



Level II Performance Review

Scott Water Management Organization

Local Government Unit Review

11/10/2015

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

Report Summary	iv
Introduction	1
Findings	2
General Conclusions.....	5
Recommendations	6
LGU Comments and BWSR Responses.....	7
Appendix A. Plan Accomplishments.....	8
Appendix B. Performance Standards	25
Appendix C. Summary of Survey Results	27
Appendix D. LGU Comment Letter	31
Appendix E. Program Data	32

This report has been prepared for the **Scott WMO** 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 Jenny Gieseke (jenny.gieseke@state.mn.us: 507-381-3131).

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.

Report Summary

<p>PRAP Level II Report Summary</p>	<p>Scott WMO</p>
<p>What is a PRAP Performance Review?</p> <p>The Board of Water and Soil Resources supports Minnesota’s counties, watershed districts and soil and water conservation districts that deliver water and related land resource management projects and programs. In 2007 the Board set up 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>Key Findings and Conclusions</p> <p>The Scott WMO can serve as an example of how a systematic approach to water management can be delivered. The WMO has a solid record of accomplishment in all areas of their water management plan.</p> <p>The WMO’s compliance with BWSR performance standards puts them among the top performers in meeting the essential, administrative, planning and communication practices that lead to an effective, efficient organization.</p> <p>The responses of the WMO’s partners reinforce these conclusions with high marks for communication, quality of work, relations with customers and follow-through.</p> <p>The designation of 4 out of the seven goals in the water resource management plan as resource outcome goals is an innovative step toward outcome based tracking of progress in improving water quality. However, this designation could be improved through the creation of resource specific, measurable water quality and habitat objectives within the plan (see Recommendation 1).</p> <p>Resource Outcomes</p> <p>Four of the seven goals in the Scott WMO Water Resources Management plan are related to resource outcomes. The WMO uses long term metrics to track progress toward those resources goals each year in their annual report. No significant trends in the water quality of local resources have been reported since 2011. However, the 2014 reports an increase in the native plant diversity and coverage in Cedar Lake.</p> <p>Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Complete annual audit on time <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Recommendation 1: Consider using Prioritized, Targeted and Measureable criteria for Goals and Objectives in the next water management plan. ■ Recommendation 2: Structure annual reports or website information to report progress and trends made in achieving resource outcome goals. <p>Commendations</p> <p>The Scott WMO is commended for meeting 11 out of 12 High Performance Standards</p>

Introduction

This is an information document prepared by the staff of the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) for the Scott Water Management Organization (WMO). It reports the results of a routine performance review of that organization's water resource management plan implementation and overall organizational effectiveness in delivery of land and water conservation projects and programs.

BWSR has reviewed the Scott WMO's reported accomplishments of their management plan action items, determined the organization's compliance with BWSR's Level I and II performance standards, and surveyed members of the Scott WMO and their partner organizations.

This review is neither a financial audit nor 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 PRAP purpose is to support local delivery of land 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.

BWSR has developed four levels of review, from routine to specialized, depending on the program mandates and the needs of the local governmental unit. A Level I review annually tabulates all local governmental units' compliance with basic planning and reporting requirements. In Level II, conducted by BWSR once every ten years for each local government unit, the focus is on the degree to which the organization is accomplishing its water resource management plan. A Level II review includes determination of compliance with BWSR's Level I and II statewide performance standards, a tabulation of progress on planned goals and objectives, a survey of board or water plan task force members and staff of the factors affecting plan implementation, a survey of LGU partners about their impressions of working with the LGU, and a BWSR staff report to the organization with findings, conclusions and recommendations. BWSR's actions in Levels III and IV include elements of Levels I and II and then emphasize assistance to address the local governmental unit's specific needs.

Scott WMO Background

The Scott WMO was formed in July of 2000, On July 21, 2000. In February of 2004, the organization adopted its first Water Resource Management Plan.

The Scott County Board of Commissioners serves as the governing body of the WMO, and three County staff currently provide staff and administration functions.

The Scott County WMO covers the majority of Scott County, including areas of five different watersheds; Sand Creek, Credit River, Southwest, Shakopee basin and portions of Prior Lake Spring Lake.

The Scott Watershed Planning Commission is a seven member commission providing oversight on policy issues, budget, plan and program priorities and advisory support for the WMO Board. Commission members include one representative from the Shakopee Basin/Prior Lake Spring Lake area, one from Credit River, one from Southwest, two from Sand Creek (because of its large area) and two at-large members.

The current water resources management plan was adopted in 2009 after over a year of issue identification, gap assessment, goal and policy development and strategy prioritization. This process included public review and input from the watershed planning commission, WMO Board, staff, and technical advisory committee. The resulting plan includes goals, four of which have resource based outcomes, and three have operational outcomes.

Scott WMO Vision:

As indicated in the 2009-2018 Water Resources Management Plan, the Vision of the Scott WMO is:

To compile a system of well buffered water courses, wetlands and lakes surrounded by an upland where Stormwater runoff is managed to reduce volumes, control peak flows and their timing, and minimize pollutant generation and export; and where water resources meet local expectations.

Findings

This section describes what BWSR learned about the performance of the Scott WMO.

Findings Part 1: Planning

The current water resources management plan was adopted in 2009 after over a year of issue

identification, gap assessment, goal and policy development and strategy prioritization. This process included public review and input from the watershed planning commission, WMO Board, staff, and technical advisory committee. The plan identifies 11 Issue areas for the Scott WMO, and includes seven goals to address the Issue Areas. Four of the goals have resource based outcomes, and three have operational outcomes. The plan has been amended three times since it was developed, with the most recent occurring in 2011.

Resource Outcomes

Four of the seven goals in the Scott WMO Water Resources Management plan are related to resource outcomes. The WMO uses long term metrics to track progress toward those resources goals each year in their annual report. No significant trends in water quality of local resources have been reported since 2011.

There are 87 different implementation items assessed in this report. Scott WMO staff have provided a description of the goals, actions and accomplishments to date. An analysis of this information shows that the Scott WMO has completed or started most of the action items in the plan. Based on this assessment, the WMO has completed 31 items (36%), has made progress on 52 items (59%), and as not started 4 items (5%).

None of the actions designated as “not started” have been dropped from the plan. These actions fall into 3 categories; rescheduled, not requested to act, and not completed. The McMahon treatment project has been rescheduled to start in 2017. Actions supporting wellhead protection efforts have not been completed because the item was included as an action that would occur “when requested by LGUs”. At the time of this review, no requests have been made. Finally, the final items evaluated as “not started” simply have not been started. These include assisting public understanding of the complexities of water management and the use of special assessments for projects.

A full description of the goals, implementation actions and progress is contained in Appendix A, pages 8-24.

