

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

**4 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM ..... 4-2**

4.1 Administrative and managerial.....4-2

4.2 Coordination with local, state, and federal governments and non-government organizations.....4-6

4.3 Studies and Programs.....4-6

    4.3.1 Cost-Share Incentive and Water Quality Restoration Program ..... 4-7

    4.3.2 Dredge Management ..... 4-7

    4.3.3 Eagle Creek Bank Restoration at Town & Country RV Park Feasibility Study ..... 4-7

    4.3.4 Education and Outreach Program ..... 4-7

    4.3.5 Fen Private Land Acquisition Study ..... 4-8

    4.3.6 Fen Stewardship and Management Program..... 4-8

    4.3.7 Gully Inventory and Assessment Program ..... 4-8

    4.3.8 Implementation of the Sustainable Lake Management Plans ..... 4-8

    4.3.9 Monitoring Program and Detailed Data Assessments..... 4-8

    4.3.10 Project and Permit Reviews ..... 4-9

    4.3.11 Seminary Fen Restoration Site C-2 Study ..... 4-9

    4.3.12 Spring Creek Site 3 Design Feasibility Study..... 4-9

    4.3.13 Trout Streams Geomorphic Assessments ..... 4-9

    4.3.14 Watershed Management Plan..... 4-11

    4.3.15 Water Resources Restoration Fund ..... 4-11

4.4 Capital Improvement Projects ..... 4-11

4.5 Funding Mechanisms ..... 4-14

    4.5.1 Funding Statutes Available to Watershed District..... 4-14

    4.5.2 Emergency Projects ..... 4-16

    4.5.3 Proposed Funding Mechanisms ..... 4-16

    4.5.4 Petitioned Projects..... 4-17

31 **4 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**

32 This section presents the Implementation Program (Program) for the Plan. The District’s Program  
33 addresses water resources and programmatic issues discussed in Section 2 and applies the goals,  
34 policies, and strategies addressed in Section 3. The District’s Program consists of administrative and  
35 managerial efforts, coordination, studies, programs, capital improvement projects (CIPs), and  
36 funding mechanisms to successfully execute the Plan. Each element is described below. The  
37 Program schedule and budget are presented in Table 4-1.- This Program was updated in 2022 after  
38 several studies and CIPs were completed, and the amended Program comprises the years 2023  
39 through 2027~~Since this Plan was not completed in time for the 2017 budgeting cycle, this Program~~  
40 ~~begins in 2018 and ends in 2027.~~ The Program’s estimated impacts on residents and local  
41 government are presented in the next section. The District will review the implementation program  
42 every two years, at minimum.

43 **4.1 ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGERIAL**

44 Administrative and managerial efforts will be carried out by the District’s administrator. The  
45 administrator, and consultants will perform the District’s day-to-day operations and implement  
46 other elements of the Program, as discussed below. Administrative services also include legal, audit,  
47 and bookkeeping services, office space, office equipment, office rental, information management  
48 systems (e.g., computers, copiers, website, etc.), training, and general engineering services. The  
49 District’s general levy finances these efforts.

50

This page left blank intentionally.

**Table 4-1: Lower Minnesota River Watershed District - Implementation Program Budget for 2023-2027**

ACTION	Year				
	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>					
<b>Administrative and Managerial</b>					
General Administrative Services, Conferences, Coordination with LGUs, Stakeholders and other Project Partners, LGU Program Reviews, 9-Foot Channel, and Advisory Committees (Technical and Citizen)	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
<b>Administrative/Managerial Budget Total</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>
<b>Studies and Programs</b>					
Cost Share Incentive and Water Quality Restoration Program	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
<b>Dredge Management</b>	<b>\$240,000</b>	<b>\$240,000</b>	<b>\$240,000</b>	<b>\$126,000</b>	<b>\$240,000</b>
Eagle Creek Bank Restoration at Town & Country RV Park Feasibility Study		\$30,000			
Education and Outreach Program	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
Fen Private Land Acquisition Study		\$50,000	\$25,000		
Fen Stewardship and Management Program	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
Gully Inventory and Assessment Program	\$90,500	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
Trout Streams Geomorphic Assessments (Trout Streams)		\$50,000	\$50,000		\$100,000
Monitoring Program and Detailed Data Assessments	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Project and Permit Reviews	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Paleo-limnology Study (Floodplain Lakes)		\$50,000			
Implementation of the Sustainable Lake Management Plans (Trout Lakes)		\$50,000	\$50,000		\$50,000
Vegetation Management Plan				\$65,000	
Seminary Fen Ravines Site C-2 and C-3 Feasibility Studies	\$20,000	\$40,000			
Spring Creek Site 3 Design Feasibility Study	\$50,000				
<b>Watershed Management Plan</b>				<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>
Water Resources Restoration Fund	\$125,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$160,000	\$150,000
<b>Studies and Programs Budget Total</b>	<b>\$795,500</b>	<b>\$1,055,000</b>	<b>\$860,000</b>	<b>\$721,000</b>	<b>\$1,035,000</b>
<b>Capital Improvements</b>					
Assumption Creek Hydrology Restoration Project					
Carver Creek Restoration Project					
Minnesota River Corridor Management Project					
Groundwater Screening Tool Model					
District Boundary Modification Project					
Downtown Shakopee Targeted BMP Feasibility Study					
Dredge Site Restoration Project					
Eagle Creek (East Branch) Project					
East Creek Bank Stabilization Project					
East Creek Water Quality Treatment Project					
Minnesota River Assessment of Ecological and Economic Impacts of Sedimentation		\$25,000	\$30,000	\$45,000	\$50,000
Minnesota River Assessment of Water Storage Benefits and Opportunities		\$30,000	\$25,000	\$45,000	\$50,000
Minnesota River Floodplain Model Feasibility Study					
Minnesota River Sediment Reduction Strategy					
Minnesota River Study Area 3 – Bluff Stabilization Project	\$250,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		
Realignment of the Prior Lake Spring Lake Outlet Channel					
Riley Creek Project – Downstream of Flying Cloud Drive					
Schroeder's Acres Park/Savage Fen Stormwater Management Project					
Seminary Fen Restoration Site A					

