
2. Implementation and Work Plan

2.1 Overview

As noted in Section 1.2, this WMP is intended to be implementation oriented. The SWWD is positioned for successful plan implementation by the establishment of clearly linked resource issues, District goals and policies, and specific action items. Ten management areas have been defined through which the SWWD will work to execute the WMP. An annual evaluation tool (see Section 5.2.3) is an essential component of this WMP to provide a feedback mechanism regarding the success of plan implementation.

The SWWD will utilize a long range work plan to identify, prioritize, and prepare for District implementation activities. The long range work plan (LRWP) consists of the action items articulated in Section 5.2.2. The long range work plan defines a probable implementation timeframe as well as an estimated index for successive years' budget. (Information on watershed financing is found in Section 7.4.) The long range work plan will generally guide District activities for the foreseeable future. However, it is anticipated that the long range work plan will be periodically reviewed and updated.

The District will annually prioritize work activities from the long range work plan which will constitute the targeted efforts for the coming year. These work activities represent the annual work plan for the SWWD. The intent of the annual work plan is to provide flexibility to address emerging issues or new opportunities. Thus, priorities set for items in the long range work plan can be modified during development of annual work plans. Unforeseen items not on the long range work plan can be added to the annual work plan.

2.2 Annual Work Plan and Budget

2.2.1 Overview

The annual work plan is intended to be a fluid document which may change from year-to-year according to the District's achievements, new opportunities or emerging issues. The annual progress evaluation tool detailed in Section 5.2.3 provides feedback necessary to revise and adjust the work plan each year. The annual work plan allows the District to establish an operating budget range for the short term while maintaining connection to the overall long term actions targeted by the District. The initial annual work plan anticipated by the SWWD (based on this WMP and associated approach) will be developed for 2007. Subsequent to this initial work plan and progress evaluation, new action items may be added, reprioritized, shelved, or similarly addressed.

2.2.2 Annual Work Plan and Budget

According to Minnesota Statute 103D.911 the SWWD must hold a hearing and adopt a budget on or before September 15th of each year. The SWWD will ~~use~~ review the LRWP contained in the WMP in **May** of each year. At this time the Board will determine if there are additions or subtractions to the LRWP. The preliminary annual budget will be established by the priority, begin date and estimated budget. This list of action items will determine the annual work plan and budget. An assessment of the previous year's accomplishments and incomplete action items will aid in determining additions to the coming year work plan and budget. This will be completed in **June** of each year.

The SWWD Board will provide the annual work plan and budget to the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) for review and comment. The CAC will convene in **June** of each year. With input from the CAC, the SWWD Board will prioritize the action items in the annual work plan and establish the preliminary budget for certification to the County. The annual work plan and budget will provide detailed tasks and budgets for projects and programs. All tasks will relate to one of the ten management areas described in the WMP. Once the annual work plan and budget is established, the SWWD Board will consult with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for coordination of potential watershed projects with local capital improvement plans.

2.2.3 Implementation and Plan Amendments

During development of the annual budget, the SWWD Board will review the LRWP for additions or deletions. If it is determined by the SWWD Board that changes to the LRWP are required, those changes will be considered "Minor Amendments" to the WMP. These amendments will be carried forward parallel to the budget process. The amendment process is discussed in Section 7.2.

2.3 Coordinated Capital Improvement Program for Stormwater Management

2.3.1 Program Need, Timing and Cost

As a result of developing and implementing its water resource management plan, working with local government units within the watershed on local water plans and capital projects, and carrying out its permitting program, the District is aware of the challenges posed to sound, comprehensive surface water management by existing urban development. Existing development and impervious surface within the watershed constructed at an earlier time may not have applied due attention to minimizing and managing stormwater impacts under pre-existing regulatory conditions. Stormwater management in these areas may be improved through retrofitting, redevelopment, roadway and sewer projects; however, space and options often are constrained and measures may be expensive.

