

Minnehaha Creek Watershed District

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

MEETING DATE: September 12, 2019

TITLE: Authorization to contract with Smith Partners, PLLP and Wenck Associates, Inc. for program alignment and rule revisions support

RESOLUTION NUMBER: 19-081

PREPARED BY: Tom Dietrich

E-MAIL: tdietrich@minnehahacreek.org

TELEPHONE: 952-473-2855

REVIEWED BY: Administrator Counsel Program Mgr. (Name): _____
 Board Committee Engineer Other: Becky Christopher

WORKSHOP ACTION:

<input type="checkbox"/> Advance to Board mtg. Consent Agenda.	<input type="checkbox"/> Advance to Board meeting for discussion prior to action.
<input type="checkbox"/> Refer to a future workshop (date): _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Refer to taskforce or committee (date): _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Return to staff for additional work.	<input type="checkbox"/> No further action requested.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): <u>Requesting approval at September 12, 2019 meeting</u>	

PURPOSE or ACTION REQUESTED:

Authorization to execute contracts with Smith Partners, PLLP and Wenck Associates, Inc. for amounts not to exceed \$51,290 and \$19,674.50, respectively for support in the development and drafting of the Permitting Program’s upcoming program alignment and rule revisions effort.

PROJECT/PROGRAM LOCATION: District-wide

PROJECT TIMELINE: September 2019 – December 2020

PROJECT/PROGRAM COST:

Fund name and number:	Rule Revisions, 2007
2019-2020 budget:	\$105,000 (\$40,000 in 2019; \$65,000 for 2020)
Expenditures to date:	\$7,565.17
Remaining budget for 2019:	\$32,434.83
Remaining budget for 2020:	\$65,000.00
Requested amount of funding:	\$70,964.00 (\$22,280.00 for 2019; \$48,684.50 for 2020)

PAST BOARD ACTION:

- January 11, 2018, RBA 18-004, Adoption of the MCWD Watershed Management Plan
- August 8, 2018, CAC Meeting, Regulatory Process and Rule Changes
- September 12, 2018, CAC Meeting, Permitting Issue and Opportunity Identification – Rule Language
- October 10, 2018, CAC Meeting, Permitting Issue and Opportunity Identification – Administrative Process
- December 12, 2018, CAC Meeting, Permitting Issue and Opportunity Identification – Compliance

**DRAFT for discussion purposes only and subject to Board approval and the availability of funds.
Resolutions are not final until approved by the Board and signed by the Board Secretary.**

- January 2, 2019, CAC Meeting, Permitting Issue and Opportunity Identification – Partnership Process
- February 6, 2019, CAC Meeting, Permitting Rule Revisions: Identification of Direction
- March 14, 2019, OPC Meeting, Permitting Program Alignment
- August 22, 2019, PPC Meeting, Stakeholder Engagement Process for Partnership Model
- September 4, 2019, CAC Meeting, Stakeholder Engagement Process for Partnership Model

SUMMARY:

In January 2018, the Board approved the fourth generation Watershed Management Plan (Plan). The updated Plan focused on improving the District’s implementation model following the direction established in the District’s *Balanced Urban Ecology (BUE)* policy, which serves as the underlying organizational strategy. This strategy prioritizes partnership with the land use community to integrate policy, planning and implementation, leveraging the value created when built and natural systems are in harmony.

To implement this strategy, the Plan articulated an approach that is two-pronged:

- Focusing in areas of high need and opportunity to achieve significant, measurable resource improvement;
- Remaining responsive to needs and opportunities district-wide through coordination with partners.

The new approach was strongly supported by the District’s communities throughout development of the Plan. Since the Plan’s adoption, the District has been working to deliver on its policy commitments and further develop its partnership model by making improvements to its programs and promoting the continued understanding and support of our partners. A significant component of developing the partnership model revolves around realigning the District’s Permitting Program with the policies outlined in the Plan.

This has occurred in parallel with an effort to refocus the Permitting Program around the strategic planning effort completed in 2018. As an initial step, realignment of the Permitting Program began with reorienting the Program’s purpose around the newly memorialized organizational strategy. At that time, the Program’s purpose was redefined as, “protecting natural resources against degradation associated with land use development; and, partnering with public and private parties to generate greater natural resource outcomes than those achieved through regulation alone.”

To achieve the Program’s new purpose, staff identified the following goals in realigning Permitting in coordination with the Citizens Advisory Committee:

1. Promote early coordination and partnership to identify opportunities to achieve greater natural resource benefits; and,
2. Improve the efficiency of baseline regulation to:
 - a. Align staff time with natural resource risk and/or partnership opportunities; and,
 - b. Improve customer service.

These efforts are being undertaken to appropriately utilize staff time commensurate to natural resource risk; to revise rules to make them less complex and easier to understand; and, to streamline standards and process for a more affordable and user friendly experience. As a result of these improvements and efficiencies, staff capacity will be expanded, providing additional time and resources toward building and executing partnership projects.

To work towards accomplishing these goals and priority activities, staff worked with the Citizen’s Advisory Committee and the Operations and Policy Committee to develop a scope of work for Permitting’s Program Alignment and Rule Revisions (attached as Figure 1). This scope of work was refined from the initial

categories outlined in Figure 1 to incorporate additional detail and tasks for consultants, which covers five primary focuses:

- Mapping the governance framework
- Rule standard consistency and compliance
- Simplifying and streamlining rule language, guidance, and process
- Partnership incentives and process memorialization; and,
- The compliance program

The description of the work, its priority, the tasks involved, and associated deadlines are detailed in the attached document (Table 2 and Table 3). This document outlines work to be performed by both a legal consultant (Smith Partners, PLLP) and an engineering consultant (Wenck Associates, Inc.). Developing the various aspects of the Program Alignment and Rule Revisions will then be coordinated between a team of District staff, Wenck Associates, Inc., and Smith Partners, PLLP.

Staff provided this document to Smith Partners, PLLP (Legal Counsel) and Wenck Associates, Inc. (District Engineer) to provide quotes on the proposed work. These quotes are included as Table 2 (Wenck Associates, Inc.) and Table 3 (Smith Partners, PLLP) along with the scope document. In addition to research, drafting, and review, the attached scope includes coordination time for both legal and engineering to cover any additional policy research or discussions that may be required throughout the process.