ACTION	Year				
	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Seminary Fen Restoration Site B		\$50,000	\$25,000		
Seminary Fen Ravines Site C-2 and C-3 Design and Construction			\$55,000	\$50,000	\$65,000
Spring Creek Project					
West Chaska Creek Project					
Dredge Site Culvert Replacement				\$51,500	
Eagle Creek Bank Restoration at Town & Country RV Park Project			\$69,800	\$90,200	
Eagle Creek Brown Trout Habitat Improvements Project					\$70,000
Minnesota River Floodplain Modeling	\$75,000				
Shakopee Riverbank Stabilization Project		\$50,000	\$50,000		
Spring Creek Sites 1 and 2 Design and Construction Stabilization Project	47,100	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$70,000	
Spring Creek Vegetation Management Project	\$40,000				
Stormwater BMP at Parking Lot near Lewis Street West and Second Avenue West Project	\$50,000	\$50,000			
Vernon Avenue Upgrade at the Dredge Site				\$62,500	
Capital Improvements Budget Total	<del>\$165,000</del> 212,100 <del>\$250,000</del>	<del>\$350,000</del> \$125,000	<del>\$399,800</del> \$175,000	<del>\$324,200</del> \$140,000	<del>\$135,000</del> \$165,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	<del>\$1,257,600</del> 10,500 <del>\$775,000</del>	<del>\$1,655,000</del> \$775,000	<del>\$1,509,800</del> \$775,000	<del>\$1,295,200</del> \$800,000	<del>\$1,420,000</del> \$800,000
General Levy	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Planning and Implementation Levy	\$525,000	<del>\$525,000</del> 625,000	<del>\$525,000</del> 650,000	<del>\$550,000</del> 675,000	<del>\$550,000</del> 700,000
Metropolitan Council Grant	\$5,500	\$5,500	\$5,500	\$5,500	\$5,500
Dredge Material Management Grant	\$240,000	\$240,000	\$240,000	\$240,000	\$240,000
WBF - Pilot Funding (Scott)					
WBF - Pilot Funding (Carver)					
WBF - Pilot Funding (Dakota)					
WBF - Pilot Funding (Hennepin)					
Special Channel Maintenance Funding					
Grants	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Closed or Unrealized Projects	\$137,100	\$434,500	\$264,300	\$24,700	\$124,500
TOTAL REVENUE	<del>\$1,257,600</del> 210,500 <del>\$775,000</del>	<del>\$1,655,000</del> \$775,000	<del>\$1,509,800</del> \$775,000	<del>\$1,295,200</del> \$800,000	<del>\$1,420,000</del> \$800,000

54 **4.2 COORDINATION WITH LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS AND**  
 55 **NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS**

56 This sub-section implements the District’s role as a facilitator. It involves staff coordination with  
 57 local, state, and federal government and ~~non-government~~ non-government organizations,  
 58 participation in issues discussed during the State of Minnesota Legislative session, and collaboration  
 59 with the COE to secure federal funds for the Minnesota River 9-Foot Channel.

60 **Table 4-2: Coordination Strategies with District Partners**

Strategy	Coordination Partner(s)	Schedule
Strategy 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 2.3.1, 2.3.4	LGUs, BWSR, MPCA, Metropolitan Council, SWCDs and neighboring WDs and WMOs	Quarterly at a minimum
Strategy 1.3.3, 2.2.1, 6.1.1-2	LGUs	Annually
Strategy 2.2.3, 2.2.4	LGUs and SWCDs	Annually
Strategy 2.3.1-3, 3.2.1, 4.2.1-3	LGUs, BWSR, MPCA, Metropolitan Council, SWCDs, and neighboring WDs and WMOs	Annually
Strategy 3.3.1	DOH	Annually
Strategy 5.1.2 - 3	LGUs and BWSR	Annually
Strategy 7.1.1	MPCA, LGUs	Annually
Strategy 7.4.1	LGUs, SWCDs and shoreland property owners	Annually
Strategies 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.3.1	COE, LGUs	On-going
Strategies 9.1.1-4 and 9.2.1-3	LGUs, TAC, CAC, and SWCDs	On-going, Quarterly

61

62 **4.3 STUDIES AND PROGRAMS**

63 Studies and programs for the 2023-2027 Implementation Program include the following:

- 64 ● Cost Share Incentive and Water Quality Restoration Program (All strategies)
- 65 ● Dredge Management (Strategies 1.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.2.2, and 8.3.1)
- 66 ● ~~Periodic Assessments and Program Reviews (Strategy 1.3.1)~~
- 67 ● ~~Detailed Data Assessments (Strategy 2.3.2)~~
- 68 ● Eagle Creek Bank Restoration at Town & Country RV Park Feasibility Study (Strategies 4.2.1 and  
 69 7.4.1)
- 70 ● Education and Outreach Program (Strategies 1.2.1, 4.2.3, 8.1.1, 9.1.1-4 and 9.2.1-3)
- 71 ● Fen Private Land Acquisition Study (Strategy 4.3.1)
- 72 ● Fen Stewardship Program (Strategies 1.1.1 and 2.3.3)
- 73 ● Gully Inventory and Assessment Program (Strategy 7.3.1)
- 74 ● Implementation of the Sustainable Lake Management Plans (Strategies 3.2.1-2 and 3.3.1)
- 75 ● Monitoring Program and Detailed Data Assessments (Strategies 2.3.1-2 and 3.3.1)

- 76 ● Project and Permit Reviews (Strategies 1.1.1, 1.3.1., 3.2.2, 4.2.2, and 5.1.3)
- 77 ● Seminary Fen Restoration Site C-2 Study (Strategies 4.1.1 and 7.4.1)
- 78 ● Spring Creek Site 3 Design Feasibility Study (Strategy 7.4.1)
- 79 ● Trout Streams Geomorphic Assessments (Strategies 4.2.1)
- 80 ● Watershed Management Plan (All Strategies)
- 81 ● Water Resources Restoration Fund (Strategies 1.1.1, 3.2.1-2, and 3.3.1)

- 82 ● ~~Vegetation Management Standard/Plan (Strategy 7.2.1)~~
- 83 ● ~~Dredge Material Beneficial Use Plan (Strategy 8.2.2)~~
- 84 ● ~~9-Foot Channel Strategic Funding Plan (Strategy 8.3.4)~~

85 These studies and programs were introduced and described in Section 3. Budgets for each study and  
 86 program, with expenses beyond staff time, are shown in Table 4-1. These preliminary budgets are  
 87 reviewed and approved annually. Revenue for the operation and management of the District is  
 88 primarily through the District’s planning and implementation levy.

89 **4.3.1 Cost-Share Incentive and Water Quality Restoration Program**

90 The District values and supports efforts made by residents to help achieve their goals of the  
 91 District. Through the Cost Share Incentive and Water Quality Restoration Program, the  
 92 District hopes to engage citizens in community actions that protect local lakes, rivers,  
 93 streams, wetlands, and fens. Eligible Applicants must meet eligibility criteria and apply to  
 94 and be approved by the Board of Managers. The cost share and incentives will be reviewed  
 95 annually. Program effectiveness will be measured in two ways: 1) by comparing water quality  
 96 trends before and after projects are implemented, and 2) by how many projects are funded  
 97 through the program.

98 **4.3.2 Dredge Management**

99 The District will continue its role as the local sponsor responsible for providing placement sites for  
 100 the Army Corps of Engineers. The purpose is to place dredge material from the Minnesota River  
 101 and maintain a 9-foot-deep river channel. This program includes the identification of locations to  
 102 temporarily store dredge material from the river, private dredge spoil disposal and transfer, and  
 103 other beneficial uses of the dredge material.

104 **4.3.3 Eagle Creek Bank Restoration at Town & Country RV Park Feasibility Study**

105 Signs of hillslope failure have been observed near the campground on Main Branch of Eagle Creek  
 106 which is an added environmental stressor on the stream. The District will assess the eroding banks  
 107 at the campground and determine the urgency for stabilization on Eagle Creek.

108 **4.3.4 Education and Outreach Program**

109 The District’s education and outreach program consists of maintaining a Citizen Advisory  
 110 Committee, various social media accounts, and outreach to schools, partners, and non-governmental  
 111 organizations. As part of the District’s public education and outreach program support is provided

112 for the Citizen Advisory Committee that includes preparing monthly meeting agendas and minutes,  
113 securing educational presentations, reaching out to increase membership, and developing handouts.  
114 The District's social media accounts are managed and quarterly content calendars developed.  
115 Interpretive signage has been created for sites in the District with plans for additional signs at  
116 project and high resources value sites. Outreach to schools, partners, and non-governmental  
117 organizations focusing on educational support and outreach is conducted annually. Editing and  
118 updating the District's website is an on-going function.