Findings Part 2: Performance Standards

BWSR has developed a set of performance standards that describe both basic and benchmark best management practices related to overall operation of the organization. The standards address four areas of operation: administration, planning, execution, and communication/coordination. The **basic practice** standards describe practices that are either legally required or fundamental to WMO operations. The **high performance** standards describe practices that reflect a high level of performance. While all watershed management organizations should be meeting the basic standards, only the more ambitious ones will meet many benchmark standards. The results for the Scott WMO are listed in Appendix B, pages 25-26.

BWSR tracks all 18 watershed management organizations' compliance with three of the basic standards each year in a Level I review. This is reported in a publically accessible database on the BWSR website...

For this Level II review, which includes a report of compliance with all the basic and benchmark standards, the Scott WMO reports compliance with 12 of the 13 basic performance standards. The WMO does not comply with the annual audit requirement. The organization meets 11 of 12 high performance standards (no orientation and continuing education record exists for board members).

Findings Part 3: LGU Self-Assessment

The information for this part and the next is based on responses to surveys developed by BWSR to get the opinions of both board members and staff and from the WMO's partner organizations about performance. Scott WMO staff identified, at BWSR's request, their current Watershed Planning Commission members and staff, and those partner organizations with which they have an on-going working relationship. BWSR invited those people to take the on-line survey and their responses were received and analyzed by BWSR staff. The identity of survey respondents is unknown to both BWSR and the Scott WMO.

Part 3 summarizes the results from the survey of WMO planning commission members and staff regarding the accomplishments of the organization over the past several years. A total 10 watershed planning commission members and staff were invited to take the survey and 6 (60%) responded, a good responses

rate. Out of those 6 participants, a few (up to 50% in some cases) did not answer all of the questions. The full responses are reported in Appendix C, pages 27-30, and briefly summarized here.

100 percent of watershed planning commission members and staff who participated in the survey indicated that the Scott WMO "always" consults their management plan or some other master planning document to guide their decisions on the board.

In listing the organization's most successful accomplishments, respondents mentioned the Cedar Lake aquatic plant management and water quality studies most frequently. Other successes mentioned include Quarry Creek, Sand Creek watershed improvements and monitoring, Shoreline and Prairie restorations and Credit River, among others. A complete listing of responses can be found in Appendix C.

Respondents attributed the success of these projects to excellent partnerships and collaboration between Scott WMO personnel and landowners and citizens, and to cost share funding.

Survey participants were also asked to list programs or projects which have not shown as much progress or success. Responses included larger capital improvement projects and Sand Creek. Limited funding, time constraints and jurisdiction as reasons for limited success on these projects. It is interesting to note that Sand Creek was also among the projects listed as a success.

Respondents listed Scott SWCD, Prior Lake/Spring Lake WD, local cities, Vermillion River WD, Scott County Parks and Public works, Cedar Lake Improvement District, adjacent counties and BWSR as organizations the Scott WMO currently has strong working relationships with. The New Prague sportsmanship club, SMSC- Sioux community, some townships and the MPCA were listed as organizations with which better collaboration would benefit the Scott WMO.

Findings Part 4: Partners' Assessment

Scott WMO staff identified 18 individuals who have or potentially could partner with the organization in the implementation of its plan. These people were invited to take an on-line survey of their opinions regarding their working relationship with and assessment of the WMO. 12 of the 18 individuals responded, a good (66%) response rate. The partners were asked questions that focused on their working relationship

with the WMO and their rating of the work done by the WMO. These responses are reported in Appendix C, pages 27-30, and summarized here.

All partner organization respondents expressed familiarity with the Scott WMO as indicated by reporting interactions from several times a year (50%), to monthly (25%), to weekly (17%) and daily (8%). 83% of the partners expressed that the amount of work they do with the Scott WMO is about right and 17% indicated there was potential for more collaboration.

Overall, the partners gave high marks to the Scott WMO's performance in four key areas of partnership (see following table).

Performance Area	Partner Ratings				
	Strong	Good	Accept-able	Poor	Don't Know
Communication	33%	42%	17%	8%	0%
Quality of Work	83%	8%	8%	0%	0%
Relations with Customers	58%	33%	0%	0%	8%
Timelines/ Follow through	67%	25%	8%	0%	0%

Finally, 92% of the partner organizations believe they have a powerful or strong working relationship with Scott WMO. A full summary of the survey results is in Appendix C, page 27-30.

General Conclusions

The Scott WMO can serve as an example of how a systematic approach to water management can be delivered. The WMO has a solid record of accomplishment in all areas of their water management plan.

The WMO's compliance with BWSR performance standards puts them among the top performers in meeting the essential, administrative, planning and communication practices that lead to an effective, efficient organization.

The responses of the WMO's partners reinforce these conclusions with high marks for communication, quality of work, relations with customers and follow-through.

The designation of 4 out of the seven goals in the water resource management plan as resource outcome goals is an innovative step toward outcome based tracking of progress in improving water quality. However, this designation could be improved through the creation of resource specific, measurable water quality and habitat objectives within the plan (see Recommendation 1).

Action Items

Action items are tied to basic performance standards with which the WMO is not in compliance. These are identified in the Part 2 Findings section above and in Appendix B. The Scott WMO has 1 action item.

- Complete annual audit on time

Under typical circumstances the inclusion of an action item would coincide with a specific recommendation in this report. However, recent revisions to Minn. Rules Chapter 8410 have changed when audit reports are due in situations where a county or city audit report contains the financial statements for an Organization. With the new rule in place, the audit report for the Scott WMO will now be due 30 days after the county receives the audit report. We are confident that this change will result in on-time audit report submittal and do not feel the need to include an official recommendation at this time.

Commendations

Commendations are issued based on compliance with BWSR's High Performance Standards, as reported in the Findings, Part 2 above. The Scott WMO is commended for meeting the following High Performance Standards, reflecting practices that indicate organizational strength:

- Staff training: orientation and continuing education records exist for each staff member
- Operational guidelines exist and current.
- Biennial Budget Request submitted within last 24 months.
- The strategic plan identifies short term activities and budgets based on state and local watershed priorities
- Water quality trends tracked for priority water bodies.
- Watershed hydrologic trends monitored / reported.
- The website contains meeting notices, agendas and minutes, updated after each board meeting, and additional content
- Track progress for I & E objectives in Plan.
- Stakeholder input has been obtained within the last 5 years
- Partnerships: cooperative projects/tasks done with neighboring districts and organizations, counties, cities, non-governmental organizations.
- Coordination with County/City/Twp. by WMO Board members or staff.