The combined cost for the proposed scope of work is \$70,964.50 over 2019 and 2020, which is within budget. A breakdown of costs by consultant and by year is included in Table 1 below. Smith Partners and Wenck Associates are uniquely qualified for this role based on their history of work with the District, including their involvement in the development of the 2017 Plan, the Balanced Urban Ecology Policy, and their deep knowledge of the District's programs and policies. Staff recommends executing contracts with Smith Partners in an amount not to exceed \$51,290.00 and Wenck Associates in an amount not to exceed \$19,674.50 for this scope of work.

Year	Consultant	Hours	Cost
2019	Wenck Associates, Inc.	64	\$10,320.00
2020	Wenck Associates, Inc.	52.50	\$9,354.50
Wenck Associates Total		116.50	\$19,674.50
2019	Smith Partners, PLLP	52	\$11,960.00
2020	Smith Partners, PLLP	171	\$39,330.00
Smith Partners Total		223	\$51,290.00
COMBINED TOTAL		339.50	\$70,964.50
2019 Total Cost		116.00	\$22,280.00
2020 Total Cost		223.50	\$48,684.50

Table 1: Consultant Quotes Received

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NUMBER: 19-081

TITLE: **Authorization to Contract with Smith Partners, PLLP and Wenck Associates, Inc. for Program Alignment and Rule Revisions Support**

WHEREAS, on January 11, 2018, the Board adopted Resolution 18-004, approving the Watershed Management Plan that identified the primary focus of improving the District's implementation model following the direction established in the Board policy, *In Pursuit of a Balanced Urban Ecology in the Minnehaha Creek Watershed*; and

WHEREAS, to realign the Permitting Program and revise rules consistent with the Board policy, *In Pursuit of a Balanced Urban Ecology in the Minnehaha Creek Watershed* and the 2017 Watershed Management Plan staff has developed a scope of work in coordination with the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Operations and Policy Committee to achieve the goals of (1) promoting early coordination and partnership to identify opportunities to achieve greater natural resource benefits; and, (2) improve the efficiency of baseline regulations to align staff time with natural resource risk and improve customer service; and

WHEREAS, Staff developed a scope of work to obtain assistance from Smith Partners, PLLP and Wenck Associates, Inc. with policy analysis, research, drafting and editing associated with realigning the Permitting Program and revising rules; and

WHEREAS, District governance policies state that the District administrator shall not purchase professional services in excess of \$25,000 without obtaining written quotes or bids, or utilizing a Qualification Based Selection process;

WHEREAS, a waiver of this policy is appropriate in that Smith Partners, PLLP and Wenck Associates, Inc. are uniquely qualified for this role based on their history of work with the District, including involvement in the development of the 2017 Plan, the Balanced Urban Ecology Policy, and deep knowledge of the District's programs and policies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MCWD Board of Managers hereby authorizes the District Administrator to execute a contract with Smith Partners, PLLP for assistance with the Permitting's Program Alignment and Rule Revision process for an amount not to exceed \$51,290.00;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Managers authorizes the District Administrator to execute a contract with Wenck Associates, Inc. for research, drafting, and editing associated with Permitting's Program Alignment and Rule Revision process for an amount not exceed \$19,674.50.

Resolution Number 19-081 was moved by Manager _____, seconded by Manager _____.
Motion to adopt the resolution ___ ayes, ___ nays, ___ abstentions. Date: _____.

Secretary Date: _____

REQUEST FOR QUOTES

The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District is requesting quotes for work associated with realigning its Permitting Program and undertaking a rule revision process. The Program Alignment and Rule Revision Process fulfills the policy commitments made in the District's 2017 Watershed Management Plan. Namely, these goals are focusing on achieving greater natural resource benefits through partnership, a principal tenant of the Balanced Urban Ecology policy that serves as the District's organizational philosophy. The goals for the Program Alignment and Rule Revision Process and a brief summary of the work to date has been outlined below.

Goals of Program Alignment & Rule Revisions

1. Promote early coordination and partnership to identify opportunities to achieve greater natural resource benefits;
2. Improve efficiency of baseline regulation to:
 - Align staff time with natural resource risk and/or partnership opportunities; and,
 - Improve customer service.

To identify the scope of work required to accomplish the goals outlined above, staff holistically examined the issues associated with the Permitting Program. These issues were categorized, and vetted through the Citizen's Advisory Committee. Once categorical issues were further refined, staff and the CAC identified solutions to address each category. These solutions were further refined by staff and routed through the OPC (Table 1).

This internal effort with the CAC and OPC established the scope of work for the Program Alignment Process. For clarity, the scope of work has been broken down into larger headings below, each with several discrete tasks. Each task identifies several responsible parties, their corresponding tasks and high level schedule deadlines. Each section heading outlines the goal of the work, its purpose, and a brief discussion on the current state of operation within the program, the needs of the program considering the goals, and a short 'notes' section for additional considerations. These summaries are intended to provide high level context on work the District endeavors to complete for this process.

For additional clarity, an overall schedule and budget has been included on the following page.

A "detailed summary of tasks" has been included as an attachment for your consideration and analysis. This document follows the headings described below and outlines tasks by responsible party in greater detail. Please read through this document and the "detailed summary of tasks" and provide quotes no later than end of business **Monday, September 2nd, 2019**.

Please contact me directly with any questions or concerns at (952) 473-2855 or tdietrich@minnehahacreek.org.

