

PERFORMANCE

REVIEW AND

ASSISTANCE

PROGRAM



FEBRUARY 2008

REPORT TO THE
MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

About this Report

This report has been prepared for the Minnesota State Legislature by the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Minnesota Statutes Chapter 103B.102, subdivision 3. This statute requires BWSR to provide designated legislative committees with “an analysis of local water management entity performance” each year. This is the first in a series of reports that will be prepared by BWSR for this purpose. Because this is a new mandate established during the previous year’s legislative session, BWSR’s focus during the time since enactment has been on designing the program that will implement these new statutory responsibilities. Consequently, this first report is mostly about program design. Subsequent reports will focus on the results and findings from analyzing local water management entity performance as the program is fully implemented.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Performance Review	4
Assistance	6
Program Results	8
Reporting	9
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	10
Appendices	11
A. Minnesota Statutes Chapter 103B.102	
B. PRAP Advisory Team Members	
C. Overdue LGU Management Plan Revisions	
D. Annual Audit Receipt Status	
E. 2007 LGU Performance Awards and Recognition	
F. Proposed LGU Performance Standards	

Board of Water and Soil Resources
520 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

BWSR is an equal opportunity employer.
Information contained in this report is available in an alternative format upon request.
Printing costs for the production of this report were \$300
For more information contact: 651-296-0786

Executive Summary

Legislative Action

During the 2007 legislative session, Minnesota Statutes 103B.102 was amended to give the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) a new responsibility to monitor, report and enhance the performance of local government land and water conservation entities. The local government units (LGUs) that are the focus for this program include soil and water conservation districts, watershed districts, water management organizations, and the water management and planning function of counties—a total of more than 240 entities. This action reflects a heightened interest in ensuring that local government conservation efforts result in measurable progress in protecting and improving Minnesota's land and water resources. The Legislature designated \$100,000 per year for program development and initiation in the 2007-2009 biennium.

Program Design

Design of the new Performance Review and Assistance Program (PRAP) began in the summer of 2007 with two significant actions. The BWSR Board developed a set of Guiding Principles for the program. Then BWSR staff invited LGU representatives to appoint members to sit on an advisory team to help define program scope and key elements. During three meetings this past fall, the team developed key performance standards for each type of LGU.

Program Elements

The PRAP has three components:

- **Performance review**
- **Assistance with performance issues**
- **Reporting of results and progress**

The common standard for assessing LGU performance will be their effectiveness in executing their management plans. BWSR will look at the LGU operations in four different performance areas:

- Administration
- Planning
- Execution
- Communication & Coordination

BWSR has devised the program to be carried out on multiple levels based on level of funding and demonstrated need.

Level I: tabulation of required LGU reports and documents, website posting of results, and routine training for assistance. A few “hard case” LGU assistance consultations may be provided by staff, but these would be similar to services provided prior to the establishment of this program. Level I can be achieved within the \$100,000/year funding level.

Level II: interactive performance review with up to 50 LGUs per year to evaluate in detail the four performance areas.

Assistance would be targeted to the specific needs of the LGUs and could be provided by staff or consultants.

Level III: performance review would be conducted by staff to provide an in-depth assessment of performance problems and issues. Assistance would be targeted to address specific needs and be more intensive than Level II.

Level IV: This level is for those LGUs that have significant performance issues, requiring extensive and intensive monitoring. The BWSR Board would be involved at this level in establishing LGU accountability standards with consequences.

Implementation of Levels II, III and IV will require supplemental funding.

Introduction

Legislative Action

During the 2007 legislative session, Minnesota Statutes 103B.102 was amended to give the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) a new responsibility to monitor, report, and enhance the performance of local government land and water conservation entities. (See Appendix A.) The local government units (LGUs) that are the focus for this program include soil and water conservation districts (SWCDs), watershed districts (WDs), water management organizations (WMOs), and the water management and planning function of counties—a total of more than 240 entities. This action reflects a heightened interest in ensuring that local government conservation efforts result in measurable progress in protecting and improving Minnesota’s land and water resources. The Legislature designated \$100,000 per year for program development and initiation in the 2007-2009 biennium.

Guiding Principles

The first action taken by BWSR after receiving the new authority was for the Board to establish a set of principles to guide the program’s development and implementation.

- **Pre-emptive** - so that problems are identified and diagnosed early.
- **Systematic** - thorough, consistent and expected so that local governments can be prepared.
- **Constructive** - recognizes uniqueness, charts a path for those needing help to improve, and showcases successes.
- **Includes consequences** - that are proportional to the uncorrected deficiencies and rewards that acknowledge high performance.