Recommendations

This section contains recommendations offered by BWSR to the **Scott WMO** and staff to enhance the organization's service and its delivery of effective water and related land resource management. BWSR financial assistance may be available to support the **Scott WMO's** implementation of some of these recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Consider using Prioritized, Targeted and Measureable criteria for Goals and Objectives in the next water management plan.

The WMO staff and Board should consider expanding on the idea of resource outcomes in their next plan and structure their goals and objectives to explicitly acknowledge prioritized, targeted and measurable goals. While the current plan identifies generalized resource outcomes, there are no measurable actions associated with those goals.

Recommendation 2: Structure annual reports or website information to report progress and trends made in achieving resource outcome goals.

The current plan designates four out of seven goals in the water resource management plan as resource outcome goals. Efforts should be made in annual reports or on the Scott WMO website to share progress and trends made in achieving those resource outcome goals. While some of this information is included in the Annual Reports, it would be beneficial to include the information in easy to understand and easy to access formats on the website and the annual reports. The significant work the WMO has done in tracking water quality throughout their jurisdiction should make this shift in reporting attainable.

LGU Comments and BWSR Responses

A written response to this draft report from the Scott WMO is invited and will be summarized and responded to in this section and reproduced in its entirety in Appendix D of the final report.

Scott WMO Comment 1: *BWSR should consider whether organizations have had to deal with emergencies as these can consume a lot of staff time and pull organizations temporarily away focusing on implementing their plan.*

BWSR Response: BWSR has noted this comment. Currently, this information can be captured through the survey when staff and Board members respond to the question about why a particular project or effort hasn't moved forward as planned. However, we will also consider this recommendation when revising the PRAP survey questions and performance standards checklist in the future.

Scott WMO Comment 2: *Flexibility is very important for responding to unforeseen things like emergencies, and for learning and adapting, and should be a consideration.*

BWSR Response: Comment Noted, see above response to Scott WMO Comment 1.

Scott WMO Comment 3: *We have reviewed and commented on the Prioritized, Measureable and Targeted approach document prepared by BWSR. We appreciate BWSR's recommendation regarding its use. However, based on our experience and success with implementing practices with land owners we feel the approach promoted by the document is missing key elements. These include: a) that the amount of land scape scale change in practices and land use needed to affect water quality improvements means that more than just good targeting is needed, we also need momentum and community capacity; and 2) we need to be intentional about building relationships and trust with land owners.*

BWSR Response: Comment noted. BWSR supports the Scott WMO's excellent work and dedication to building relationships and community capacity, and recommend applying the PTM approach along with those efforts.

Appendix A. Plan Accomplishments

LGU Name: Scott Watershed Management Organization
 Type of Management Plan: Metro Watershed Management Organization Plan
 Date of Last Plan Revision: August 2013

Date of This Assessment: 5/27/2015

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

GOAL No. 1 : Wetland Management: To Protect and Enhance Wetland Ecosystems, and to Encourage a Measurable Net Gain of Wetland Functions and Acreage

Page 3-6 of Mgmt. Plan

Policy 1.1 : Preserve Wetlands (no net loss) for Water Retention, Recharge, Soil Conservation, Wildlife Habitat, Aesthetics, and Natural Enhancement of Water Quality

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 1.1.1 Adopt Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) Requirements as the Basic Wetland Management Standard of the WMO	2009 and 2010	2009 and 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
2.Strategy 1.1.2 Operate WCA	2009 through 2018	2009 through 2014	Sand Creek Twp. requested County/WMO operate WCA in TWP. Was done until 2014. Then County delegated to the Scott SWCD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None
3.Strategy 1.1.3 Assist with Wetland Replacement Monitoring	2009 on as requested by others	On-going	Supported SWCD efforts in 2009 and have had no requests since.	<input type="radio"/>	Continue as planned
4. Strategy 1.1.4 Assist with Opportunities to Acquire Land for Banking and Mitigation	2009 through 2010	On-going	Assisted SWCD with application to BWSR for bank that was not approved. Made offer to landowners to create bank in 2012 that was turned down.	<input type="radio"/>	Continue as planned

Policy 1.2: Protect Wetlands and Impacts Caused by Stormwater Runoff

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 1.2.1 Erosion Control and Post Construction Stormwater Water Quality Standards	2009 and 2010	2009 and 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation

2.Strategy 1.2.2 Wetland Buffer Standards	2009 and 2010	2009 and 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
---	---------------	---------------	--	-------------------------------------	---

Policy 1.3 Enhance and Restore Wetlands

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Strategy 1.3.1: Incentive Payments (for wetland restoration)	2009 through 2018	2009 through 2018	The practice and incentive is in the Scott WMO Technical Assistance and Cost Share (TACS) Program Docket. Only one application has been received and approved since 2009.	○	Continue to offer in the Docket.
2.Strategy 1.3.2 Coordination with Other Wetland Restoration Programs	2009 through 2018	2009 through 2014	Worked with the SWCD to compile and submit 5 applications for RIM/WRP in 2009. None were approved for funding by BWSR. From 2010 through 2014 worked with NRCS and BWSR to partner on the WREP program. One restoration was approved.	○	Consider partnering again if opportunities arise.
3. Strategy 1.3.3 Promote Public Values Incentive Program	2009 through 2018	2009 through 2018	Public Values approach was finalize and County Zoning Ordinances amended. However, with recession no subdivision applications for PUD have been submitted involving wetland restoration.	○	Continue to promote and pursue through development review process at the County
4. Strategy 1.3.4 Targeted Wetland Restoration /Riparian Reforestation Program	2009 through 2018	2009 through 2018	A number of targets were contacted as part of the WREP project and for riparian buffer improvements as part of a McKnight Foundation Grant in 2009 and 2010 with limited success. One restoration was completed as part of the WREP program and two wetland enhancements completed on public/park property. Four riparian RIM projects, three riparian buffers and numerous filter strips have been completed as part of the TACS Program since 2009. Riparian efforts were reassessed and a new targeted effort with Great River Greening is starting 2015 treating them as capital projects versus cost share projects.	○	Continue to promote through the TACS program, but emphasize the Targeted Riparian contacts with Great River Greening through the Sand Creek Targeted Watershed Grant.