#### 119 **4.3.5 Fen Private Land Acquisition Study**

120 To preserve and protect fens in the District in perpetuity, the District will map and assess the values  
121 of adjacent private properties to each fen and work with corresponding municipalities, -to consider  
122 opportunities to purchase private fen land for conservation. If land acquisition is not feasible, the  
123 District will consider opportunities to develop agreements with private property owners to ensure  
124 management of each fen is consistent and comprehensive.

#### 125 **4.3.6 Fen Stewardship and Management Program**

126 The District, in partnership with the DNR and Metropolitan Council, will develop a fen stewardship  
127 program for the District's fens. The effort will review historical data, assess current conditions, and  
128 develop a road map for restoration, preservation, and protection of the District's fens. Management  
129 plans or sustainability reports will be developed for all fens (starting with Seminary Fen and Savage  
130 Fen) to effectively manage and protect these groundwater-dependent resources.

#### 131 **4.3.7 Gully Inventory and Assessment Program**

132 The District performs routine gully inventories to provide information to municipalities within the  
133 watershed district on the current conditions of gullies and pipe outfalls; it also identifies new  
134 locations that may be contributing sediment into the Minnesota River. Once each gully inventory is  
135 complete, the District will coordinate collaboration sessions with city partners and other potential  
136 stakeholders to review findings, discuss high-priority sites, and strategize ways to stabilize gullies,  
137 repair outfalls, and prevent sediment from entering the Minnesota River.

#### 138 **4.3.8 Implementation of the Sustainable Lake Management Plans**

139 In 2019, the District developed Sustainable Lake Management Plans (SLMPs) ~~were~~  
140 developed for trout lakes in the District in 2019 within its boundary. Going forward, the ~~The~~  
141 District will plans to implement the recommended management strategies from the SLMPs,  
142 such as routine vegetation surveys and temperature profiling.

#### 143 **4.3.9 Monitoring Program and Detailed Data Assessments**

144 The District will continue to perform water quantity and quality monitoring of resources  
145 within the boundaries of the District. The District's Monitoring Plan will be updated to  
146 include the geochemistry recommendations from the Fens Sustainability Gaps Analysis

147 report and the monitoring parameter recommendations from the Quarry Lake Sustainable  
148 Lake Management Plan report.

149 Over the past few years, the District has collected a large quantity of water quality data. The  
150 Plan includes a preliminary assessment of lake water quality data. However, the last  
151 comprehensive data evaluation was completed in 2000. Periodic data evaluations are  
152 necessary to convert data into information that decision makers can use. Data collected for  
153 each water resource will be evaluated on a 3-year or 5-year cycle. As part of Strategy 1.3.1, all  
154 water resources within the watershed will be evaluated. An outcome of Strategy 1.3.1 will be  
155 groupings of water resources into High, Medium, and Low categories for detailed data  
156 assessments and timetables formulated for each category.

#### 157 **4.3.10 Project and Permit Reviews**

158 Through this permitting process, the District works with property owners and local governments to  
159 manage and permit regulate activities related to soil erosion and sediment control, floodplain and  
160 drainage alteration, stormwater management, and development on steep slopes within the  
161 boundaries of the District. Project and permit reviews will be performed to determine compliance  
162 with the District's rules and to protect the public's health and welfare, as well as the natural  
163 resources of the District.

#### 164 **4.3.11 Seminary Fen Restoration Site C-2 Study**

165 Seminary Fen Ravine Site C-2 is actively discharging sediment into the Seminary Fen Wetland  
166 Complex. This project will conduct a ravine study to estimate the sediment contribution to the  
167 Seminary Fen from the C-2 site and provide approaches and cost estimates for correcting the  
168 erosion problems.

#### 169 **4.3.12 Spring Creek Site 3 Design Feasibility Study**

170 Site 3 at Spring Creek is prioritized as a top at-risk site for erosion; however, a stabilization design  
171 has not been developed. The District will work with the landowner and the Carver Soil and Water  
172 Conservation District to conduct a feasibility study to determine the best approach to stabilize the  
173 area.

#### 174 **4.3.13 Trout Streams Geomorphic Assessments**

175 The trout streams geomorphic assessments will consider changes in trout stream alignment,  
176 confluence point(s), or geometry, baseflow, geometry, and selected stream reaches upstream and  
177 downstream of confluence point(s). Stream width-to-depth ratios, stream bed slope, meander  
178 pattern, and other bed features shall be modeled according to a stable reference reach. Reference  
179 reaches are nearby, hydrologically, and geomorphically stable stream segments. A reference reach  
180 could be upstream or downstream, or in a nearby watershed. Assessment of the current and future

181 discharge and sediment regimes shall be based on watershed conditions that are above stream or as  
182 close as possible to the stream. This assessment is generally considered twice during the Plan cycle.

183 **4.3.14 Watershed Management Plan**

184 The District’s Watershed Management Plan describes how the District will address water resources  
185 management over a period of 10 years. The District’s current plan will expire in 2027 and will  
186 require updates to plan the next 10 years of water resources management within the watershed  
187 district’s boundaries.

188 **Paleo-limnology Study**

189 ~~The District is home to several floodplain lakes. These lakes are inundated with water and sediment~~  
190 ~~from the Minnesota River. Through this project, the District will analyze sediment cores in two (2)~~  
191 ~~lakes to understand their quality and rate deposition over time.~~

192 **Fen Stewardship Program**

193 ~~The District, in partnership with the DNR and Metropolitan Council, will develop a fen stewardship~~  
194 ~~program for the District’s fens. The effort will review historical data, assess current conditions, and~~  
195 ~~develop a road map for restoration, preservation, and protection of the District’s fens.~~

196 **4.3.15 Water Resources Restoration Fund**

197 This broad-based fund implements Goals 2 and 3, which are to protect, improve, and restore surface  
198 water and groundwater quality within the District. This program will fund projects sponsored by  
199 LGUs that reduce urban nonpoint source pollution, improve, and protect groundwater quality, and  
200 promote surveys and studies of wetlands<sup>2</sup> (fen) health and management. Program effectiveness will  
201 be measured in two ways: 1) by comparing water quality trends before and after projects are  
202 implemented, and 2) by how many projects are funded through the program.

203 \_\_\_\_\_

204 **4.4 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

205 Water management organizations that have adopted a watershed management plan, in accordance  
206 with M.S. 103B.231, may certify for payment by the counties all or any part of the cost of capital  
207 improvement projects (CIPs) contained in the capital improvement program of the Plan. A copy of  
208 the Plan shall be forwarded to the county boards.

209 The District is required to hold a public hearing on the proposed CIP. The public hearing details  
210 must be published in a legal newspaper once a week for two successive weeks in counties that have  
211 affected waters and lands. The last publication shall occur not more than 30 days, or less than ~~ten~~  
212 (10) days before the hearing. The notice shall state the hearing's time and place, the general nature of  
213 the proposed improvement, the estimated cost, and the cost improvement's payment method,  
214 including the cost allocated to each county. At least ~~ten~~(10) days before the hearing, the District  
215 shall send notices by mail to the counties, to each home rule charter, or to each statutory city or  
216 town located wholly or partly within the District's territory. The District recognizes that failure to  
217 mail a notice (or failure to provide a notice without have defects in the notice) shall not invalidate  
218 the proceedings. After the proceedings and assessment statements have been filed with the auditor,  
219 each affected county shall pay its apportioned share of the project's total cost based on the  
220 engineer's reports or mManagers' order.