- **Transparent** - allowing for greater public awareness and participation.
- **Retains local ownership and autonomy** –even when the State does not fully agree with decisions.
- **Maintains proportionate expectations** – comparisons are inevitable but need to acknowledge wide diversity of capacity and budget.
- **Preserves the state/local partnership** - the State provides review, training and resources, and as a partnership package.
- **Results in “more better” on-the-ground conservation** – must add value to conservation and clean water outcomes, not become an outcome unto itself.



These principles are consistent with the new BWSR strategic plan’s focus on creating an effective local delivery system to the mission of improving water resources and soil conservation on private lands.

Advisory Team

BWSR formed an advisory team to assist with program design. The statewide organizations representing the four LGUs were invited to appoint representatives to the team (see Appendix B). Team members provided advice on program values, scope, and performance standards targeted to each type of LGU. They agreed on the need for

the program to use existing reports and mechanisms to avoid increasing administrative workload, and to include assistance along with accountability.

Multi-level Process

The program, as it is currently designed, has three operational components:

- **performance review**
- **assistance**
- **reporting**

The following sections of this report explain these components in more detail. In order to monitor LGU performance and determine the assistance needed, BWSR will use a multi-level approach. The proposed actions range from annual tabulation of required report and planning documents, to periodic detailed performance reviews, to prescriptive, applied assistance.

Based on the experience of working with all types of LGUs, BWSR expects that the

performance of most will fall somewhere in the middle between the high performers and a few low performers. Assistance will therefore range from suggesting how the good ones can become even better to helping struggling LGUs get back on track to good performance.

The program will also include recognition of high performing entities. For the chronically underperforming LGUs BWSR will apply the steps provided in statute to address those deficiencies.

Reporting will be designed to make information accessible to LGU constituents and allow LGUs to compare their performance with that of their peers. BWSR will use both web-based and annual program status reports.



Performance Review

Plan-based Review

Realizing the diversity of soil and water conservation issues and local government capabilities statewide, the legislature selected the LGUs' execution of their planning goals as the common denominator measure of performance. Consequently, the primary purpose of performance review in this program is to determine each LGU's success in executing their overall plan. The standard for review is set by the LGU itself—goals and objectives for program implementation within their area of jurisdiction. Ancillary to that review will be a complete tabulation of compliance with program reporting requirements.

Four Cornerstones of Performance

BWSR will assess four categories of performance for each LGU:

- **administration**
- **planning**
- **execution**
- **communication-coordination.**

Administration is how the LGU organizes and manages itself to carry out its mission. Planning is both the process and the documentation that sets the direction for LGU action. Execution is how effectively the plans are carried out. And Coordination-Communication is concerned with how the LGU works with partners to accomplish its objectives and how well those objectives are influenced and supported by stakeholders and clients.

Performance Standards

Performance standards are the specific actions that BWSR will monitor for each LGU in order to determine their effectiveness. With the help of the Advisory Team, BWSR has identified different performance standards for different LGUs, in

recognition of their different resource management responsibilities. Standards have been defined for SWCDs, metro and greater Minnesota WDs, metro area WMOs, and counties. Counties, with local water planning as only a fraction of their broad responsibilities, have the fewest. Initial standards that have been defined through the advisory team process are of three types:

- basic practices or statutory requirements,
- target qualitative standards
- quantitative standards.

Appendix F contains lists of performance standards for all LGUs. The standards used will evolve to those that provide the most relevant information about LGU performance.

Levels of Review

Level I: Annual for All LGUs

The most frequent level of performance review will be for BWSR to annually monitor the LGUs' completion of mandated plans and program reports. Because performance assessment looks primarily at management plan execution, having an up-to-date management or watershed comprehensive plan is a key indicator at this level. Audit activity reports are examples of other routine submittals. Based on BWSR's experience, by addressing problems that show up at this level, other more serious problems can often be avoided. In addition, performance issues at this level can be symptomatic of deeper problems that need to be addressed.

Level II: 50 LGUs per year

The next most frequent type of review will be an in-depth performance analysis of each LGU once every five years. BWSR staff will conduct these reviews in an interactive format to determine compliance with the Level II performance standards. In addition

to the Level I requirements, Level II reviews will determine LGU progress in plan execution, the extent of coordination with partners, and the types of business practices that are in place.