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

GOAL No. 2 : Surface Water Quality. To Protect and Improve Surface Water QualityPage 3-11 of Mgmt. Plan**Policy 2.1 : Promote a Sustainable System of Buffers and Green Infrastructure**

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 2.1.1 Watercourse Buffer Standards	2009 and 2010	2009 and 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
2.Strategy 2.1.2 Promote Disconnected Stormwater Management and Low Impact Development (LID)	2009 and 2010	2009 and 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
3.Strategy 1.3.3 Promote Public Values Incentive Program	See Goal 1, Policy 1.3 and Strategy 1.3.3 above			See 1.3.3	See above
4. Strategy 2.1.3 Support Detailed Area Planning	2009 through 2013	2009 through 2013	DAP study completed and Bradshaw Lakes/ Ditch 5 Planning Study also completed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None

Policy 2.2 : Prevent Further Degradation

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 2.2.1 Stormwater Quality Standards for New and Redevelopment	2009 and 2010	2009 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
2.Strategy 2.2.2 Cost Share for Innovative Practices	2009 through 2018	2009 through 2018	Innovative practices have been defined and included in the TACs program Docket. Several have been completed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
3.Strategy 2.2.3 Nitrate Management Demonstrations	2012 through 2018	2013-2015	Nutrient Management added to the TACs Program Docket. Discussion held with Scott County Parks about demonstrations on parks lands, and partnership formed with MAWRC to start Farmer Led Cop-Op.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue Parks discussions and consider recommendations from Farmer Led Co-op
4. Strategy 2.1.2 Promoting Disconnected Stormwater Management and Low Impact Development	See Policy 2.1 and Strategy 2.1.2 above			See 2.1.2	See above

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

Policy 2.3 : Address Impaired Waters and Improve Water Quality

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Strategy 2.3.1 Cost Share and Incentive Program for Existing Land Uses	2009-2018	2009-2018	TACs program is operating at a robust level with hundreds of practices implemented since 2009.	○	Assess annually, adjust as necessary and continue the TACs program.
2. Strategy 2.3.2 Targeted Project Implementation and Capital Projects	2009-2018	2009-2018	Seven of thirteen CIP projects listed have been constructed. One of these needs repair. One additional listed CIP is about 80% complete. Two are scheduled for construction in 2015, and another for 2017 where funding is in place. Land owner contacts were initiated in 2015 on one, and the one was found to be not cost effective and will be removed as part of the next Plan amendment.	○	Continue to implement scheduled projects for 2015. Complete dosing calculations for McMahan Lake Treatment prior to treatment in 2017. Add additional stream bank and ravine CIPs prioritized by Feasibility Study currently underway as part of next Plan amendment.
3. Strategy 2.3.2 Technical Assistance	2009-2018	2009-2018	Staffing at the Scott SWCD annually funded by the WMO for the Technical Assistance and Cost Share (TACS) program. Demand has been increasing every year. Currently responding to about 200 to 250 technical assistance requests per month. April 2015 was a record with about 300 requests for assistance.	○	Continue as planned. Assess long term sustainability of the staffing given the increasing demand.
4. Strategy 2.3.4 Promote and Enable Curly-Leaf Pondweed Control	2009 -2018	2009-2018	Partnerships have been developed with the Cedar Lake Improvement District and the O'Dowd Chain of Lakes Association to treat Cedar, O'Dowd and Thole Lakes. Cedar Lake treatments are on scheduled as presented in Table 3-3 in the Plan. Treatments are also being completed on McMahan Lake.	○	Continue as planned.

5. Strategy 2.3.5 Promote and Enable Rough Fish Control	2009 - 2018	2009 2018	Small efforts have been tried on Cedar Lake to harvest carp in partnership with the Cedar Lake Improvement District including an annual bow fishing tournament with only modest success. In 2014 a study to better estimate carp populations in Cedar Lake was completed and was inconclusive.	○	Continue as planned until a better population estimate is obtained and/or methods for control developed.
6. Strategy 2.3.6 Fish IBI Improvements	2010 - 2018	2010-2018	Activities listed in the Plan have all been implemented or are on-going.	○	Continue as planned
7. Strategy 2.3.7 Sand Creek Sediment Reduction	2010-2018	2010-2018	Most Level 5: Specific Targets have been contacted and some completed. TACS program also has a priority for practices that control grade, reduce sediment and moderate runoff. TACS program is currently operating at a robust level. The new Sand Creek Targeted Grant has a focus on sediment/TSS reduction and has been kicked off.	○	Continue as planned with the TACs program. Extend TACS program in the upper watershed of Sand Creek in Rice and Le Sueur Counties, and start targeted stream bank stabilizations as CIPs in middle Sand Creek and Picha Creek subwatersheds.
8. Strategy 2.3.8 Lake Sediment Phosphorus Reduction	2019	2017	Treatment of McMahon will be re-scheduled for 2017 as part of the next Plan amendment.	□	Re-schedule McMahon treatment for 2017.
9. Strategy 2.3.9 Credit River Protection Plan	2012-2018	2012-2018	WMO was awarded a Clean Water Partnership Grant in 2013 to implement the Protection Plan. Since that time several targeted projects, a community volunteer conservation event, and a number of native grass plantings have been completed.	○	Continue as planned. Emphasize Small Acreage Plan preparation in 2015.
10. Strategy 2.3.10 Cedar Lake Watershed	2013 - 2018	2013-2018	Other successes and the 2014 disaster pulled staff away from contacting targets in the subwatershed. However, this was identified as a priority for 2015 and for the balance of a USEPA 319 grant. Proposals started being sent to targets in May 2015.	○	Continue, developing proposals and contacting targeted landowners.

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

Policy 2.4: Improve Understanding of Water Quality

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 2.4.1 Complete Diagnostic Studies/TMDLs and Subwatershed Assessments leading to targeted implementation and monitoring	2009 - 2018	2009 -2018	Detailed diagnostic and feasibility studies have been completed for Sand Creek, TMDLs for Cedar and McMahan Lakes, and a Protection Plan for the Credit River. In addition Subwatershed Assessment have been completed for the Cedar Lake and Picha Creek subwatersheds. Targeted implementation actions identified in these studies have been incorporated into the Plan through 3 plan amendments since 2009. The exception is the Picha Creek Assessment which will be considered as part of the next Plan amendment.	○	Participate in the MPCA WRAP effort for the Lower Minnesota River Basin and consider incorporating findings and action in the next Plan Update in 2018. Consider incorporating the Picha Creek Assessment findings in the next Plan amendment scheduled for summer/fall of 2015.
2.Strategy 2.4.2 Monitoring and Assessment Tools Development	2009-2018	2009-2018	SWAT models have been developed for Sand Creek and Credit River. Monitoring generally proceeding according to timeline in Figure 3.3. However, in 2015 monitoring is focusing on Picha Creek instead of the Credit River.	○	Continue as planned. Consider dropping additional Credit River monitoring as part of next Plan amendment, since study showed Metropolitan Council site is adequate and MPCA WRAP study is collecting data in 2014 and 2015.