221 Table ~~4-3~~ contains descriptions and planning level cost estimates for the CIP identified for the  
222 period between the Plan amendment completed in 2022 adoption of this Plan and the biennial Plan  
223 review.

Table 4-3: Lower Minnesota River Watershed District – Capital Improvement Projects

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
<i>Capital Improvement Projects</i>				
Minnesota River Study Area 3 – Bluff Stabilization Project	To address riverbank erosion, we will analyze the design and construction of the Minnesota River at Study Area 3 project in Eden Prairie. A study was completed in October 2008 for the City of Eden Prairie in cooperation with the district. Our project will expand the 2008 study by collecting and analyzing additional data that will extend to the final design, permitting, and construction.	City of Eden Prairie	<del>\$350,000</del> <u>200,000</u>	2022 - <u>2025</u>
<u>Minnesota River Floodplain Modeling</u>	<u>The Lower Minnesota River Floodplain Model Feasibility Study determined that the hydrologic and hydraulic modeling commonly used to regulate development in the floodplain and evaluate Rule C permits are out of date. The hydrologic statistical analysis, based on the USGS streamgage at Jordan, has not been updated in 20 years, missed four of the top ten recorded floods on the Minnesota River and must be re-evaluated to determine the flood flows within the LMRWD reach. Following the hydrologic update, the hydraulic model of the Lower Minnesota River should be comprehensively updated to incorporate recent developments in the floodplain, the revised flow data, and better data were available to evaluate the flood risk within the Lower Minnesota River floodplain. The initial capital investment of updating the hydrology and hydraulic model will be followed by annual updates to maintain the hydraulic model and incorporate the most recent data from municipalities and LMRWD permits.</u>	<u>Army Corps of Engineers</u>	<u>\$75,000</u>	<u>2023</u>
<u>Spring Creek Vegetation Management Project</u>	<u>The creek will be prone to further erosion without the added protection of adequate vegetation. Vegetation management (e.g., removal of invasives, native plantings, etc.), particularly in the floodplain and channel banks, will be explored with the property owners.</u>	<u>Carver SWCD</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>	<u>2023</u>
<u>Stormwater BMP at Parking Lot near Lewis Street West and Second Avenue West Project</u>	<u>This stormwater best management practice project will be coordinated with the parking lot rehabilitation near Lewis Street West and Second Avenue West near Pablo's restaurant in Shakopee. The project focuses on providing water quality treatment to untreated stormwater runoff that is routed directly to the Minnesota River.</u>	<u>City of Shakopee</u>	<u>\$750,000 (District's Contribution: \$50,000)</u>	<u>2023 - 2024</u>
Seminary Fen Restoration Site B	A partially drained 17-acre wetland from Falls Curve Road to Old Highway 12, <del>which that</del> is predominantly growing reed canary grass, will be restored. The restoration involves disabling the drainage system and restoring vegetation.	City of Chaska and <u>MNDNR</u>	\$75,000	2024 - 2025
<u>Shakopee Riverbank Stabilization Project</u>	<u>This project will include stabilizing sections of the Minnesota River riverbank that are eroding along the City of Shakopee's parallel trunk sanitary sewer line that flows to L-16 and other storm sewer outlets.</u>	<u>City of Shakopee</u>	<u>\$5,280,000 (District's contribution: \$100,000)</u>	<u>2024 - 2025</u>
<u>Spring Creek Site 1 and 2 Stabilization Project</u>	<u>After the vegetation management project is complete, Site 1 and Site 2 along Spring Creek will be stabilized using the Carver SWCD's designs (increased riprap size and standard gradation recommended).</u>	<u>Carver SWCD</u>	<u>\$270,000</u>	<u>2024 - 2026</u>
<u>Eagle Creek Bank Restoration at Town &amp; Country RV Park Project</u>	<u>The District will develop a design and stabilize the hillslope failure near the campground on Main Branch of Eagle Creek to reduce sedimentation to the creek.</u>	<u>MNDNR, City of Savage</u>	<u>\$160,000</u>	<u>2025 - 2026</u>

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
Seminary Fen Ravines Site C-2 and C-3 Design and Construction	The final design and construction will be done for the Ravine Sites C-2 and C-3, which are discharging sediment into the Seminary Fen Wetland Complex.	City of Chaska and DNR	\$170,000	2025 - 2027
<u>Dredge Site Culvert Replacement</u>	<u>A culvert near the site entrance needs to be removed and replaced. The District will work with the Army Corps of Engineers to perform the culvert replacement.</u>	<u>Army Corps of Engineers</u>	<u>\$51,500</u>	<u>2026</u>
<u>Vernon Avenue Upgrade at the Dredge Site</u>	<u>Approximately two-thirds of a mile of Vernon Avenue (from Hwy 13 to the site entrance) requires upgrading to allow for increased truck traffic. The District will coordinate with the Army Corps of Engineers to upgrade Vernon Avenue.</u>	<u>Army Corps of Engineers</u>	<u>\$62,500</u>	<u>2026</u>
<u>Eagle Creek Brown Trout Habitat Improvements Project</u>	<u>Background research indicates the East Branch historically has been able to support a more reliable brown trout population despite having some of the worst habitat conditions in the watershed. The District will complete habitat improvements in the East Branch to support brown trout populations.</u>	<u>MNDNR, USFWS</u>	<u>\$70,000</u>	<u>2027</u>
<u>Assumption Creek Hydrology Restoration Project</u>	<u>Assumption Creek is a trout stream, so it is important to maintain the temperature of groundwater discharge. According to the City of Chaska, portions of the creek dry out periodically. It is unknown exactly what has reduced the hydrology of the creek. It may have been the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' historic creek rerouting for the brick factory, road construction, or other development effects. The project described here will evaluate the opportunities available to resupply the groundwater hydrology to the creek.</u>	<u>City of Chaska and DNR</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>	<u>2019</u>
<u>Carver Creek Restoration Project</u>	<u>This will include stabilizing the outer bends with toe protection, grading banks to a more stable slope, and stabilizing the gully.</u>	<u>City of Carver, Carver WMO, Carver County SWCD and USFWS</u>	<u>\$95,000</u>	<u>2019 - 2020</u>
<u>Minnesota River Corridor Management Project</u>	<u>Using the Minnesota River as a focal point, this project will examine issues facing the river's complex natural system, a shared resource and a place where varied interests and other systems converge. We seek to (1) create greater understanding of the Lower Minnesota River Corridor and its landscape, (2) demonstrate a desired future for the river and how change in the surrounding landscape can help attain this future, (3) suggest a structure or framework by which the vision can be implemented, and (4) identify shared community and public values that form the basis of the project. (This design is modeled after the Vermillion River Corridor Plan.)</u>	<u>All District LGUs</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>2020 - 2021</u>
<u>Groundwater Screening Tool Model</u>	<u>The District will develop a district specific groundwater model that can be used as a preliminary screening tool for the evaluation of groundwater appropriation requests related to four fens within the district (Black Dog, Fort Snelling, Nicols, and Quarry Island). The goal of the model is to define the approximate extent of the recharge zones for the fens and provide a method for evaluating whether the proposed groundwater withdrawals may cause significant decline in head at one or more of the referenced fens.</u>	<u>DNR</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>	<u>2018 - 2020</u>