High-Level Overall Schedule:

Task/Milestone	Date
“Soft Roll Out” (calls/interview with key city staff and policymakers to build support)	September – October 2019
External Process Kickoff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals, Scope of Work, Process 	December 2019
TAC Meeting #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020 TAC Work Plan Goals, Scope, Direction, Process, flag TAC issues/concerns Policy and Outreach for Early Coordination 	January 2020
Begin Drafting Rules	January 2020
TAC Meeting #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope of Regulation MCWD Role 	February 2020
TAC Meeting #3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamlining Rule Standards MS4 Compliance 	March 2020
TAC Meeting #4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early Coordination Staged Submittals/Land Use Sync Partnership Framework & Incentives 	April 2020
TAC #5 – Responsive Model Focus	May 2020
TAC #6 – Responsive Model Focus	June 2020
Complete Initial Rules Draft	June 2020
TAC #7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipal Partnerships – regulation, compliance, opportunity ID 	July 2020
TAC #8 – Review Draft Rules & Open Informal 30 Day Comment Period	August 2020
Board Authorization to Release for 45-Day Comment	September 2020
Response to Comments	September 2020 – October 2020
TAC #9 – Response to Received Comments	November 2020
Rule Text Revisions Based Upon Comments	November 2020
TAC #10 – Outline Future Work Plan	December 2020
Board Adoption	December 2020

Budget:

- 2019 - \$35,000 total
- 2020 - \$65,000 total

Program Component	Categorical Issue	Identified Direction
Rules Language	<u>Clarity</u> – rules are complex and confusing.	Revise text for clarity, plain language, and incorporate guidance materials. Simplify and streamline standards
	<u>Land Use Synchronization</u> – rules are disconnected from municipal processes	Construct rules to incentivize early coordination and allow for staged submittals.
	<u>Universal Technical Submittals</u> – prescriptive submittal requirements across all rules.	Construct rules to focus on standards with submittal requirements moved to guidance documents.
	<u>Regulatory Scope</u> – rules duplicate efforts of other agencies, capture a large volume of low-risk projects, and are out of sync with state requirements	Assess alternative means of processing applications that constitute a low natural resources risk. Assess compliance with state standards (MS4) Assess regulatory overlap and investigate opportunities for municipal partnerships.
Administrative Process	<u>Cycle Time</u> – the review ‘cycle’ is too time consuming and inefficient.	Simplify and streamline the administrative process.
	<u>Number of Cycles</u> – applications are repeating the cycle too many times due to incomplete submittals.	Identify and pursue IT improvements (as part of a District-wide plan).
Compliance Program	<u>Ineffectual Deterrents</u> – the District has limited actionable measures in place to discourage non-compliance	Refine the escalation process for crispness and clarity. Explore the range of actions at the Board’s discretion. Update financial assurance protocols and amounts. Develop state and municipal compliance partnerships.
	<u>Insufficient Field Capacity</u> – given the size (area) of the District and the number of active permits, staff cannot inspect all construction sites.	Refine the prioritization framework to dial in site selection effectiveness.
Partnership Framework	<u>Timing</u> – the disconnection with the land use process causes applications to come to the District late in the process, where there is little opportunity to assess or pursue greater natural resource benefits.	Develop educational, guidance, and marketing materials. Develop external trainings for municipal staff and process documentation.
	<u>Process Memorialization</u> – past opportunities have been advanced using an anecdotal process based upon institutional knowledge.	Develop a framework and process based upon past success, to provide internal and external clarity.
		Investigate options for incentivizing partnership with the District (through scope of services available, environmental PUD, etc.) Develop municipal partnerships to assist with opportunity identification.

Table 1: Program Alignment Scope

We collaborate with public and private partners to protect and improve land and water for current and future generations.

Mapping the Governance Framework

Goal: Make the rules clear and simple through outlining the District’s role and scope in the regulatory environment..

Purpose: Map the interaction of various water resource/natural resource regulators, outline the District’s specific role and regulatory scope within this environment, identify duplicative requirements, and create efficiency or guidance where possible.

Need/Existing Mechanisms: The water resource regulatory environment involves multiple agencies at the local, state, and federal level. Very little guidance exists as to which agencies regulate what aspects of various resources, thus creating confusion amongst discrete regulators, the general public, and private entities seeking to apply for appropriate permits.

As stated above, the purpose of this effort is to identify obvious duplications of regulation amongst various agencies and the watershed, and consolidate rules where possible. If consolidation is not possible, high level summaries of the various regulations will be included into a guidance document that will be included as an appendix to District rules. This is to provide clarity, not only on where the District sits within the water resource regulatory environment, but to how each agency interacts with the other, what regulations they oversee, and what an applicant will need to consider should those rules be triggered.

Additionally, under current conditions, the District casts a broad regulatory net, regulating nearly all new single family home builds, assuming the disturbance exceeds the erosion control criteria. As we move forward with realigning the program and focusing on larger natural resource risks and partnership opportunities, we are evaluating the merits of focusing on small scale/low natural resource risk projects. In general, SFHs have comprised more than 50% of the District’s annual permit load, and are rarely inspected (due to time constraints and limited inspection coverage). In order to realign staff time to appropriately focus on larger opportunities and greater natural resource risk, and tailor our regulatory scope appropriately, we need to assess how we administer permits associated with single family homes and understand how different approaches impact the amount of staff time dedicated towards these projects.

Scope of Work:

Task	Description	Team	Due Date
Map District regulations (likely in matrix format by rule)	Excel/Word Doc that outlines each District regulation and its major criteria.	Staff – Cole Thompson	COMPLETE
Map comparable agency analogs (DNR/FEMA, MPCA (CSW), City, etc.	Excel/Word Doc that outlines regulations similar to our own governed by different agencies.	Staff – Cole Thompson in coordination with Engineer – Erik/Chris	Mid-September 2019
Quantify the benefits/drawbacks of regulating SFH (how much staff	This analysis must outline:	Staff – Will & Erin Engineering – Erik	Sept. 30, 2019

<p>time is spent processing lower risk permits SFH; NR value of regulating by project type; risk associated with different permit types).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of SFH processed over the last 10 years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This should include SFH w/ Buffers • % of Permit Load SFH's represent • Average staff time/processing time • Geographic Distribution • Subdivision vs. Discrete • Inspection Coverage • City perception (Cold Calls – these will be completed by Tom) • The natural resource value of regulating single family homes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining a quantitative value in regulating SFH (e.g. lbs of TSS/TP prevented from moving downstream) AND a quantitative determination of natural resource risk imposed by SFH comparable to other projects the District regulates. 	
<p>Outline the Potential/Conceivable Options and Tradeoffs</p>	<p>Short summary (memo and table format) of potential options, their tradeoffs – i.e. reduction in staff time; work load reduction; legal feasibility; how the District would go about implementing; appetite of partners (a few options have already been identified below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status Quo • Completely Eliminate Regulation (SFH) 	<p>Legal – Chuck</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlining Potential Options and their Legal Feasibility • Recommend approaches found to be appropriate • Roadmap on how each potential option would be implemented (identify approx. 	<p>TAC #2 – February 2020</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blanket Permits (for developments) • General Permits (for sp. Contractors/city, etc.) • City assumption of authority 	timeframe required if applicable) Staff – Tom/Erin <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimations for staff time reduction/work load improvements • Compiling summary document (short memo and table) 	
Provide Guidance for Regulations outside the District’s purview.	Appendix document that guides applicant through the triggers, process, and consideration of other agency rules.	Staff – Drafting Staff Team (TBD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Legal/Eng – Review/Feedback	Final Draft – September 2020

Notes:

This information will be used to convey how much staff capacity we are able to make available through a variety of changes. Realistically, the District will not be entirely eliminating its involvement in SFH permitting; there will be modifications on how it might be applied (referring to blanket permits for subdivisions, general permits for contractors, or cities assuming authority), but few changes in the actual requirements of the rule (aside from conformance with CSW).

