



## Agenda

### Vermillion River Watershed Planning Commission

August 11, 2021 – 4:00 p.m., Conference Room A and Teleconference via Zoom

1. Call to Order and Pledge
2. Roll Call
3. Audience Comments on Items Not on the Agenda  
(*please limit audience comments to five minutes*)
4. Approval of Agenda Action
5. Approval of Minutes from the July 14, 2021 Meeting Action
6. Business Items
  - a. Recommendation to Adopt the VRWJPO 2022 DRAFT Budget Action
  - b. Mid-term Vermillion River Watershed Management Plan Review Information
7. Updates
  - a. Chairperson's Report
  - b. Staff Updates
8. Adjourn Action

**Please note**, the August 11, 2021 Watershed Planning Commission meeting will take place **in-person** in Conference Room A at the Extension and Conservation Center, 4100 220<sup>th</sup> Street West, Farmington Minnesota **and via teleconference** on the web-based application, Zoom. The Extension and Conservation Center building remains locked. In-person participants must notify staff of their plan to be present beforehand or ring the doorbell at arrival for the meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://dakotacountymn.zoom.us/j/92302820471?pwd=UjJCMFErWnQvL2lyVk5ud0l1bCtQdz09>

Meeting ID: 923 0282 0471

Passcode: 551594

One tap mobile

+16513728299,,92302820471#,,,,\*551594# US (Minnesota)

Dial by your location

+1 651 372 8299 US (Minnesota)

Meeting ID: 923 0282 0471

Passcode: 551594

Find your local number: <https://dakotacountymn.zoom.us/j/92302820471?pwd=UjJCMFErWnQvL2lyVk5ud0l1bCtQdz09>

---

Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization

4100 220<sup>th</sup> Street West, Suite 103, Farmington, Minnesota 55024



#### Other Information

---

Next Meeting Date: **September 8, 2021** at 4:00 p.m.

**Please confirm your attendance by contacting Mark Zabel at [mark.zabel@co.dakota.mn.us](mailto:mark.zabel@co.dakota.mn.us)**

You will be notified if the meeting is cancelled due to an anticipated lack of quorum.



# Minutes

## Vermillion River Watershed Planning Commission Meeting

July 14, 2021 – 4:00 p.m.

In-person and Zoom Videoconference

### WPC Members in Attendance

Mark Henry      Chuck Clanton  
Josh Borton     James Kotz  
Ken Betzold     Tony Wotzka  
Andy Riesgraf   Steve Hamrick

### Staff in Attendance

Mark Zabel, VRWJPO  
Mark Ryan, VRWJPO  
Brita Moore-Kutz, VRWJPO  
Paula Liepold, VRWJPO

### Others in Attendance

Curt Coudron, Dakota County SWCD

### 1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Henry at 4:04 p.m.

### 2. Roll Call

All members present except Carolyn Miller.

### 3. Audience Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None.

### 4. Approval of Agenda

Chair Henry asked for any changes to the agenda. Upon hearing none, Chair Henry called for a motion to approve the agenda as provided in the packet.

*Motion by Commissioner Borton, second by Commissioner Betzold, to approve the agenda. The agenda was unanimously approved by an 8-0 vote.*

### 5. Approval of Minutes

Chair Henry requested any adjustments to the minutes as presented. Upon hearing none, Chair Henry called for a motion to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2021, meeting of the WPC.

*Motion by Commissioner Clanton, second by Commissioner Kotz, to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2021, meeting, as distributed. The minutes were unanimously approved by an 8-0 vote.*

## **6. Business Items**

### **a. Landspreading of biosolids**

Chair Henry called on Mark Zabel to introduce the item. Mark Zabel opened a presentation for Commissioner Clanton to present information on land application of biosolids. Commissioner Clanton includes this as a component of one of the university courses he teaches. Commissioner Clanton began by going through the potential end uses of biosolids (the recovered solids materials in the wastewater treatment process), one of them being land application. Incineration is used at about 22%, Landfilling at about 17%, and Land spreading at about 60% of uses. Sludges contain; organic and inorganic solids, nutrients, heavy metals, pathogens, and persistent organic chemicals. Biosolids are sampled for solids, pH, Nitrogen, Metals, PCBs, Phosphorus, and Potassium. There is a set of requirements for calculating the rate of application that is very strict based primarily on Nitrogen content. Nine metals are tested. There is a maximum annual application rate based on heavy metal concentration that limits the "site life". There is a maximum amount of specific heavy metals (limiting constituent) that can be applied to a site through land application of biosolids before the site can no longer be used for biosolids applications. Site life is usually in the 75 to 100-year range. Chair Henry commented that there is a site in Castle Rock Township that receives annual application of biosolids that may be a concern. There are concerns about odors and road maintenance associated with applications. Commissioner Clanton commented that the treatment plant should have records of where applications have taken place for which they can calculate the site life. Commissioner Clanton then described the fate of heavy metals applied to soil, concluding that due to chemical characteristics heavy metals do not generally move in soil. Heavy metals are also phytotoxic (poisonous to plants) and reach toxic levels for plants before they would be toxic to animals. Commissioner Clanton then went on to describe the concerns and fate for pathogens and persistent organic chemicals. There are also nuisance concerns for odors, insects (flies and mosquitos), varmints, and birds. Insects, varmints, and birds can be attracted to the spread area. Commissioner Clanton discussed commercial uses like the sale of milorganite or similar products as fertilizer or soil treatments. Commissioner Clanton went on to speak to specific cases involving Duluth, Mille Lacs County, City of Owatonna, Metropolitan Council, City of Omaha, City of Denver, and New York City. There was presentation about issues in debate about the land application of biosolids and application of risk assessment in decision making about land application of biosolids. Commissioner Kotz asked about incineration and whether that causes issues of concentrated pollutants in the ash. Incinerator ash is normally landfilled. However, incineration has increased costs associated with energy demand for burning. Mark Ryan commented that Met Council must apply for and obtain permits for land application of biosolids through the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and so there is some oversight and checks-and-balances there. There is also information available about the processes used at each of the Metro Plants for solids processing. Mark Henry described the process of Met Council and MPCA coordination with Castle Rock Township, especially route and road management. Commissioner Kotz asked about the consistency of the biosolids material; how solid are they? Commissioner Clanton commented that they are usually more liquid than solid, but treatment plants try to dry as much as possible because of costs to transport. Commissioner Betzold said that working fields where it has been spread can be challenging because if its consistency and tractors can have difficulty getting traction. Commissioner Clanton added that only about 2% of the agricultural land in the state receives land application of biosolids. Mark Zabel asked if the WPC members felt that the VRWJPO should take a role related to the control or management of land application of biosolids. There seemed to be consensus that there is not a need for VRWJPO involvement at this time.

