

## **4 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**

This section presents the Implementation Program (Program) for the Plan. The District's Program addresses water resources and programmatic issues discussed in Section 2 and applies the goals, policies, and strategies address in Section 3. The District's Program consists of administrative and managerial efforts, coordination, studies, programs, capital improvement projects (CIP), and funding mechanisms to successfully execute the Plan. Each element is described below. The Program schedule and budget are presented in Table 4-1. Since this Plan was not completed in time for the 2017 budgeting cycle, this Program begins in 2018 and ends in 2027. The Program's estimated impacts on residents and local government are presented in the next section. The District will review the implementation program every two years, at minimum.

### **4.1 ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGERIAL**

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

**Table 4-1: Lower Minnesota River Watershed District - Implementation Program Budget for 2018 -2027**

ACTION	Strategy Addressed	Potential Funding Sources	Duration	Year									
				2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>													
<u>Administrative/Managerial</u>													
<u>General Administrative Services, Conferences, Coordination with LGUs, Stakeholders and other Project Partners, LGU Program Reviews, 9-Foot Channel, and Advisory Committees (Technical and Citizen)</u>	All	GL	Annual	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
<u>Administrative/Managerial Budget Total</u>	All	-	-	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
<u>Studies and Programs</u>													
<u>Sustainable Lake Management Plans (Trout Lakes)</u>				\$50,000	\$50,000					\$50,000	\$50,000		
<u>Geomorphic Assessments (Trout Streams)</u>				\$50,000	\$50,000					\$50,000	\$50,000		
<u>Paleo-limnology Study (Floodplain Lakes)</u>				\$50,000									
<u>Cost Share Incentive and Water Quality Restoration Program</u>				\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
<u>Monitoring Program</u>				\$65,000	\$65,000	\$65,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000
<u>Education and Outreach Program</u>				\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
<u>Fen Stewardship Program</u>				\$75,000	\$75,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
<u>Water Resources Restoration Fund</u>						\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
<u>Studies and Programs Budget Total</u>				\$340,000	\$290,000	\$235,000	\$245,000	\$245,000	\$250,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
<u>Capital Improvements</u>													
<u>Carver Creek Restoration Project</u>					\$93,500								
<u>Corridor Management Project</u>						\$25,000	\$75,000						
<u>District Boundary Modification Project</u>				\$10,000									
<u>Dredge Site Restoration Project</u>				\$240,000	\$240,000								
<u>Eagle Creek (East Branch) Project</u>				\$12,000									
<u>East Creek Bank Stabilization Project</u>					\$50,000								
<u>East Creek Treatment Wetland Project</u>				\$10,000	\$10,000	\$150,000							
<u>Minnesota River Sediment Reduction Strategy</u>				\$25,000	\$25,000								
<u>Minnesota River Study Area 3 – Bluff Stabilization Project</u>								\$100,000	\$250,000				
<u>Riley Creek Project – Downstream of Flying Cloud Drive</u>				\$25,000	\$25,000								

Riley Creek Sediment Reduction Project				\$25,000	\$50,000								
Spring Creek Project					\$45,000								
Capital Improvements Budget	-	-	-	\$347,000	\$538,500	\$175,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	-	-	-	\$937,000	\$1,078,500	\$660,000	\$570,000	\$595,000	\$750,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
<b>REVENUE</b>													
General Levy	-	-	-	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Planning and Implementation Levy	-	-	-	\$447,000	\$588,500	\$410,000	\$320,000	\$345,000	\$500,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Special Channel Maintenance Funding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grants	-	-	-	\$240,000	\$240,000			-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	-	-	-	\$937,000	\$1,078,500	\$660,000	\$570,000	\$595,000	\$750,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$500,000	\$500,000

## 4.2 COORDINATION WITH LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS AND NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS

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

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

Strategy	Coordination Partner(s)	Schedule
Strategy 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 2.3.1, 2.3.4	LGUs, BWSR, MPCA, Metropolitan Council, SWCDs and neighboring WDs and WMO	Quarterly at a minimum
Strategy 1.3.1-2	LGUs, BWSR, MPCA, Metropolitan Council, SWCDs, neighboring WDs and WMOs and TAC	2011 - 2014
Strategy 4.3.1, 7.2.1	LGUs, BWSR, MPCA, Metropolitan Council, SWCDs, neighboring WDs and WMOs, and TAC	2015 - 2017
Strategy 1.3.3, 2.2.1, 6.1.1-2	LGUs	Annually
Strategy 2.2.3, 2.2.4	LGUs and SWCDs	Annually
Strategy 2.3.1-3, 3.2.1, 4.2.1-3	LGUs, BWSR, MPCA, Metropolitan Council, SWCDs, and neighboring WDs and WMO	Annually
Strategy 3.1.3	DOH	Annually
Strategy 3.3.2	Metropolitan Council Environmental Services	2016
Strategy 5.1.2 - 3	LGUs and BWSR	Annually
Strategy 7.1.1	MPCA	Annually
Strategy 7.4.1	LGUs, SWCDs and shoreland property owners	Annually
Strategy 8.1.1	DNR, and US Coast Guard and Auxiliaries	2016
Strategies 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.3.1	COE	On-going
Strategies 9.1.1-4 and 9.2.1-3	LGUs, TAC, CAC, and SWCDs	On-going, Quarterly