To facilitate actions to improve stormwater management in existing developed areas, the District administers a Coordinated Capital Improvement Program (CCIP) to provide financial assistance to local land use and public works authorities for water quality improvement projects. The CCIP seeks to:

- Facilitate local government units within the District to explore water quality improvement opportunities and incorporate those opportunities into routine infrastructure operation and maintenance projects;
- Promote closer collaboration between local units and the District on water quality improvement efforts as an element of capital improvement plans;
- Foster stormwater management innovation and create demonstration/education examples; and
- Defray local costs in the broader, watershed-wide interest of improving water quality.

The program will operate for the entire period of the Watershed Management Plan. Each year, the Board will set a budget and collect sub-watershed stormwater utility fees for the program pursuant to the Board's assessment of needs and funding limitations.

2.3.2 CCIP Description

District cost-share funding for projects will be determined based on a formula and funding cap per project. An efficient process for reviewing proposals and committing cost-share funds is necessary. Local government or District representatives often become aware of opportunities within the context of an infrastructure maintenance project. For water quality elements to be incorporated into the project, or to make use of the retrofit cost efficiencies that the project offers, action often must occur quickly. For these reasons, the District does not intend to undertake further formal amendments to this plan as individual projects are identified. Rather, the District intends to follow a set of steps in reviewing individual proposals that will ensure thorough review and a full opportunity for input from public agencies, watershed residents and other interested parties.

First, the overall program funding level will be set annually through the District's budgeting process, not to exceed \$1,000,000 per year. This is an open process that occurs in August and early September each year, and includes a public hearing required by statute at which all parties can review and address the Board of Managers on the District's proposed program budget.

Second, cost-share funding proposals will be processed and evaluated according to a written set of guidelines adopted by the Board of Managers. The primary purposes of these guidelines are to: (a) provide for consistency in District review and selection of proposals for funding; (b) direct District funds to projects and locations that will improve water quality in the most effective manner and consistent with the priorities of the District plan; and (c) ensure that funding is formalized in an agreement that guarantees project completion and maintenance. The Board may revise these terms from time to time, but any revisions will not deviate from the three purposes cited. The Board of Managers will specify the following:

- A funding cap (max funding per project) and funding formula of estimated project cost, limited to eligible water quality improvement elements.
- A list of eligible water quality improvements to be updated from time to time to incorporate new technology, science and data.
- Projects must be designed using the standards adopted by the District in the SWWD Standards Manual and Developers Packet.

- An annual solicitation/funding cycle with limited opportunity for funding outside of the cycle.
- Application requirements including conceptual design, project justification including water quality benefit estimates, and detailed cost estimate.
- Evaluation criteria include that the project:
 - Addresses stormwater that drains to a priority waterbody;
 - Demonstrates a reduction in runoff volume or identified pollutants;
 - Is designed consistent with established standard engineering practices and level of service; and
 - Concerns a redevelopment retrofit, existing development improvements or routine infrastructure operation and maintenance, and not new development.
- Required execution of a written agreement including, among other things, the applicant's commitment to indefinite maintenance of the funded facilities.
- Funds payable only on project completion.
- All project documentation maintained in the public record.

Third, the citizens' advisory committee will have a formalized role in reviewing submitted proposals and the Board carefully will consider the committee's recommendations.

Fourth, the District will follow the procedure of Minnesota Statutes §103B.251 before funding approval. This section requires that a public hearing be held to consider the merits of the proposal, with prior published notice as well as written notice to all counties and cities within the watershed. The Board will hear and consider all public comments and make funding decisions in open public meeting.

2.3.3 Program Funding Source and Financial Impact

Stormwater quality improvements made under the CCIP are more local in nature, however, cumulatively these projects will benefit the watershed as a whole. As improvements are more local, the CCIP program is funded on a sub-watershed basis through the collection of stormwater utility fees as described in 7.4.2. In following the sub-watershed approach, *ad valorem* levies will not be used to fund the CCIP. Other funding sources such as regional, state or federal grants may be applied to the program if the District is successfully awarded such grants for this purpose. The financial impact of the program on property taxpayers within the sub-watershed will not be substantial. The annual cost of the program is expected to constitute approximately 3-5% of the District's overall annual expenditures. The District will commit enough resources to the CCIP annually, as an advantageous approach to water quality improvements. Further, the program was developed specifically to complement local government unit capital improvement projects as a tool to achieve water quality gains cost-effectively. The financial impact of the program on local units of government will be beneficial, as it will reduce stormwater infrastructure costs. Local units receiving program funds will assume maintenance and other obligations involving cost, but if that cost is unacceptable in a given case, program funding is voluntary and need not be accepted.

