

Organizational Assessment

**Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek
Watershed District**

Local Government Unit Review

Draft Report

October 18th, 2022

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources

520 Lafayette Road North

St. Paul, MN 55155

651-296-0768

www.bwsr.state.mn.us

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Executive Summary	2
Findings	4
Findings Part 1: Planning	4
Findings Part 2: Performance Standards	6
Findings Part 3: Internal and External Surveys	7
Internal Survey: Self-Assessment by RPBCWD staff and board members	7
External Survey: Assessment of RPBCWD by Partners	10
Findings Part 4: Wetland Conservation Act Administrative Review	12
General Conclusions	13
Commendations	13
Action Items	13
Recommendations	14
LGU Comments and BWSR Responses	15
Appendix A. Plan Accomplishments	16
Appendix B. Performance Standards	45
Appendix C. Internal and External Survey	46
Appendix D. Wetland Conservation Act Report	51
Appendix E. Comment Letter	53
Appendix F. Program Data	54

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

Prepared by Jennifer Mocol-Johnson (jennifer.mocol-johnson@state.mn.us; 507-344-2820).

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

<p>Organizational Assessment Report Summary</p>	<p>Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District</p>
<p>What is a PRAP Performance Review?</p> <p>The Board of Water and Soil Resources supports Minnesota’s counties, watershed districts, watershed management organizations, and soil and water conservation districts that deliver water and related land resource management projects and programs. In 2007, the Board established a program (PRAP) to systematically review the performance of these local units of government to ensure their effective operation. Each year BWSR staff conduct routine reviews of several of these local conservation delivery entities. This document reports the results of one of those reviews.</p>	<p><u>Key Findings and Conclusions</u></p> <p>The Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD is commended for building partnerships, implementing projects, and investing in staff and programs to increase community engagement and monitoring efforts.</p> <p>The results of the performance standards checklist indicate the WD is compliant with 20 of 20 basic performance standards.</p> <p><u>Resource Outcomes</u></p> <p>The Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD adopted the 2018-2027 Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District Management Plan. The plan contains 69 action items; 65 of which are ongoing, one not started, and three completed.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u></p> <p>Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD has no action items to address</p> <p><u>Commendations</u></p> <p>The Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD is commended for meeting 10 out of 12 High Performance Standards (applicable to the WD)</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>Recommendation 1: Engage in Mediated Discussions with Third Party to Ensure both the Board and Staff Address Issues that Adversely Affect the Organization</p> <p>Recommendation 2: Evaluate Options for Increased Efficiencies at Board Meetings</p> <p>Recommendation 3 – Conduct a Strategic Assessment to Evaluate the Mission, Vision and Establish goals and priorities for the future</p> <p>Recommendation 4 – Establish new and improve existing working relationships with partners</p>

Introduction

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

For this review, BWSR has analyzed the LGU's reported accomplishments of their management plan action items, determined the organization's compliance with BWSR's Level I and II performance standards, surveyed members of the organization and their partner organizations for feedback, and completed a desk and file review for the Wetland Conservation Act program.

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

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

What is PRAP?

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

The PRAP program includes an Annual Statewide Summary, and three types of assessments. Depending on the program mandates and needs of the local government unit, review types include both routine and specialized. The Annual Statewide Summary annually tabulates all local governmental units' compliance with basic planning and reporting requirements.

Organizational Assessments, conducted by BWSR once every ten years for each local government unit, evaluate operational effectiveness, partner relationships, and whether the LGU has achieved county water plan, watershed management plan, and/or SWCD comprehensive plan implementation goals. This assessment also evaluates compliance with performance standards, and the Wetland Conservation Act, where applicable.

Watershed-based Assessments are routine reviews conducted with partnerships of local governments working together to implement comprehensive watershed management plans (CWMPs) developed through the One Watershed One Plan Program. This review evaluates progress on plan implementation and analyzes partners working relationships.

Special Assessments are conducted with LGUs experiencing significant obstacles or performance deficiencies and may include BWSR Board action to assign penalties as authorized by statute.

More details can be found on the BWSR PRAP webpage.

Executive Summary

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) staff met with the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District (RPBCWD) administrator to discuss an evaluation of the water management function of the RPBCWD in September 2022. The findings in this document represent the data collected over the course of approximately 60 days of review and the recommendations are a result of the observations and conclusions we have made based on that data. There are four distinct parts of an Organizational Assessment conducted via the BWSR Performance Review and Assistance Program (PRAP) as authorized by M.S. 103B.102, the RPBCWD was subject to each of the four parts.

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

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

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

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

During an Organizational Assessment, BWSR staff thoroughly review data and feedback from an organization and their partners and develop a list of Actions and Recommendations to help guide the water management entities in their continued growth of program delivery. We do this to ensure they continue to meet basic standards as established in statutes and policy. We also develop a list of commendations for the great work these entities do as our partners in delivering conservation across the varied landscapes of Minnesota. Each of the above listed parts of the review are described in the findings section of this document, and the completed documents can be found in the notated appendices for further review. This report will be summarized in conjunction with other PRAP Annual Statewide Summary and Organizational Assessment reports collected in 2022 to be used as the official BWSR PRAP report delivered to the legislature as part of our reporting requirement under M.S. 103B.102.

Key Findings and Conclusions

The Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District (RPBCWD) is commended for their efforts in implementing projects within the watershed and developing the necessary partnerships to accomplish projects. The RPBCWD has shown a strong investment in both staff and programs, which can be seen in their community engagement efforts and monitoring program.

Ongoing water management challenges in the metro area have created the necessity to forge stronger working relationships among partners to improve local water management within the watershed.

The RPBCWD is commended for meeting all applicable basic performance standards including completing required annual reports, maintaining an updated management plan, and keeping a dedicated website up to-date on projects and programs. They are also commended for meeting most high-performance standards, including monitoring hydrologic trends and maintaining cooperative partnerships.

Summary of Recommendations

The following recommendations were developed after analyzing the data and information collected during this review. BWSR relies heavily on our relationships with local government staff and representatives as well as the input of partners and board members to make sure we provide recommendations that are relevant, timely, and helpful for the LGUs to implement and improve their operations. The full text of the recommendations can be found in the conclusions section of this report.

Recommendation 1 – Engage in Mediated Discussions with Third Party to Ensure both the Board and Staff Address Issues that Adversely Affect the Organization

Recommendation 2 – Evaluate Options for Increased Efficiencies at Board Meetings

Recommendation 3 – Conduct a Strategic Assessment to Evaluate the Mission, Vision and Establish goals and priorities for the future

Recommendation 4 – Establish new and improve existing working relationships with partners

Findings

This section describes what BWSR learned about the performance of the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District (RPBCWD) via the various collection methods as outlined below.

Findings Part 1: Planning

The findings in this section describe the Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District Management Plan and action items and the accomplishments to-date.

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

In reviewing the Watershed Management Plan for RPBCWD, a total of 69 action items were listed. A total of thirteen goals were established, which form the foundation of the plan. The goals are:

1. Operate in a manner that uses District resources and capacity efficiently and effectively while advancing the District's vision and goals
2. Collect data and use the best available science to recommend and support management decisions
3. Design, maintain, and implement Education and Outreach programs to educate the community and engage them in the work of protecting, managing and restoring water resources
4. Plan and conduct the District's implementation program to most effectively accomplish its vision with consideration for all stakeholders and resources
5. Include sustainability and the impacts of climate change in District projects, programs and planning
6. Implement the District's regulatory program to protect water resources from further degradation, enhancing resources when possible
7. Support Carver and Hennepin County to operate effectively as Ditch Authorities
8. Protect, manage, and restore water quality of District lakes and creeks to maintain designated uses
9. Preserve and enhance the quantity, as well as the function and value of District wetlands
10. Preserve and enhance habitat important to fish, waterfowl, and other wildlife
11. Promote the sustainable management of groundwater resources
12. Protect and enhance the ecological function of District floodplains to minimize adverse impacts
13. Limit the impact of stormwater runoff on receiving waterbodies.

Within the plan, each goal includes strategies, and actions to identify how the goal would be addressed.

Typically, fewer action items in a long-range plan denote more broad, continuous activities. Conversely plans with a long list of action items may be too specific to be achievable within the plan timeframe. With regards to metro watershed management plans, the RPBCWD Watershed Management Plan appears to be a broader plan with fewer action items. A great number of activities are listed as continuous, or involve multiple components within one activity (ie develop and implement). In these instances, the activity is listed as on-going (vs complete). Of the

total 69 actions within the plan, three were identified as completed. One item is listed as not started/dropped, and sixty-five are on-going.

The BWSR evaluated version of the Plan Progress Evaluation Table submitted by Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD staff is contained in [Appendix A, pages 16-44](#).

Findings Part 2: Performance Standards

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

The high-performance standards describe practices that reflect a level of performance that exceeds the required practices and may be items found within BWSR guidance materials or best practices recommendations. While all local government water management entities should be meeting all of the basic standards, the more ambitious LGUs will also meet several high-performance standards. The performance standards checklists submitted and reviewed for Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD are contained in [Appendix B, page 45](#).