### **b. Mid-term Vermillion River Watershed Management Plan Review**

Mark Zabel referred to a spreadsheet that was shared via email, handed out at the meeting, and shared on-screen, and described its contents. The spreadsheet contains all the objectives and actions included in Section 6: The Goals, Objectives, and Actions identified for the VRWJPO in its Watershed Management Plan. Staff have assigned a status for each action as; Done, Ongoing, or Future. Zabel indicated that staff are asking for input from the WPC members as to priorities for each of the actions identified as Future or Ongoing in status. Zabel reminded members that this is the mid-term which means we still have almost five full years to implement the plan. The purpose of this would be to inform our future work plans and staff time allocations to get the high priority work addressed. Zabel is not asking for immediate input, rather staff is hoping that the WPC members will review this information and give their input and comments and perhaps have further discussion at future meetings. Commissioner Clanton asked about the assignment of status by staff, when assigning future as the status does that mean it hasn't been started? Zabel replied that in many cases, yes. Commissioner Clanton pointed out the action directing development of procedures to operate wetland banks and asked if that wasn't already addressed. Zabel commented that establishing a wetland banking policy has been addressed but this action addresses procedures for the trade of credits which has not yet been developed and will need to be soon as credits become available for sale. Commissioner Borton asked if there is a staff priority or a means of adding some context. Zabel asked if another column is needed. Zabel added that there is a lot of work that is a matter of opportunity where a partner comes forward with a project that becomes a short-term priority. But in the context of Section 6 of the Watershed Plan it's a matter of comparing these actions to each other and prioritizing. Paula identified 71 actions as future, 132 as ongoing, and 32 as done. Brita identified that much of the public outreach and communications work is inherently ongoing activities. Paula noted that roles may overlap where an action may appear under one role but have application under other roles as well. Mark Ryan commented that as members go through the list, they may see something that is of interest to them and may like to highlight that area. That is also feedback that we would like to capture in this process. Commissioner Clanton suggested that he would likely go through and rank one third high, one third medium, and one third low for each status. Zabel commented that he didn't know if dividing into thirds would add value, but ranking as high, medium, or low could. Commissioner Clanton commented that ranking all actions as high wouldn't be useful at all. Commissioner Clanton spoke to an action regarding fencing across the river and how common that is on the river. Zabel commented that there was no fencing across the river from Hwy 52 to Hastings. Zabel pointed out that there were many actions identified as Coordination and Collaboration as the role; yet that is a smaller part of the VRWJPO Budget. That may reflect an expectation that Coordination and Collaboration is done simply as part of our daily work. Commissioner Betzold commented that if too many actions are ranked as high it doesn't help prioritize. Zabel commented that if you limit to one third you create an artificial cutoff that once reached you are now forced to rank something that you may see at one level as something else. Zabel commented that real ranking in the context of high, medium, or low is a good approach; but without a limit as to how many can be ranked in a category. Commissioner Henry suggested perhaps a 1 through 5 ranking. Zabel then asked how members would like to rank; high-medium-low, 1-5, 1-10? Members should agree on one method that everyone will use and then we can compile and report the result. Zabel commented that if members have questions on some of the actions, we can discuss those at future meetings as this will be completed over a few months.

## **7. Updates**

### **a. Chairperson's Report**

Chair Henry asked if Dakota County and the VRWJPO would have a presence at the County Fair in the Natural Resources Building. Brita replied that yes, they will, and she would be covering that in staff reports.

**b. Staff Updates**

Curt Coudron commented that weather has been favorable for completing projects. Most of CIP funds from the VRWJPO have been allocated to projects. There has been an application of interseeding of cover crop. Interseeding allows germination and some plant development during crop growth that is favorable to getting a good stand of cover as opposed to having to wait until the crop is harvested to be able to seed the cover. Some projects are being adjusted due to dry weather to provide a better opportunity for seeding and plant growth rather than risking losing plants due to their drying out after germination. Commissioner Clanton asked about a mailing that had gone out from the SWCD. Curt described the purpose of the mailing for targeted landowners in the Hastings Drinking Water Supply Management Area for promoting Kernza as an alternative crop. There is a field day coming up in Goodhue County associated with this promotion where a landowner is growing Kernza. Chair Henry mentioned the pollinator event that was held in Dakota County recently highlighting native prairie strips planted on the contours.

