota Riverbank Protection Project.
⁴ Cost-share with Murphy's Landing for Minnesota River access and other improvements.
⁵ Cost-share with City of Burnsville for Burnsville Nature Center.
⁶ Cost-share with City of Chaska for water quality project(s) (\$50,000 was earmarked for Chaska Park water quality diversion project that was not implemented).
⁷ Prior Lake-Spring Lake WD/City of Shakopee/LMRWD/Developer cooperative project to divert stormwater flows from Dean Lake.
⁸ Cost-share with City of Carver for Carver local water management plan.

Table 6-2. Status of Local Water Management Planning

Local Unit of Government	Plan Completion Date	WMO Approval Status
City of Bloomington	Plan now under development (Completion likely in 2000)	N/A
City of Burnsville	1996	Approved by Black Dog, Vermillion River, and Credit River WMOs
City of Carver	Plan now under development	N/A
City of Chanhassen	1994	Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek WD and Minnehaha Creek WD
City of Chaska	1990 (1994, Water Quality Management Plan)	Approved by Hazeltine-Bavaria WMO
City of Eagan	1990 (Revision likely in 2000)	Approved by the Gun Club Lake WMO
City of Eden Prairie	1970/Revision underway	N/A
City of Lilydale	1990/revised 1997	Approved by Lower Mississippi River WMO
City of Mendota	No plan	N/A
City of Mendota Heights	1993	Approved by Lower Mississippi River WMO
City of Savage	1996	Approved by Lower Minnesota River WD?, Prior Lake-Spring Lake WD and Credit River WMO
City of Shakopee	1994	Approved by Prior Lake-Spring Lake WD;
Chaska Township	No plan	N/A
Jackson Township	No plan	N/A
Louisville Township	No plan	N/A
Carver County	No plan	N/A
Dakota County	No plan	N/A
Hennepin County	No plan	N/A
Scott County	No plan	N/A

Table 6-3. Prioritization for Assessing the District's Resources

Priority	Category				
	Upland Lakes	Floodplain Lakes	Trout Streams	OtherStreams	
				Inter-WMO	Minor/Other
1	Dean Lake				
2			Assumption Creek		
3	Courthouse Lake				
4				Credit River	
5				Nine Mile Creek	
6				Purgatory Creek	
7				Riley Creek	
8				Bluff Creek	
9				Bavaria (East Chaska) Creek	
10				Chaska Creek	
11				Carver Creek	
12			Kennaley's Creek		
13			Unnamed #1		
14			Unnamed #4		
15			Unnamed #7		
16			Eagle Creek		
17					34 minor tributary streams
18		11 named lakes			