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
District Boundary Modification Project	District staff will work with BWSR and the neighboring watershed districts and water management organizations to review and possibly modify the district's jurisdictional boundary.	BWSR, Carver County WMO, and Riley — Purgatory Bluff Creek WD	\$10,000	2018
Downtown Shakopee Targeted BMP Feasibility Study	A feasibility study will be done in downtown Shakopee to identify opportunities for implementing the targeted best management practices.	City of Shakopee	\$50,000	2022
Dredge Site Restoration Project	This project consists of implementing the site restoration project identified in the February 15, 2017, <i>Estimate of Probable Cost, Cargill East River (MN—14.2 RMP) Dredge Material Site</i> technical memorandum prepared by Burns & McDonnell, Young Environmental Consulting Group, LLC, and Berrini & Associates, LLC, for the Cargill East River (MN—14.2 RMP) Dredge Material Site located on the Minnesota River in Savage, Minnesota.	BWSR	\$480,000	2018—2019
Eagle Creek (East Branch) Project	This project will restore approximately 2,400 feet of stream and repair erosion under the 128th Street Bridge. The goals of the project are to reduce erosion and improve fish habitat. Due to beaver dams, the stream cuts into three valley walls, contributing to significant deposits of sediment.	DNR, MN Trout Unlimited and City of Savage.	\$20,000	2018—2019
East Creek Bank Stabilization Project	Identified in the East Chaska Creek Restoration feasibility study, the scour hole downstream of Crosstown Boulevard Bridge will be repaired, bank armoring installed, toe protection and grade control structures added behind Cuzzys Brickhouse Restaurant, and bank armoring and toe protection installed on the right bank of East Oak Street.	City of Chaska, MPCA and BWSR	\$50,000	2019
East Creek Water Quality Treatment Project	This feasibility study reports that the ideal site to construct a treatment wetland was south of the creek in two vacant lots along Chaska Boulevard. Most lots there are paved right up to the edge of the creek bank. The flow could be diverted from the creek channel into a stormwater treatment system to provide for sediment removal, flood storage, and bacteria treatment.	City of Chaska and MPCA	\$75,000	2019—2020
Minnesota River Assessment of Ecological and Economic Impacts of Sedimentation	This project will examine sedimentation in the Lower Minnesota River Watershed including monitoring, modeling, and analyzing sediment sources, sinks, and pathways in the watershed; summarizing how sources, sinks, and pathways may have changed; and estimating the economic and ecological effects of sedimentation. The project team will look at how sedimentation (1) changes the stage-discharge relationships that may cause flooding, (2) generates costs to maintain a commercial navigation channel on the Minnesota River, and (3) affects the watershed with its ecological conditions. Through these analyses, a new baseline can be established, and an understanding created of how changes in land use will alter the watershed baseline and create a new condition.	BWSR and Army Corps of Engineers	\$150,000	2024—2027

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
Minnesota River Assessment of Water Storage Benefits and Opportunities.	Using the Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework (ACPF) and the Prioritize, Target, and Measure Application (PTMApp), we will determine if a flow reduction would benefit from the placement of storage measures in key locations throughout the basin. This analysis will help us understand if the threshold for meaningful change can be realized to recommend specific levels of storage in the basin. The analysis is needed to accomplish the desired outcomes: (1) hydro-correct DEMs for the lower watershed where storage impacts are desired, (2) run ACPF on priority sub-basins to determine where storage opportunities exist, (3) develop a detailed hydrologic model if one does not exist, (4) run existing and storage scenarios to determine if the amount of the discharges could be lowered for hypothetical rainfall events ranging from 10-year to 100-year events, and (5) summarize the saturation of storage and the maximum change anticipated in the specific agro-ecoregion.	MPCA and BWSR	\$150,000	2025–2027
Minnesota River Floodplain Model Feasibility Study	We will review the existing Minnesota River floodplain model to determine if updates are required.	DNR, Army Corps of Engineers, and all LGUs within the District	\$30,000	2019
Minnesota River Sediment Reduction Strategy	This project team will collaborate with the MPCA in developing strategies for evaluating and mitigating sediment loads going into the Minnesota River.	MPCA and BWSR	\$40,000	2018–2019
Realignment of the Prior Lake Spring Lake Outlet Channel	This project will place additional capacity and control structures in the channel to handle increased runoff that is draining into the channel because of developments.	City of Shakopee	\$100,000	2021–2022
Riley Creek Project—Downstream of Flying Cloud Drive	The project will provide an energy dissipation below the County Road 61/ Flying Cloud Drive bridge and redirect flows away from outside the creek meanders.	Hennepin County	\$75,000	2018–2019
Schroeder's Acres Park/Savage Fen Stormwater Management Project	This project will evaluate options for incorporating storm-water wetland and irrigation reuse systems on the site and address phosphorous, temperature, metals, E. coli and runoff volume in Eagle Creek.	City of Savage and DNR	\$220,000	2019–2020
Seminary Fen Restoration Site A	At the intersection of Engler and Audubon in Chaska, Minnesota, 3.61 acres of wetland will be purchased and restored. This site is dominated by reed canary grass and offers the greatest threat to the rare plants of the Seminary Fen Wetland Community. The site is next to a 6-acre wetland that was restored by the City of Chaska in partnership with the DNR.	City of Chaska and DNR	\$75,000	2021
Seminary Fen Ravines Site C-2 and C-3 Studies	Seminary Fen Ravine Sites C-2 and C-3 are actively discharging sediment into the Seminary Fen Wetland Complex. This project will conduct a ravine study to estimate sediment contribution to the Seminary Fen from sites C-2 and C-3 and provide approaches and cost estimates for correcting the erosion problems.	City of Chaska and DNR	\$60,000	2024–2025
<b>Potential Projects - Unfunded</b>				
SSTS Direct Discharge Incentives	In 2007, the county board established a cost-share program to accelerate the elimination of direct discharge SSTS. The approved TMDLs for Carver and Bevens Creeks identified that some of the fecal coliform entering those water bodies was from direct discharge and (failing) septic systems. The	Carver County, CCWMO	\$150,000	