For this Organizational Assessment, RPBCWD reports compliance with 20 of 20 applicable basic standards, and 10 of 12 applicable high-performance standards. The high achievements noted include:

- Track progress for Information and Education objectives in Plan
- Coordination with County, SWCD, City and Township officials
- Partnerships: cooperative projects/tasks with neighboring organizations, such as counties, SWCDs, WDs, tribal governments, Non-Government Organizations
- Water quality trends tracked for key water bodies
- Watershed hydrologic trends monitored / reported

Findings Part 3: Internal and External Surveys

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

Internal Survey: Self-Assessment by RPBCWD staff and board members

A total of 12 staff and board members of the RPBCWD were invited to take the online survey, and seven responses were provided (58%).

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

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

- Lower Riley Creek restoration (x3)
- Alum treatments for lakes
- Vegetation treatment plans
- Creek assessment program has been successful in classifying the areas of the creeks that need improvements
- Pioneer Wetland Restoration (x4)
- Continued expansion of education and outreach programs
- Junior Watershed Explorer program, activity book designed by District staff and distributed widely
- St Hubert Water Quality Improvement project
- Chanhassen High School Stormwater Reuse project
- CRAS completed and continued monitoring
- Salt education for the community
- Middle Riley Creek Restoration
- Rice March Lake Water Quality Improvement Project
- Bluff Creek Tributary Creek Restoration Project
- Duck Lake bridge removal and sub watershed projects
- Scenic Height school project
- Silver Lake water quality project
- Partnership with Minnetonka Public Schools to do a forest and wetland restoration as well as stormwater management at Scenic Heights Elementary
- Partnership with the MN DNR and the City of Chanhassen to purchase and move three homes within a floodplain
- Partnership with Bear Path Golf and Country Club to restore roughly 1000 feet at Riley Creek, reconnect the flood plain, and establish buffers
- Watershed stewardship grants to private residents, homeowners' associations, school districts and municipalities for everything from wetland buffer establishment to salt brine tanks and applicators.

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

- Having an assessment program in place and competent engineering
- Work together as a team and communicate effectively with the consultants

- Communication to the board as we take steps forward, as the board can understand the overall vision and give input
- Partnerships with cities, private organizations, schools, and landowners
- Terrific engineering, planning, building, and follow through by staff and contractors. Also, buy in from the public, including their ideas and comments
- Partnerships with various entities
- Dedicated and skilled staff
- Board members being forward thinking and supportive

The Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD staff and Board were asked to provide examples of areas where the agencies’ work has been difficult to implement, as well as potential explanations for the difficulties. Responses below:

Identified Difficulty	Examples/Causes provided in survey (<i>paraphrased</i>)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Shoreline assessment and protection</i> • <i>Treatment of runoff into lakes, particularly Lotus Lake, the largest body of water within the district</i> • <i>Lower Purgatory Creek particularly near Frederick Miller Springs</i> • <i>Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion initiative</i> • <i>Project delays which delay others identified in the 10-year plan</i> • <i>Groundwater conservation program needs enrichment</i> • <i>Stabilization of reach P4B on Purgatory Creek through Bent Creek Golf Course.</i> • <i>Spent Lime Facility on Lake Lucy</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lack of focus by staff and managers</i> • <i>Main reason projects and programs see slow or little progress is due to the board of managers. Board often inserts themselves in ways that are not productive, asking for an overwhelming amount of information before they vote “yes” to a project that has already been vetted and recommended to them by staff and/or consultants. Does not show feelings of trust. Staff and consultants know the board will question everything and rarely accept recommendations.</i> • <i>Limited resources so we use a project prioritization process</i> • <i>Add-on projects we undertook</i> • <i>Impossible to forge the partnerships with private entities needed to implement the project</i>

RPBCWD staff and Board were asked to list partners they had good working relationships with:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carver County • Carver County SWCD • Chanhassen (x2) • Chanhassen Engineering and PW • Eden Prairie (x2) • Eden Prairie Parks and Recreation • Bloomington (x3) • Schools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Churches • Other Water Management Organizations • Shorewood • City of Minnetonka • University of Minnesota (research) • Nine Mile Creek Watershed • Lower MN Watershed |
|--|--|

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

- Cities within the district
- DNR
- Board of Water and Soil Resources
- Construction and home builders
- Hennepin County Environmental Services
- Carver County

Finally, the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD staff and board were also asked to identify ways to improve the effectiveness of their organizations. Responses below:

- *Review the plan and analyze our progress and shortcomings. It appears we are proceeding ad hoc, and maybe we are following our plan but don't know because I have not received a report on progress on the plan*
- *Respect the roles and expertise of the various levels of staff and consultants*
- *For the board of managers to understand their role better and allow staff to function*
- *Develop closer relationships with partner organizations so we can identify opportunities for joint projects sooner*
- *Be part of our cities planning process: to know when projects are being presented and discussed so we can contribute for a successful outcome vs. finding out after the project is discussed and planned and difficult to change. Just having a seat at the table*
- *More outreach to potential partners, especially involving community development departments from various cities*

The full content of internal and external survey responses can be found in **Appendix C, pages 46-50.**

External Survey: Assessment of RPBCWD by Partners

Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD Partners Survey: BWSR was provided a list of 37 partners by RPBCWD staff. Twenty partners responded to the survey, a 54% response rate. The partners reported a wide range of interaction with the JPO over the past 2-3 years: A total of 25.0% of the respondents reported they interacted with the JPO *several times a year*. Another 20.0% indicated *monthly*, 25.0% stated *almost every week*, while the remaining 30.0% of respondents stated *a few times*. Of those respondents, 90% indicated that the amount of interaction they had with the RPBCWD was *about right*, while 10.0% indicated that there may be room for more collaboration in the future.

The partners were asked to assess their interactions with the RPBCWD in five operational areas within the survey. The partners' rating of the organization's work in these areas was largely *strong* or *good* indicating a working relationship between the partners and RPBCWD. There were also three performance areas identified as *poor*. *Communication* (20%), *Customer Relations* (10%), and *Timelines/Follow through* (15%) are each areas the district could work to improve.

Performance Area	RPBCWD Partner Ratings (percent)				
	Strong	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Don't Know
Communication	35.0%	30.0%	15.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Quality of Work	45.0%	45.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Customer Relations	15.0%	40.0%	25.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Initiative	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Timelines/ Follow through	15.0%	35.0%	25.0%	15.0%	10.0%

The partners' overall rating of their working relationship with the RPBCWD was largely *strong* (50.0%) or *powerful* (5.0%). The JPO did receive scores stating *it could be better* (25.0%), and *acceptable but a struggle at times* (20.0%) indicating a potential area of growth.

When partners were asked for additional thoughts about how the RPBCWD could be more effective, responses received were as follows:

- Permitting requirements on projects can be difficult and time consuming to meet standards. The permit review process could be more efficient. They could always be more collaboration between the two organizations with respect to water resource issues
- Board members shift leading to changes in focus and priorities
- Improve remote meeting capacity and encourage remote participation
- Be more available
- Make permitting of public works projects more efficient and effective. Often times, the majority of the stormwater management effort on the engineering front is expended on small improvements that have little benefit. Additionally, the ways in which the rules are written, interpreted, and implemented have little benefit in reality
- They have been difficult to contact and communicate with. They could be much better at being available to communicate
- More consistency of purpose and increased teamwork between the board and staff would improve effectiveness. The board and staff do not appear to work together effectively. Many discussions are circular. The whims of the board consume a lot of staff time. Staff are highly qualified but seem overwhelmed and are doing the best they can.
- Some of the appointed board members micro-manage and push staff to spend too much time on things that are not the main focus of the organization. Trust the staff and let them do their job

- Improve communication would lead to improved collaboration
- Having a board and staff that understands the “real world” issues that municipalities face in getting projects permitted. Lighten up on exhaustive analysis needed for simple replacement projects- often time the amount of time, energy and cost to obtain a permit far outweighs the cost of the improvements. Provide rules that are clear and flexible in meeting combined goals of better water quality
- Clearer understanding of the responsibilities of Board members and increasing the amount of trust they have in staff and consultants. The technical and administrative individuals that work for the District are among the best in the State at what they do. They should be commended for their ability to manage turnover and continue to implement high level effective projects.
- Hire more staff if financially viable- remove board members that prevent the organization from running smoothly.
- District board meetings can be excessively long. This results in significant costs if several staff members and paid consultants routinely have to attend meetings when items are on the agenda for approval.

Findings Part 4: Wetland Conservation Act Administrative Review

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

Data for this report was collected via direct interview with staff, a review of an appropriate number and type of project files, a review of existing documentation on file (i.e. annual reporting/resolutions), and through prior BWSR staff experience/interaction with the Watershed District. On site reviews were deemed not necessary for this review. The interview, project file review, and review of existing documentation were done by two BWSR staff.

Specific Methods

BWSR Wetland Specialist Jed Chesnut and Alyssa Core met with Terry Jeffery, District Administrator for the Riley-Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District on September 19th, 2022. The Watershed District has been administering WCA since March 2018.

The WD currently administers WCA as the LGU for two cities, Deephaven and Shorewood.