Considering that, it will be important to be able to articulate to our partners what we are investigating (in terms of improvements to how the rule is applied) as we start the external process, and understand how some of these alternative approaches may be applied. However, actually implementing them can be something we can pursue beyond this rule revisions process (e.g. pursuing MOUs with cities interested in assuming rule authority) – we just need to understand how we go about getting there.

Rule Standard Consistency & Compliance

Goal: To streamline rule standards through improving consistency and compliance with other state/local entities.

Purpose: Understand how new state (MS4) requirements will impact our realignment process, our end product, our overall flexibility within our regulatory framework (i.e. what is now off the table?), and what opportunities for partnership may be presented through this process.

Need/Existing Condition: MS4 is a state regulation handed down to all operators of publically owned stormwater conveyances. The District is subject to the permit, and has relied on determinations of equivalency to conform to various provisions of the permit. Recent interactions with the MPCA have highlighted that the District’s current rules should be updated to conform to MS4 requirements rather than relying on equivalency.

Moreover, new MS4 language is being drafted that will prompt the District to incorporate newly developed standards. Cities subject to the MS4 permit, generally have far more applicable requirements than does the District (i.e. larger inventory of assets requiring inspection and maintenance, responsibility to apply de-icer and train their applicators, etc.). As a component of the MS4 rule update process, we have the opportunity to align our rules with the permit and potentially add value to our municipal partners’ programs by easing the burden of meeting MS4 regulations through conformance with our own rules. The work outlined below accomplishes two goals:

1. Identifying where the District will need to update its rules/policies/practices, and outlining how that impacts flexibility within the final rule standards.
2. Identify what opportunities and potential costs/risks are presented for partnership with other MS4 permit holders.

Scope of Work:

Task	Description	Team	Due Date
Outline MCM Requirements (final language anticipated in Fall 2019)		Staff – Tom	COMPLETE
Compare Against Analog District Rules, Programs, and Initiatives (Matrix format)	<p>This comparison will be a matrix showing a side by side comparison of MS4 language and District rules, AND a brief bulleted summary that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlines changes that must be made to District Operations • Highlight impacts to rule-making flexibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outlines how we might 	<p>Staff – Tom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation of matrix • Identification of partner concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engineering to assist in quantifying difference between current District 	<p>Matrix: On Release of MS4 Public Notice Language (Late Summer/Early Fall 2019</p> <p>Summary: Prior to End of MPCA Public Notice Period (TBD)</p>

	<p>mitigate for the lack of flexibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Highlights potential partner concerns 	<p>standards and proposed MS4 standards.</p> <p>Legal – Chuck</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bulleted summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excluding partner concerns. 	
--	---	--	--

Notes:

Cities will be tracking MS4 permit language closely, so it will likely be a topic of extreme interest as we move toward our external process. Understanding our limitations in revising our own standards and the concerns of our partners will allow us to clearly articulate how we can add value in these scenarios.

Simplifying & Streamlining Rule Language, Guidance, & Process

Goal: Simplify and streamline the rule language, provide in-text guidance, and clarity on process.

Purpose: The rules are not clear, the standards and language are confusing, and the document is not accessible to its primary audience.

Need/Existing Condition: Under current conditions, the District’s rules and standards utilize technical and legal-centric language that is confusing and difficult to approach from a user’s perspective. The non-approachable nature of our regulatory text has generated numerous calls, emails, and questions for clarification on what our process requires.

In order to reduce the burden on staff time and create a user-friendly customer experience, the rules need to be simplified through use of clear, approachable language.

Scope of Work:

This work is contingent on:

1. Determination of what content will be in the rules (referring to incorporating/consolidating/simplifying other agency regulations into our own, if applicable).
2. What the standards will be (referring to MS4 update).

Work can proceed without this material, but may result in duplication of efforts if certain sections need to be completely re-written.

Task	Description	Team	Due Date
Draft rule language	Using plain language principles (outlined in further detail below under the ‘notes’ section for clarity), re-organize the rule structure and modify rule language. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submittal guidance will be pulled out and relocated into a guidance document • Initial draft will be provided to Engineering to make sure standards are correct and account for best engineering practices. • Once editing/drafting is complete, an internal 	Primary Drafters – Chuck, Tom, & Heidi <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff will organize rules and structure. Counsel will serve as primary drafter of rule text. Engineer Review Team – Erik/Chris, Tom, Review Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review text drafted by counsel and provide comment. 	Start Date: Dec ‘19 – Jan ‘20 Draft for Review Team: May 2020 Draft for Board Authorization and External Comment: September 2020 *see detailed task schedule for additional information on schedule.

