

MAY									
S	Μ	Т	W	Т	F	S			
				1	2	3			
4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
11	12	13	14	15	16	17			
18	19	20	21	22	23	24			
25	26	27	28	29	30	31			



RCWD BOARD OF MANAGERS WORKSHOP

Monday, May 12, 2025, 9:00 a.m.

Rice Creek Watershed District Conference Room 4325 Pheasant Ridge Drive NE, Suite 611, Blaine, Minnesota Virtual Monitoring via Zoom Webinar Join Zoom Webinar: https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87577372727?pwd=9nLTgPpIFsEWtG1dyw9pigmyKaKwwz.1 Passcode: 129740 +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago) Webinar ID: 875 7737 2727 Passcode: 129740

Agenda

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- RCWD Investments Update
- Regulatory Program Review & 2025 Forecast
- Enhanced Street Sweeping Initiative Prioritization Analysis
- Administrator Review Process

Administrator Updates (If Any)

4325 Pheasant Ridge Drive NE #611 | Blaine, MN 55449 | T: 763-398-3070 | F: 763-398-3088 | www.ricecreek.org

RCWD Investments Update

LIMITED TERM DURATION FUND

MARCH 31, 2025

4M LTD CHARACTERISTICS								
30-Day Net Yield ¹	4.19%							
Net Market Yield ²	3.87%							
Duration	0.78							
Average Credit Quality	AA							

Fund

Objective

The 4M Limited Term Duration (4M LTD) Fund seeks to provide excess income over money market and deposit products while maintaining limited price volatility.

Portfolio Allocation



Investment Approach

- Diversified, short-term, investment-grade fixed income securities
- Average maturity of 0-2 years, targeting one-year Fund duration
- Structured to protect capital and enhance income
- Minimum credit quality of portfolio holdings: A1/P1 or A, as applicable
- Fund investments compliant with Minnesota State Statute 118A
- The portfolio is designed with limited duration to control price volatility
- Our disciplined investment process helps clients preserve principal and maximize returns

FEATURES

- Created for 4M Participants
- Integrated Fund Reporting
- Professional Asset Management
- Monthly Withdrawals

RISK MANAGEMENT

- Diversified portfolio
- Ongoing credit research
- Emphasis on liquidity
- Laddered maturities

▶ 4M LIMITED TERM DURATION FUND

SALES AND RELATIONSHIP TEAM



Kent Johnson

Senior Vice President, Director - MN Office kjohnson@pmanetwork.com



Corey Boyer

Vice President, Investment Services cboyer@pmanetwork.com



Laura Hamacher

Associate Vice President, Investment Services Ihamacher@pmanetwork.com



Xander Nguyen Institutional Investment Specialist xnguyen@pmanetwork.com

INVESTMENT TEAM



John Huber, CFA Senior Vice President, Chief Investment Officer jhuber@pmanetwork.com



Brandon Swensen, CFA Senior Vice President, Senior Portfolio Manager bswensen@pmanetwork.com



Kendra Shelland

Vice President, Institutional Portfolio Manager kshelland@pmanetwork.com

Performance



Net returns are calculated net of all fees paid including management fees, custodial fees and other fees as applicable. Returns for periods greater than 1 year have been annualized. Past performance is no guaranty of future results. *Inception date is 04/16/2021 **Benchmark is ICE BofA 9-12 Month US Treasury Index

Who Should Invest

- An investment in the LTD Fund is intended only for cash reserves not needed for 12 months or longer
- Municipal entities looking for a professionally-managed investment program that complies with MN State Statute 118A for public funds investment in Minnesota

Risks and Limitations

- The Fund has a Floating Net Asset Value (NAV). Market value fluctuations will occur daily, and it is possible the market value of the shares could decline below the amount originally invested
- Monthly withdrawals available on the third Wednesday of each month upon at least two weeks advance notice
- Due to limited withdrawal dates, the Fund is best suited for resources not needed for at least 12 months
- Minimum investment balance of at least \$50,000 in the LTD Fund
- Please consult your investment policy to determine if the Fund is an appropriate investment for your municipality
- For complete information about risks, expenses and other important facts associated with investing in the 4M LTD Fund, please see the 4M Information Statement available at <u>www.4mfund.com</u>



(763) 497-1490 | 4mfund.com

Securities, public finance services and institutional brokerage services are offered through PMA Securities, LLC. PMA Securities, LLC is a broker-dealer and municipal advisor registered with the SEC and MSRB, and is a member of FINRA and SIPC. PMA Asset Management, LLC, an SEC registered investment adviser, provides investment advisory services to local government investment pools and separate accounts. All other products and services are provided by PMA Financial Network, LLC. PMA Financial Network, LLC, PMA Securities, LLC and PMA Asset Management, LLC (collectively "PMA") are under common ownership and provide services to the Fund. All investments mentioned herein may have varying levels of risk, and may not be suitable for every investor. PMA and its employees do not offer tax or legal advisors before making any tax or legal related investments decisions. Additional information is available upon request. For more information visit www.pmanetwork.com

4

Regulatory Program Review & 2025 Forecast

s an	
RCWD RICE CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT	

MEMORANDUM Rice Creek Watershed District

Date:	May 7", 2025
То:	RCWD Board of Managers
From:	Patrick Hughes, Regulatory Manager
Subject:	Regulatory Annual Review and Forecast

Introduction

Staff will present a review of the regulatory program accomplishments in the past year, trends in permit activity, and the forecasted goals and budget needs for 2026.