Compliance with Performance Standards are ranked from “This does not meet minimum requirements”, “This meets minimum requirements but needs improvement”, to “This is effectively implementing the program”. When applicable, recommendations to improve WCA implementation are provided.

The review focused on performance standards in both the administration and execution of the local WCA program and the recommendations provided were in regard to those specific standards.

Full details regarding the Wetland Conservation Action review can be found in Appendix D, pages 51-52 of this report.

General Conclusions

After a thorough review of the provided information including water plan progress, performance standards, and reviewing the survey inputs we have developed some recommendations for the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District (RPBCWD).

In brief review, the RPBCWD reports compliance with 20 of 20 basic performance standards, and 10 of 12 applicable high-performance standards. The RPBCWD has demonstrated progress towards implementation of actions within their watershed management plan. The RPBCWD should continue to build upon and enhance working relationships with partners to meet the water management and conservation challenges in the watershed. The 69 actions within the plan were reviewed and three items are listed as completed, one has not been started, and 65 are listed as on-going progress. Of the 65 items that are listed as on-going, many of the items have made strong progress and by virtue of how the activity is written, will continue to be part of the tasks the organization will work on into the future.

Commendations

Commendations are based on achievement of BWSR's high performance standards (see Findings, Part 2 and Appendix B, [page 45](#)). These practices reflect above average operational effectiveness and level of effort.

The Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District is commended for:

- Administrator on staff
- Staff training: orientation and continuing education plan and record for each staff
- Operational guidelines for fiscal procedures and conflicts of interest exist and are current
- Coordination with County Board, SWCD Board, City/Township officials
- Meeting the High-Performance Standards identified in Appendix B

Action Items

Action items are based on compliance with BWSR's basic practice performance standards (see Findings, Part 2 and Appendix B, [page 45](#)). Action Items address lack of compliance with one or more basic standards.

The RPBCWD has no action items to address at this time due to their successful implementation of all applicable basic standards. Continue to work with your Board Conservationist to maintain this level of performance.

Recommendations

This section contains recommendations offered by BWSR to the board and administrator of the RPBCWD. The intention of these recommendations is to enhance the organization's delivery of effective water and related land resource management and service to the residents of the watershed. BWSR financial assistance may be available to support the implementation of some of these recommendations.

Recommendation 1 – Engage in Mediated Discussions with Third Party to Ensure both the Board and Staff Address Issues that Adversely Affect the Organization

Multiple survey comments indicated inefficiencies due to confusion of board roles and responsibilities. Both staff and partners indicated frustration, lack of trust, micro-management, and processes taking excessively long. The Watershed District should consider hiring a mediator to evaluate processes and working relationships. BWSR financial assistance may be available to support the implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation 2 – Evaluate Options for Increased Efficiencies at Board Meetings

Survey responses indicated inefficiencies in board meetings. Comments received stated that board meetings were unnecessarily long, and a poor use of resources as both staff and consultants attend. Consider working together to establish processes to aid in efficiencies. One option is to assign time for each agenda item, and track to that time. Be clear and concise when presenting items, clarify the intent of the item discussed and stay on the task at hand.

Recommendation 3 – Conduct a Strategic Assessment to Evaluate the Mission, Vision and Establish goals and priorities for the future

The submitted Performance Standards Checklist indicates that the Watershed District has not completed a strategic plan or assessment or evaluated short-term priorities over the past five years.

Initiating a strategic assessment exercise would give both staff and board members the opportunity to review and evaluate whether the existing mission and vision are relevant, or whether changes are needed. It would also give a chance to create an organizational roadmap, establishing programmatic goals, and short- and long-term priority setting.

Recommendation 4 – Establish new and improve existing working relationships with partners

Over the past three years, the watershed district has seen organizational change. While many responses indicated that the staff/board weathered the change very well, responses from partners indicate an interest in improving working relationships, with 45% stating the relationship *could be better and is acceptable but a struggle at times*. Partner responses indicated Communication, Contact, and being more available and present were potential areas of improvement. Partners suggested more communication in the permitting process, and internal survey responses indicated the possibility of becoming more involved in partner cities planning processes. This would allow the watershed district to be proactive vs reactive in responses.

LGU Comments and BWSR Responses

Riley board members and staff were invited to comment on the findings, conclusions and recommendations in the draft version of this report. The RPBCWD will provide a comment letter which can be found in Appendix E (pg. 53).

Appendix A. Plan Accomplishments

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

LGU Name: Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District

Date of This Assessment: October 3, 2022

Type of Management Plan: Watershed Management Plan

Date of Last Plan Revision: 6/27/2018

GOAL No. 3.2.1 Administration:

Page 3-3 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective - Admin 1:

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Develop Annual Workplan and Budget	Annually	Annually	Has been completed Annually	○	Continue as scheduled
2. Periodic assessment of capacity and resources	No specificity	Twice in last five years	Most recently, staff has updated its organizational chart to reflect current staffing levels, duties, and future needs	○	Implement updated organizational chart and reevaluate next December
3. Annual review of progress towards plan goal to be published in annual reports	Annually	Annually	Annual report has been drafted and disseminated each year	○	Continue as scheduled
4. Review local water management plan for consistency	Per statute	Per statute	All local plans have been reviewed and adopted. Two communities have suggested assuming local control but have not yet proceeded with implementation.	○	Start drafting new plan in late 2023 for adoption in January of 2027. Continue evaluation of existing plan and amend as needed.

5. Collaborate with member cities to ensure equivalent protections	No specificity/ongoing	Ongoing	No city has adopted equivalently protective local controls. The district continues to enact their regulatory program throughout the district.	○	Continue enacting regulatory program. Continue looking for ways to partner with cities for protection of resources.
--	------------------------	---------	---	---	---

GOAL No. 3.2.2 Data Collection:

Page 3-3 through 3-4 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective Data Collection: Collect data and use best available science to recommend and support management decisions

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Creation of a wetland inventory based upon best available data	Not specified – 10 years	In progress	MNRAMs have been completed on all NWI wetlands as of October 2022. Floristic Quality Assessments have been performed on approximately 50% of all NWI wetlands as of 10/22. A working model of an ecosystem services assessment method is nearing completion of Phase I	○	Complete FQA. Develop strawman model of Ecosystem Services Assessment.
2. Develop and implement monitoring plan. (creeks and lakes)	Not specified	C.R.A.S. was completed in 2017 and updated 2020	The Creek Restoration Action Strategy was completed in 2017 with a 2020 update. Creeks are walked and assessed on a three-year rotating schedule. Lake chemistry and biological data collection follows the same three-year schedule. Data has been used to restore three creek reaches and to design two others. In addition, it has been used to update UAA's and design five structural BMPs, three of which are constructed, and draft three other concept plans in addition to those for the five projects above.	○	Continue three-year rotation of sampling. Add monitoring of district initiated structural BMP projects. Update measured parameters as science and regulations dictate.

<p>3. Periodically review and update monitoring plan</p>	<p>Not specified</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>Annually, while setting our budget and levy, we look at upcoming capital projects and landscape changes and modify data collection schedule as appropriate. In addition, every spring we hold a water conference with the DNR, met council, and other stakeholders to discuss emerging science and provide updates on projects and findings. This information is used to further guide future data collection needs.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue annual review.</p>
<p>4. Collection of data for assessment of potential impacts of climate change on district projects, programs, and resources</p>	<p>Not specified</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district is in the process of creating a districtwide high-resolution model of flood hazard risks based upon the atlas 14 mid-century storm. This was completed for the City of Bloomington in 2020 and Eden Prairie and Minnetonka will be completed in 2023.</p> <p>Additional data has been collected to calibrate the model as deficiencies were observed.</p> <p>The district is engaging a consulting firm to develop a climate action plan that looks at combining all studies into a comprehensive subwatershed and examine the role of soils and native vegetation in community resilience.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Complete model for remaining areas within the district.</p> <p>Employ the model to identify mitigative measures to be taken to offset the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Develop sub-watershed climate action plan.</p>
<p>5. Monitor district managed resources for the presence of aquatic invasive species.</p>	<p>Not specified</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>The district is administering an adopt-a-dock program whereby lakeshore owners volunteer to install monitoring plates. RPBCWD partners with Carver County, Chanhassen, and Eden Prairie to hire inspectors at various boat launches. RPBCWD assists Carver County in performing eDNA sampling. RPBCWD does our own veliger sampling.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue with the programs mentioned.</p> <p>Incorporate emerging science as appropriate.</p>

<p>6. Utilization of data to assess performance and recommendation of district programs and projects</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>In 2017, the district updated several UAA using data collected. In addition, prior to implementing any projects, data was collected to calibrate H&H and water quality models. We have installed continuous monitoring equipment at our RML 12A MTD project and Lake Susan Park Pond Fe enhanced sand filter to measure performance of these BMPs and to use in future design considerations. We update our CRAS on a 3-year rotating schedule. This will capture the efficacy of the stream stabilization projects. Bank pins are installed to measure soil loss due to scour and scarp formation.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue current program. Procure additional sampling equipment to monitor installed BMPs. Work with partner cities on long-term maintenance and assessment of BMPs. Update protocols with best available science as it changes.</p>
<p>7. Data analysis to inform management decisions</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>See #6 above. The district is looking at soil health, and other ecosystem services to update management decisions. The districtwide flood risk assessment will be used to determine mitigative measures for climate resilience. Upon completion of the wetland assessment protocol, the data will be used to identify areas for wetland restoration, wetland enhancement, and to prioritize protection areas.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue with programming as described.</p>