	<p>review team will review and provide feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edits will be made accordingly • Rule text is packaged for delivery to the Board/External Committee for 45 day review and comment. 	<p>Review Team – TBD (representatives from each Department and Wenck to verify standards work)</p>	
Draft Guidance Materials	<p>(1) Materials that will be distributed to cities, residents, permit applicants, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These materials are intended to guide users through the process and outline the basic principles of the rules • These should have a marketing element (partnership piece), but more of a focus on ‘how-to’ apply and receive a permit. <p>(2) Moving submittal guidance (models, plan sheets, etc.) to an appendix; a new supplement to the rules.</p>	<p>(1) Primary Drafters: Ed/Comm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In coordination and reviewing with, Tom, Grace, Becky. <p>(2) Primary Drafters: Tom, Becky, Heidi, Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build out submittal guidance outline in a coordinated meeting. • Staff will expand and polish the final text for the appendix. 	<p>September 2020 (for 45 day comment release)</p>
Draft SONARs	<p>Accompanying SONARs for rule language release.</p>	<p>Legal – Chuck</p> <p>Staff – Tom & Becky (Review Capacity)</p>	<p>September 2020 (for 45 comment release)</p>
Final Drafting	<p>Revise rules and respond to commentary received throughout the 45 day comment period. This also involves packaging the final rule text for the Board and for Partners for Distribution.</p>	<p>Revision Team – Chris M., Chuck, Tom</p>	<p>October 2020</p>

Notes:

- 1) Plain language principles
 - a) Organization to serve the audience
 - i) Know the audience and purpose before beginning
 - ii) Most important messages are first

- iii) Other information presented in order of importance
- iv) Breaking text into logical chunks with straightforward headings
- b) Choose words carefully
 - i) Active voice
 - ii) Use words and numbers that resonate with your audience
 - iii) Short sentences and paragraphs
 - iv) Include 'you' and other personal pronouns
- c) Make information easy to find
 - i) Use headings and text boxes
 - ii) Delete unnecessary words, sentences, and paragraphs
 - iii) Use lists and tables (with ample white space, bold headers, and bulleted lists)

Partnership Incentives & Process Memorialization

Goal: Increase the likelihood of partnerships through the Permitting Program.

Purpose: Identify methods of attracting partnership opportunities, promoting early coordination, and building a repeatable process that advances potential opportunities into formal partnerships.

Needs/Existing Conditions: In its current state, the Permitting Department relies on un-incentivized, un-solicited early coordination from cities and developers to identify potential partnership opportunities. Otherwise, the District is catching opportunities late in the municipal land-use process and scrambling to capitalize on them. Very few materials exist that are distributed externally, outlining our unique way of doing business. As a result, we have very few applicants coordinating with us early, causing potential misses on partnership opportunities.

Further, should an applicant come in early with a partnership opportunity, there is no process memorialized that guides the applicant/staff through the steps to formalizing an opportunity into a partnership. From a developer perspective, a situation in which you are negotiating a partnership with no formal process presents a tremendous amount of risk. From a staff perspective, not having clarity on what steps should/may be required increases the odds for mistakes or delays that affect the outcome.

The Department needs to develop a formal partnership framework that identifies incentives for partnering with the District, and a formal, repeatable process to guide potential opportunities into partnerships. This effort is to increase the likelihood and frequency of partnership opportunities, and in turn, greater natural resource benefits.

Scope of Work:

Task	Description	Team	Due Date
Alignment with Land Use Process	<p>Outline of potential ways the Permitting Program can synchronize their process with local land use to encourage partnership opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of options complete with tradeoffs of incorporating the practice • Recommendation of how to move forward. <p>This will likely be an initial meeting to brain-storm potential ideas, followed by</p>	<p>Legal – Chuck</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building out list of potential options • Tradeoff analysis in coordination with staff team. • Compile recommendations <p>Staff – Tom & Becky</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of initial/potential options. 	<p>List of potential options: External Process Kickoff December 2019</p> <p>Tradeoffs and Recommendation: TAC #4 (April 2020 – leaves enough time to implement the change in the drafting process)</p>

	additional research and analysis by legal counsel.		
Marketing Materials	Development of materials available to cities, private developers, and consultants that describes our way of doing business, highlights benefits and examples, and how to engage the District.	Staff – Telly, Tom, Grace, Will and Becky. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ed/Comm largely responsible for pulling together drafts; rest of staff team available to vet and dial in. 	Final Draft (November 2020)
Identification of Potential Partnership Incentives	<p>An outline of potential means and methods that may consist of refinement of existing mechanisms/rules; or build out of new process. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refinement of Variance/Exception Language Inclusion of a new ‘Partnership’ rule (under Variances/Exceptions) Pursuit of an Environmental PUD with cities Case by case negotiation that outlines available Scopes of Service from the District and potential negotiable assets. <p>This work will outline the potential options, the tradeoffs presented with each option, and finally a recommendation from counsel on what, considering the goals of the effort, approaches most closely meet the needs of the Department.</p>	Staff – Tom, Becky, Mike, Wenck and James <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for meeting with counsel and outlining potential options for incentivizing partnership. Legal – Chuck <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research and analysis on potential options Identification of potential tradeoffs Recommendation on what options most meet District needs (in coordination with staff team) Engineering – Chris/Erik <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of potential options to outline typical submittal requirements and feasibility (need to have an idea of what will be submitted for the options). 	Outline of Potential Options (sans tradeoff analysis and recommendation): External Committee Kick off (December 2019) Tradeoff Analysis and Recommendations : TAC # 4, April 2020 Implementation: by Initial Drafting Completion: June 2020

Partnership Process	Develop a repeatable process based upon past successes that outlines steps from initial opportunity identification through partnership formalization and project management	Staff – Tom, Heidi, Becky, Mike, Anna, Laura/Gabe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitting largely responsible for building out the framework in coordination with Planning and Policy Managers. • James, Leadership Team, Wenck (optional) and Program Managers to vet Legal – Chuck <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and vetting of process. 	High Level Summary: TAC #4 (April 2020) Final Process: Completion of Initial Draft (June 2020)
---------------------	---	--	---

Notes:

Identifying potential incentives will be one of the more difficult, abstract concepts throughout the PARR process. The list of potential options will be important to communicate to our partners at our external process kickoff to articulate what we are looking at and why. The next milestone will be TAC #2, where we dive into partnership in more detail. At that point, we’ll want to have an understanding of the tradeoffs to each approach and the general direction we’re trending. The same is true of the land-use synchronization piece, which will be touched on in TAC #2 (February 2020), and again in more detail in TAC #4 (April 2020).

Depending on the recommendations for the incentives, Engineering will be weighing in on how submittal requirements might be constructed, and what methods of demonstrating greater natural resource benefits may be warranted.

The Partnership Process will largely be built upon the elements of success from previous projects, and is thus staff led with Engineering and Legal review.

Compliance Program

Goal: Clearly define the actionable measures in place, and evaluate opportunities to encourage compliance.

Purpose: To articulate in formal policy, how we identify inspection priorities, process non-compliant sites and related issues, what range of actions the Board of Managers has, and how we work and coordinate with our partners to jointly pursue compliance.