Level III: estimated 5 per year

Performance review at this level is tied to specific performance deficiencies or requests for assistance made by the LGU. The types of assessments at this level include a benchmarking survey, a 360° review, BWSR self-assessment, and others. The type of review will be tailored to the needs of the LGU. Typically BWSR staff will work with the LGU to develop and monitor an interim performance improvement agreement for the LGU. The cost of this type of review is additive relative to Level II. Assessment tools and methods will typically be included in an assistance program designed by the BWSR staff and the LGU.

Level IV: less than 5 per year

Level IV review will occur after BWSR has issued a notice of deficiency for chronic underperformance by an LGU. (See Program Results on page 7 for a description of this process.) Typical review standards will be to monitor the LGU's accomplishment of goals in the interim performance improvement agreement.

2007 Performance Review Actions:

- Identified LGUs with overdue and expiring management plans (Appendix C)
- Identified LGUs with overdue 2006 annual audits or financial reports. (Appendix D)

2007 Level I Results

- 37 of 40 SWCD audits done
- 31 of 32 Metro WD/WMO audits done
- 29 of 31 outstate WD financial reports completed
- Only 2 SWCD overdue financial reports (See Appendix D for more details.)

2008 Proposed Performance Review Actions:

- Send notification letters to LGUs with overdue and expiring plan revisions
- Send notification letters to LGUs with late audits
- July – November: Begin Level I performance review tabulation
- January – November: Based on available resources, conduct Level II performance reviews

Conclusions

- Level I review can be achieved within the \$100,000 funding level.
- Level II, III and IV review will require supplemental funding.
- Level III review will have to be capped based on available funds.

Recommendations

- The Legislature should provide supplemental funding to enable performance review implementation.
- BWSR should train staff in the application of LGU performance assessment tools.
- BWSR should develop performance measures to track its own implementation of this new program.

Assistance

Purpose of Assistance

Assistance always has as its goal the improvement of operational effectiveness as measured by the LGU's success in implementing its planned goals. Assistance includes a variety of methods to improve LGU performance, to address problems or barriers to operational effectiveness, and to provide needed skills. Assistance can be requested by the LGU as a means to improve their effectiveness or to address a persistent problem. It can also be proposed by BWSR as a remedy to documented underperformance by an LGU. In those rare cases where an LGU has had a petition for termination filed against it, BWSR will provide assistance within the context of the statutory authority to delay action on the petition.

Local Government Interest

In every venue where the PRAP concept has been presented to groups of LGU representatives during the past few months, there has been a clear call for BWSR to provide the assistance that addresses the identified performance needs. In responding to this concern BWSR has agreed with the LGUs, but has also cautioned that, as currently funded, need-specific assistance is not possible. Without further support, BWSR's assistance will be applied on a "most critical need" basis. Some LGUs have indicated their intent to support increased funding for this key program function.

Assistance Tools

Assistance will be provided by BWSR staff or consultants, as appropriate and as funding allows. The type of assistance that BWSR offers will depend on needs and

recurring problems that require attention. The following items are suggestive only and it is expected that as the program continues, these and other tools will prove their utility and effectiveness in meeting the needs of LGUs.

- Training
- Strategic planning / SWOT analysis
- Facilitation
- Mediation
- Coaching
- Mentoring
- 360° survey

BWSR expects that proven techniques and tools already employed by LGUs to address specific concerns can be shared with others.

Levels of Assistance

BWSR intends to provide LGUs with assistance that is complementary to the Levels of Performance Review described in the previous section.

Level I assistance will be largely voluntary and will consist primarily of training that provides information of benefit, often to multiple LGU audiences.

Level II assistance will be prescribed to address the routine needs of particular LGUs, such as help with plan revisions, facilitation, and training in needed fiscal or administrative skills.

Levels III and IV assistance will be intensive and designed to address the needs, or more likely performance problems, of a particular LGU. At these levels tools such as mentoring, mediation, and coaching are most likely to be used.



Limits to Assistance

Under current funding levels, BWSR intends to provide assistance using the following criteria:

- **Provide assistance that addresses a need shared by many LGUs**
- **Provide limited assistance to LGUs with known critical needs**

2007 Assistance Actions

- Facilitated several governance option discussions for LGUs considering change by enlargement, merger or dissolution.
- Notified all SWCDs about options for changing supervisor district alignment.
- Applied new legislative requirement for SWCDs to establish websites.

2008 Proposed Assistance Actions

- Provide assistance needed by LGUs with overdue management plan revisions.
- Provide training on topics of benefit to most LGUs.