## 4.3 STUDIES AND PROGRAMS

Studies and programs include:

- Cost share Incentive and Water Quality Restoration Program (All strategies)
- Periodic Assessments and Program Reviews (Strategy 1.3.1)
- Detailed Data Assessments (Strategy 2.3.2)
- Monitoring Program (Strategies 2.3.1-2 and 3.3.1)
- Vegetation Management Standard/Plan (Strategy 7.2.1)

- Dredge Material Beneficial Use Plan (Strategy 8.2.2)
- 9-Foot Channel Strategic Funding Plan (Strategy 8.3.1)
- Education and Outreach Program (Strategies 1.2.1, 4.2.3, 8.1.1, 9.1.1-4 and 9.2.1-3)

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

#### **4.3.1 Sustainable Lake Management Plans**

Sustainable lake management plans (SLMPs) will be developed for trout lakes in the District. These SLMPs will assess the following:

- Aquatic plant coverage and management
- Exotic species issues and management
- Shoreline condition and management
- Nutrient and temperature dynamics and management
- Stormwater runoff and groundwater contributions and management
- Roles and responsibilities for management
- Implementation schedule and plan
- Recreational opportunities (pier, public access, etc....)

#### **4.3.2 Geomorphic Assessments**

The geomorphic assessments will consider changes in trout stream alignment, confluence point(s), or geometry, and stream reaches upstream and downstream of confluence point(s). Stream width-to-depth ratios, stream bed slope, meander pattern, and other bed features shall be modeled according to a stable reference reach. Reference reaches are nearby, hydrologically, and geomorphically-stable stream segments. A reference reach could be upstream or downstream, or in a nearby watershed. Assessment of the current and future discharge and sediment regimes shall be based on watershed conditions that are above stream or as close as possible to the stream.

#### **4.3.3 Paleo-limnology Study**

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

#### **4.3.4 Fen Stewardship Program**

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

#### **4.3.5 Water Resources Restoration Fund**

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

#### **4.4 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

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

The District is required to hold a public hearing on the proposed CIP. The public hearing details must be published in a legal newspaper once a week for two successive weeks in counties that have affected waters and lands. The last publication shall occur not more than 30 days, or less than ten (10) days before the hearing. The notice shall state the hearing's time and place, the general nature of the proposed improvement, the estimated cost, and the cost improvement's payment method, including the cost allocated to each county. At least ten (10) days before the hearing, the District shall send notices by mail to the counties, each home rule charter, or statutory city or town located wholly or partly within the District's territory. The District recognizes that failure to mail a notice (or have defects in the notice) shall not invalidate the proceedings. After the proceedings and assessment statements have been filed with the auditor, each affected county shall pay its apportioned share of the project's total cost based on the engineer's reports or Managers' order.

Table 4-3 contains descriptions and planning level cost estimates for the CIP identified for the period between adoption of this Plan and the biennial Plan review.