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
	program offers direct incentives and low-interest loans to landowners to fix these systems, which are mainly concentrated in rural and agricultural areas in the county. The program is responsible for the entire county, except the City of Chanhassen, which has its own program.			
Trout Stream #4 Restoration	The DNR and MN Trout Unlimited are considering rehabilitating a trout stream near the Cedar Bridge area. These efforts are to keep the stream listed as a trout stream by the DNR. The City of Burnsville may need to make storm sewer and drainage improvements in the existing system to help the stream become a viable trout habitat.	DNR, MN Trout Unlimited, City of Burnsville	\$10,000	2018
Bluff Area Risk Analysis	This analysis of the bluffs within the city will identify areas where the risk of failure is high or where failure would lead to a public safety risk or create a significant expense in a short time. This study will aid in the planning of related improvements in future capital improvement plans and future maintenance operations to proactively prevent slope failure.	City of Burnsville	\$50,000	2018
CH 51 & CH 53 Culvert Replacement	Culverts will be replaced to address continuing erosion stabilization problems along the right-of-way. These culverts are larger in size and cannot be replaced by county maintenance forces. CH 51: between CH 1 and gravel portion. CH 53: ~ 1/2 mile south of TH 169	Scott County	\$668,000	2018
Resiliency Assessment of Major Drainage Systems and Improvements	This assessment includes a review of the City of Burnsville's major drainage systems to identify areas where failure of major drainage systems would necessitate expensive repairs in a short time and/or cause significant damage to private buildings. These high-risk areas will be identified to aid staff in planning future improvements.	City of Burnsville	\$390,000	2018-19
Transportation Capital Improvement Plan	This plan includes storm sewer system repair in Dakota County and the cities within it. Transportation infrastructure should be more environmentally sensitive.	Dakota County, Applicable LGUs	\$2,500,000	2018-2022
Parks and Greenways Capital Improvement Plan	This plan advances natural resource protection and restoration of the park and greenway system. In addition to managing 2,280 acres of land that have been restored or are undergoing restoration, the 2018-2022 CIP will restore an additional 956 acres. No specific projects are named, but \$1.023 million dollars is set aside annually for "Natural Resources Management: Base Program Funding."	Dakota County	\$1,023,000	2018-2022
Land Conservation Capital Improvement Plan	This program works with willing landowners and partners to permanently protect and manage shoreland along rivers, streams, and undeveloped lakeshore; high quality natural areas; wetlands; and associated agricultural land throughout Dakota County. Easements are a main component of this plan, mainly on agricultural lands, but on other private lands as well. Monitoring of the easements will also take place to ensure compliance with legal and stewardship plans and NRMP (natural resources management systems plan) requirements.	Dakota County, State of MN, Environmental Legacy Fund	\$11,335,000	2018-2022
Keller Lake to Minnesota River Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis and Report	This analysis of the chain of water bodies that starts at Keller Lake and ends at the Minnesota River will identify adjustments that could be made to optimize water levels in the system. Changing rainfall frequencies and amounts are the reasons for this reevaluation.	City of Burnsville	\$75,000	2019
Blakeley Bluffs Ravine Stabilization, Phase 1	Phase 1 calls for assessment of ravine erosion on three county parcels within the future Blakeley Bluffs Park Reserve. Active erosion is occurring in several ravines. It appears the current rate of erosion is causing sedimentation and pollution of the dry creek bed leading to the Minnesota	Scott County, Clean Water	\$100,000	2019-2020

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
	River. Further erosion has the potential to cut further into the bluff top areas, potentially encroaching on areas designated for future park use. Further understanding of the issue is needed to determine an appropriate response. Stabilization measures are likely needed to slow down the erosion currently taking place.			
Ravine Restoration	This analysis of ravines will target those most in need of maintenance and then fund their repair to prevent loss of soils, retaining property values and reducing off site deposit of these soils.	City of Burnsville	\$1,000,000	2019-2021
Wetland Mitigation Bank	Wetland credits are needed for projects that are not eligible for the BWSR Local Road Wetland Replacement Program. The program does not provide mitigation for impacts due to trails or capacity-only construction projects. These types of improvements require the purchase of wetland banking credits on the open market or on-site mitigation. This project will work with several sites and potential property owners where wetland restoration is feasible and cost-effective to develop a wetland restoration project. If easements on suitable sites can be secured, construction could occur in the same year, and some credits could be released for use by the county as soon as as-built plans are prepared and certified.	Scott County, State of MN	\$795,000	2019-2023
Salisbury Hill (CR 51) Ravines	This is a high-priority project for the WMO. It's willing to lead, finance, or provide incentives for this project. Unstable ravines are contributing large amounts of sediment to the Minnesota River and affecting county road maintenance. This project was included as a CIP in the previous plan but has been delayed because of changing priorities from the 2014 disaster and the need to wait for decisions about the future of roads in the area. The schedule is currently unknown because we are waiting for decisions about roads in the area.	Scott County WMO	\$750,000-\$1,500,000	2019-2026
Blaha Ravine/Chestnut Ravine	These ravine stabilization projects have been discussed with the City of Belle Plaine in the past; they have now included it as an official request in the letter of issues submitted to the Scott WMO at the start of the plan update process. The Scott WMO acknowledges that this will have some pollutant-loading reduction to the Minnesota River, but the reduction is small compared to the whole basin; thus, it is listed as a Tier 2 project. The City of Belle Plaine will lead the project.	Scott County, Belle Plaine, Scott WMO	\$102,000	2019-2026
Minnesota River Quadrant (MRQ) Stormwater and Floodplain Study and Report	This analysis of the MRQ's overall stormwater management system needs will accommodate future development. The report will guide the review of future developments in the MRQ to optimize the location of future stormwater management facilities.	City of Burnsville	\$50,000	2022
Courthouse Lake Native Restoration	Multiple projects are underway around Courthouse Lake to restore both the shoreline and turfed areas to a native setting.	Carver SWCD, CCWMO	\$75,000	2023 - 2027
Big Woods and Hazeltine Lake Goldfish Management Program	A feasibility study is currently underway to produce a management plan for goldfish control on Big Woods and Hazeltine Lakes. Depending on the outcomes of the study, long term management will follow the outline provided in this study.	MNDNR, CCWMO	\$100,000	2023 - 2027
Chaska Creek Bank Stabilization	Streambank erosion is present along Chaska Creek between Hwy 212 and Creek Road in Chaska contributing TSS and TP to Chaska Creek, especially	City of Chaska, CCWMO	\$332,000	2023 - 2027