Conclusions

- **Level II, III and IV assistance is beyond the capability of the program as currently funded.**
- **BWSR will need to set an annual cap on Levels III and IV assistance and seek to prioritize assistance offered within that limit.**

Recommendations

- **BWSR should train staff in the application of LGU assistance tools.**

Program Results

Rewards

While much of the program emphasis is focused on assisting underperforming LGUs, BWSR recognizes there are a significant number of LGUs that are performing admirably. (See Appendix E.) BWSR will recognize the contribution that these LGUs make to the conservation of Minnesota's soil and water resources. At this time, there are no provisions for any type of monetary rewards. However, as mentioned elsewhere in this report, BWSR intends to recognize these LGUs publicly on its website. In addition, BWSR would like to enlist board and staff members of those LGUs to help with the training, coaching, and mentoring of others.



Penalties

The 2007 statutory amendments include a provision for BWSR to take action to address serious LGU performance problems. Based on the statute, BWSR intends to take the following actions to apply that authority:

1) based on staff recommendations, the BWSR Board would issue a Notice of Deficiency to an LGU, indicating that the Level IV Performance Review and Assistance will be applied;

- 2) publish the Notice of Deficiency on BWSR's PRAP webpage and inform local stakeholders;
- 3) BWSR staff develops, in concert with the LGU, a series of interim performance objectives with timelines and consequences for non-performance;
- 4) staff report monthly to the LGU and the Board of their assessment of the LGU's compliance with the interim objectives;
- 5) when necessary, the BWSR Board would act on the consequences, including restriction of grant or other program funding to the LGU; and
- 6) the Board would issue a notice to the LGU indicating what steps must be taken for funding to be restored.

2007 Reward and Penalty

Actions:

- None

2008 Proposed Reward and Penalty Actions:

- Develop criteria to identify LGU top performers
- Post top performing LGUs on website
- Implement Level IV Corrective Actions as needed

Conclusions

- **LGUs are primarily responsible to their constituents and stakeholders for their performance. BWSR must support the public's right to know regarding the performance of LGUs.**

Recommendations

- **The Legislature and BWSR should establish a system for rewarding high performing LGUs with appropriate incentives.**

Reporting

Purpose of Reports

The purpose of reporting on LGU performance is threefold:

- To provide a perspective of the progress in meeting statewide soil and water conservation goals through the efforts of local government-based activities and programs,
- To give stakeholders access to information about the effectiveness of their local water management entities,
- To provide both information and incentives that will encourage LGUs to learn from one another about methods and programs that produce the most effective results.

Report Types

There are several types of reports that this program will use to achieve the above listed purposes.

LGU-generated

These include information posted routinely on the LGU's web-site and the required or voluntary reports submitted to other units of government and the public about fiscal status, plans, programs and activities.

These all serve as a means of communicating what each LGU is achieving and allow stakeholders to make their own evaluation of LGU performance.

BWSR Web-site

BWSR will establish a page on its website to serve as a source of information about LGU performance. This site will be updated regularly and will be designed to allow for analysis of statewide performance trends. BWSR will also seek to identify and highlight those entities that are performing well or that have developed

approaches to land and water conservation that are particularly effective.

Annual Legislative Report

BWSR's annual program report will summarize recent LGU performance and identify program issues and make policy recommendations.

2007 Reporting Actions:

- Webpage "under construction" on BWSR website
- Preparation of PRAP legislative report
- Prepared Watershed District Guidebook to recognize recent accomplishments
- Began data collection for Soil and Water Conservation District Guidebook

2008 Proposed Reporting Actions:

- Begin tabulating Level I results on BWSR website
- Establish webpage featuring high performing LGUs

Conclusions

- **Multiple report formats will be most useful to local citizens and stakeholders seeking to inform themselves about the performance of their LGUs.**

Recommendations

- **LGUs with overlapping jurisdictions should use reported results to help coordination with one another.**
- **BWSR should incorporate easy navigation links to each LGU within the BWSR website.**

Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary of Conclusions

Performance Review

- Level I review can be achieved within the \$100,000 funding level.
- Level II, III and IV review will require supplemental funding.
- Level III review will have to be capped based on available funds.

Assistance

- Level II, III and IV assistance is beyond the capability of the program as currently funded.
- BWSR will need to set an annual cap on Levels III and IV assistance and seek to prioritize assistance offered within that limit.

Program Results

- LGUs are primarily responsible to their constituents and stakeholders for their performance. BWSR must support the public's right to know regarding the performance of LGUs.