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

<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Project Partner</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>	<u>Estimated Timeline</u>
<i><b>Capital Improvement Projects</b></i>				
<u>Boundary Assessment Project</u>	<u>This project consists of working with BSWR and neighboring watershed districts and water management organizations to review and possibly modify the District’s jurisdictional boundary.</u>	<u>Carver County WMO and Riley – Purgatory Bluff Creek WD</u>	<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>2018</u>
<u>Eagle Creek (East Branch) Project</u>	<u>This project would restore approximately 2,400 feet of stream and repair erosion under the 128th Street Bridge. The goals of the project are to reduce erosion and improve fish habitat. Due to beaver dams, the stream is cutting into three valley walls again contributing significant sediments.</u>	<u>DNR, MN Trout Unlimited and City of Savage.</u>	<u>\$12,000</u>	<u>2018</u>
<u>Dredge Site Restoration Project</u>	<u>This project consists of implementing the site restoration project identified in the February 15, 2017 <i>Estimate of Probable Cost, Cargill East River (MN – 14.2 RMP) Dredge Material Site</i> technical memorandum prepared by Burns &amp; McDonnell, Young Environmental Consulting Group, LLC, and Berrini &amp; Associates, LLC, for the Cargill East River (MN – 14.2 RMP) Dredge Material Site located on the Minnesota River in Savage, Minnesota.</u>	<u>BWSR</u>	<u>\$480,000</u>	<u>2018 - 2019</u>
<u>Minnesota River Sediment Reduction Strategy</u>	<u>This project consists of collaborating with the MPCA on developing strategies for evaluating and mitigating sediment loads to the Minnesota River.</u>	<u>MPCA and BWSR</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>2018 - 2019</u>
<u>Riley Creek Project (Downstream of Flying Cloud Dr.)</u>	<u>This project consists of providing energy dissipation below the County Road 61/ Flying Cloud Drive bridge and redirecting flows away from outside of the creek meanders.</u>	<u>Hennepin County</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>2018 - 2019</u>
<u>Riley Creek Sediment Reduction Project</u>	<u>This project consists of providing an energy dissipation structure below CR 61 and redirecting flows away from outside creek meanders</u>	<u>Riley-Purgatory Bluff Creek WD</u>	<u>\$75,000</u>	<u>2018 - 2019</u>
<u>East Creek Treatment Wetland Project</u>	<u>The East Chaska Creek Restoration feasibility study identified an ideal site to construct a treatment wetland south of the Creek within two vacant lots along Chaska Boulevard. Currently, most of the lots are paved right up to the edge of the Creek bank. Flow could be diverted from the Creek channel into a wetland system to provide for sediment removal, flood storage and bacteria treatment.</u>	<u>City of Chaska and MPCA</u>	<u>\$170,000</u>	<u>2018 - 2020</u>
<u>Carver Creek Restoration Project</u>	<u>The project consists of the following activities: stabilize outer bends with toe protection, grade banks to a more stable slope and stabilize the gully</u>	<u>City of Carver, Carver WMO, Carver County SWCD and USFWS</u>	<u>\$93,500</u>	<u>2019</u>
<u>East Creek Bank Stabilization Project</u>	<u>This project consists of repairing the scour hole downstream of crosstown boulevard bridge, installing bank armoring, toe protection and grade control structures behind Cuzzy’s Brickhouse Restaurant and bank armoring, and installing toe protection on the right bank of East Oak Street This project was identified in the East Chaska Creek Restoration feasibility study. The total cost of the project is \$168,500.</u>	<u>City of Chaska, MPCA and BWSR</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>2019</u>

<u>Spring Creek Project</u>	<u>This project consists of retrofitting two (2) catch basins into structural treatment devices in the Lenzen 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> additions. The project will treat untreated discharge to Spring Creek at 6<sup>th</sup> Street from upstream.</u>	<u>City of Carver</u>	<u>\$45,000</u>	<u>2019</u>
<u>Minnesota River Corridor Management Project</u>	<u>Using the Minnesota River as the focal point, this project will examine issues facing the River as a complex natural system, a shared resource, and a place where varied interests and other systems converge. The project seeks to: 1. Create greater understanding of the Lower Minnesota River Corridor and its landscape 2. Demonstrate a desired future for the River and how change in the surrounding landscape can help attain this future 3. Suggest a structure or framework by which the vision can be implemented and, 4. Identify shared community and public values that form the basis of the project. (Modeled after the Vermillion River Corridor Plan)</u>	<u>All District LGUs</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>2020 - 2021</u>
<u>Minnesota River Study Area 3 (Bluff Stabilization Project)</u>	<u>This project consists of analysis, design, and construction of Minnesota River at Study Area 3 project in Eden Prairie to address the river bank erosion. An October 2008 study of the area was completed for the city of Eden Prairie in cooperation with the District. This project expands the 2008 study with additional data collection and analysis and extends it to final design, permitting, and construction.</u>	<u>City of Eden Prairie</u>	<u>\$350,000</u>	<u>2022 - 2023</u>



## 4.5 FUNDING MECHANISMS

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

### 4.5.1 Funding Statutes Available to Watershed District

#### 4.5.1.1 Special Assessments

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

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

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

#### 4.5.1.2 Ad Valorem Taxes

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

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

Formal minor plan amendments are not required for projects funded using the additional levy allowed under M.S. 103D.905, Subd. 3. Therefore, the District will follow an informal proposed project information process to inform the LGUs about these proposed projects. The District will distribute the proposed project information to the affected LGUs for review and comment, but not

to the state review agencies or the Metropolitan Council. BWSR will not take formal action, since it is not a formal amendment.

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

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

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

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

Formal minor plan amendments will be required for projects funded under M.S. 103B.241 or M.S. 103B.251 that are not described in sufficient detail in the Plan. The District will follow the formal minor plan amendment process of MN Rules 8410.0140 for these types of projects. The formal process requires that the District distribute the plan amendment to the affected local units of government, the Metropolitan Council, and the state review agencies (including BWSR) for review and comment. The counties will have 90 days from receipt of the minor plan amendment to either approve or disapprove the amendment, and to hold any public hearings regarding the amendment. Unless the District agrees to an extension, if a county fails to complete its review within the prescribed period, the amendment will be deemed approved by that county. The proposed amendment will be deemed as a minor amendment if either BWSR agrees that the amendment is a minor amendment, or BWSR fails to act within 45 days of receipt of the minor plan amendment.

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

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

#### **4.5.1.3 Utility/Fees**

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

#### **4.5.2 Emergency Projects**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **4.5.4 Petitioned Projects**

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