Brita Moore-Kutz reported that she was scheduled to be at Hastings at their Party in the Park, but unfortunately the event was cancelled. The VRWJPO will have a presence in the Natural Resources Building at the Dakota County Fair along with several others from Dakota County Environmental Resources Department, Minnesota DNR, and Dakota County SWCD. Brita commented that there are coordination meetings working to develop a cohesive conservation message among these groups. The group is also coordinating with Dakota County to include an environmental component in the County Building where Transportation is the main theme, perhaps a salt/ deicing management component. Brita then reported about the media coverage picked up in regard to goldfish, beginning from a tweet of a picture of a large goldfish found in Keller Lake in Burnsville. There was coverage on Good Morning America (GMA) this morning and a colleague from Carver County was interviewed by Inside Edition yesterday. There was also a Washington Post article. Zabel added that the GMA report included a good education/ outreach message directing people not to release goldfish into the wild. Mention was made of an alligator (dead) being found in Lake Marion in the past. Staff are also planning for a Watershed Tour later in September.

Commissioner Clanton asked about groundwater sampling. He referred to a form that had been sent by Dakota County requesting sampling of his private well be taken and submitted and he was curious about what it was about. Zabel commented that he could ask Valerie Grover, Supervisor of the Groundwater Unit, for more information.

Zabel presented the draft 2022 VRWJPO Budget going over line items that were changed or added compared to the 2021 VRWJPO Budget. The VRWJPO Budget will be presented for WPC recommendation at the August meeting. Staff welcome any input from WPC members prior to the August 11, 2021 meeting. The budget totals presented are; revenues of \$2,160,700, expenses of \$1,885,010, with a cash reserve of \$275,690 (12.8% of total budget). A reduction of the overall budget from \$2,497,900 this year to \$2,160,700 next year. This may change before recommendation to the Joint Powers Board based on gathering new or more accurate information. Chair Henry asked if he VRWJPO was accessing any of the American Recovery Plan funds (COVID money). Zabel commented that the VRWJPO did not submit projects for that funding and that several projects were submitted by Dakota County Environmental Resources Department that would support projects of interest to the VRWJPO that we may be coordinated in implementation.

Commissioner Clanton referred to the Watershed Based Funding Implementation (WBIF) grant funds for anti-icing equipment for the City of Rosemount and asked if other Cities were interested in similar access. Zabel commented that representatives of the cities and townships were invited to the same meeting to identify and prioritize potential projects for the WBIF grant and so there is equal opportunity for them to put forward their priority projects. Zabel also added that due to the highly porous soils in the majority of the City of Rosemount they manage most of their stormwater through infiltration and so require less overall stormwater management and treatment.

## **8. Adjourn**

*Motion by Commissioner Betzold, second by Commissioner Borton, to adjourn the meeting at 5:54 p.m.  
The motion passed on an 8-0 vote.*

**6a. Recommend Adoption of the Draft Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization 2022 Budget and Watershed Management Tax District Levy**

Meeting Date: 8/11/2021  
Item Type: Regular-Action  
Contact: Mark Zabel  
Telephone: 952-891-7011  
Prepared by: Mark Zabel  
Reviewed by: N/A

N/A



**PURPOSE/ACTION REQUESTED**

- Recommend adoption of the draft Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization 2022 Budget and Watershed Management Tax District Levy

**SUMMARY**

The proposed draft Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization (VRWJPO) 2021 Budget (included as Attachment A) is \$1,942,600 which includes revenues from underspending in the previous, levy and grant funding from Clean Water Fund. Expenses total \$1,778,860. The difference between revenues and expenses leaves a cash reserve of \$163,740 for the 2022 budget year, 8.4% of the budget total. The draft VRWJPO 2022 Budget recommends a Watershed Management Tax District Levy of \$1,000,000; \$34,650 in the Scott County portion of the watershed and \$965,350 in the Dakota County portion of the watershed. This amount is unchanged from the overall Watershed Management Tax District levy compared to 2021. The draft budget reflects recommendations from VRWJPO staff, partners, and items from the implementation section of the Watershed Plan.

An approved 2022 budget will remain “draft” until such time as the Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Board (VRWJPB) approves a budget and the Dakota County and Scott County Boards approve the Watershed Management Tax District Levy in December of 2021.

**RESOLUTION**

**6a. Recommendation to Adopt the Draft Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization 2022 Budget and Watershed Management Tax District Levy**

**WHEREAS**, the Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization requires a budget and the subsequent levy to implement the programs and projects described in its Watershed Management Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the Vermillion River Watershed Planning Commission has reviewed and discussed the Draft VRWJPO 2022 Budget and Vermillion River Watershed Management Tax District Levy.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Vermillion River Watershed Planning Commission hereby recommends approval of the Draft VRWJPO 2022 Budget totaling \$1,942,600 and recommends a Vermillion River Watershed Management Tax District Levy of \$1,000,000 (\$34,650 in the Scott County portion of the watershed and \$965,350 in the Dakota County portion of the watershed).