Reporting

- Reporting will be most useful to local citizens and stakeholders to inform them about the performance of their LGUs.

Summary of Recommendations

Performance Review

- The Legislature should provide supplemental funding to enable performance review implementation.
- BWSR should train staff in the application of LGU assistance tools.
- BWSR should develop performance measures to track its own implementation of this new program.

Assistance

- BWSR should train staff in the application of LGU assistance tools.

Program Results

- Legislature and BWSR should establish a system for rewarding high performing LGUs with appropriate incentives.

Reporting

- LGUs with overlapping jurisdictions should use reported results to help coordination with one another.
- BWSR should incorporate easy navigation links to each LGU within the BWSR website.

Appendices

- A. Minnesota Statutes Chapter 103B.102**
- B. PRAP Advisory Team Members**
- C. Overdue LGU Management Plan Revisions**
- D. Annual Audit and Financial Report Status**
- E. 2007 LGU Performance Awards and Recognition**
- F. Proposed LGU Performance Standards**

Appendix A

103B.102, Minnesota Statutes 2007

Copyright © 2007 by the Office of Revisor of Statutes, State of Minnesota.

103B.102 LOCAL WATER MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.

Subdivision 1. **Findings; improving accountability and oversight.** The legislature finds that a process is needed to monitor the performance and activities of local water management entities. The process should be preemptive so that problems can be identified early and systematically. Underperforming entities should be provided assistance and direction for improving performance in a reasonable time frame.

Subd. 2. **Definitions.** For the purposes of this section, "local water management entities" means watershed districts, soil and water conservation districts, metropolitan water management organizations, and counties operating separately or jointly in their role as local water management authorities under chapter 103B, 103C, 103D, or 103G and chapter 114D.

Subd. 3. **Evaluation and report.** The Board of Water and Soil Resources shall evaluate performance, financial, and activity information for each local water management entity. The board shall evaluate the entities' progress in accomplishing their adopted plans on a regular basis, but not less than once every five years. The board shall maintain a summary of local water management entity performance on the board's Web site. Beginning February 1, 2008, and annually thereafter, the board shall provide an analysis of local water management entity performance to the chairs of the house and senate committees having jurisdiction over environment and natural resources policy.

Subd. 4. **Corrective actions.** (a) In addition to other authorities, the Board of Water and Soil Resources may, based on its evaluation in subdivision 3, reduce, withhold, or redirect grants and other funding if the local water management entity has not corrected deficiencies as prescribed in a notice from the board within one year from the date of the notice.

(b) The board may defer a decision on a termination petition filed under section [103B.221](#), [103C.225](#), or [103D.271](#) for up to one year to conduct or update the evaluation under subdivision 3 or to communicate the results of the evaluation to petitioners or to local and state government agencies.

History: 2007 c 57 art 1 s 104

Appendix B

PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAM ADVISORY TEAM MEMBERS

NAME	ORGANIZATION	REPRESENTING
Kevin Bigalke	Nine-Mile Creek WD	Metro WD
Ray Bohn	MN Assoc. of Watershed Districts	WD association
Brian Dwight	BWSR	BWSR-No. Region
Tom Ebnet	Thirty Lakes WD	Greater MN WD
Annalee Garletz	Assoc. of Minnesota Counties	County government
Barbara Haake	Rice Creek WD	WD association
Louis Jambois	Assoc. of Metropolitan Municipalities	Water management organizations
Kathryn Kelly	Renville SWCD	SWCD supervisors
Tim Koehler	USDA-Natural Res. Conservation Service	Federal agencies
Kevin Ostermann	MACDE / Nicollet SWCD	MACDE
Dave Peterson	BWSR	BWSR-So. Region
Sheila Vanney	MN Assoc. of Soil & Water Cons. Districts	SWCD association
Steve Woods	BWSR-St. Paul	BWSR management

Appendix C

2007 Overdue Management Plan Revisions

Soil and Water Conservation Districts

Resolution Overdue

None

Counties

Local Water Plan Revision Overdue

None

Watershed Districts

Watershed Management Plan Revision Overdue

Belle Creek

Crooked Creek

Middle-Snake-Tamarac Rivers¹

No. Fork Crow River

Rice Creek

Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek

Stockton-Rollingstone-Minnesota City

Yellow Medicine River

Watershed Management Organizations

Watershed Management Plan Revision Overdue

Carver County²

Lower Rum River

Richfield-Bloomington²

Six Cities

Notes:

