Coon Creek Watershed District
2014 Annual Report and Management Assessment
An Assessment of Progress in Implementing the Comprehensive Watershed Plan and the Needs and Adjustments to Ensure Success
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Reporting Requirements

1. The Minnesota Watershed Act (M.S. 103D.351)
2. The Metropolitan Water Management Act (M.S. 103B.231)
3. The Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (M.S. 103A)
4. The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program.
Assessment Objectives

1. Report Activities and Events
2. Monitor implementation of the Comp Plan
3. Evaluate goals, priorities and progress
4. Adjust management direction
5. Identify and improve capabilities
DISTRICT MISSION

To manage ground water and the surface water drainage system to prevent property damage, maintain hydrologic balance and to protect water quality for the safety and enjoyment of citizens and the preservation and enhancement of wildlife habitat.
District Mandatory Roles

- Drainage Authority
- Comprehensive Surface Water Management Organization
- Local Governmental Unit (LGU) for WCA
- Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)
Priorities

1. Prevent flooding

2. Improve water quality in impaired or impacted waters

3. Maintain and enhance water quality in waters that are not impaired.
Accomplishing Our Mission
Using Programs to Accomplish Goals
SIGNIFICANT EVENTS in 2014

• Approved 78 projects involving 490 acres
• Updated hydrology Model increasing accuracy of flood prone lands
• Provided training to 50 public employees and contractors on salt use
• Completed water quality Stressor I.D. study
• Received $5,000 grant for forest thinning and bank stabilization
SIGNIFICANT EVENTS in 2014

• Processed 154 applications for development and technical assistance
• Reviewed 18 residential projects involving 136 lots on 150 acres
• Conducted 2 Creek Cleanups with service groups
• Assisted 2 Lake Associations with lake planning and Invasive Species control
Current Trends Affecting Management

- Demand for Beneficial Uses
- Trends in Emergencies & Natural Disasters
- Growth & Economic Trends
- Legislative & Agency Trends
- Local Government Trends
- Metro Watershed Districts
- Legislative Obligations
- Land and Taxable Market Values
- Trends in Weather & Climate
- Trends in Work Force

District Operations
Water Resource Demands

1. Drinking Water
2. Flood Control & Drainage
3. Aquatic Life & Recreation
4. Water Quality
5. Wetlands
6. Aesthetics
7. Mining
8. Groundwater Recharge
9. Irrigation
Emergencies and Natural Disasters

Natural Disasters

- Flood
- Range Fire
- Tornado
- Straight Line Winds

Map: Estimated Property Loss:
- Tornadoes: $67,850,000
- Winds: $81,225,000
- Fire: $53,373

Map Details:
- Flooding
  - 1990-1995 (20)
  - 1996-2000 (15)
  - 2001-2005 (15)
  - 2006-2010 (11)
  - 2011-2015 (71)
- Wildfires
  - 1990-1995 (17)
  - 1996-2000 (87)
  - 2001-2005 (22)
  - 2006-2010 (42)
  - 2011-2015 (12)
- Tornadoes (38)
- Straight Line Winds (6)
Growth

District Population

Projected Applications

Year
Legislative Trends & Issues

• Aquatic Invasive Plant Management
• Drainage
• Groundwater
• Federal State Water Quality Regulations
• Endangered & Threatened Species (Federal & State)
Government Trends and Concerns

• Infrastructure Age and the Cost to Retrofit or Replace

• Stormwater Asset Management

• Online Citizen Engagement

• Geographic Information Systems & App Development
Metro Watershed Districts and the Relative Importance of Management

**Relative Fiscal Capacity**
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**Taxable Market Value per Acre**

**Use of Fiscal Capacity per Acre**
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Taxable Market Values
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Rainfall Weather and Climate

Monthly Precipitation Pattern

- Average (2010-2014)
- 30-Year Average
Work Force Trends

• Decreasing Enrollment and Graduation In Natural Resources

• Increasing Generational Shifts and Succession

• Increased focus on Retention and Recruiting
Factors for Providing Beneficial Uses and Water Management Services

- Provision of Beneficial Uses and Water Management Services
  - Annual Budget & Work Plan
    - Staff, Professional Services, Collaboration & Involvement
      - Land Capability and Watershed Condition
Land Capability and Watershed Condition

2015 Watershed Condition Classification

U.S. Forest Service Condition
- 1.0-1.6: High Integrity
- 1.7-2.2: Moderate Integrity
- 2.3-3.0: Low Integrity