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

Policy 2.5 : Promote Street Sweeping

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 2.5.1 Local Water Plan Amendment	2009-2010	2009-2010	Street sweeping priorities were included in approved Local Water Management Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None
2.Strategy 2.5.2 Encourage the use of Regenerative Dustless Sweepers	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	Allowed as an innovative practice in the TACS Docket. However, no interest in applications for this practice has been shown.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None

Policy 2.6 : Coordinate with other agencies and water quality programs

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Strategy 2.6.1 Coordination and Meeting Attendance.	2009 - 2018	2009-2018	WMO staff attends meetings of others as time allows, and other agency staff are invited to participate in the Technical Advisory meetings of the WMO.	<input type="radio"/>	Continue as planned

Policy 2.7 : Promote Source Protection

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 2.7.1 MS4 SWPPPs in Local Water Plans	2009-2010	2009-2010	References to SWPPPs were included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None
2.Strategy 2.7.2 Salt and Sanding Best Management Practices in Local Water Plans	2009-2010	2009-2010	A description of salt and sand BMPs used by entities was required as part of approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
3. Strategy 2.7.3 Promote Nutrient Management Plans	2009-2018	2009-2018	Technical assistance is available through the TAC program. At least eight nutrient management plans have been completed. An incentive for nutrient management was also added to the TACS program Docket, and starting in 2015 a partnership started with the MAWRC promoting a Farmer Led Co-op.	<input type="radio"/>	Continue as planned.

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

GOAL No. 3: To Protect Groundwater Quality and Supplies

Page 3-46 of Mgmt. Plan

Policy 3.1: Preserve and protect groundwater resources both in quality and quantity

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 3.1.1 Stormwater infiltration criteria	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
2.Strategy 3.1.2 Promote Conservation and Wise Use of Groundwater	2009- 2018	2009 - 2018	Information/articles periodically published in the County newsletter the SCENE.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue as planned
3. Strategy 3.1.3 Cost Share Well Decommissioning	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	Included as an eligible practice in the TACS program Docket. At least 34 applications approved since 2009.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue as planned
4. Strategy 2.2.3 Nitrate Management Demonstrations	See Goal 2, Policy 2.2 above			See 2.2	See above

Policy 3.2: Improve Understanding of Groundwater Resources

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 3.2.1 Groundwater Monitoring	2011 -2 018	2011 -2018	A detailed designed monitoring effort of rural wells was completed in 2011 for nitrates and atrazine. In addition one to two nitrate testing clinics are completed per year in partnership with the Department of Agriculture and the Scott SWCD.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue as planned. Repeat detailed monitoring in 2016 or 2017.
2.Strategy 3.2.2 Regional Modeling	2009 - 2013	2009 -2013	County used the Metropolitan Council model for the Detailed Area Planning study which was completed. Confirmed lower impacts for rural residential development in the DAP area. Staff continues to engage in Met Council supply modeling and planning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue as planned
3. Strategy 3.2.3. Support Wellhead Protection Efforts	2009 - 2018	2009- 2018	Have not gotten involved as specific technical assistance requested have not been received.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue as planned
4. Strategy 2.1.3 Support County Detailed Area Planning	See Goal 2, Policy 2.1 above			See 2.1	See above

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

GOAL No. 4: Flood Management. To protect human life, property, and surface water systems from damage caused by flood events

Page 3-50 of Mgmt. Plan

Policy 4.1: Minimize Flooding Risk For and From, New and Re-Development, By Regulating: 1) Activities In the Floodplain, 2) Placement of Structures in Flood Prone Areas, AND 3) Loss of Floodplain Capacity

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 4.1.1 Require Floodplain and Shoreline Ordinances	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
2.Strategy 4.1.2 Low Floor Elevation Standards	2009 - 2010	2009 – 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
3. Strategy 4.1.3 Floodplain Capacity Standard	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation

Policy 4.2: Manage New Development And Drainage Alterations To Prevent Increases In Flood Flows And Downstream Impacts

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 4.2.1 Peak Runoff Rate Control Standards	2009 - 2010	2009- 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
2.Strategy 4.2.2 Land Locked Basin Standards	2009 - 2010	2009 – 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
3. Strategy 4.2.3 Drainage Alteration Standards	2009 - 2010	2009 – 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
4. Strategy 4.2.4 Local Water Plan Coordination Regarding Cross Jurisdiction Boundary Discharges in Developing Areas	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	Areas of concern were identified in Local Water Plans. However, with the development crash in 2009 there has been little pressure to study these areas. Picha Creek area, however, has been identified for study in 2016 in partnership with the City of Prior Lake. Shakopee Blue Lake Channel also identified as an area for coordination with SMSC following the June 2014 disaster.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Get involved in Blue Lake channel discussions. Consider study of Picha Creek watershed for 2016.

5. Strategy 2.1.2 Promoting Disconnected Stormwater Management and Low Impact Development	See Goal 2, Policy 2.1 above	See 2.1	See above
---	------------------------------	----------------	-----------

Policy 4.3 : Promoting And Ensuring Maintenance of Drainage and Stormwater Systems

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 4.3.1 Stormwater Facility Maintenance Standards	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation
2.Strategy 4.3.2 Future Public Ditch Operations	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Completed with decision to keep ditch operations with the County.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None
3. Strategy 4.3.3 Coordination with Others on Outlet Structure Maintenance	2009- 2018	2009 -2018	Issues forwarded to responsible parties when identified.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue as planned
4. Strategy 4.3.4 Coordinating with Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) Permit Maintenance Requirements.	2009 – 2010 and 2014	2009 – 2010 and 2014	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans. Also in 2014 County/WMO Water Resources Engineer assisted MS4 Townships with their SWPP requirements.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Coordinate with MS4 Townships as needed

Policy 4.4 : Minimize Risk of Flooding By Promoting A Regional Approach To Stormwater Management And Maximizing Upstream Storage

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 4.4.1 Promoting and Facilitating Regional Stormwater Management	2009 - 2018	2009 -2018	Public values Incentives for dedicating areas for stormwater management were incorporated into County Zoning Ordinance other aspects of the strategy have not proceeded very far due to lack of funding, a crash in development, developer reluctance, and the state level adoption of an MS4 permitting approach that undermined the ability to implement regional facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Re-evaluate strategy with next Plan update.
2.Strategy 4.4.2 Incorporating Flexibility in Standards for Regional Approaches	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan, and included in approved Local Water Plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitor Local Water Plan Implementation

Indicator symbol for Progress Rating: =not started/dropped

=on-going progress

=completed/target met

Policy 4.5: Address Known Regional Flooding Concerns and Problems That Have Cross Jurisdictional Implications And/Or Origins

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 4.5.1 O'Dowd/Thole Lake Outlet Feasibility Assessment	2012	2012	Study was completed identified protecting channel in public ownership/easement as development occurs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Implement recommendations as development occurs.
2.Strategy 4.5.2 Markley Lake Outlet Feasibility Assessment Coordination	2009 - 2014	2009 - 2014	Coordinated with City of Prior Lake on Feasibility Study. Ultimately City opted for compensatory storage which was incorporated into a development proposal in 2014.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Track implementation success through annual meetings with the City.
3. Strategy 4.5.3 Hwy 169 Area Drainage Feasibility Assessment	2009	2009 - 2015	Larger Hwy 169 Corridor land use study has not be completed. Currently the issue is being assessed as part of Environmental Impact Statements being completed for proposed frack sand mining operations in the area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ensure issues are addressed as part the EISs.
4. Strategy 4.5.4 City of Jordan Flood Damage Reduction Efforts	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2015	Corp of Engineer Study results were finally finished in 2014. In 2014 the WMO also partnered with the City to complete a study of sediment clean out in Sand Creek. The result was a permit to the City from DNR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue to talk with the City regarding Sand Creek floodplain issues.