¹Plan revision delayed due to litigation

²Exceeded intended due date but not statutory limit

Appendix D

Status of 2006 Annual Financial Reports and Audits

as of January 25, 2008

Metro Area Watershed Districts: Overdue Audits

Coon Creek [audit submitted; review not yet completed by State Auditor's Office]

Metro Area Watershed Management Organizations: Missing Audits

None

Greater Minnesota Watershed Districts: Financial Report Not Prepared

Bear Valley
Sand Hill River¹

Soil and Water Conservation Districts: Overdue Audits

Anoka
Cass
Kittson¹

Soil and Water Conservation Districts: Overdue Financial Reports

Big Stone
Swift

Notes:

¹Overdue because of accounting firm delays.

Appendix E

2007 Local Government Unit Performance Awards and Recognition

Governor's Minnesota Great Award
Heron Lake Watershed District

Board of Water and Soil Resources Outstanding SWCD Employee
Pete Beckius, Scott SWCD

Sustainable St. Paul Award
Capital Region Watershed District

DNR Watershed District of the Year
Heron Lake Watershed District

MAWD Program of the Year
Ramsey Washington Watershed District: Landscape Ecology Awards Program (LEAP)

MAWD Project of the Year
Wild Rice Watershed District: Heiberg Dam

Minnesota Waters Citizen Monitoring Program of the Year
Wadena Soil and Water Conservation District

Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts
SWCD of the Year
Scott Soil and Water Conservation District

Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts
Outstanding Supervisor Award
Louise Smallidge, Washington Conservation District

DNR Appreciation Award
Washington Conservation District

National Association of Conservation Districts: District Excellence Award
Dakota Soil and Water Conservation District

Pheasants Forever Brood Booster Award
Brian Nyborg, Jackson SWCD

GREATER MN WATERSHED DISTRICT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS				
Perf. Area	Performance Standard	Methods (Level)		Rating
		(I)	(II)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ Target (high performance) standard ■ Basic practice or Statutory requirement ◇ Quantitative standard 	Annual Compliance Tabulation	BWSR Staff Review and Assessment (1/5 yrs.)	
Administration	■ Annual report submitted by deadline	X		Y/N
	■ Financial audit: completed within last 12 months	X		Y/N
	■ Rules: are current and reviewed by BWSR		X	Y/N
	■ Personnel policies: written and reviewed/updated within last 5 years		X	Y/N
	■ Data practices policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 years		X	Y/N
	■ Annual report: contains progress report	X		Y/N
	■ Manager appointments are current and reported		X	
	★ Have in-house staff		X	Y/N
	★ Board training: ed and certifications, orientation plan and record for each board member		X	Y/N
	★ Staff training: ed and orientation plan and record for each staff member		X	Y/N
	★ By-laws, operational guidelines exist and current		X	Y/N
	★ Public ditch records: modernized, usable, indexed (where applicable)		X	Y/N
	◇ Expenditure trend: previous yrs		X	number
Planning	■ Watershed Management plan: up-to-date	X		Y/N
	★ Implementation and/or CIP review every 2-3 yrs.		X	Y/N
	◇ Number of local water plans reviewed and/or approved		X	number
Execution	■ Engineers Reports: reviewed by DNR and BWSR	X		Y/N
	★ Watershed Management plan: percent of objectives met vs. targets		X	Y/N
	◇ \$ for program-projects/total budget \$(% of total expenditures) (incl. explanation)	X	X	number
	◇ Water quality trend completed for key water bodies			data
	◇ Watershed yield trends monitored / reported			data
Communication & Coordination	■ Functioning advisory committee: recommendations on projects, reports, attendance at Board mtgs.		X	Y/N
	■ Stakeholder survey: within last 5 yrs		X	Y/N
	■ Website: annual report, annual budget, minutes	X		Y/N
	■ Coordination of Watershed Plan with local water plans,		X	
	■ Communication piece: sent within last 12 months	X		Y/N
	★ Public education program: seminars, tours		X	Y/N
	★ Coordination with County Bd. by Managers or staff		X	Y/N
	★ Partnerships: with municipalities, counties cooperative projects/tasks done		X	Y/N
	★ Website: contains contact information staff and mgrs. , mtg. agendas, minutes, updated after each board meeting	X		Y/N