<p>8. Coordination of monitoring efforts with other entities for efficiency</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district is collaborating with EP, Chanhassen, and Carver County on zebra mussel inspections. The district is collaborating with partner cities on monitoring of structural and non-structural BMPs – offering guidance and funding when needed. These partnerships are memorialized in cooperative agreements. The district is partnering with Three Rivers Park District on sediment sampling of Hyland Lake for alum dosing and water quality response. The district partners with the UofM to do lake vegetation monitoring and to plan future management.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue with existing coordination. Seek out new partnerships.</p>
---	----------------	----------------	---	----------	---

GOAL No. 3.2.3 Education and Outreach:

Page 3-4 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective Data Collection: Design and implement E&O program to educate and engage community on water resources

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
<p>1. Regular review of E&O plan with updates as needed</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>E&O staff have bi-weekly check-ins to align resources and provide internal feedback.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue regular review and updates.</p>
<p>2. Utilization of formative and summative data to evaluate success of E&O and change as necessary</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Staff track event and program participation from year to year. Social media engagement is evaluated to determine best approaches. Post-event and classroom visit assessment is done to evaluate success and identify potential improvement.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue tracking and evaluating E&O programming. Consider implementation of pre- and post-testing for student programming.</p>
<p>3. Modification of E&O strategies to be appropriate for each target audience</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Digital and printed and communication materials are tailored to target audiences. Classroom education programming is age appropriate.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue to offer content tailored for target audiences.</p>

4. Raise awareness of watershed management issues and best practices via E&O program	Ongoing	Ongoing	Issues and best practices are promoted through the district website, handouts and displays at tabling events and conferences, media interviews, public open houses, and other digital and in-person media.	○	Continue distribution of information through various formats including collaboration with municipal partners.
5. Build awareness of water resources by highlighting recreational opportunities	Ongoing	Ongoing	District recreation map is available on webpage. Printed copies of recreation map are available at the office and distributed at community tabling events. Cycle the Creek event held in Oct 2021 invited locals on a district-led bicycle tour of Purgatory Creek Recreation Area. Staff participated in Chanhassen Feb Fest in 2021 and led snowshoe hikes.	○	Continue recreational events. Evaluate recreation map for updates.
6. Seek opportunities to engage public in its projects and programs through diverse methods as outlined in E&O plan	Ongoing	Ongoing	District events, projects and programs are promoted through the website, online calendar, social media, tabling events, and flyers. Open houses (in-person and/or online) are held as needed to gauge concerns of adjacent property owners. We developed attractive custom stickers, magnets and keychains to encourage visitors at tabling events.	○	Evaluate opportunities for partner collaborations to increase community reach.
7. Provide resources to increase stewardship within the community	Ongoing	Ongoing	Website offers education pages about resource issues and best management practices. The district partners with others to host chloride reduction workshops for property managers and contractors. The district is participating in the Hennepin County Chloride Initiative and hosting a webpage for the Low Salt, No Salt Minnesota initiative.	○	Continue to provide resources online and at community events.

<p>8. Build community capacity through work with schools, lake associations, volunteers, et al</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Active zebra mussel monitoring program utilizing volunteers to monitor passive plate samplers on dock and other shoreline structures.</p> <p>Gloves, buckets, and grabbers were purchased to lend out to volunteer groups doing trash pick-ups in the district.</p> <p>The district restored a forest in partnership with Minnetonka Public Schools to be used for education.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue and promote volunteer programs.</p>
<p>9. Implementation of cost share program to incentivize stewardship</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The Watershed Stewardship Grant program offers cost-share for projects that improve or protect water quality. Program is offered to homeowners, HOAs, businesses, cities and other property owners within the district.</p> <p>Additional cost-share programs include Action Grants for small group projects, Educator Grants to support teachers, and the Chloride Reduction Grant to reduce winter salt use.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue to offer and promote cost-share programs</p>

GOAL No. 3.2.4 Planning:

Page 3-5 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective Plan 1: Plan and conduct the district’s implementation program to most effectively accomplish its vision while considering stakeholders and resources

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Utilize an adaptive management approach	Ongoing	Ongoing	The district continues to use the data collection results to identify gaps in the project prioritization schedule or to advance projects as appropriate. Eg. The CRAS rated a section of creek in the Lotus Lake watershed as low priority. After completion of the city’s I&I work, this channel was found to be a significant sediment load source and the district is currently working this channel into it’s programmed Lotus Lake WQ improvement project.	○	Continue to collect and utilize new data to evaluate the best practices and locations of practices to best protect and restore water resources. Continue working with partners to develop ecological enhancement plans to provide multiple benefits.
2. Annual review of 10-year implementation plan	Annually	Annually	Every year, with the creation of the budget and levy, the district evaluates project progress and shifts schedules accordingly. Every year, the district creates a work plan for the following year. The district has installs continuous flow meters and conducts grab samples to inform as to the efficacy of different management techniques.	○	Continue project and program review annually with each budget cycle. Continue data collection to measure efficacy of practices.

<p>3. Evaluate the success of implemented projects and programs every two years</p>	<p>Bi-annually</p>	<p>Less than bi-annually</p>	<p>The district has installed monitoring equipment at selected BMPs to measure removal efficiencies to guide future projects.</p> <p>The district has kept track of participants at E&O events and number of recipients of materials as well as viewers on social media.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will continue to increase their data collection to measure efficacy of practices.</p> <p>The district will update H&H and water quality models with collected data.</p> <p>The district will continue to gather quantitative measures of E&O.</p> <p>The district will develop qualitative measures of E&O and other programs.</p>
<p>4. Implement projects based upon project prioritization method described in chapter 4</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>The district has used the metrics contained in the project prioritization methodology to identify and plan for projects.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will evaluate if the metrics used are weighted appropriately and if there are other metrics to be considered in the prioritization of projects.</p>
<p>5. Perform resource assessments and feasibility studies to evaluate options.</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>The district develops a feasibility study for each project it implements. These are based upon data collected as well as available studies such as TMDL, UAA, 1W1P, etc</p> <p>The district developed the Creek Restoration Action Strategy (CRAS) to prioritize creek restoration projects.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will continue with this practice.</p> <p>The district will look to update UAA within 2 years.</p>

<p>6. Partner with cities, state agencies, et all to implement projects and programs</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>>The district owns no land and therefore requires partners for all projects. The district has partnered with Eden Prairie, Chanhassen, Minnetonka, Three Rivers Parks, Minnetonka Public Schools, Eden Prairie Public Schools, Eastern Carver County Public Schools, St Hubert Catholic Schools, Bear Path Golf and Country Club, et al to implement numerous projects and programs.</p> <p>>The district collaborates with all member cities w/ WCA implementation, data collection, lake management, construction site inspections, and plan review.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue implementing as we have and seek out new opportunities for partnerships.</p>
<p>7. Pursue grants and cost-share opportunities to leverage district funds</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>The district has received several grants to assist in the implementation of projects and programs</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue as before</p>
<p>8. Develop and implement a cost share program to assist LGUs fund emergency repairs</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>The district has established the repair and maintenance fund and a specific municipal grant program.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue modifying program</p>

Objective Plan 2: Consider sustainability & the impacts of climate change in district projects, programs, and planning

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
<p>1. Consideration of climate change in the development of district projects and programs.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>The district held a climate resilience summit in 2017 and had planned others except for the pandemic.</p> <p>>The district has added flood storage, soil storage capacity, and native plan restoration into capital project to increase resiliency.</p> <p>>The district is building a district-wide, high-resolution H&H model and flood risk map.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue to develop climate action plan and incorporate resiliency into project.</p> <p>Work with community groups and other organizations to identify partnerships and opportunities.</p> <p>Utilize flood risk map to identify potential mitigation and climate resilience projects.</p>
<p>2. Consideration of sustainability in the design and implementation of projects and programs.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>The district has completed high-risk map for Bloomington, Eden Prairie, and Minnetonka.</p> <p>>The district has developed an ecological enhancement planning tool to employ with creek restoration projects – looking at the overall corridor rather than just the channel.</p> <p>>Stewardship grant program makes native restoration projects eligible.</p> <p>>All permits are required to place six inches of topsoil and decompact to 200psi or less.</p> <p>>Capital projects incorporate native restoration and soil amendments whenever possible to do so. Limiting factor is land availability.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue existing programs.</p> <p>Develop an overall climate action plan.</p> <p>Identify other places where climate resilience can be added.</p> <p>Development of urban soil health plan.</p>