Rank | Subwatershed     | Score
---   |------------------|------
1     | Ditch 44         | 1.680
2     | Stonybrook Creek | 1.748
3     | Oak Glen Creek   | 1.803
4     | Ditch 23         | 1.856
5     | Mississippi River| 1.883
6     | Ditch 41         | 1.893
7     | West Coon Rapids | 1.894
8     | Ditch 59         | 1.918
9     | Ditch 11         | 1.985
10    | Springbrook Creek| 2.006
11    | Ditch 58         | 2.034
12    | Ditch 37         | 2.035
13    | Pleasure Creek   | 2.093
14    | Ditch 60         | 2.122
15    | Ditch 57         | 2.132
16    | Ditch 39         | 2.143
17    | Ditch 20         | 2.158
18    | Ditch 52         | 2.158
19    | LCC              | 2.180
20    | Ditch 54         | 2.197
Change in Condition

2014 to 2015 Watershed Condition Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Subwatershed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditch 60</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ditch 11</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ditch 57</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pleasure Creek</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ditch 44</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>West Coon Rapids</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ditch 41</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ditch 23</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ditch 37</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ditch 59</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ditch 39</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Stonybrook Creek</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Oak Glen Creek</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Springbrook Creek</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ditch 58</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ditch 20</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ditch 52</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ditch 54</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Watershed Condition Summary

Strengths:
• Capable of improving, but will need direct and active management across the watershed.

Weakness:
• 25% of the system is unstable
• Very close to not being able to provide demanded beneficial uses, or provide them with any consistency or certainty (Flood control, Water Quality, Aesthetics (Property values))
Staff, Professional Services, Collaboration & Public Involvement

Who Does the Work
(Total FTEs = 16.1)

- Staff: 40%
- Contractors: 36%
- Cities: 11%
- Professional Services: 12%
- Volunteers: 1%
2014 Staff Time

(6.5 FTE Available - 8.6 FTE Needed)
Staff Summary

**Strengths:**
- Able to attract and retain good people
- Pay on par with local alternatives
- Good use of knowledge skills and abilities
- Good and strong technical skills

**Weakness**
- Demand on staff time is 1.3 times the availability.
Professional Services

- Engineering Services
- Legal Services
- GIS Services
- IT Services
- Audit
- Accounting

Yearly breakdown of professional services expenditure from 2011 to 2015.
Professional Services Summary

**Strengths:**
- Strength and quality of the services.
- Adaptability.
- Significant knowledge of the District.
- Complement technical strengths of District staff.
- Service delivery tailored to District priorities & style.
- Good value.

**Weaknesses:**
- Retention of significant institutional knowledge.
- Dedication and loyalty of service providers.
Contacts with Collaborators

**Strengths:**
- The Board’s interaction with City councils and the County Board.
- Good awareness of the problems and issues facing collaborators.
- Making beneficial contributions to the Cities and County.
- Quality of the District services.
- Satisfaction, even when there are differences, with the District’s work and roles.

**Weakness:**
- Image among newly elected officials and some members of the public because of its status as a ‘governmental unit.’
Involvement & Volunteers
Involvement Summary

Strengths:

• Transparency and reliance on collaboration and involvement
• Adaptability (within constraints such as notice, and review requirements)
• Frequent communication, tailored for specific audiences
Fiscal Capacity

District Tax Capacity Rates 2006 - 2014

Tax Capacity Rates

2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014
Financial Summary

Strengths:
• Ample access to capital
• Ability to continue water and related resource management efforts
• Financial stability
• Sufficient liquidity and reserve to meet state minimum requirement

Weaknesses:
• Use very small percentage of its financial capacity
• Inadequate in fees and taxes
• Inadequate reserves for rapid response & natural disasters
Issues

1. Age, condition and adequacy of existing stormwater infrastructure to prevent flooding and protect water quality
2. Insufficient staff to address permits, land use & maintenance problems
Issues

3. Inadequate financial reserves to respond to emergencies, natural disasters and rapid response needs
5. Ineffective use of the District financial capacity

### Use of Fiscal Capacity per Acre

- Comfort Lake
- Ramsey Washington Metro
- Cannon-Maine
- South Washington
- Minnehaha
- Rice Creek
- Capitol Region
- Prior Lake Spring Lake
- Middle Mississippi
- Valley Branch
- N Fork Crow River
- Riley-Purgatory Creek
- Coon Creek
- Nine Mile
- Lower Minnesota

| Percent of Taxable Market Value per Acre |
Issues

6. Insufficient staff and time to engage public and explain projects or permit requirements.
Needs
Needs

1. Policies, that are flexible and adaptive enough to be effective under a wide range of future socioeconomic and ecological conditions.
2. Two Full-Time Equivalent staff people to address work needs in:
   – Land use review
   – Permit inspection
   – Enforcement
   – Operations and maintenance
   – Monitoring
   – GIS
3. Contingency funds for natural disasters and rapid response
4. More fully utilize the District’s financial capacity
Needs

5. Begin process of seeking office space.