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
	during period of high flow. Potential project areas will be identified and implemented in coordination with City of Chaska's Creek Rd redevelopment projects.			
<u>Stormwater Pollutant Reduction in Untreated and Undertreated Urban Areas - East Chaska Creek Chain of Lakes</u>	The District and Carver WMO will work with City of Chaska to identify areas where additional stormwater treat will provide additional nutrient removal within the East Chaska Creek Chain of Lakes Watershed. Priority will be given to project that provide TP reductions to help meet TMDL goals for impaired waters of Hazeltine, Jonathon, and McKnight Lakes.	<u>City of Chaska, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>2023 - 2027</u>
<u>East Chaska Creek Chain of Lakes Ravine Stabilizations</u>	Ravines draining to the Chain of Lakes are contributing both sediment and phosphorus to the lake. These projects will stabilize slopes and manage stormwater discharge to reduce the amount of sediment reaching adjacent lakes.	<u>City of Chaska, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>	<u>2023 - 2027</u>
<u>SW Chaska Ravine Stabilizations</u>	Ravines ultimately draining to the Minnesota River are contributing both sediment and phosphorus to the river. These projects will stabilize slopes and manage stormwater discharge to reduce the amount of sediment discharging downstream.	<u>City of Chaska, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>2023 - 2027</u>
<u>SW Chaska Wetland Preservation and Enhancements</u>	Future development of this area of Chaska may provide opportunities for wetland preservation or enhancements. Priority for project locations will be based upon the Wetland Restoration Assessment of the 2020 Water Plan.	<u>City of Chaska, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>2023 - 2027</u>
<u>Big Woods Lake Gully Restoration</u>	One ravine has been identified as a potential project site to restore. Restoration will reduce the amount of sediment and phosphorus that will reach Big Woods Lake.	<u>City of Chaska, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>	<u>2023 - 2027</u>
<u>Lower Minnesota River Sediment Analysis</u>	Previous analysis of how sedimentation has changed in the floodplain of the Lower Minnesota River has involved using pollen assemblages to date horizons. However, further analysis is required to confirm that the interpreted horizons are correct. The District will use dating of the stored core material to date the sediment to provide a more accurate understanding of sedimentation in the floodplain.	<u>Freshwater Society, U of M</u>	<u>\$12,500</u>	<u>2024</u>
<u>Minnesota River Assessment of Ecological and Economic Impacts of Sedimentation</u>	This project will examine sedimentation in the Lower Minnesota River Watershed by monitoring, modeling, and analyzing sediment sources, sinks, and pathways in the watershed; summarizing how sources, sinks, and pathways may have changed; and estimating the economic and ecological effects of sedimentation. The project team will look at how sedimentation (1) changes the stage-discharge relationships that may cause flooding, (2) generates costs to maintain a commercial navigation channel on the Minnesota River, and (3) affects the ecological conditions of the watershed. Through these analyses, a new baseline could be established, and an understanding created of how changes in land use alter the watershed baseline and create a new condition.  In addition, the District will pursue upstream flow management that is consistent with recommendations of the NCED group using the Management Option Simulation Tool (MOSM) in the Le Sueur watershed and similar approaches in other watersheds to mitigate this issue.	<u>Army Corps of Engineers</u>	<u>\$162,500</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>Minnesota River Assessment of Water Storage Benefits and Opportunities</u>	Using the Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework (ACPF) and the Prioritize, Target, and Measure Application (PTM app), we will determine whether a flow reduction would benefit from the placement of storage measures in key locations throughout the basin. This analysis will help us	<u>Army Corps of Engineers</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
	<u>understand if the threshold for meaningful change can be realized to recommend specific levels of storage in the basin. The analysis is needed to accomplish the desired outcomes: (1) hydrocorrect DEMs for the lower watershed where storage impacts are desired, (2) run ACPF on priority sub-basins to determine where storage opportunities exist, (3) develop a detailed hydrologic model if one does not exist, (4) run existing and storage scenarios to determine whether the amount of the discharges could be lowered for hypothetical rainfall events ranging from 10-year to 100-year events, and (5) summarize the saturation of storage and the maximum change anticipated in the specific agro-ecoregion.</u>			
<u>East Chaska Creek Chain of Lakes SWA Implementation</u>	<u>The District will collaborate with the City of Chaska to implement strategies identified in the East Chaska Creek Chain of Lakes Subwatershed Analysis Feasibility Study. Projects would reduce impervious surfaces and add stormwater treatment for currently untreated areas and improve the quality of stormwater runoff reaching the East Chaska Creek Chain of Lakes. Projects will be completed as time and funding allow.</u>	<u>City of Chaska, Carver County Watershed Management Organization (CCWMO)</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>Schroeder's Acre Park Water Reuse</u>	<u>This project consists of providing irrigation to three baseball diamonds and soccer fields with water supplied by the stormwater pond in the park.</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$370,000</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>Schroeder's Acres Park Alum Treatment</u>	<u>The City of Savage proposes to conduct an alum treatment at Schroeder's Acres. This would prevent 12 to 24 pounds of total phosphorus (TP) from entering Eagle Creek each year.</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$35,600</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>BF Nelson Pond Alum Treatment</u>	<u>The City of Savage proposes to conduct an alum treatment at the BF Nelson Pond. This would prevent 22 to 44 pounds of TP from entering Eagle Creek each year. Each dose is expected to cost \$39,900. Doses need to be applied every five years. Alum treatment here has a total cost of \$199,500 over 25 years.</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$39,900</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>Wyoming Avenue Stormwater Structure</u>	<u>The Wyoming Avenue Stormwater Structure includes the installation of a water quality treatment structure in an untreated industrial land use that discharges directly to Eagle Creek at TH 101.</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$668,600</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>TH 13 Stormwater Structure</u>	<u>This proposed project consists of installing an underground stormwater treatment structure in the right-of-way south of Trunk Highway 13. The structure would work in conjunction with the previously mentioned structure along Wyoming Avenue South to provide treatment to over 13 acres of industrial runoff currently flowing directly into Eagle Creek.</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$240,100</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>Zinran Avenue Stormwater Structure</u>	<u>This proposed project would consist of installing an underground stormwater treatment structure along Zinran Ave. The structure would provide treatment to over 18 acres of commercial runoff currently not being treated by the City of Savage.</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$168,800</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>Eagle Creek Parkway Bank Stabilization</u>	<u>This proposed project would stabilize banks underneath the Eagle Creek Parkway bridge crossing the East Branch of Eagle Creek. The creek is currently estimated to be eroding an average of 2 inches per year, which could deposit approximately 8,600 lbs. of sediment into the creek annually.</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$106,00</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>Covington Pond Filtration Bench</u>	<u>This proposed project consists of an intensive pond restoration plan for the basins on the City-owned parcel at Ensign Ave and 125th St W. A filtration bench would be placed between the existing ponds to provide additional treatment to a large portion of residential and upstream drainage areas.</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$315,200</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>
<u>Preserve Trail Stormwater Structure</u>	<u>This proposed project would install an underground stormwater treatment structure on the western portion of a parcel owned by the Savage Economic</u>	<u>City of Savage</u>	<u>\$558,300</u>	<u>2024 - 2027</u>

Project Name	Project Descriptions	Project Partner	Estimated Cost	Estimated Timeline
	Development Authority. The structure would provide treatment to over 17 acres of residential runoff prior to it entering the large storm basin in the business park.			
<u>Carver Creek Gully Stabilization</u>	The District will collaborate with the Carver WMO to stabilize a large gully on Carver Creek in Dahlgren Township (Section 26).	<u>Carver SWCD, NRCS, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>	<u>2025</u>
<u>Dahlgren Road Stormwater Retrofit</u>	The District will collaborate with the Carver WMO to address stormwater issues along Dahlgren Road west of County Road 11. Stormwater from the road surface currently drains untreated to Timber Creek, a tributary of Carver Creek.	<u>Dahlgren Township, City of Carver, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>	<u>2025</u>
<u>Grace Lake Ravine Stabilizations</u>	Ravines on the northwest side of Lake Grace are contributing both sediment and phosphorus to the lake. These projects will stabilize and reduce the amount of sediment reaching Lake Grace.	<u>City of Chaska, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$300,000</u>	<u>2025 - 2027</u>
<u>East Chaska Creek Chain of Lakes Reclamation - Phase 2</u>	The District will collaborate with the Carver WMO to implement methods to control carp populations and improve water quality in the East Creek Chain of Lakes as identified in the Drawdown Feasibility Study. This phase would focus on Big Woods, McKnight, Jonathan and Grace Lakes.	<u>City of Chaska, CCWMO</u>	<u>\$225,000</u>	<u>2027</u>

225

226 **4.5 FUNDING MECHANISMS**

227 Laws regarding project funding are different between metropolitan WDs and WMOs, and out-  
228 state watershed districts. M.S. Chapter 103D applies to all watershed districts, while Chapter  
229 103B applies only to the Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area watershed districts and WMOs.  
230 ~~Since~~Because the District is both a watershed district and in the metropolitan area, both sets of  
231 statutes apply. This section provides a summary of the funding sources available to the District,  
232 followed by a discussion of the District’s proposed funding method(s).

233 **4.5.1 Funding Statutes Available to Watershed District**

234 **4.5.1.1 Special Assessments**

235 **M.S. 103D.601** allows a project to be instituted by resolution by a majority of the watershed  
236 district managers. The project must be financed by grants totaling at least 50 percent of the  
237 estimated cost, and the engineer's estimate of costs to parties (including assessments against  
238 benefited properties but excluding state, federal, or other grants) ~~must~~is not be more than  
239 \$750,000. Initiated projects using this procedure must be paid for by special assessments against  
240 benefitting properties. Benefitted properties are defined in M.S. 103D.725.