<p>3. Partner with cities, state agencies, et all to implement projects and programs</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district is working with Eden Prairie, Bloomington, and Minnetonka to develop a high-resolution H&H model.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Work with remaining member cities to continue modeling the entire district.</p> <p>Partner with member cities to identify mitigative measures for high-risk areas.</p> <p>Work with Hennepin and Carver Counties to find partnership and collaborative opportunities for the implementation of climate-action plans.</p> <p>Develop climate action plan consistent with Hennepin County plan and with the input and partnership of member cities.</p>
--	----------------	----------------	---	----------	--

GOAL No. 3.2.5 Regulation:

Page 3-7 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective Regulation 1: Implement regulatory program to protect water resources from degradation and enhance where possible

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
<p>1. Implement regulatory by reviewing land disturbing activity and ensure compliance with district rules, policies, and standards.</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>The district has drafted and implemented rules, addressing, among other things, water quality, water volume, stream protection, shoreline protection, erosion prevention and sediment control, flood plain protection, and buffer requirements.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Since the program was re-instituted in 2015, the district has issued 545 permits after review for compliance with district standards. In addition, dozens more plans were reviewed and found not to trigger the district rules.</p> <p>In 2017, a fulltime regulatory coordinator was hired. Barr Engineering, the district's consulting engineer is responsible for review of plans and models.</p>

<p>2. The district will periodically review and update its rules in accordance with applicable statutes</p>	<p>Not Specified</p>	<p>2018, 2019, 2020</p>	<p>The district modified rules in 2018, 2019, and 2020 to provide for more efficient, yet equally protective, implementation.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district is currently evaluating rules in light of the importance of ecological services and the increased development pressures on marginal land. This will take place throughout 2023.</p> <p>The district is reviewing their rules with consideration of the recently updated NPDES MS4 and Small Site Construction permits.</p>
<p>3. The district will periodically review the implementation of its regulatory program for process improvement opportunities</p>	<p>Not Specified</p>	<p>2017, 2020, 2022</p>	<p>The district drafted a revised Notice of Probable Violation form and updated Rule M – Enforcement in 2017</p> <p>The district developed a permit database and online application system with HEI in 2020.</p> <p>The district developed an ESRI Online based site inspection application in 2020.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will work with partner LGU to find more opportunities to share redundant duties such as site inspection.</p> <p>The district will work with partner LGUs to improve communications between all parties involved in permitting process.</p>
<p>4. The district will coordinate with LGU in the project/development review process</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district regularly communicates with LGU during project and permit review, sharing review comments and plan iterations.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will seek ways to improve communications.</p>

Objective Regulation 2: Support Hennepin and Carver Counties to operate effectively as ditch authorities.

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. There are no jurisdictional ditches within the boundaries of RPBCWD	NA	NA	NA	NA; ✧	NA

GOAL No. 3.2.6.1 Water Quality Goals:

Page 3-8 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective WQual 1: Protect, manage, and restore water quality in district lakes and creeks to maintain or achieve designated uses

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Minimize negative impacts of erosion and sedimentation via regulatory, E&O, and incentive programs	Ongoing	Ongoing	>Rule C: EPSC was enacted in 2015 and applies to every permit issue except surface water appropriation. >Staff training in SWPPP preparation and/or site inspector through UofM. >All district-initiated projects follow NPDES requirements as well as incorporate best practices. >Watershed Stewardship Grant program is used to incentivize property owners to plant native species on eroded slopes, install native buffers around waterbodies, and stabilize shorelines via bio-engineering.	○	Develop erosion control materials for website and print. Provide sediment control devices to landowners and LGU for smaller projects that do not trigger NPDES or district permit requirements.

<p>2. Identify and address areas with existing erosion issues and those at high risk for erosion via implementation of district's capital, regulatory, and E&O programs</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>The district created a map of high-risk erosion areas. In areas identified as having a high risk of erosion, additional requirements exist for permitting and for district capital projects.</p> <p>Identified high-risk areas are weighted in the implementation metric.</p> <p>>The district utilizes bank pins and chains to measure scour and scarp formation in the creeks.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district is planning to inventory seeps in the lower valleys of the three namesake creeks.</p> <p>The district will continue data collection of scour, incision, and scarp formation.</p>
<p>3. Assist agencies with implementation of projects and programs based upon Metro Chloride TMDL</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>The district has partnered with MPCA, Nine Mile Creek Watershed District, and Fortin Consulting to offer smart salting courses.</p> <p>The district has provided funding to Chanhassen to construct a brine manufacturing facility, purchase brine tanks and sprayers for maintenance equipment, and to modify salt augers for better calibration and geometry to minimize salt application.</p> <p>>The district partnered with NMCWD, MCWD, BCWMO, Hennepin County, and various cities throughout Hennepin County to form the Hennepin Chloride Initiative program that has developed educational materials, including video and printed materials to change winter maintenance behaviors at institutional properties.</p> <p>>The district partnered with LMRWD, RBWMO, and NMCWD to administer a grant program for private and public entities to purchase equipment and/or develop programming to minimize the impacts of winter maintenance.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue partnering with Smart Salting program.</p> <p>Identify new opportunities to foster change through incentive programs.</p> <p>Consider how to implement chloride management plan into regulatory program.</p> <p>Work with MAWD and other organizations to address liability concerns of winter maintenance companies and property management groups.</p>

<p>4. Minimize pollutant loading through capital, regulatory, and E&O programs</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>Since the adoption of the current plan, the district has completed construction on eight structural BMP projects: a spent lime facility: a Kraken MTD/rain garden and prairie restoration project, a 7-acre wetland restoration, two water capture and use project, an iron enhanced sand filtration bench with pump, and a tree trench and other improvements in partnership with a private school. These structural BMPs remove 161 lbs of phosphorous from the district on an annual basis.</p> <p>>The district has restored and stabilized the channel and corridor of three major reaches. These projects have stabilized 6,730 lineal feet of channel, created more than 75,000 square feet of naturalized buffer with an average width of 50 feet, and reconnected several acres of flood plain to the channel, improving resilience and creating migratory corridors for wildlife. These projects have also resulted in a net annual load reduction of 1,349 tons of sediment delivery.</p> <p>>The district has addressed internal loading in Riley, Lotus, Rice Marsh, and Hyland Lakes via Alum treatments.</p> <p>>The watershed stewardship grant has purchased a regenerative air street sweeper for the city of Chanhassen, paid for sump manholes and SAFL baffles in the Silver Lake watershed for the City of Shorewood and in the Lake Lucy watershed for the City of Chanhassen. The grant has been used by the City of Bloomington to install an iron enhanced sand filter bench on an existing pond and to install pervious pavement parking lot in a Chanhassen Park. The grant program has also funded 42 biofiltration / infiltration features on private land and stabilized and/or created buffer on more than 1,700 of feet of shoreline or stream bank on 35 properties.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will continue to implement their capital plan.</p> <p>The district is currently working with Chanhassen on a regional stormwater park to address loading to Lotus Lake and Purgatory Creek. The district is currently working with Eden Prairie Public Schools and the City of Eden Prairie to design a regional stormwater system to protect Round Lake and Purgatory Creek</p> <p>Two additional creek stabilization and corridor enhancement projects are currently in the design phase.</p> <p>Sediment coring of lakes to measure P release rates will continue to determine if further alum dosing is needed.</p>
--	----------------	----------------	--	----------	---

			>The district continues to implement their regulatory program to require abstraction of 1.1" of runoff and net annual removal efficiencies of 60%TP and 90% TSS. Data can be made available if requested.		
5. Identify opportunities to protect, restore, and enhance district resources	Ongoing	Ongoing	<p>The district partnered with the DNR and the City of Chanhassen to remove three homes from the 50-year flood elevation of a degraded (partially drained) wetland and restored the wetland (7 ac) to provide habitat, flood storage, and channel protection.</p> <p>In each stream stabilization project, the district works with the partners to create an ecological enhancement to provide buffers, floodplain storage, and habitat for terrestrial and aquatic organisms.</p> <p>The district has performed MNRAM 3.0 on all watersheds within the district and an FQA on roughly half of them. The district is halfway through phase 1 of the creation of our own wetland assessment to be used to define how to manage wetlands – restore, enhance, or protect.</p> <p>The district worked with Minnetonka Public Schools to restore 7.75 acres of woodland buffering Purgatory Creek to be used by the school for education.</p>	○	<p>The district is evaluating the inclusion of bluff areas and high-risk erosion areas into overall planning efforts to see if additional measures are needed to protect marginal lands from development pressures.</p> <p>Finish wetland assessment program and use to develop prioritization schedule.</p> <p>The district is in the early stages of developing an urban soil health management plan.</p>

<p>6. Cooperate with other entities to investigate treatment efficacy of emerging pollutant removal practices</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district sat on the technical advisory committee for the MPCA to review MTD and the TAPE evaluation methodology for application in MN.</p> <p>The district collaborated with Dr. John Gulliver of the UofM to study stormwater pond loading and potential mitigative measures such as dredging, alum application, and the use of iron filing.</p> <p>The district has funded research at the SAFL pertaining to the impacts of wake boats on shoreline and phase 2 which is looking at vertical wash from props.</p>	<p>◇</p>	
<p>7. Work with other entities to identify emerging pollutants of concern</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>No opportunity has arisen</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will continue to engage the UofM and other research institutions</p>
<p>8. Cooperate with PCA in the development of TMDL and WRAP studies</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>All TMDL and Wraps are complete in the district.</p>	<p>◇</p>	<p>Implement recommendations into future plan.</p>
<p>9. Work with LGU to minimize pollution risk to groundwater</p>	<p>None Stated</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district has met with cities to discuss ways in which the district can assist cities.</p> <p>The district has completed a study on groundwater / surface water interactions.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Identify opportunities to collaborate with cities.</p>