Policy 4.6: Improve understanding of flooding risks in the WMO

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 4.7.1 Technical Advisory Committee Input	2009	2009	Members of the TAC were asked to identify risk areas at one of the meetings in 2009. No new problem areas were identified in 2009. One of the TACS meetings in 2014 was also used for a post disaster debriefing of where problems were identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Observe and document when we have storms.
2. Strategy 4.7.2 Digital Terrain Modeling	2009	2009	Study was complete and found that most basins/depressions in the studies areas had outlet.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Observe and document when we have storms.

Indicator symbol for Progress Rating: =not started/dropped

=on-going progress

=completed/target met

GOAL No. 5: Increase Public Participation and Land and Water Stewardship

Page 3-60 of Mgmt. Plan

Policy 5.1: Assist and Enable MS4 Educational Efforts

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 5.1.1 Lead Coordination and Implementation of the Scott County Stormwater Education Plan	2009 - 2018	2009-2018	A joint education effort called the Scott Clean Water Education Program (SCWEP) was initiated in 2009 lead by the Scott SWCD. The program is still operating. Participating partners changes from year to year.	○	Continue as planned.

Policy 5.2: Encourage Public Participation

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 5.2.1 Maintain and Enable the Watershed Planning Commission	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	The Watershed Planning Commission continues to meet monthly to discuss issues and make recommendations.	○	Continue as planned.
2. Strategy 5.2.2 Engage and Utilize Volunteers	2009-2018	2009-2018	The WMO continues to look for ways to embrace volunteers. Currently there are several volunteers for lake monitoring and the WMO has hosted several conservation implementation events using volunteers in the past couple of years.	○	Continue as planned. Currently looking to host conservation events in the Cedar Lake, Credit River and Sand Creek subwatersheds in the 2015 or 2016.
3. Strategy 5.2.3 Provide Opportunities for Public Input	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	WMO hosts public meetings/hearings as required or as needed to solicit input.	○	Continue as planned.
4. Strategy 5.2.4 Provide Opportunities for Public Participation in Stewardship Events	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	The WMO continues to have and promote the Watershed Stewards grant program for local organizations. One to two applications are approved per year. In addition, the WMO is actively scheduling and hosting Stewardship/Conservation events (see Strategy 5.2.2 above) where volunteers can get involved.	○	Continue as planned

Indicator symbol for Progress Rating: =not started/dropped

○=on-going progress

=completed/target met

Policy 5.3: Provide Education and Marketing to Foster Sustainable Behaviors and Environmental Stewardship

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 5.3.1 Make Scientific Studies and Products of the Scott WMO Readily Available to the Public	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	Studies are posted on the WMO page of the Scott County website when they are completed.	○	Continue as planned
2. Strategy 5.3.2 Specific Information and Education Materials	2009-2018	2009-2018	The WMO has developed specific brochures and public friendly Executive Summaries of studies. The Scott SWCD with funding from WMO has created a host of informational handouts for SCWEP around the theme that "Clean Water Starts with Me."	○	Continue as planned, and create water body specific information fact sheets.
3. Strategy 5.3.3 Promote a Variety of Education Programs	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	The WMO and SCWEP are using a variety of efforts which are summarized each year in the Annual Report. These range from workshops to stories.	○	Continue as planned with emphasis on success stories.
4. Strategy 5.3.4 Use Multiple Outlets to Distribute Information	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	WMO uses the county website, the County newsletter the SCENE, occasional press releases, literature racks, presentations, etc.	○	Continue as planned
5. Strategy 5.3.5. Small Acreage Outreach	2013-2016	2013-2016	In 2013 the WMO started a pilot effort in the Credit River Watershed to promote Small Acreage or Hobby Farm Planning. To date little interest has been found.	○	Continue to promote through 2015.

GOAL No. 6: Improve Communication

Page 3-66 of Mgmt. Plan

Policy 6.1: Improve Communications with Other Agencies and Jurisdictions

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 6.1.1 Coordinate with and involve LeSueur and Rice Counties in studies and management actions	2009 - 2018	2009-2018	County and SWCD staff of both Counties are invited to participate in the Technical Advisory Committee of the WMO, were consulted in compiling the Sand Creek CWP study, and have been partners in several grants resulting in a number of practices being completed in the two Counties.	○	Continue as planned.

2. Strategy 6.1.2 Continue Technical Advisory Committee meetings	2009- 2018	2009 - 2018	Two TAC meetings are typically held each year by the WMO. The exception was 2014 caused by lack of time availability with responding to the disaster when only one meeting was held.	○	Continue as planned.
3. Strategy 6.1.3 Routinely share data and information	2009 - 2018	2009 -2018	WMO shares data when requested, and posts studies and reports on the County website. Water quality data is also provided to the MPCA for EQUIS.	○	Continue as planned.
4. Strategy 6.1.4 Quarterly WMO & BWSR Meetings	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2012	Meetings were held for a few years but were discontinued. A local county water management professionals group has been meeting once or twice a year for the past few years. WMO staff attends.	○	Continue with local group meetings.