241 **M.S. 103D.701** requires that to initiate projects, watershed districts must first have a BWSR-  
242 approved watershed management plan. Projects that are to be paid for by assessment of  
243 benefited property must be initiated by a petition, by unanimous resolution of the managers, or  
244 by some other method prescribed in statute.

245 **M.S. 103D.705** provides for cities or residents to petition a watershed district for a project that  
246 generally conforms to the watershed management plan. The petitioners must guarantee the  
247 funds used to pay for the project’s preliminary feasibility studies.

248 **4.5.1.2 Ad Valorem Taxes**

249 **M.S. 103D.905** allows watershed district managers to use a portion of their administrative fund  
250 for project construction and maintenance beneficial to the watershed district. The upper limit of  
251 this fund is \$250,000 per year for the District. This also authorizes watershed district managers  
252 to levy a tax over the entire watershed district (an ad\_valorem tax) to pay the cost attributable to  
253 the basic water management features of projects initiated by petition of a municipality or  
254 ~~/~~political subdivision, or at least 50 resident owners whose property lies within the watershed.  
255 The levy may not exceed 0.00798 percent of the taxable market value for a period not to exceed  
256 15 consecutive years.

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

259 Formal minor plan amendments are not required for projects funded using the additional levy  
260 allowed under M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 3. Therefore, the District will follow an informal proposed

261 project information process to inform the LGUs about these proposed projects. The District  
262 will distribute the proposed project information to the affected LGUs for review and comment,  
263 but not to the state review agencies or the Metropolitan Council. The BWSR will not take formal  
264 action, ~~since~~ because it is not a formal amendment.

265 **M.S. 103B.231** requires watershed districts within the Twin Cities metropolitan area to prepare a  
266 water management plan. The statute requires that a capital improvement project be part of the  
267 Plan. For those improvements included in the plan M.S. 103B.231, Subd.10 and M.S. 103D.605,  
268 allow watershed districts to implement projects without a petition. According to these statutes,  
269 watershed districts may levy ad valorem taxes to pay for capital improvements (including  
270 maintenance of improvements) either over the entire watershed district (M.S. 103B.241), or over  
271 all property within a portion or subwatershed of the watershed district (M.S. 103B.251). M.S.  
272 103B.241, like M.S. 103D.729, also allows watershed districts to accumulate funds to finance  
273 improvements as an alternative to issuing bonds. For the District to use either funding  
274 mechanism, the District must adequately describe the projects, studies, and project maintenance  
275 in the Plan. The Plan must also specify that the source of funding will be in accordance with  
276 these statutes. Currently there is no levy limit.

277 The advantage of using M.S. 103B.231 (Subd. 10) and 103B.241 is that a hearing is not required  
278 for each project. If the capital improvement project is specified in the Plan, the watershed  
279 district need only conduct an annual hearing on the entire capital improvement program, in  
280 accordance with M.S. 103B.241. Under M.S. 103B.241, projects are paid for by an ad valorem  
281 tax over the entire watershed district.

282 **M.S. 103B.251**, on the other hand, allows the watershed district to set up a special taxing district  
283 or subwatershed over which funds are raised by an ad valorem tax. M.S. 103B.251 requires that  
284 (a) a copy of the Plan be filed with the county, (b) a special improvement hearing be held for the  
285 capital improvement projects, and (c) the county raises the funds by selling bonds paid for by an  
286 ad valorem tax over the subwatershed/special tax district.

#### 287 *4.5.1.2.1 Procedure for Projects to be Funded Using M.S. 103B.241 or M.S. 103B.251*

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

298 agrees that the amendment is a minor amendment, or BWSR fails to act within 45 days of  
299 receipt of the minor plan amendment.

#### 300 *4.5.1.2.2 Procedure Following Approval of Proposed Project Information or Minor Amendment*

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

#### 308 **4.5.1.3 Utilities and Fees**

309 Like stormwater utilities for cities, M.S. 103D.729 allows watershed districts to establish a water  
310 management district, or a subwatershed within the District, for collecting revenues and paying  
311 project costs initiated under M.S. 103B.231, M.S. 103D.601, 605, 611, or 730. For the District to  
312 use this funding mechanism, it must be included in its Plan, or the Plan must be amended to  
313 include this funding mechanism in accordance with 103D.411 or 103D.231 and in compliance  
314 with subdivisions 3 and 4.

#### 315 **4.5.2 Emergency Projects**

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

320 **M.S. 103B.252** allows watershed districts to declare an emergency and order work to be done  
321 without a contract. M.S. 103B.252 is like M.S. 103D.615, except it does not contain levy limits.  
322 In addition to the abovementioned funding sources, the District could receive funding from  
323 various state, federal, and private sources, such as grant and loan programs. This affords the  
324 District the opportunity to use grants and loans for projects instead of county-issued bonds.

#### 325 **4.5.3 Proposed Funding Mechanisms**

326 The District has financed its past administrative, program, and project costs through its annual  
327 administrative fund ad valorem tax levies under the authority of the Watershed Act (M.S.  
328 103D.905). The District's administrative fund levy limit is \$250,000. The District's administrative  
329 fund is used only for initiatives that benefit the water resources of the District; it is not used for  
330 projects that benefit commercial navigation. Many of the District's efforts and funding have  
331 been put toward activities that address water quality, runoff management, or flood control  
332 problems and issues. In the past, the District has maintained a capital reserve fund consisting of  
333 any unused portions of previous administrative levies.

334 Both the Watershed Act, referenced above, and the Metropolitan Surface Water Management  
335 Act (M.S. 103B.201 *et seq.*) provide additional revenue generating authority to the District. For  
336 projects creating a unique benefit to individual properties, the District may adopt and levy  
337 benefits assessments against project-benefitted properties. For projects and programs of  
338 District-wide benefit, that are included in the District's CIP, the District may impose an  
339 additional ad valorem tax levy to generate the revenue necessary to implement programs and  
340 projects on its CIP. For special water or resource management projects, the District may  
341 establish a Water mManagement dDistrict within which it may impose a water management  
342 charge to pay for basic water management activities made necessary by land uses with in the  
343 Water Management District.

344 Other than the administrative fund, all revenue generating authorities of the District require  
345 strict compliance with administrative proceeding requirements found in the Watershed Act and  
346 Metropolitan Surface Water Management Act.

#### 347 **4.5.4 Petitioned Projects**

348 The District will place a priority on petitioned projects that are identified as implementation  
349 projects in future resource plans. The advantages of a petition process are: 1) the statute sets  
350 forth a definite process for the petition and subsequent actions; 2) the mManagers are required  
351 to decide whether to order the project ~~or not~~; and 3) if additional funding is needed, the statute  
352 allows for ad valorem funding of these petitioned projects. The disadvantage of the petition  
353 process is that it may require more lead time to approve a project than the current District  
354 process. M.S.103D.905, subd.3 allows the District to levy an additional ad valorem tax over the  
355 entire District to pay for the basic water management features of projects ~~that, which~~ have been  
356 initiated by a petition of a municipality within the watershed. The Managers anticipate funding  
357 projects using this authority, except projects that benefit navigation. If no city petitions the  
358 District for a project which the District believes is a priority, the District may consider initiating  
359 the project under the provisions of Chapter 103.