GOAL No. 3.2.6.1 Water Quality Goals:

Page 3-8 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective WQual 2: Preserve and enhance the quantity, as well as the function and value, of wetlands

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
<p>1. Identify opportunities to protect, restore, and enhance district resources</p>	<p>Life of Plan</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district has performed MNRAM 3.0 on all watersheds within the district and an FQA on roughly half of them. The district is halfway through phase 1 of the creation of our own wetland assessment to be used to define how to manage wetlands – restore, enhance, or protect.</p> <p>The district partnered with the DNR and the City of Chanhassen to remove three homes from the 50-year flood elevation of a degraded (partially drained) wetland and restored the wetland (7 ac) to provide habitat, flood storage, and channel protection.</p> <p>When the Bent Creek Golf Club was unwilling to work with the district to restore the section of Purgatory Creek within their property, the district advanced another restoration project on Riley Creek and partnered with Bearpath Golf and Country Club.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district is developing a urban soil health action plan.</p> <p>The district will use their wetland assessment program, upon completion, to identify wetlands for restoration, enhancement, or preservation depending upon the needs of the subwatersheds.</p> <p>The district is evaluating marginal lands, particularly in the lower valley, to protect them from development pressures.</p> <p>The district has levied funds specifically for opportunity projects. When they arise, the district is able to make a plan amendment and undertake the project with available funding.</p>

GOAL No. 3.2.6.1 Water Quality Goals:

Page 3-8 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective WQual 3: Preserve and enhance habitat important to fish, waterfowl, and other wildlife

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
<p>1. Encourage cities and developers to seek opportunities to incorporate habitat protection or enhancement into projects</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>Rule J – Stormwater Management is intended to encourage preservation of green space to minimize stormwater needs.</p> <p>>The district has allowed credit for tree canopy preservation and establishment as well as disconnected impervious.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will look for additional ways to incentivize habitat protection and enhancement into projects.</p> <p>The district will work with city committees such as environmental commissions, resiliency commissions, et al to motivate city decision makers.</p>

<p>2. Implement measures to manage carp populations</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>The district has successfully implemented the Riley and Purgatory Creek Common Carp Management Plans to manage common carp populations in the district.</p> <p>>Successful removal (i.e., winter seining, spring backpack electrofishing) and prevention (i.e., winter aeration, bluegill stocking, barrier maintenance) has led to carp populations being reduced to under the damaging threshold of 100 kg/ha.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will continue to monitor these populations via summer/fall electrofishing adult surveys and small mesh trap net young of year surveys to ensure they don't become a problem. In a three-year period, lakes have had at least one of each survey type conducted, with potentially problem systems having a greater frequency of monitoring.</p>
<p>3. Cooperate with DNR to enhance fisheries consistent with DNR's ecological classification</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district works with the DNR Area Hydrologist and the AIS Coordinator to improve fisheries per DNR guidance. All data collected by district is shared with the DNR. Every February the district hosts a lake summit to discuss lake management including fisheries.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue the same.</p>
<p>4. Seek opportunities to establish and preserve natural corridors for wildlife habitat and migration</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>See Creek Restoration (CRAS) projects and Ecological Enhancement Plans.</p> <p>See wetland restoration project and wetland assessment program.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district is looking to continue the CRAS and wetland program.</p> <p>The district is looking at soil health which will likely include the benefits of native vegetation on soil health to improve the water holding capacity of soils.</p>

<p>5. Promote the use of natural materials and bioengineering for the maintenance and restoration of shorelines and streambanks</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district uses bio-engineering on all creek stabilization projects. This includes root wads and waddles using felled trees in project area as well as VRSS.</p> <p>Landowners wishing to stabilize their shoreline must use the district's Erosion Intensity Worksheet to demonstrate the erosive forces require the proposed solution. If rip-rap is used, the project is not eligible for district cost share. Bio-engineered and natural revetment techniques are eligible for cost share.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district is evaluating existing cost share and regulatory programs to promote further use of natural materials.</p> <p>The district is looking to do a demonstration shoreline stabilization utilizing natural materials for E&O purposes.</p> <p>The district hosted two seminars on proper shoreline maintenance techniques.</p>
<p>6. Consider opportunities to incorporate habitat protection, restoration, or improvement into district capital projects</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district incorporates prairie restoration, buffer establishment, wetland restoration, and woodland restoration into all projects.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue to seek opportunities.</p>
<p>7. Form partnerships to minimize the spread and reduce the adverse ecological impacts of AIS</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>The district works with the DNR, the City of Chanhassen, the City of Eden Prairie, Carver County Parks, the Lotus Lake Conservation Association, and the Riley Lake Association to perform boat inspections at boat launches on Lake Riley, Lotus Lake and Lake Susan.</p> <p>>The district manages an adopt-a-dock program where residents put out monitoring plates to assess the presence and proliferation of zebra mussels in area lakes.</p> <p>>The district partners with the DNR and Carver County to perform veliger surveys and eDNA surveys on Lotus Lake.</p> <p>>The district maintains educational information on our website.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue existing programs and seek new partnerships where we can.</p>

<p>8. Manage non-native invasive macrophytes to improve water quality and habitat in accordance with approved lake vegetation management plans</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>The district manages curly leaf pond weed (CLP) and Eurasian water milfoil on Staring, Lotus, Mitchel, Riley, and Susan.</p> <p>>The district performs point intercept surveys on all lakes on a three-year rotating schedule.</p> <p>>The district does plant surveys on all lakes annually.</p> <p>>The district works with the Lotus Lake Association, the Lake Mitchel Association, and the Riley Lake Association to coordinate aquatic plant management. The district does not manage for recreation but provides survey data to associations as well as pointing out nursery areas that should not be harvested.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue existing management programs and partnerships.</p>
<p>9. Promote the use of vegetated buffers around all waterbodies</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Any property with a wetland or stream channel that needs a permit, must establish a buffer per Rule D.</p> <p>Cost share is available for any land owner wishing to establish a native buffer around a water body.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Increase public awareness of cost share program.</p> <p>Identify pilot projects the district can undertake for demonstration of buffer efficacy.</p>

GOAL No. 3.2.6.3 Groundwater Goals:

Page 3-10 of Mgmt. Plan

Objective Ground 1: Promote the sustainable management of groundwater resources

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Promote groundwater conservation through E&O and collaboration with municipalities	Ongoing	Ongoing	The district has worked with Bloomington, Eden Prairie, Minnetonka, and Chanhassen to provide funding for water conservation initiatives developed by each city.	○	Expand the E&O program to provide additional information and to reach new stakeholders.
2. District will work with partner counties to develop a ground water action plan.	Ongoing	Ongoing	No work has been done to date.	□	Develop plan
3. District will work to increase understanding of the groundwater -surface water interactions.	Ongoing	Ongoing	The district performed a study on the ground water – surface water interactions throughout the district.	○	The district will use this study, coupled with the seep study and the wetland assessment, as well as the district H&H model to identify areas to promote recharge and avoid pollutant loading of ground water. This information will also be used to augment stream baseflows while reducing flashiness and increasing resilience.

GOAL No. 3.2.6.1 Water Quantity:

Objective WQuan 1: Protect and enhance the ecological function of district floodplains to minimize adverse impacts

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Preserve and enhance the natural function of floodplain	Ongoing	Ongoing	<p>>Regulatory program requires 50-foot setback from top of bank, 1:1 mitigation for the fill of any water feature below the 100-year flood elevation and has updated model to reflect flooding with Atlas-14 data at a higher resolution.</p> <p>>The district has reconnected floodplain along 6,730 feet of channel creating several acres of flood storage and habitat.</p>	○	<p>>continue to develop ecological enhancement plans with all stream restoration projects.</p> <p>>seek opportunities when land develops to protect and enhance floodplain.</p>
2. District will promote/encourage cities and developers to incorporate low impact development	Ongoing	Ongoing	<p>>District has tried to incentivize green space preservation through stormwater management rule.</p> <p>>District has supported cities when they have requested density swaps or other planning tools to preserve areas of ecological importance.</p>	○	<p>Not having land use authority limits the influence the district can have on LID implementation. The district is evaluating additional ways to incentivize LID as well as ways in which the district can otherwise protect and preserve marginalized lands.</p>

Objective WQuan 2: Limit the impact of stormwater runoff on receiving waterbodies.