Policy 6.2: Inform and Involve the Public

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 5.2.1 Maintain and enable the Watershed Planning Commission	See Goal 5, Policy 5.2 above			See 5.2	See above
2. Strategy 6.2.1 Keep Public Informed	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	WPC meetings are on cable access, and information is provided in annual reports, the website, articles in the press and Scott County SCENE.	○	Continue as planned.
3. Strategy 6.2.2 Assist public with understanding the complexities of water management locally and at the State	2009 - 2018		Not completed	□	None

Indicator symbol for Progress Rating: □=not started/dropped

○=on-going progress

☑=completed/target met

GOAL No. 7: Optimize Public ExpendituresPage 3-68 of Mgmt. Plan**Policy 7.1: Minimize Public Expenditures**

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 7.1.1 Partner with Public Works Departments	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	The WMO has worked with the Public Works Departments of the County, City of Savage, City of Jordan, and City of Belle Plaine to provide assistance and complete beneficial projects. In addition, after the 2014 disaster WMO staff worked with all the Public Works Departments to compile a county-wide tabulation of damages.	○	Continue as planned. In 2015 joint projects/assistance is planned with the County Public Works and City of Savage.
2. Strategy 7.1.2 Linear Project Flexibility	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan.	☑	None

Policy 7.2: Maintain Consistency of the WMO's Standards with other Standards and Regulations

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 7.2.1 Use Existing Regulations as the Basis for WMO Standards	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Included as part of Standards appended to the Plan.	☑	None

Policy 7.3: Minimize Redundancy and Improve Jurisdictional Boundaries

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 7.3.1 Emphasize LGU Implementation Through Local Water Plans	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	Necessary Local Water Plans have all been completed and approved. WMO staff meet with each municipality annually for discuss progress. The exception are 2013 and 2014 when meetings were completed with only some of the communities.	○	Continue as planned. Get back on track with annual meetings now that development is picking up.
2. Strategy 7.3.2 Consider Boundary Change with the PLSLWD	2009 - 2010	On-going	Various parties have discussed. Currently waiting for City of Shakopee.	○	Bring up with City of Shakopee

Indicator symbol for Progress Rating: ☐=not started/dropped

○=on-going progress

☑=completed/target met

Policy _7.4_: It is the policy of the Scott WMO to use County and SWCD staff unless.... This policy is used to guide when outside services are used. There are no underlining strategies.

Policy _7.5_ : Streamline Local Water Plan Requirements

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 7.5.1 Utilize Existing Approved Local Water Plans	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Several cities chose to update their LWPs using the simplified process in this strategy. Their plans were reviewed and approved.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None

Policy _7.6_ : Regularly Assess Programs and Progress

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Strategy 7.6.1. Periodic Assessments and Program Progress	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	Regular assessments are being completed as described in the strategy. The exception is LWP review meetings in 2013 and 2014 when only a few meetings were completed. Minor plan amendments are also being completed as anticipated with 3 amendments completed and approved since 2009.	○	Continue as planned. Get back on track with annual meetings now that development is picking up.
2. Strategy 7.6.2 Use Long Term and Short Term Metrics to Measure Progress	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	Listed metrics have been assessed annually as part of the Annual Reports.	○	Continue as planned.

Policy _7.7_ : Promote Equitable Distribution of Project and Program Costs

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1. Strategy 7.7.1. Expect Local and Land Owner Participation	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	TACS program Docket includes a land owner share for most practices, and curly leaf pondweed control costs are shared with benefited shoreline owners through partnerships with lake associations or Improvement Districts.	○	Continue as planned.
2. Strategy 7.7.2 Regulate in Proportion to Impact	2009 - 2010	2009 - 2010	Philosophy articulated in the policy is reflected in standards appended to the Plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None.
3. Strategy 7.7.3 Tax/Assess Affected Parties for Larger Capital Improvements	2009 - 2018	2009 - 2018	Special assessments have not been used to date for projects by the WMO	<input type="checkbox"/>	Continue as planned.

4. Strategy 7.7.4 Share Costs with LGUs for Projects with Inter-Jurisdictional Benefits and/or Impacts	2009 - 2018	2009 – 2018	A number of projects have been implemented sharing the cost with LGUs in the WMO.	○	Continue as planned
--	-------------	-------------	---	---	---------------------

Policy _7.8_: Engage Volunteers

Planned Actions or Activities	Proposed Timeframe	Actual Timeframe	Accomplishments to Date	Progress Rating	Next Steps
1.Strategy 5.2.1 Volunteer Monitors	See Goal 5, Policy 2 above			See 5.2	See above
2. Strategy 7.8.1 Volunteer Stewards and Educators	See Goal 5 above			See 5	See above

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

Appendix B. Performance Standards

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

LGU Name: Scott Watershed Management Organization

Performance Area	Performance Standard	Level of Review	Rating	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Basic practice or Statutory requirement ★ High performance (optional) standard (see instructions for explanation of standards)	I Annual Compliance II BWSR Staff Review & Assessment (1/5 yrs.)	Yes, No, or Value YES NO	
Administration	■ Activity report: annual, on-time	I	Y	
	■ Financial report & audit completed on time	I		NO
	■ eLink Grant Report(s): submitted on time	I	Y	
	■ Consultant RFP: within 2 yrs. for professional services	II	Y	
	■ Personnel policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 yrs.	II	Y	
	■ Data practices policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 yrs.	II	Y	
	★ Board training: orientation and cont. Ed record for each board member	II		NO
	★ Staff training: orientation and cont. Ed record for each staff member	II	Y	
	★ Operational guidelines exist and current	II	Y	
Planning	■ Watershed Management Plan: up-to-date	I	Y	
	■ Capital Improvement Program: reviewed every 2 years	II	Y	
	■ City/twp. local water plans not yet approved	II	0	
	★ Biennial Budget Request submitted within last 24 months	II	Y	
	★ Strategic plan identifies short-term activities & budgets based on state and local watershed priorities	II	Y	
Execution	■ Total expenditures (past 10 years)	II	\$12,938,777	
	★ Water quality trends tracked for priority water bodies	II	Y	
	★ Watershed hydrologic trends monitored / reported	II	Y	
Communication & Coordination	■ Website: contains annual report, financial statement, board members, contact info, grant report(s), watershed mgmt plan	I	Y	
	■ Functioning advisory committee: recommendations on projects, reports; 2-way communication with Board	II	Y	
	■ Communication piece: sent within last 12 months	II	Y	
	★ Website: contains meeting notices, agendas & minutes; updated after each board mtg; additional content	II	Y	
	★ Track progress for I & E objectives in Plan	II	Y	
	★ Obtain stakeholder input: within last 5 yrs.	II	Y	

	★ Partnerships: cooperative projects/tasks done with neighboring districts and organizations, counties, cities, non-governmental organizations	II	Y	
	★ Coordination with County/City/Twp. by WMO Board members or staff	II	Y	

Scott WMO expenditures per year	
2005	\$474,208
2006	\$1,161,452
2007	\$1,077,007
2008	\$1,144,903
2009	\$1,269,246
2010	\$1,190,283
2011	\$1,566,389
2012	\$1,153,095
2013	\$1,400,917
2014	\$2,501,277
Total	\$12,938,777

Appendix C. Summary of Survey Results

Survey Overview:

The survey was developed by BWSR staff for the purpose of identifying information about the local government unit’s performance from both board members and staff and from the unit’s partner organizations. The Scott WMP identified, at BWSR’s request, their current board members, staff and the partner organizations with whom they have an on-going working relationship. BWSR staff invited those people to take the on-line survey and their responses were received and analyzed by BWSR staff. Board members and staff answered a different set of survey questions than the partners. The identity of the survey respondents is unknown to both BWSR and the Scott WMO.