## VRWJPO Draft 2022 Budget

<u>Category</u>	<u>Budget Items</u>	<u>2022 Draft Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>	<u>2021 Revised Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>
<b>EXPENSES</b>					
<b>Administration and Operations</b> <b>-2170020000</b>	1 Dakota County VRW Staff	\$180,500	9.3%	\$180,500	7.2%
	2 Scott County VRW Staff	\$15,000	0.8%	\$15,000	0.6%
	3 Other Dakota County Staff Time	\$12,000	0.6%	\$12,000	0.5%
	4 Legal Support	\$25,000	1.3%	\$25,000	1.0%
	5 Miscellaneous Expenses (per diems, mileage, postage, etc.)	\$6,000	0.3%	\$6,000	0.2%
	6 Training, Conferences, and Certifications	\$2,000	0.1%	\$2,000	0.1%
<b>Subtotal Administrative</b>		<b>\$240,500</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	<b>\$240,500</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
<b>Research and Planning</b> <b>-2170020130</b>	1 Dakota SWCD Incentive Program Policy Assistance	\$1,600	0.1%	\$1,600	0.1%
	2 Scott County Staff	\$2,000	0.1%	\$2,000	0.1%
	3 VRW Staff	\$12,000	0.6%	\$12,000	0.5%
	4 Conservation Attitudes and Behaviors Survey	\$0	0.0%	\$50,000	
<b>Subtotal Research and Planning</b>		<b>\$15,600</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>\$65,600</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
<b>Monitoring and Assessment</b> <b>-2170020230</b>	1 Vermillion River Monitoring Network in Dakota Co.				
	1a Staff Time for Sample Collection, Equipment Installation, Maintenance, Downloading	\$39,000	2.0%	\$39,000	1.6%
	1b Data analysis, database management, data reporting, FLUX modeling, reporting	\$17,000	0.9%	\$17,000	0.7%
	1c Water Quality Sample Analysis and QA/QC samples	\$19,000	1.0%	\$19,000	0.8%
	1d Equipment and Supplies	\$8,000	0.4%	\$8,000	0.3%
	2 Vermillion River Monitoring Network in Scott Co	\$9,800	0.5%	\$9,800	0.4%
	3 USGS Cost Share for Blaine Ave. Station	\$8,900	0.5%	\$8,900	0.4%
	4 DNR Flow Gaging Assistance	\$9,700	0.5%	\$9,700	0.4%
	5a Biological and Habitat Assessments	\$7,000	0.4%	\$7,000	0.3%
	5b Electrofishing	\$16,000	0.8%	\$16,000	0.6%

## VRWJPO Draft 2022 Budget

<u>Category</u>	<u>Budget Items</u>	<u>2022 Draft Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>	<u>2021 Revised Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>
	6 Monitoring Programs Review and Evaluation	\$15,000	0.8%	\$15,000	0.6%
	7 General GIS support (Dakota SWCD)	\$5,000	0.3%	\$5,000	0.2%
	8 Nitrate Treatment Practice Sampling	\$1,000	0.1%	\$1,000	0.0%
	9 Iron Enhanced Sand Filter Performance Sampling	\$2,000	0.1%	\$2,000	0.1%
	<b>Subtotal Monitoring and Data Analysis</b>	<b>\$157,400</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>\$157,400</b>	<b>6.3%</b>
<b>Public Communications and Outreach</b>	1 Communication and Outreach Staff	\$100,000	5.1%	\$110,000	4.4%
	2 Vermillion River Watch Program	\$6,000	0.3%	\$6,000	0.2%
	-2170020330 3 Vermillion River Stewards	\$15,000	0.8%	\$20,000	0.8%
	4 Scott County Outreach Efforts	\$2,250	0.1%	\$2,050	0.1%
	5 Vermillion River Watershed Projects Signage and Map Updates	\$5,000	0.3%	\$5,000	0.2%
	6 Newsletter, Mailings, Website, General Communication Materials	\$10,000	0.5%	\$10,000	0.4%
	7 Landscaping for Clean Water Workshop Program (Dakota SWCD)	\$30,400	1.6%	\$30,400	1.2%
	8 K-12 Classroom Presentations (Dakota SWCD)	\$4,000	0.2%	\$4,000	0.2%
	9 Watershed Tours	\$0	0.0%	\$1,500	0.1%
	10 Local Standards/ Ordinance and Turf/ Salt Workshops	\$3,500	0.2%	\$3,500	0.1%
	<b>Subtotal Public Outreach and Communication</b>	<b>\$176,150</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>\$192,450</b>	<b>7.7%</b>
<b>Regulation</b>	1 Scott SWCD Assistance with Plan Review	\$900	0.0%	\$900	0.0%
	-2170020530 2 Engineering Assistance and Review	\$35,000	1.8%	\$45,000	1.8%
	3 VRW Staff Local Program Assistance	\$20,000	1.0%	\$20,000	0.8%
	<b>Subtotal Regulation</b>	<b>\$55,900</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>\$65,900</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
<b>Coordination and Collaboration</b>	1 Coordination VRW Staff	\$32,000	1.6%	\$32,000	1.3%
	2 Wetland Health Evaluation Program Cost Share	\$0	0.0%	\$3,000	0.1%
	-2170020531 3 Children's Water Festival Support	\$600	0.0%	\$600	0.0%