Need/Existing Conditions:

Currently, the compliance program is run using informal policy that is largely undocumented. While a prioritization framework tool has been developed by staff to assist in identifying high priority sites, the mechanism is unrefined, not a formal policy/tool, and is not clearly communicated externally. Further, the steps required in compliance proceedings are lengthy, involving the exchange of inspections reports, establishing re-inspection dates to allow for the implementation of corrective action, and, assuming continual non-compliance, scheduling proceedings before the Board. While the rules identify the Board’s ability to order corrective action in scenarios of non-compliance that are elevated before them, there is not a clear understanding of the range of actions at their disposal to incentivize future compliance, or remediate a current issue. Finally, under the program’s current operation, the District has relied on informal ‘handshake’ agreements between specific city staff to jointly pursue compliance. In absence of formal agreements, as city staff turns over, the understanding that may have been present between the District and a specific city can be lost, which requires significant staff time and effort to re-build.

In short, the District needs to formalize the compliance process, its prioritization framework, the range of actions available to the board, and agreements between the District and partner cities for joint compliance efforts.

Scope of Work:

Task	Description	Team	Due Date
Map a Clear Compliance Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the steps involved within the process in clear, plain language • Incorporate all applicable District policies • Coordinate with Ed/Comm to develop fact sheets • Summary of actions the board may consider in 	<p>Staff – Cole</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft process document • Coordinate with Ed/Comm (Telly/Kim) in building fact sheets <p>Staff – Tom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review drafts <p>Legal – Chuck</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide input (bulleted list or summary) on 	<p>Mandatory Steps (Foundation of Process – First bullet under ‘Legal): September 2019</p> <p>High Level Steps: TAC Kickoff (Dec 2019)</p> <p>Final Document & Fact Sheets: Initial Draft Completion (June 2020)</p>

	<p>compliance proceedings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determination if any of these actions have the possibility of being delegated to staff. 	<p>mandatory steps in the compliance process (i.e. required by statute/due process, etc.; what actions staff can/cannot take e.g. issue stop work orders)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulleted list/summary of actions the Board can consider and/or delegated • Review draft process documents <p>Review final process documents</p>	
<p>Establish Framework for Compliance Partnerships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How we envision the partnership aspect of compliance working; • Summary of what we prioritize (summary of what the prioritization tool is selecting) • What our general recourse is/what we need from our partners • Structure of partnership (MOU/MOA; what the building blocks of these agreements look like) 	<p>Staff – Cole</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting and coordination framework <p>Legal – Chuck</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline building blocks of compliance partnerships <p>Review of drafts and final product</p>	<p>High Level Summary: TAC Kickoff (Dec 2019)</p> <p>Full Framework: End of Drafting (September 2020)</p>
<p>Edit prioritization framework into formal policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing the informal practice into a formal policy • Must account for updates to rule 	<p>Staff – Cole</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting <p>Staff – Permitting & Becky</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Draft 	<p>Final Product: TAC #8 (August 2020)</p>

	<p>language (MS4, CSW, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify how success of the tool will be measured and evaluated into the future. • This should include developing targets for inspection coverage for construction/post-construction activities. 		
<p>Financial Assurance Updates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated financial assurance amounts based upon the MnDOT Construction Index and considering how other agencies construct such rules. • Outline guidance on how the District might pursue joint financial assurances with its member cities. 	<p>Engineering – Erik/Chris</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial research on how other agencies conduct financial assurances • Recommendations on equations for determining amounts • Verifying amounts are tied to a sliding scale (construction index) <p>Staff – Cole, Tom, Becky</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Recommendations and Edits <p>Legal – Chuck Outline how the District could consider financial assurances jointly w/ cities.</p>	<p>Final Product Due: Initial Draft – June 2020</p>