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Promote strategies that minimize baseflow impacts.	Ongoing	Ongoing	<p>>Infiltration is required on all permits for storm water management.</p> <p>>The district has provided technical and financial assistance to landowners to construct 42 rain gardens to promote infiltration and improve baseflows.</p> <p>>The district has incorporated infiltration into several capital projects.</p>	○	<p>>Continue regulatory, E&O, and capital programs to promote infiltration.</p> <p>>Evaluate and incorporate the principles of soil health into capital projects and, as appropriate, regulatory program.</p> <p>>Evaluate opportunities and effects of extended detention in areas where infiltration is infeasible.</p>
2. Continue to promote infiltration	Ongoing	Ongoing	<p>See above</p> <p>>The district works with homeowner associations and lake associations to educate on stormwater management and encourage participation.</p>	○	<p>The district will begin the process of opening dialogue with community development departments instead of just communicating with public works as the barriers are often tied to planning and zoning ordinances. Eg. parking requirements, zoning densities, storage regulations, etc</p>

<p>3. Maintenance of H&H model with most recent data.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>The district has updated their H&H model and corresponding flood risk map in Minnetonka, Eden Prairie, and Bloomington to look at Atlas 14 1% storm as well as mid-century. The model is updated to include storm sewer conveyance and storage from as-built record drawings whenever available.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue to update map to include high-resolution for entire district. Continue to update map as private and public developments result in the creation of new infrastructure.</p>
<p>4. Seek to alter hydrographs via practices that reduce peak discharge rates and flow volumes</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>District rules require that discharge rates cannot increase at any point leaving a site.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>The district will develop a stream protection strategy that looks at extended detention as well as a variety of abstraction techniques, include emerging practices.</p>
<p>5. Develop and implement actions to reduce flood risk</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>>District is partnering with member communities to update the district H&H model and corresponding flood risk map.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>>Upon completion of modeling and mapping, the district will work with public works, public safety, planning, and parks and recreation of the member cities to develop mitigation strategies, programs, and practices to minimize risks.</p>

<p>6. Work with cities and stakeholders to encourage conservation practices</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>See above answers</p> <p>District worked with ISD 112 to install and maintain a capture and use system to irrigate athletic fields at Chanhassen High School</p> <p>District partnered with Eden Prairie to install a capture and use system to wash trucks and firehouses at one of their fire stations.</p> <p>District partnered with Chanhassen Parks and Rec to install a reuse system at Lake Susan Park to irrigate the baseball field.</p> <p>District worked with The Preserve Association in Eden Prairie to convert 10's of acres of maintained lawn to native prairie or no mow.</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>>2023 E&O workplan will be updated to identify ways to engage decision makers and other departments within our member cities.</p>
<p>7. Investigate alternatives to infiltration practices to promote volume reduction in areas where infiltration is not practicable</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>District has encouraged reuse on private development when separation to ground water, contamination, or infiltration rates are an issue. To date, a handful of developments have taken this approach.</p> <p>District allows for credit to be given for leaf interception for tree canopies over impervious surface. This is based upon the work done by the Center for Watershed Protection</p>	<p>○</p>	<p>Continue current programs and practices.</p> <p>Evaluate the role of urban soils in storm water management.</p>

Appendix B. Performance Standards

PRAP Organizational Assessment

Part 2-Performance Standards

2022

METRO WATERSHED DISTRICT and WMO PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

LGU Name: Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District

Performance Area	Performance Standard	Level of Review	Rating		
			YES	NO	
	★ High Performance standard	I Annual Compliance	Yes, No, or Value		
	■ Basic practice or statutory requirement (see instructions for explanation of standards)	II BWSR Staff Review & Assessment (1/10 yrs.)			
Administration	■ Activity report: annual, on-time	I	X		
	■ Financial report & audit completed on time	I	X		
	■ Drainage authority buffer strip report submitted on time	I	NA		
	■ eLINK Grant Report(s): submitted on time	I	X		
	■ Rules: date of last revision or review – Please enter month/year (i.e., 01/20)	II	Aug 2018		
	■ Personnel policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 years	II	X		
	■ Data practices policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 years	II	X		
	■ Manager appointments: current and reported	II	X		
	■ Consultant RFP: within 2 yrs. for professional services	II	X		
	■ WD/WMO has resolution assuming WCA responsibilities and appropriate delegation resolutions as warranted (N/A if not LGU)	II	X		
	■ WD/WMO has knowledgeable & trained staff that manages WCA program or has secured qualified delegate. (N/A if not LGU)	II	X		
	★ Administrator on staff	II	X		
	★ Board training: orientation and continuing education plan, record for each board member	II	X		
	★ Staff training: orientation and continuing education plan and record for each staff	II	X		
	★ Operational guidelines for fiscal procedures and conflicts of interest exist and current	II	X		
★ Public drainage records: meet modernization guidelines	II	NA			
Planning	■ Watershed management plan: up-to-date	I	X		
	■ City/twp. local water plans not yet approved	II		X	
	■ Capital Improvement Program: reviewed every 2 years	II	X		
	★ Strategic plan or self-assessment completed in last 5 years	II		X	
	★ Strategic plan identifies short-term priorities	II		X	
Execution	■ Engineer Reports: submitted for DNR & BWSR review	II	X		
	■ WCA decisions and determinations are made in conformance with all WCA requirements. (if delegated WCA LGU)	II	X		
	■ WCA TEP reviews & recommendations appropriately coordinated. (if delegated WCA LGU)	II	X		
	★ Certified wetland delineator on staff or retainer	II	X		
	■ Total expenditures per year (past 10 yrs.)	II		see below	
	★ Water quality trends tracked for key water bodies	II	X		
★ Watershed hydrologic trends monitored / reported	II	X			
Communication & Coordination	■ Website: contains information as required by MR 8410.0150 Subpart 3a, i.e. as board meeting, contact information, water plan, etc.	II	X		
	■ Functioning advisory committee(s): recommendations on projects, reports, 2-way communication with Board	II	X		
	■ Communication piece: sent within last 12 months	II	X		
	Communication Target Audience:				
	★ Track progress for Information and Education objectives in Plan	II	X		
	★ Coordination with County Board, SWCD Board, City/Township officials	II	X		
★ Partnerships: cooperative projects/tasks with neighboring organizations, such as counties, SWCDs, WDs, tribal governments, Non-Government Organizations	II	X			

Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Expenditures	1,877,000	1,968,000	1,738,983	1,607,440	2,859,000	3,157,243	3,038,390	4,911,237	4,290,671	1,976,046

* Through May

Appendix C. Summary of Survey Results

Internal Survey

Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD Board and Staff Questions and Responses

How often does your organization use your current management plan to guide decisions about what you do? (response percent)	
Always	71.4%
Usually	14.3%
Seldom	14.3%
Never	0.0%

- As a manager, I have asked for an update on our progress on the plan
- Goals are stated in the 10-year plan, and those goals inform every project and program the District undertakes. Staff consults the plan as needed when re-prioritizing needs to occur
- It's a roadmap to activities in our district
- There are occasions where opportunities to undertake a project are not identified specifically in our plan or when the schedule of projects are altered as a partner came forward or dropped out. Otherwise, we follow the plan exclusively.

List your organization's most successful programs and projects during the past 3-5 years.

- Lower Riley Creek restoration (x3)
- Alum treatments for lakes
- Vegetation treatment plans
- Creek assessment program has been successful in classifying the areas of the creeks that need improvements
- Pioneer Wetland Restoration (x4)
- Continued expansion of education and outreach programs
- Junior Watershed Explorer program, activity book designed by District staff and distributed widely
- St Hubert Water Quality Improvement project
- Chanhassen High School Stormwater Reuse project
- CRAS completed and continued monitoring
- Salt education for the community
- Middle Riley Creek Restoration
- Rice March Lake Water Quality Improvement Project
- Bluff Creek Tributary Creek Restoration Project
- Duck Lake bridge removal and sub watershed projects
- Scenic Height school project
- Silver Lake water quality project
- Partnership with Minnetonka Public Schools to do a forest and wetland restoration as well as stormwater management at Scenic Heights Elementary
- Partnership with MN DNR and City of Chanhassen to purchase and move three homes within a floodplain
- Partnership with Bear Path Golf and Country Club to restore roughly 1000 feet at Riley Creek, reconnect with flood plain, and establish buffers
- Watershed stewardship grants to private residents, homeowners' associations, school districts and municipalities for everything from wetland buffer establishment to salt brine tanks and applicators.

What helped make these projects and programs successful?