## VRWJPO Draft 2022 Budget

<u>Category</u>	<u>Budget Items</u>	<u>2022 Draft Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>	<u>2021 Revised Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>
	4 Watershed Partners	\$5,000	0.3%	\$5,000	0.2%
	5 Master Water Stewards	\$5,000	0.3%	\$5,000	0.2%
<b>Subtotal Coordination and Collaboration</b>		<b>\$42,600</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>\$45,600</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
<b>Land and Water Treatment</b>					
	1 Cost Share Programs in Dakota County (SWCD)	\$80,000	4.1%	\$80,000	3.2%
<b>Capital Improvement Projects</b>	2 Cost Share Programs in Scott County (SWCD)	\$31,300	1.6%	\$41,300	1.7%
<b>-2170920130</b>	3 Cost-share	<b>\$250,000</b>	12.9%	\$125,000	5.0%
	4 WBIF match	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
<b>Subtotal Capital Improvement Projects</b>		<b>\$361,300</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>\$246,300</b>	<b>9.9%</b>
<b>Maintenance</b>	1 Past projects maintenance/ repair	<b>\$40,000</b>	2.1%	\$25,000	1.0%
<b>-2170920130</b>	2 CIP construction oversight, maintenance/ repair staff costs	\$25,000	1.3%	\$25,000	
<b>Subtotal Maintenance</b>		<b>\$65,000</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>2.0%</b>
<b>Feasibility/Preliminary Studies</b>	1 Preliminary Design, Technical Assistance and Marketing for Capital Improvements (Dakota SWCD)	\$40,000	2.1%	\$40,000	1.6%
<b>-2170020631</b>	2 Preliminary Design, Technical Assistance and Marketing for Capital Improvements	<b>\$150,000</b>	7.7%	\$200,000	8.0%
<b>Subtotal Feasibility/Preliminary Studies</b>		<b>\$190,000</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>\$240,000</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
<b>Irrigation Audit and Cost Share Program</b>	1 Irrigation Audits	\$5,000	0.3%	\$5,000	0.2%
<b>2170020431</b>	2 Irrigation Cost-Share	\$5,000	0.3%	\$5,000	0.2%
<b>Subtotal Irrigation Audit and Cost Share</b>		<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
<b>CWF Grant (BWSR) Middle Creek Highview</b>	1 Middle Creek Restoration	<b>\$0</b>	0.0%	\$370,000	14.8%
<b>-2170020852</b>	2 VRWJPO cash match	<b>\$0</b>	0.0%	\$50,000	2.0%

## VRWJPO Draft 2022 Budget

<u>Category</u>	<u>Budget Items</u>		<u>2022 Draft Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>	<u>2021 Revised Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>
Subtotal CPL Grant Middle Creek/ Pinnacle Reserve			\$0	\$0	\$420,000	16.8%
CWF Grant (BWSR) Erickson Park Stormwater Improvement	1	Erickson Park Stormwater Improvement	\$0	0.0%	\$114,300	4.6%
-2170020841	2	VRWJPO cash match	\$0	0.0%	\$50,000	2.0%
Subtotal CWF Grant Erickson Park Stormwater Improvement			\$0	\$0	\$164,300	6.6%
CWF Grant (BWSR) Aronson Park Stormwater Reuse	1	Aronson Park Stormwater Reuse Project	\$0	0.0%	\$10,000	0.4%
-2170020843	2	VRWJPO cash match	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Subtotal CWF Grant Aronson Park Stormwater Reuse			\$0	\$0	\$10,000	0.4%
CWF Grant (BWSR) Webster Wetland Restoration	1	Webster Wetland Restoration	\$0	0.0%	\$67,000	2.7%
-2170020844	2	VRWJPO cash match	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Subtotal CWF Grant Webster Wetland Restoration			\$0	0.0%	\$67,000	2.7%
CWF Grant (BWSR) Technical Assistance and Cost Share	1	Technical Assistance and Cost Share (TACS)	\$17,700	0.9%	\$17,700	0.7%
-2170020845	2	VRWJPO cash match	\$1,800	0.1%	\$1,800	0.1%
Subtotal CWF Grant Technical Assistance and Cost Share Program			\$19,500	1.0%	\$19,500	0.8%
CWF Grant (BWSR) Imminent Health Threat Septic Upgrades	1	Imminent Health Threat Septic Upgrades	\$8,000	0.4%	\$8,000	0.3%
-2170020846	2	VRWJPO cash match	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Subtotal CWF Grant Imminent Health Threat Septic Upgrades			\$8,000	0.4%	\$8,000	0.3%
2020-2023 WBIF Grant (BWSR)						
North Creek Stabilization	1	North Creek Stabilization	\$288,700	14.9%	\$168,750	
-2170020853	2	VRWJPO cash match	\$18,750	1.0%	\$18,750	

VRWJPO Draft 2022 Budget

Category		Budget Items		2022 Draft Budget Amount	Budget % of Total	2021 Revised Budget Amount	Budget % of Total
Subtotal 2020-2023 WBIF Grant North Creek Stabilization				\$307,450	15.8%	\$187,500	7.5%
2020-2023 WBIF Grant (BWSR)							
Farmington Direct Drainage	1	Farmington Direct Drainage Assessment		\$13,400	0.7%	\$13,300	
-2170020854	2	VRWJPO cash match		\$3,330	0.2%	\$3,330	
Subtotal 2020-2023 WBIF Grant Hastings/ Farmington Direct Drainage Assessment				\$16,730	0.9%	\$16,630	0.7%
2020-2023 WBIF Grant (BWSR)							
Hastings Direct Drainage	1	Hastings Direct Drainage Assessment		\$26,700	1.4%	\$13,300	
-2170020855	2	VRWJPO cash match		\$3,330	0.2%	\$3,330	
Subtotal 2020-2023 WBIF Grant Hastings/ Farmington Direct Drainage Assessment				\$30,030	1.5%	\$16,630	0.7%
2020-2023 WBIF Grant (BWSR)							
Ravenna Basins Restoration	1	Ravenna Basins Restoration		\$59,000	3.0%	\$29,500	
-2170020856	2	VRWJPO cash match		\$6,000	0.3%	\$6,000	
Subtotal 2020-2023 WBIF Grant Ravenna Basins Restoration				\$65,000	3.3%	\$35,500	1.4%
2020-2023 WBIF Grant (BWSR)							
Rosemount Anti-Icing	1	Rosemount Anti-Icing		\$0	0.0%	\$15,000	
-2170020857	2	VRWJPO cash match		\$0	0.0%	\$0	
Subtotal 2020-2023 WBIF Grant Ravenna Basins Restoration				\$0	0.0%	\$15,000	0.6%
CWF Grant (BWSR)	1	WBF Grant Admin		\$17,700	0.9%	\$23,700	0.9%
-2170020848							
Subtotal WBF Grant Admin				\$17,700	0.9%	\$23,700	0.9%
Subtotal of Expenditures				\$1,778,860	91.6%	\$2,297,510	92.0%