Table 1: Engineering Scope of Work & Quote									
Section	Description of Work	Priority	Task	Deadline	Quote (CM \$197)	Quote EM (\$145)	Quote Total	Total Time (hrs)	
Mapping the Governance Framework	Map District Regulations & Comparable Agency Analogs : This work involves identifying regulations that are analogous to District regulations at the local, state, and federal level. This effort will be built upon a staff-established matrix outlining both District rules and comparable member city rules.	Medium	Detailed matrix outlining the regulation of agencies with regulatory purview similar to MCWD (e.g. DNR via General Permit, MPCA - CSW requirements, City Ordinances, BWSR WCA Requirements, etc.)		0	6	\$ 870.00	9	
			Vet final product with staff (city component already completed; Cole Thompson to supply City Ordinance Matrix)	Sept. 30, 2019	1	2	\$ 487.00		
	Quantify the Benefits/Drawbacks of Regulating Single Family Homes : This work involves quantifying the value to natural resources achieved through regulating single-family homes (SFH). Additionally, this work will describe levels of natural resource risk imposed by various types of projects with the goal of identifying where SFHs fall in terms of risk.	High	Determine a quantitative value of regulating Single Family Homes (staff will compile data on SFH projects in the last 10 years with the factors outlined on page four, "Quantify staff time spent processing lower risk permits"). Quantitative Value should be assessed for the following: Erosion Control : The approximate TP/TSS reduction from retaining sediment on-site (Outlining cost of keeping sediment on-site vs. cost to remove from a downstream waterbody may be appropriate - use similar NRCS evaluation as guidance). This should be reported as the approximate value of regulating per average single family home. Wetland Buffers : use average number of single family homes requiring buffers per year and extrapolate approximate water quality benefit per SFH.	Friday, October 18, 2019	3	14	\$ 2,621.00	24	
			Devise method of assigning natural resource risk by project type (factors may include likelihood to impact key resources, types of remedial action available should something go wrong, inherent complexity of construction activity, etc). AND Identify natural resource risk imposed by average single family home project (e.g. very low, low, medium, high, very high). Provide short summary memo to identify how the analysis was done, and what the findings were.	Friday, October 18, 2019	1	6	\$ 1,067.00		
	Provide Guidance for Regulations Outside the District's Purview : This work will involve the drafting of an appendix document (by staff) to provide guidance on the trigger, applicability, and process of other agencies rules/regulations. This will be reviewed by legal and engineering before being incorporated as an appendix to the District's rules. The document will also include submittal guidance, described elsewhere in this scope of work.	Low	Review and edit guidance materials drafted by staff - the guidance materials will be for regulations outside of the District's purview (other agencies).	September 2020 - Final Draft	3	1	\$ 736.00	4	
Rule Standard Consistency & Compliance	Compare MS4 Standards Against Analog District Rules, Programs, & Initiatives : This work will involve taking a staff generated matrices of District Rules/Programs to MS4 requirements, and identifying (1) Changes that must be made to District Operations; and, (2) Impacts to rule-making flexibility and how that might be mitigated (if at all).	Low	Quantify the difference between meeting current District standards and new MS4 standards (i.e., what is the delta between the two and how much difficulty is associated with achieving that delta on-site. This task should be reported informally to staff (email/bullet points)	On release of MS4 Public Notice Language	1	4	\$ 777.00	5	
Simplifying & Streamling Rule Language, Guidance, and Process	Draft Rule Language : This work will involve using plain language principles to reorganize and edit the rule structure and text. In addition, this work will involve pulling out submittal guidance of the rule text and relocating it into a guidance document.	High	Review draft of rule text (provided by Legal Counsel) and provide comments/edits.	Early May 2020	6	2	\$ 1,472.00	8	
			Assist in responding to any comments received within the comment period.	October - November 2020	4	4	\$ 1,368.00		
	SONAR's and Final Drafting : This work will involve drafting SONARs for public release of the rules, assistance in preparing materials for the Board of Managers, responding to comments received, and finalizing the rule text.	High	Final drafting/edits on rules based on comments.	Nov-20	6	4	\$ 1,762.00	18	
			Draft Guidance Materials : This work (for purposes of this work task) is focused on relocating submittal requirements from the current rule text, and incorporating them into an appendix, as a supplement to the rules. The submittal guidelines are intended to incorporate the range of different materials that may be submitted to the District to demonstrate conformance with a provision of the rules, and is intended to be less rigid than its current format.	Low	In coordination with staff, build an outline of submittal guidance to be included in an appendix to the rules.	Mar-20	0.5		4
			Review final appendix document generated by staff.	Jun-20	0.5	2	\$ 388.50	7	
Partnership Incentives & Process Memorialization	Alignment with Land Use Process : This work consists of outlining potential ways the Permitting Program can synchronize their process with local land use to encourage partnership opportunities.	Medium	Convene/discuss with staff and Legal Counsel to identify a list of options or potential methods to synchronize with local land use.	External Process Kickoff - December 2019	3	1	\$ 736.00	8.5	
			Review Legal Counsel's Tradeoff Analysis and Convene with staff and Legal Counsel to vet range of options and tradeoffs (analysis conducted by Legal Counsel), and identify a direction.	February 2020 - April 2020	3	0	\$ 591.00		
			Provide feedback on the implementation roadmap identified by Legal Counsel.	TAC #4 - 4/1/20	1.5	0	\$ 295.50		
	Identification of Potential Partnership Incentives : This work will outline the potential options the District may consider to encourage partnership opportunities, identify the tradeoffs with these options, and present recommendations on what mechanisms the District should incorporate into its program.	High	Initial focus meeting in coordination with staff and Legal Counsel to build out a list of potential incentivization options. Legal Counsel to conduct tradeoff analysis on identified options.	External Process Kickoff - December 2019	4	2	\$ 1,078.00	13	
		Review Legal Counsel's Tradeoff Analysis - Convene with staff and Legal Counsel to vet, identify potential submittal/engineering requirements; identify viable options and select a direction. Legal Counsel will expand on direction and submit draft mechanisms for comment.	February 2020 - April 2020	4	0	\$ 788.00			
			Review draft mechanisms going into rules/Guidance in coordination with staff and Legal Counsel. Identify any necessary submittal guidance.	Jun-20	1	2	\$ 487.00		
Compliance Process	Financial Assurance Updates : This work will consist of updating the financial assurance equations and amounts. Additionally, this area of work will explore the possibility of jointly pursuing financial assurances with partner cities.	Low	Conduct Initial High Level Research on how other Agencies (Watersheds/Select Cities) conduct financial assurances (note points of success, failure, difficulty, etc.)	External Process Kickoff - December 2019	1	4	\$ 777.00	12	
			Develop a recommendation for new or updated financial assurance equations based upon current market and assessment of other agencies. Consider tying financial assurance amounts to the MnDOT Construction Index (updated annually for accurate construction costs).	External Process Kickoff - December 2019	2	5	\$ 1,119.00		
Coordination Meetings	Misc. 2019				4	0	\$ 788.00	8	
	Misc. 2020				4	0	\$ 788.00		
					Hours (Primary - \$197/hr)	Hours (Support - \$145/hr)	Cost (\$)	Total Hours	
					Total	53.5	63	\$ 19,674.50	116.5
					2019	20	44	\$ 10,320.00	64
					2020	33.5	19	\$ 9,354.50	52.5