2.4 Long Range Work Plan

The long range work plan consists of action items based on policies within this WMP. The long range work plan provides only a general illustration of the cost range of an action item and a potential implementation schedule. It is expected that as annual work plans are developed, the cost ranges of action items will be improved. The implementation timeline provides a general frame of reference for District activities and is not intended to be an absolute schedule. Many factors influence the ability to initiate and complete action items including funding availability, activities of partners or other interest groups, or other elements.

The long range work plan will generally guide District activities for the foreseeable future. The initial long range work plan anticipated by the SWWD (based on this WMP and associated approach) is shown as Table 2.1. While it is anticipated that the overall long range work plan will be periodically reviewed and updated, action items may be added, removed, or reprioritized at any time.

The long range work plan contains a strong focus on assessing issues and providing a technical framework for resource management. The completion of assessments and / or studies will generate *outcomes* which will be added to the long range work plan. Thus the long range work plan also provides for construction of improvements that have been identified in the District's past studies and assessments. Other construction projects may be identified through future studies and will be incorporated into the long range work plan as updated from time to time. Current known construction projects in the long range work plan for the South Washington Subwatershed are summarized as Capital Improvement Projects in Table 2.2. Current known construction projects in the long range work plan for the East Mississippi Subwatershed are summarized as Capital Improvement Projects in Table 2.3. Current known construction projects in the long range work plan for the Lower St. Croix Subwatershed are summarized as Capital Improvement Projects in Table 2.4.

Table 2.2 – South Washington Subwatershed Capital Improvement Projects in Long Range Work Plan

<i>Capital Improvement Projects</i>	<i>Estimated Budget*</i>	<i>City Cost Share Involved?</i>
1. Central Draw Overflow: design and construction of watershed overflow to Mississippi River through the East Ravine Subwatershed.		
1A. Central Draw Overflow Phase I	\$1,650,000	Yes
1B. Central Draw Overflow Phase II	\$16,000,000	Yes
2. Wilmes Lake Subwatershed: Flood Damage Reduction		
2A. Non-structural flood damage reduction projects and programs	\$200,000	Yes

2B. Storage locations within Wilmes Lake subwatershed in conjunction with other projects	\$9,000,000	Yes
--	-------------	-----

*Based on long range work plan action item 2.12 with line items having on-going or pending status.

Table 2.3 – East Mississippi Subwatershed Capital Improvement Projects in Long Range Work Plan

<i>Capital Improvement Projects</i>	<i>Estimated Budget*</i>	<i>City Cost Share Involved?</i>
1. Newport Ravine: Stabilize the Newport Ravine and reduce the volume and velocity of stormwater runoff entering the ravine.		
1A. Newport Ravine Stabilization Phase I	\$1,040,000	Yes
1B. Newport Ravine Stabilization Phase II	\$780,000	No
2. Clear Channel Pond Relief		
2A. Property Acquisition	\$450,000	Yes
2B. Stormwater Storage Facility Study & Design	\$120,000	Yes
2C. Construct Storage Facility	\$450,000	Yes
3. Grey Cloud Island Slough Crossing	\$630,000	Yes

Table 2.4 – Lower St. Croix Subwatershed Capital Improvement Projects in Long Range Work Plan

<i>Capital Improvement Projects</i>	<i>Estimated Budget*</i>	<i>City Cost Share Involved?</i>

* There are not currently any Capital Improvement Projects for the Lower St. Croix Subwatershed in the SWWD Long Range Workplan.

2.5 Relationship of Implementation Elements

Various elements of the WMP interact to produce an overall implementation strategy for the SWWD. A critical element is the assessment of issues (Chapter 3). The policies set forth by the District (Chapter 5) are intended to address the identified issues. The long range action items are the specific steps the SWWD will take to implement policies and address watershed issues.