VRWJPO Draft 2022 Budget

<u>Category</u>	<u>Budget Items</u>	<u>2022 Draft Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>	<u>2021 Revised Budget Amount</u>	<u>Budget % of Total</u>
Cash Reserve		\$163,740	8.4%	\$200,390	8.0%
TOTAL Annual Expenses		\$1,942,600	100.0%	\$2,497,900	100.0%

VRWJPO Draft 2022 Budget

<u>Category</u>	<u>Budget Items</u>	2022	<u>Budget % of Total</u>	2021	<u>Budget % of Total</u>
		<u>Draft Budget Amount</u>		<u>Revised Budget Amount</u>	
REVENUE					
	CIP Reserve	\$146,000	7.5%	\$205,900	8.2%
	CIP Reserve Grant Match	\$84,000	4.3%	\$101,800	4.1%
	Fund Balance from Underspending in Previous Year	\$456,000	23.5%	\$336,000	13.5%
	CWF Grant (BWSR)	\$0	0.0%	\$370,000	14.8%
	CWF Grant WBIF (BWSR) 2019-2021	\$0	0.0%	\$218,100	8.7%
	CWF Grant WBIF (BWSR) 2020-2023	\$243,600	12.5%	\$243,600	9.8%
	Fees for Permitting Activities	\$1,000	0.1%	\$2,500	0.1%
	Dakota County Levy	\$965,350	49.7%	\$966,650	38.7%
	Scott County Levy	\$34,650	1.8%	\$33,350	1.3%
	Investment Earnings	\$12,000	0.6%	\$20,000	0.8%
TOTAL Annual Revenue		\$1,942,600	100.0%	\$2,497,900	100.0%

Vermillion River Watershed Management Tax District  
Estimated Pay 2022 Taxes \* (Dakota County)