- Having an assessment program in place and competent engineering
- Work together as a team and communicate effectively with the consultants
- Communication to the board as we take steps forward, as the board can understand the overall vision and give input
- Partnerships with cities, private organizations, schools, and landowners
- Terrific engineering, planning, building, and follow through by staff and contractors. Also, buy in from the public, including their ideas and comments
- Partnerships with various entities
- Dedicated and skilled staff
- Board members being forward thinking and supportive

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

- Shoreline assessment and protection
- Treatment of runoff into lakes, particularly Lotus Lake, the largest body of water within the district
- Lower Purgatory Creek particularly near Frederick Miller Springs
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion initiative
- Project delays which delay others identified in the 10-year plan
- Groundwater conservation program needs enrichment
- Stabilization of reach P4B on Purgatory Creek through Bent Creek Golf Course.
- Spent Lime Facility on Lake Lucy

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

- Lack of focus by staff and managers
- Main reason projects and programs see slow or little progress is due to the board of managers. Board often inserts themselves in ways that are not productive, asking for an overwhelming amount of information before they vote “yes” to a project that has already been vetted and recommended to them by staff and/or consultants. Does not show feelings of trust. Staff and consultants know the board will question everything and rarely accept recommendations.
- Limited resources so we use a project prioritization process
- Add-on projects we undertook
- Impossible to forge the partnerships with private entities needed to implement the project

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

List the ones with which you work well already

Carver County
Carver County SWCD
Chanhassen (x2)
Chanhassen Engineering and Public Works
Eden Prairie (x2)
Eden Prairie Parks and Recreation

Bloomington (x3)
 Schools
 Churches
 Other Water Management Organizations
 Shorewood
 City of Minnetonka
 University of Minnesota (research)
 Nine Mile Creek Watershed
 Lower MN Watershed

List the ones with which better collaboration would benefit your organization

Cities within the district
 DNR
 Board of Water and Soil Resources
 Construction and home builders
 Hennepin County Environmental Services
 Carver County

If you don't know much about your organization's working relationships with partners, enter "I don't know"

What steps could your organization take to increase your effectiveness in accomplishing your plan goals and objectives?

- Review the plan and analyze our progress and shortcomings. It appears we are proceeding ad hoc, and maybe we are following our plan but don't know because I have not received a report on progress on the plan
- Respect the roles and expertise of the various levels of staff and consultants
- For the board of managers to understand their role better and allow staff to function
- Develop closer relationships with partner organizations so we can identify opportunities for joint projects sooner
- Be part of our cities planning process: to know when projects are being presented and discussed so we can contribute for a successful outcome vs. finding out after the project is discussed and planned and difficult to change. Just having a seat at the table
- More outreach to potential partners, especially involving community development departments from various cities

How long have you been with the organization?	(response percent)
Less than 5 years	57.1%
5 to 15 years	42.9%
More than 15 years	0.0%

External Survey

Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD Partner Organization Questions and Responses

Question: How often have you interacted with this organization during the past two to three years? Select the response closest to your experience. (response percent)	
Not at all	0.0%
A few times	30.0%
Several times a year	25.0%
Monthly	20.0%
Almost every week	25.0%
Daily	0.0%

Is the amount of work you do in partnership with this organization...	(percent)
Not enough, there is potential for us to do more together	10.0%
About right	90.0%
Too much, they depend on us for work they should be doing for themselves	0.0%
Too much, we depend on them for work we should be doing ourselves or with others	0.0%

Based on your experience working with them, please rate the organization in the following areas:					
Performance Characteristic	Rating (percent of responses)				
	Strong	Good	Acceptable	Poor	I don't know
Communication <i>(they keep us informed; we know their activities; they seek our input)</i>	35.0%	30.0%	15.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Quality of work <i>(they have good projects and programs; good service delivery)</i>	45.0%	45.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Relationships with Customers <i>(they work well with landowners and clients)</i>	15.0%	40.0%	25.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Initiative <i>(they are willing to take on new projects, try new ideas)</i>	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Timelines/Follow-through <i>(they are reliable and meet deadlines)</i>	15.0%	35.0%	25.0%	15.0%	10.0%

How is your working relationship with this organization? (percent)	
Powerful, we are more effective working together	5.0%
Strong, we work well together most of the time	50.0%
Good, but it could be better	25.0%
Acceptable, but a struggle at times	20.0%
Poor, there are almost always difficulties	0.0%
Non-existent, we don't work with this organization	0.0%

- My interaction with RPBCWD is minimal, their annual WCA reporting is frequently late and generally requires several reminders for completion
- Can be difficult to connect/communicate with

- District is a strong partner for Cities in the realm of education and water quality. However, there can be difficulties when working on effective, efficient permitting on public works projects with the Watershed District
- We do not have much interaction
- Great group to work with! Think they could utilize our organizations technical knowledge on a wider range of projects
- They are very inflexible in meeting the intent of the rules. Permitting process is exhaustive and expensive particular for simplest of projects (culver replacements, FES replacements, erosion repairs, etc).

Do you have additional thought about how the “subject” organization could be more effective?

- **Permitting requirements on projects can be difficult and time consuming to meet standards. The permit review process could be more efficient. They could always be more collaboration between the two organizations with respect to water resources issues**
- **Board members shift leading to changes in focus and priorities**
- **Improve remote meeting capacity and encourage remote participation**
- **Be more available**
- **Make permitting of public works projects more efficient and effective. Often times, the majority of the stormwater management effort on the engineering front is expended on small improvements that have little benefit. Additionally, the ways in which rules are written, interpreted, and implemented that have little benefit in reality.**
- **They have been difficult to contact and communicate with. They could be much better at being available and communicative**
- **More consistency of purpose and increased teamwork between the board and staff would improve effectiveness. The board and staff do not appear to work together effectively. Many discussions are circular. The whims of the board consume a lot of staff time. Staff are highly qualified but seem overwhelmed and are doing the best they can.**
- **Some of the appointed board members micro-manage and push staff to spend too much time on things that are not the main focus of the organization. Trust the staff and let them do their job.**
- **Improve communication would hopefully lead to improved collaboration.**
- **Having a board and staff that understands the “real world” issues that municipalities face in getting projects permitted. Lighten up on exhaustive analysis needed for simple replacement projects- often time the amount of time, energy and cost to obtain a permit far outweighs the cost of the improvements. Provide rules that are clear and flexible in meeting combined goals of better water quality.**
- **Clearer understanding of the responsibilities of Board members and increasing the amount of trust they have in staff and consultants. The technical and administrative individuals that work for the District are among the best in the State at what they do. They should be commended for their ability to manage turnover and continue to implement high level effective projects.**
- **Hire more staff if financially viable- remove board members that prevent the organization from running smoothly**
- **District board meetings can be excessively long. This results in significant costs if several staff members and paid consultants routinely have to attend meetings when items are on the agenda for approval.**

How long have you been with your current organization?	(response percent)
Less than 5 years	30.0%
5 to 15 years	30.0%
More than 15 years	40.0%

Appendix D. Wetland Conservation Act Administrative Review Report

Wetland Conservation Act Administrative Review Report

Report Prepared for: Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District

Report Date: *October 11, 2022*

Prepared by: Alyssa Core, Wetland Specialist. Alyssa.Core@state.mn.us

Jed Chesnut, Wetland Specialist, Jed.Chesnut@state.mn.us

Introduction

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

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

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

Methods

Data for this report was collected via direct interview(s) with staff, a review of an appropriate number and type of project files, a review of existing documentation on file (i.e. annual reporting/resolutions), and through prior BWSR staff experience/interaction with the LGU or SWCD. In some cases, a project site review may be necessary. Generally, interviews, project file reviews and site visits were done with two BWSR staff on agreed upon dates.

Specific Methods

The interview for this report was conducted on September 19, 2022. The interview was conducted by Alyssa Core and Jed Chesnut. Wetland Specialists with the Minnesota Board of Water and Soils Resources. BWSR Staff met with Terry Jeffery, District Administrator for the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District at the watershed district office. In addition to the data collection forms completed, 1 project file was reviewed as well as resolutions related to the adoption of WCA and decision-making authority. No site visits were deemed necessary for this review.

WCA Report Summary and Recommendations

A. Administration

PRAP Performance Standard 1 – Watershed District has an adopting resolution assuming WCA responsibility and appropriate decision resolution as warranted.

The WCA (8420.0200) allows an LGU to designate decision-making authority to staff according to the procedures it establishes. While RPBCWD staff currently make all decisions, there is no rule, resolution or ordinance on record designating this authority. **This does not meet minimum WCA requirements.**

WCA Administrative Requirement #1: The LGU should execute a updated resolution delegating WCA decision-making authority to staff. A sample resolution was sent to them on September 22, 2022.

PRAP Performance Standard 2 – LGU has knowledgeable and trained staff members that manage WCA program and/or have secured a qualified delegate.

The LGU has two staff which have their Professional Wetland Delineation Certification. Additionally, both staff working on WCA related items have backgrounds in natural resources. **Staff are effectively implementing the program.**

B. Execution and Coordination

PRAP Performance Standard 3 – WCA Decisions and Determinations made in conformance with all WCA requirement.

The LGU has made all reviewed decisions and determinations in conformance with all WCA requirements. **Staff are effectively implementing the program.**

PRAP Performance Standard 6 – WCA TEP reviews and recommendations are appropriately coordinated.

The LGU utilizes the TEP appropriately and incorporates recommendations when the TEP provides them. **Staff are effectively implementing the program.**

Appendix E. Comment Letter

Appendix F. Program Data

Time required to complete this review

RPBCWD Staff: 34 Hours

BWSR Staff: 80 Hours

Schedule of Organizational Assessment Review

BWSR PRAP Performance Review Key Dates

- September 1st, 2022: Initial meeting with RPBCWD staff
- September 14, 2022: Initial meeting with RPBCWD board
- September 28th, 2022: Survey of board, staff, and partners
- November 2nd, 2022: Presentation of Draft Report
- December xx, 2022: Transmittal of Final Report to LGU

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