In this case, 10 board members and staff, and 19 partner organization representatives, were invited to take the survey. Six board members/staff responded (60%) and 12 partners responded (66%) a good response rate. Both sets of responses are summarized below. Some responses were edited for clarity or brevity.

Board Member and Staff Questions and Responses

How often does your organization use some sort of master plan to guide decisions about what you do?

N=6

Always	100%
Usually	0
Seldom	0
Never	0

Additional Comments: The WMO works under established guidelines, a formal budget and with a VERY EFFICIENT set of tools.

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

N=5

Aquatic Plan management Treatment. Cedar, Thole & O’Dowd Lakes

TACs program, water quality studies, completing CIPs

Quarry Creek. Sand Creek Watershed Improvements and monitoring. Monitoring water quality Cedar & McMahoL Lakes. Blue Thumb and Shoreline Restoration workshops. Cleary Lake Park Improvements. Cedar Lake restoration (Aquatic Plan Management Treatment) and Carp removal. Cedar Lake Farm improvements.

Blakely Bluffs, Cedar Lake, Prairie Restorations, Credit River

The Scott WMO has many successful programs. Very Active participation. Hard to say which are the most successful.

What things have helped make these projects and programs successful?

N=5

The available cost share programs.

Partnerships, funding and landowner relationships

Excellent collaboration between Scott County Management Organization personnel and many citizen volunteers.

The amount of community, city/township cooperation. SWCA outreach and a long history of TRUST

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

N=4

Larger Capital Improvement Projects.

Most are on track. Website improvements are behind. But that is not critical most of our stuff is one on one relationship oriented anyway.

None that I am aware of at this time.

Sand Creek

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

N=3

Limited funding availability.

Time. Demand for our other programs and the disaster in 2014 have consumed staff time.

Until this year funding has been limited, the size and scope of the project, the stream is incorrectly classified by the state, the stream's origins are in 2 other county jurisdictions.

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

List the ones with which you work well already.

N=5

Soil & Water

Scott SWCD, PLSLWD, most cities, some townships, cedar lake improvement district

Scott County SWCD. Cedar Lake Improvement, Scott County Parks and Public Works,

5 SWC agencies, 5 municipalities, 2 adjacent counties

Scott SWCD, Prior Lake/Spring Lake, BWSR, Vermillion River Watershed District, many cities and townships

List the ones with which better collaboration would benefit your organization

N=4

New Prague sportsmanship club, SMSC- Sioux community, some townships

Not aware of any.

WMO is very fortunate to have good relationships with all state & federal agencies

MPCA

What could your organization do that would make you more effective in accomplishing your plan goals and objectives?

N=5

Effective as is.

Identify additional networks for relationship building

Continue to seek input from residents of Scott County. Continue to keep Scott County residents informed about the organizations programs.

Have state and federal agencies reevaluate Scott County individually rather than lumping it into "Zones" which are not realistic.

Money and good staff are what it takes. Along with good communication

Partner Organization Questions and Responses

Question: How often have you interacted with this organization during the past three years? Select the response closest to your experience. **N=12**

Not at all	0
A few times	0
Several times a year	50%
Monthly	25%
Almost every week	17%
Daily	8%

Is the amount of work you do in partnership with this organization...

N=12

Not enough, there is potential for us to do more together	17%
About right	83%
Too much, they depend on us for work they should be doing for themselves	0
Too much, we depend on them for work we should be doing ourselves or with others	0

Additional Comments: The need is always greater than funding, but we are pleased with the direction this partnership is moving.

Based on your experience working with them, please rate the organization as a partner with you in the following areas: **N=12**

Performance Characteristic	Rating (percent of responses)				
	Strong	Good	Acceptable	Poor	I don't know
Communication (they keep us informed; we know their activities; they seek our input)	33%	42%	17%	8%	0%
Quality of work (they have good projects and programs; good service delivery)	83%	8%	8%	0%	0%
Relationships with Customers (they work well with landowners and clients)	58%	33%	0%	0%	8%
Timelines/Follow-through (they are reliable and meet deadlines)	67%	25%	8%	0%	0%

How is your working relationship with this organization?

N=12

Powerful, we are more effective working together	66.7%
Strong, we work well together most of the time	25.0%
Good, but it could be better	8.3%
Acceptable, but a struggle at times	0.0%
Poor, there are almost always difficulties	0.0%

Comments from Partners about their working relationship with the Scott WMO: It is always a pleasure working with Paul and his staff.

Do you have additional thoughts on how the Scott WMO could be more effective?

N=1

The SWMO is an excellently run organization. We could not ask for a better, more reliable or more professional partnership.

Appendix D. LGU Comment Letter

September 22, 2015

We wish to thank BWSR staff for the performance review of the Scott Watershed Management Organization. It is always helpful to get feedback from others on how we are doing. Measuring progress, learning and adjusting is part of providing good governance. We also wish to thank BWSR staff for presenting the findings at our August Watershed Planning Commission meeting, and for a productive discussion. In general the Commissioners are proud of the rating of High Performer given to us, and we will consider BWSR's recommendations. Commissioners and staff at the meeting had following general comments for BWSR to consider as it completes more reviews.

1. BWSR should consider whether organizations have had to deal with emergencies as these can consume a lot of staff time and pull organizations temporarily away focusing on implementing their plan.
2. Flexibility is very important for responding to unforeseen things like emergencies, and for learning and adapting, and should be a consideration.
3. We have reviewed and commented on the Prioritized, Measureable and Targeted approach document prepared by BWSR. We appreciate BWSR's recommendation regarding its use. However, based on our experience and success with implementing practices with land owners we feel the approach promoted by the document is missing key elements. These include: a) that the amount of land scape scale change in practices and land use needed to affect water quality improvements means that more than just good targeting is needed, we also need momentum and community capacity; and 2) we need to be intentional about building relationships and trust with land owners.

Thank You
Paul Nelson
Environmental Services Program Manager
Scott County

Appendix E. Program Data

Time required to complete this review

Scott WMO Staff: 10 Hours

BWSR Staff: 28 Hours

Schedule of Level II Review

BWSR PRAP Performance Review Key Dates

- June 4, 2015: Survey of Board/Committee, staff and partners
- August 24, 2014: Presentation of Draft Report to Board/Committee and staff
- November 10, 2015 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.