METRO WATERSHED DISTRICT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS				
Perf. Area	Performance Standard	Methods (Level)		Rating
		(I)	(II)	
	★ Target (high performance) standard ■ Basic practice or Statutory requirement ◇ Quantitative standard	Annual Compliance Tabulation	BWSR Staff Review and Assessment (1/5 yrs.)	
Administration	■ Activity report: annual, on-time	X		Y/N
	■ Financial report & audit: completed within last 12 months	X		Y/N
	■ Rules: are current and reviewed by BWSR		X	Y/N
	■ Personnel policies: written and reviewed/updated within last 5 years		X	Y/N
	■ Data practices policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 years		X	Y/N
	■ Activity report: content MR 8410 compliant (incl. self-assessment of progress)	X		Y/N
	■ Manager appointments are current and reported		X	Y/N
	■ Consultant RFP: ≤3 yrs for legal, engineering, accounting		X	Y/N
	■ Water appropriation permit program exists (Hennepin and Ramsey only)	X		Y/N
	★ Have in-house staff		X	Y/N
	★ Board training: ed and certifications, orientation plan and record for each board member		X	Y/N
	★ Staff training: ed and orientation plan and record for each staff member		X	Y/N
	★ By-laws, operational guidelines exist and current		X	Y/N
	★ Public ditch records: modernized, usable, indexed (where applicable)		X	Y/N
◇ Expenditure trend: previous yrs		X	number	
Planning	■ Watershed Management plan: up-to-date	X		Y/N
	★ Capital Improvement Plan review every 2-3 yrs.		X	Y/N
	◇ Number of local water plans reviewed and/or approved		X	number
Execution	■ Engineers Reports: reviewed by DNR and BWSR	X		Y/N
	★ Management plan: being substantially		X	Y/N
	★ Cooperative projects/tasks done with partners		X	Y/N
	◇ \$ for program-projects/total budget \$(% of total expenditures) (incl. explanation)	X	X	number
	◇ Water quality trend completed for key water bodies		X	data
◇ Watershed yield trends monitored / reported		X	data	
Communication & Coordination	■ Functioning advisory committee: recommendations on projects, reports, attendance at Board mtgs.		X	Y/N
	■ Stakeholder survey: within last 5 yrs		X	Y/N
	■ Coordination of Watershed Plan with local water plans,		X	
	■ Communication piece: sent within last 12 months	X		Y/N
	★ Public education program: seminars, tours		X	Y/N
	★ Coordination with County Bd. and City/Twp. officials by Managers or staff		X	Y/N
	★ Partnerships: with municipalities, counties cooperative projects/tasks done		X	Y/N
	◇ Advisory committee: # mtgs within last 12 months		X	number

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE STANDARDS				
Perf. Area	Performance Standard	Method (Level)		Rating
		(I)	(II)	
	★ Target (high performance) standard ■ Basic practice or Statutory requirement ◇ Quantitative standard	Annual Compliance Tabulation	BWSR Staff Review and Assessment (1/5 yrs.)	
Administration	■ Activity Report: annual, on-time	X	X	Y/N
	■ Activity report: content MR 8410 compliant (incl. self-assessment of progress)	X	X	Y/N
	■ Consultant RFP: ≤3 yrs for legal, engineering, accounting		X	Y/N
	■ Financial report & audit completed within last 12 months	X		Y/N
	■ Personnel policies: written and reviewed/updated within last 5 years		X	Y/N
	■ Data practices policy: reviewed/updated within last 5 years		X	Y/N
	■ Water appropriation permit program exists (Hennepin and Ramsey only)		X	Y/N
	■ Joint Powers Bd.: tabulation of current members and terms exists	X		Y/N
	★ Staff training: cont ed and orientation record for each staff member		X	Y/N
	★ Board training: cont ed and orientation record for each board member		X	Y/N
	★ Public ditch records: modernized, usable, indexed (where applicable)		X	Y/N
	★ By-laws or operational guidelines exist and current		X	Y/N
	◇ Expenditure trend: previous years		X	number
Planning	■ Management Plan: up-to-date	X		Y/N
	★ Capital Improvement Plan reviewed 2/3 years		X	Y/N
	◇ Local plan approvals by WMO		X	number
Execution	★ Management plan: being substantially executed		X	Y/N
	★ Cooperative projects/tasks done with partners		X	Y/N
	◇ Water quality trend completed for key water bodies			data
	◇ Watershed yield trends monitored / reported			data
	◇ # of projects/program costs (% of total expenditures)		X	number
Communication & Coordination	■ Stakeholder survey: within last 5 yrs		X	Y/N
	■ Communication piece: sent within last 12 months	X		Y/N
	■ Website: contains mbrs, minutes, updated after each board meeting	X		Y/N
	◇ Advisory committee: # mtgs within last 12 months	X		number
	★ Public education program: seminars, tours		X	
	★ Coordination with County / City / Twp. by JP Board members or staff		X	
	★ Advisory committee makes recommendations on projects, issues, reports		X	