Attachment B

Residential Property

Market	Tax	Proposed 2022 Levy								2021 Actual	2020 Actual	2019 Actual	2018 Actual	2017 Actual	2016 Actual	2015 Actual	2014 Actual	2013 Actual	2012 Actual	2011 Actual	2010 Actual	2009 Actual
Value	Capacity	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$500,000	\$750,000	\$965,350	\$1,000,000	\$1,250,000	\$1,500,000	\$966,650	\$966,000	\$912,900	\$887,900	\$861,700	\$821,140	\$817,500	\$858,900	\$831,600	\$868,000	\$964,700	\$1,047,905	\$1,138,839
Rate		0.0857%	0.1294%	0.1731%	0.2823%	0.3764%	0.3916%	0.5008%	0.6101%	0.3700%	0.3990%	0.4030%	0.4290%	0.4490%	0.4490%	0.4660%	0.5450%	0.5430%	0.5410%	0.5550%	0.5660%	0.4368%
Various Values																						
\$150,000	1,263	\$1.08	\$1.63	\$2.19	\$3.56	\$4.75	\$4.94	\$6.32	\$7.70	\$4.67	\$5.04	\$5.09	\$5.42	\$5.67	\$5.67	\$5.88	\$6.88	\$6.86	\$6.83	\$7.01	\$7.15	\$5.52
\$170,514	1,486	\$1.27	\$1.92	\$2.57	\$4.20	\$5.59	\$5.82	\$7.44	\$9.07	\$5.50	\$5.93	\$5.99	\$6.38	\$6.67	\$6.67	\$6.93	\$8.10	\$8.07	\$8.04	\$8.25	\$8.41	\$6.49
\$185,000	1,644	\$1.41	\$2.13	\$2.85	\$4.64	\$6.19	\$6.44	\$8.23	\$10.03	\$6.08	\$6.56	\$6.63	\$7.05	\$7.38	\$7.38	\$7.66	\$8.96	\$8.93	\$8.89	\$9.12	\$9.31	\$7.18
\$190,000	1,699	\$1.46	\$2.20	\$2.94	\$4.80	\$6.39	\$6.65	\$8.51	\$10.36	\$6.28	\$6.78	\$6.85	\$7.29	\$7.63	\$7.63	\$7.92	\$9.26	\$9.22	\$9.19	\$9.43	\$9.61	\$7.42
\$200,000	1,808	\$1.55	\$2.34	\$3.13	\$5.10	\$6.80	\$7.08	\$9.05	\$11.03	\$6.69	\$7.21	\$7.28	\$7.75	\$8.12	\$8.12	\$8.42	\$9.85	\$9.82	\$9.78	\$10.03	\$10.23	\$7.90
\$210,000	1,917	\$1.64	\$2.48	\$3.32	\$5.41	\$7.21	\$7.51	\$9.60	\$11.69	\$7.09	\$7.65	\$7.72	\$8.22	\$8.61	\$8.61	\$8.93	\$10.45	\$10.41	\$10.37	\$10.64	\$10.85	\$8.37
\$225,000	2,080	\$1.78	\$2.69	\$3.60	\$5.87	\$7.83	\$8.15	\$10.42	\$12.69	\$7.70	\$8.30	\$8.38	\$8.92	\$9.34	\$9.34	\$9.69	\$11.34	\$11.29	\$11.25	\$11.54	\$11.77	\$9.09
\$275,000	2,625	\$2.25	\$3.40	\$4.54	\$7.41	\$9.88	\$10.28	\$13.15	\$16.02	\$9.71	\$10.47	\$10.58	\$11.26	\$11.79	\$11.79	\$12.23	\$14.31	\$14.25	\$14.20	\$14.57	\$14.86	\$11.47
\$279,600	2,675	\$2.29	\$3.46	\$4.63	\$7.55	\$10.07	\$10.48	\$13.40	\$16.32	\$9.90	\$10.67	\$10.78	\$11.48	\$12.01	\$12.01	\$12.47	\$14.58	\$14.53	\$14.47	\$14.85	\$15.14	\$11.69
\$291,400	2,804	\$2.40	\$3.63	\$4.85	\$7.92	\$10.55	\$10.98	\$14.04	\$17.11	\$10.37	\$11.19	\$11.30	\$12.03	\$12.59	\$12.59	\$13.07	\$15.28	\$15.22	\$15.17	\$15.56	\$15.87	\$12.25
\$300,000	2,898	\$2.48	\$3.75	\$5.01	\$8.18	\$10.91	\$11.35	\$14.51	\$17.68	\$10.72	\$11.56	\$11.68	\$12.43	\$13.01	\$13.01	\$13.50	\$15.79	\$15.73	\$15.68	\$16.08	\$16.40	\$12.66
\$325,000	3,170	\$2.72	\$4.10	\$5.49	\$8.95	\$11.93	\$12.41	\$15.88	\$19.34	\$11.73	\$12.65	\$12.78	\$13.60	\$14.23	\$14.23	\$14.77	\$17.28	\$17.21	\$17.15	\$17.59	\$17.94	\$13.85
\$350,000	3,443	\$2.95	\$4.45	\$5.96	\$9.72	\$12.96	\$13.48	\$17.24	\$21.00	\$12.74	\$13.74	\$13.87	\$14.77	\$15.46	\$15.46	\$16.04	\$18.76	\$18.69	\$18.62	\$19.11	\$19.49	\$15.04
\$375,000	3,715	\$3.18	\$4.81	\$6.43	\$10.49	\$13.99	\$14.55	\$18.61	\$22.67	\$13.75	\$14.82	\$14.97	\$15.94	\$16.68	\$16.68	\$17.31	\$20.25	\$20.17	\$20.10	\$20.62	\$21.03	\$16.23
\$400,000	3,988	\$3.42	\$5.16	\$6.90	\$11.26	\$15.01	\$15.61	\$19.97	\$24.33	\$14.75	\$15.91	\$16.07	\$17.11	\$17.90	\$17.90	\$18.58	\$21.73	\$21.65	\$21.57	\$22.13	\$22.57	\$17.42
\$425,000	4,250	\$3.64	\$5.50	\$7.36	\$12.00	\$16.00	\$16.64	\$21.29	\$25.93	\$15.73	\$16.96	\$17.13	\$18.23	\$19.08	\$19.08	\$19.81	\$23.16	\$23.08	\$22.99	\$23.59	\$24.06	\$18.57
\$450,000	4,500	\$3.85	\$5.82	\$7.79	\$12.70	\$16.94	\$17.62	\$22.54	\$27.45	\$16.65	\$17.96	\$18.14	\$19.31	\$20.21	\$20.21	\$20.97	\$24.53	\$24.44	\$24.35	\$24.98	\$25.47	\$19.66
\$475,000	4,750	\$4.07	\$6.14	\$8.22	\$13.41	\$17.88	\$18.60	\$23.79	\$28.98	\$17.58	\$18.95	\$19.14	\$20.38	\$21.33	\$21.33	\$22.14	\$25.89	\$25.79	\$25.70	\$26.36	\$26.89	\$20.75
\$500,000	5,000	\$4.28	\$6.47	\$8.65	\$14.12	\$18.82	\$19.58	\$25.04	\$30.50	\$18.50	\$19.95	\$20.15	\$21.45	\$22.45	\$22.45	\$23.30	\$27.25	\$27.15	\$27.05	\$27.75	\$28.30	\$21.84

*Estimated TCAP (as of 06/23/2020)	228,815,208
Pay 2020 Median Value: 279,600	
Pay 2021 Median Value: 291,400	



WHAT IF TAX COMPARISON PAY 2021 vs Pay 2022

FISCAL YEAR 2021			
8,368,832 GROSS TAX CAPACITY		\$	33,350 FINAL CERTIFIED LEVY
(9,016) 10% KV TRANS LINE (-)			
(411,066) FISCAL DISPARITY (-)			
7,948,750 NET TAX CAPACITY		\$	(3,287) FISCAL DISPARITY (-)
		\$	30,063 TAX LEVY OR SPREAD LEVY
Tax Rate		0.378%	
FISCAL YEAR 2022			
8,664,890 GROSS TAX CAPACITY		\$	34,650 PROPOSED LEVY OR CERTIFIED LEVY
(10,249) 10% KV TRANS LINE (-)			
(441,022) FISCAL DISPARITY (-)			
8,213,619 NET TAX CAPACITY		\$	(3,287) FISCAL DISPARITY (-)
		\$	31,363 TAX LEVY OR SPREAD LEVY
as of 10/28/2021		Tax Rate 0.382%	