Table 2: Legal Scope of Work & Quote

Section	Description of Work	Priority	Task	Deadline	Quote (CH - \$230/hr)	Total Time (hrs)	Cost (\$)
Mapping the Governance Framework	<p>Outline the Potential/Conceivable Options and Tradeoffs (of Processing Natural Resource Risk Permits): This work will involve outlining and identifying the range of options the District can implement as an alternative to processing low risk natural resource permits (SFHs with or without wetland buffers). Other related work (by Engineering) will quantify the natural resource value of regulating single family homes, and the amount of staff time dedicated toward processing SFHs.</p> <p>Provide Guidance for Regulations Outside the District's Purview: This work will involve the drafting of an appendix document (by staff) to provide guidance on the triggers, applicability, and process of other agencies rules/regulations. This will be reviewed by legal and engineering before being incorporated as an appendix to the District's rules. The document will also include submittal guidance, described elsewhere in this scope of work.</p>	Medium	Outline potential options for alternative processing (this may include status quo, elimination of regulation, blanket permits, Formulate recommendation on how to proceed.	Dec-19	15	20	\$4,600.00
			Check in with staff based upon results. Identify roadmap for implementation.	Jan-20 February 2020 - TAC #2	2 3		
Rule Standard Consistency & Compliance	<p>Compare MS4 Standards Against Analog District Rules, Programs, & Initiatives: This work will involve taking a staff generated matrices of District Rules/Programs to MS4 requirements, and identifying (1) Changes that must be made to District Operations; and, (2) Impacts to rule-making flexibility and how that might be mitigated (if at all).</p>	Medium	Review staff's compiled matrix of differences between current District requirements and proposed MS4 standards, highlighting changes that must be made to District Operations	TBD Depeding On release of MS4 Public Notice Language & Length of Public Notice Period (Fall 2019)	2	20	\$4,600.00
			Impacts to ultimate rule making flexibility and how the District might counteract this (if applicable).	TBD 2019	4		
			Assist staff in compiling a comment letter to the MPCA.	TBD 2019	4		
Simplifying and Streamlining Rule Language, Guidance, & Process	<p>Draft Rule Language: This work will involve using plain language principles to reorganize and edit the rule structure and text. In addition, this work will involve pulling out submittal guidance of the rule text and relocating it into a guidance document.</p> <p>SONAR's and Final Drafting: This work will involve drafting SONARs for public release of the rules, assistance in preparing materials for the Board of Managers, responding to comments received, and finalizing the rule text.</p>	High	Initial re-organization/re-configuration of rules will be done by staff. Review and comment on proposed organization.	Jan-20	3	45	\$10,350.00
			Using this reorganization as a starting point, edit rule text in conjunction with staff (i.e. joint meetings) to incorporate plain language principles as outlined earlier in this document.	February 2020 - April 2020	32		
			Document will be submitted to Engineering for review (this is included FYI, no work required).	Late April 2020	0		
			Provide additional edits based on Engineering commentary. Vet through MCWD staff review group (this is anticipated to be a coordinated meeting).	Early May 2020	2.5		
			Make necessary edits suggested by staff and Complete Draft Rules	Late May 2020	2.5		
			Draft SONARs in preparation for 45-day comment period.	Jun-20	5		
			Assist in packaging materials for Board authorization and release for 45-day commentary (i.e. memo, presentation, etc.)	Jul-20	15		
			Submit for staff review	July - August 2020	5		
			Make necessary edits.	Early August 2020	0		
			Assist in responding to any comments received within the comment period.	Early August 2020	2.5		
Alignment with Land Use Process: This work consists of outlining potential ways the Permitting Program can synchronize their process with local land use to encourage partnership opportunities.	Medium	Convene/discuss with staff and the Engineer to identify a list of options or potential methods to synchronize with local land use.	External Process Kickoff - December 2019	2	25	\$5,750.00	
		Conduct a high-level analysis on the tradeoffs/considerations for implementation for each option.	Jan-20	8			
Identification of Potential Partnership Incentives: This work will outline the potential options the District may consider to encourage partnership opportunities, identify the tradeoffs with these options, and present recommendations on what mechanisms the District should incorporate into its program.	High	Convene with staff and the Engineer to vet range of options and tradeoffs. Identify a direction.	February 2020 - April 2020	2	35	\$8,050.00	
		Identify an implementation roadmap for the selected option. Share with Staff and Engineer for any comments/feedback.	TAC #4 - 4/1/2020	5			
Partnership Incentives & Process Memorialization	Medium	Initial focus meeting in coordination with staff and the Engineer to build out a list of potential incentivization options.	External Process Kickoff - December 2019	2.5	5	\$1,150.00	
		Using list of identified options, conduct an analysis confronting tradeoffs.	Jan-20	10			
Partnership Process: This work will develop a repeatable process to route opportunities/partnerships through, based upon past successes. This will outline steps from initial opportunity identification through partnership memorialization.	Medium	Convene with staff and Engineer to vet, identify potential submittal/engineering requirements; identify viable options.	February 2020 - April 2020	2.5	3	\$1,150.00	
		Identify roadmap for implementation for viable options. Draft mechanisms into rules/Guidance in coordination with staff and Engineering.	TAC #4 - 4/1/2020	5			
Partnership Process: This work will develop a repeatable process to route opportunities/partnerships through, based upon past successes. This will outline steps from initial opportunity identification through partnership memorialization.	Medium	Review staff drafted partnership process outline and provide comment/suggestions.	Jun-20	15	3	\$1,150.00	
		Review staff drafted partnership process.	TAC #4 - 4/1/2020	2			

Compliance Program	Map a Clear Compliance Process: This work will incorporate clearly identifying the steps involved with the compliance process, updating the process with all applicable District policies, and summarizing the range of actions the Board of Managers have at their discretion in matters of compliance.	Low	Outline the statutory obligations (mandatory steps) within the Compliance Process (bulleted list to staff). This should also a list of commonly associated actions that staff either can or cannot take (i.e. issuance of stop work orders).				
			Outline (bulleted list) a list of actions the Board can/may consider in matters of compliance, and identify whether these actions can be delegated to staff.	27-Sep-19	3		
			Review and edit final compliance process documents produced by staff.	Initial Draft Completion - June 2020	2	5	\$1,150.00
	Establish Framework for Compliance Partnerships: This work will involve memorializing how we envision the partnership aspect of the compliance program working into the future. This incorporates summaries of what we prioritize (NR Risk, Public Awareness, etc.), what our general recourse is, how our partners plug into this system for the most efficient/effective resolution, and how partnerships are structured.	Low	Staff will be responsible for developing the framework based upon past successes. The primary task for Legal Counsel is outlining the specifics of how partnerships are structured (i.e. whether MOUs/MOAs are appropriate; what the general structure of the agreement looks like).	Nov-19	3		
			Review and edit final compliance partnership documents.	Initial Draft Completion - June 2020	2	5	\$1,150.00
	Financial Assurance Updates: This work will consist of updating the financial assurance equations and amounts. Additionally, this area of work will explore the possibility of jointly pursuing financial assurances with partner cities.	Low	Identify and outline how the District could jointly pursue financial assurances with member cities to avoid duplication of efforts.	External Process Kickoff - December 2019	2.5		
			Review final financial assurances recommendations and provide edits/guidance.	Initial Draft Completion - June 2020	2.5	5	\$1,150.00
	General Coordination	NA	Misc. Meetings 2019		4		
			Misc. Meetings 2020		4	8	\$1,840.00
						Total Hours	Cost (\$)
					223	\$ 51,290.00	
					52	\$ 11,960.00	
					171	\$ 39,330.00	