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS				
Perf. Area	Performance Standard	Method (Level)		Rating
		(I)	(II)	
	★ Target (high performance) standard ■ Basic practice or Statutory requirement ◇ Quantitative standard	Annual Compliance Tabulation	BWSR Staff Review and Assessment (1/5 yrs.)	
Administration	■ Financial statement: annual, on-time and balances	X		Y/N
	■ Financial audit completed within last 3 yrs or \$400K	X		Y/N
	■ eLINK Annual report: submitted on-time	X		Y/N
	■ Data practices policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 years		X	Y/N
	■ Personnel policy: exists and reviewed/updated within last 5 yrs		X	Y/N
	■ Technical approval authorities: reviewed annually		X	Y/N
	■ By-laws, operational guidelines exist and current		X	Y/N
	★ Board training: cont ed and orientation plan and record for each board member			X
★ Staff training: cont ed and orientation plan and record for each staff member			X	Y/N
Planning	■ Comprehensive Plan: updated within 5 yrs. or unexpired county LWM plan	X		Y/N
	■ Annual Plan of Work: on time; w/ cost share applied to priorities	X		Y/N
	★ Annual plan priorities based on natural resource quality trend data		X	Y/N
Execution	■ Comprehensive plan: being substantially executed		X	Y/N
	★ Certified wetland delineator: on staff or retainer		X	Y/N
	◇ L&W treatment projects: # of projects/\$leveraged		X	number
	◇ Expenditure trend: previous 10 yrs and sources of revenue		X	numbers
	◇ \$ for program-projects/total budget \$(% of total expenditures) (incl. explanation)		X	number
	◇ Cost share/grant utilization %			number
Communication & Coordination	■ Website: annual report, annual budget, minutes	X		Y/N
	■ SWCD Guidebook entry: provides background and accomplishments		X	Y/N
	★ Website: contains mbrs, mtg. agendas, minutes, updated after each board meeting	X		Y/N
	★ Stakeholder survey: within last 5 yrs		X	Y/N
	★ Public information included in annual work plan		X	Y/N
	★ Public education program: seminars, tours		X	Y/N
	★ Annual written report: includes progress towards goals		X	
	★ Projects/programs based on stakeholder survey input		X	Y/N
	★ Coordination with County Bd. Supervisors or staff		X	

COUNTY LOCAL WATER PLANNING PERFORMANCE REVIEW STANDARDS				
Perf. Area	Performance Standard / Benchmark	Method (Level)		Rating
		(I)	(II)	
		Annual Compliance Tabulation	BWSR Staff Review and Assessment (1/5 yrs.)	
	★ Target (high performance) standard ■ Basic practice or Statutory requirement ◇ Quantitative standard			
Administration	■ Block grant annual report: reported results comply with work plan	X		Y/N
	■ Local match for grant: certified	X		Y/N
	■ eLINK report completed on time	X		Y/N
	★ Public ditch records: modernized, usable, indexed		X	Y/N
	★ Self-report progress: submitted in annual report		X	Y/N
	★ Maintain record of WD manager appointments and terms	X		Y/N
	◇ Local \$ leveraged by state grant		X	\$ amt
Planning	■ Local water mgmt. plan: 10-yr voluntary but unexpired w/o lapse	X		Y/N
	■ LVMM Implementation plan: completed within last 5 yrs		X	Y/N
	★ Performance review/feedback: periodic reprioritization		X	Y/N
	★ Annual plan priorities based on water quality trend data for key water resources		X	Y/N
Execution	◇ Local water plan objectives met to date		X	percent
	◇ L&W treatment projects: # of projects/\$leveraged	X		number
	◇ Water quality trend for key water resources			data
Communication & Coordination	■ Stakeholder survey: within last 5 yrs	X		Y/N
	■ Communication piece: sent within last 12 months	X		Y/N
	★ Partnerships: liaison with SWCDs/AWDs and cooperative projects/tasks done		X	Y/N
	★ Plan contains public education objectives		X	Y/N
	★ Public education program annual objective met		X	Y/N
	★ County water plan on county website		X	Y/N
	★ Water management ordinances on county website		X	Y/N