RESIDENTIAL IMPACTS

RESIDENTIAL IMPACTS										Pay 2021	Pay 2022			Median & Average Values			
	% Value Range Inc/Dec	# of affected Properties	Average Market Value 2021	Average Market Value 2022	Value Exclusion 2021	Taxable Market Value 2021	Value Exclusion 2022	Taxable Market Value 2022	Taxable % Chg 21-22	Net Payable 2021	Net Payable 2022	Net Inc/Dec 2021 vs 2022	Net Difference % Change	2021 Median Values	2022 Median Values	2022 Average Values	2022 Value % Change
Elko New Mrkt City 1500	+15.01+%	12	\$ 301,300	\$ 346,495	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 6,055	\$ 340,440	16.92%	\$ 11.01	\$ 13.00	\$ 1.99	18.041%	\$ 307,400	\$ 316,300	\$ 311,000	2.9%
	+10.01-15.00%	81	\$ 301,300	\$ 338,963	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 6,733	\$ 332,229	14.10%	\$ 11.01	\$ 12.69	\$ 1.67	15.194%				
	+5.01-10.00%	289	\$ 301,300	\$ 323,898	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 8,089	\$ 315,808	8.46%	\$ 11.01	\$ 12.06	\$ 1.05	9.500%				
	+0.01-5.00%	1016	\$ 301,300	\$ 308,833	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 9,445	\$ 299,387	2.82%	\$ 11.01	\$ 11.43	\$ 0.42	3.807%				
	No Change	17	\$ 301,300	\$ 301,300	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	0.00%	\$ 11.01	\$ 11.12	\$ 0.11	0.960%				
	-0.01-5.00%	78	\$ 301,300	\$ 293,768	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 10,801	\$ 282,967	-2.82%	\$ 11.01	\$ 10.80	\$ (0.21)	-1.887%				
	-5.01-10%	3	\$ 301,300	\$ 278,703	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 12,157	\$ 266,546	-8.46%	\$ 11.01	\$ 10.18	\$ (0.83)	-7.580%				
	-10.01-15%	2	\$ 301,300	\$ 263,638	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 13,513	\$ 250,125	-14.10%	\$ 11.01	\$ 9.55	\$ (1.46)	-13.274%				
-15.01+	2	\$ 301,300	\$ 256,105	\$ 10,123	\$ 291,177	\$ 14,191	\$ 241,914	-16.92%	\$ 11.01	\$ 9.24	\$ (1.78)	-16.121%					
New Market Twp 1152	+15.01+%	12	\$ 472,000	\$ 542,800	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 542,800	15.00%	\$ 17.85	\$ 21.13	\$ 3.28	18.393%	\$ 452,300	\$ 463,200	\$ 484,200	2.4%
	+10.01-15.00%	18	\$ 472,000	\$ 531,000	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 531,000	12.50%	\$ 17.85	\$ 20.57	\$ 2.72	15.238%				
	+5.01-10.00%	63	\$ 472,000	\$ 507,400	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 507,400	7.50%	\$ 17.85	\$ 19.45	\$ 1.59	8.928%				
	+0.01-5.00%	900	\$ 472,000	\$ 483,800	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 483,800	2.50%	\$ 17.85	\$ 18.47	\$ 0.62	3.484%				
	No Change	50	\$ 472,000	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 472,000	0.00%	\$ 17.85	\$ 18.02	\$ 0.17	0.960%				
	-0.01-5.00%	81	\$ 472,000	\$ 460,200	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 460,200	-2.50%	\$ 17.85	\$ 17.57	\$ (0.28)	-1.564%				
	-5.01-10%	4	\$ 472,000	\$ 436,600	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 436,600	-7.50%	\$ 17.85	\$ 16.67	\$ (1.18)	-6.612%				
	-10.01-15%	16	\$ 472,000	\$ 413,000	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ 70	\$ 412,930	-12.51%	\$ 17.85	\$ 15.77	\$ (2.08)	-11.675%				
-15.01+	8	\$ 472,000	\$ 401,200	\$ -	\$ 472,000	\$ 1,132	\$ 400,068	-15.24%	\$ 17.85	\$ 15.28	\$ (2.58)	-14.426%					
County Wide		45,815	\$ 339,400	\$ 358,100	\$ 6,694	\$ 332,706	\$ 5,011	\$ 353,089	6.13%	\$ 12.58	\$ 13.48	\$ 0.90	7.145%	\$ 303,800	\$ 321,400	\$ 358,100	5.8%

**6b. Mid-term Vermillion River Watershed Management Plan Review**

Meeting Date: 8/11/2021  
Item Type: Information  
Contact: Mark Zabel  
Telephone: 952-891-7011  
Prepared by: Mark Zabel



**PURPOSE/ACTION REQUESTED**

- Mid-term Vermillion River Watershed Management Plan Review

**SUMMARY**

The Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Board adopted the 2016-2025 Vermillion River Watershed Management Plan (Plan) in June 2016. The Vermillion River Watershed Management Organization (VRWJPO) has been working toward achieving the goals, objectives, and actions identified in the Plan since its adoption. Each year the staff review the Plan Implementation Section to identify those areas listed for action and incorporate activities into work plans, develop feasibility studies, or pursue grant proposals, as appropriate. Each year the VRWJPO also prepares and publishes an annual activity report listing accomplishments from the previous year.

This is the mid-point of the term of the current Plan; therefore, it is time to review the progress made and to identify any adjustments required for Plan implementation. Staff presented a spreadsheet compiling all objections and actions listed in Section 6 of the Vermillion River Watershed Management Plan along with a status for each action as assigned by staff. The Watershed Planning Commission members discussed the process for evaluation and agreed to apply a priority ranking to each of the actions identified with a status of Future or Ongoing. Further discussion of actions and their rankings will take place with the WPC for further evaluation of Plan implementation. Considerations could include identifying any amendments that would need to be processed formally, identifying any emergent issues that were not anticipated in the development of the 2016-2025 Plan and actions appropriate to address them, and reviewing existing programs.

Staff will present a review of the actions identified in the 2016-2025 Plan for discussion with the Vermillion River Watershed Planning Commission.