Background

The mission of the Rice Creek Watershed District is to manage, protect, and improve the water resources of the District through flood control and water quality projects and programs. The purpose of the regulatory program is to implement the rules of the District and ensure the implementation adequately protects RCWD resources while providing enough flexibility that the program does not unreasonably hinder land use. Regulation is one of the three primary tools of the District in water resources management.

Staff continuously work to implement a more efficient and effective regulatory program. In recent years, we have strived to increase communication between applicants and our partners, improved our internal databases and practices, and continued to explore ways to modify the rules.

Staff forecast a similar or slightly reduced regulatory budget for 2026 with the rule revision having been completed and implemented for a calendar year.

Enhanced Street Sweeping Initiative – Prioritization Analysis

MENIORA		
Rice Creek	Watershed District	D DISTRICT
Date:	May 12th, 2025	
То:	RCWD Board of Managers	
From:	Molly Nelson, Outreach and Grants Technician	
Subject:	Presentation of Enhanced Street Sweeping Initiative- Prioritization Analysi	is

Introduction

MEMODANDUM

This item proposes the presentation, discussion, and consideration of the completed Enhanced Street Sweeping Initiative- Prioritization Analysis completed by Houston Engineering according to the Task Order 2024-006.

Background

Street sweeping is a non-structural stormwater best management practiced as a source removal method to remove sediment nutrients, total solids, chlorides, and other pollutants from streets that improves water quality in downstream receiving waters. Enhanced street sweeping methods improve upon existing practices by targeting the best times of the year to sweep, sweeping frequency, and high priority areas to remove pollutants prior to storm sewer systems or structural BMPs. In recent years, the MPCA's Stormwater Manual and studies conducted by the University of Minnesota have identified targeted enhanced street sweeping as a more effective pollutant removal method than basic street sweeping and have advanced methodologies to support local governments in creating programs to implement enhanced street sweeping plans.

On May 15th, 2024, task order 2024-006 was approved for Houston Engineering to provide the District with information where street sweeping can be prioritized for the most effective outcomes for water quality and community support within the District. The deliverables outlined in the task order were a survey for District partners to understand existing municipal street sweeping operations throughout the District, a prioritized list of District partners (cities) for enhanced street sweeping efforts, and a technical memorandum. Based on findings from the analysis, a District program policy document will be drafted for Board approval. Houston Engineering staff with the support of RCWD staff will present the Enhanced Street Sweeping Initiative- Prioritization Analysis to the Board for review and discussion.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend Board consensus on the Enhanced Street Sweeping Initiative- Prioritization Analysis report and to proceed with the development of District program policy according to the recommendations and discussion for consideration prior to the 2026 District budget approval.

Request for Board Consensus

Staff are requesting Board consensus to proceed with District program policy.

Attachment

HEI Technical Memorandum: Enhanced Street Sweeping Initiative- Prioritization Analysis dated March 27, 2025



Technical Memorandum

То:	Molly Nelson, Outreach and Grant Technician							
	Rice Creek Watershed District							
Cc:	David Petry, Kendra Sommerfeld							
From:	Rachel Olm, MS							
	Chris Otterness, PE							
Subject:	Enhanced Street Sweeping Initiative – Prioritization Analysis							
Date:	March 27, 2025							
Project #:	R005555-0358							

INTRODUCTION

Street sweeping is an essential aspect of stormwater management. The removal of leaves, sediment, and other debris from roads prevents contaminants from entering stormwater and eventually surface water resources. Sweeping removes sand, salt, sediment, vegetation, trash, vehicular waste, particulate matter, metals, and nutrients, making it a valuable effort to protect water quality and preserve the function of stormwater conveyance infrastructure.

Current sweeping efforts vary for cities in the Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD, or "District"), oftentimes due to city resources and road densities. RCWD contracted Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) to provide quantitative research on where District partnership with cities in enhanced street sweeping efforts is most likely to be impactful. Enhanced sweeping is encouraged by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), and is generally defined as sweeping more than once each in the spring and fall. Enhanced sweeping considers both the number of times swept as well as targeting of high priority areas.

A District-wide prioritization analysis was completed to provide RCWD with data and information about where sweeping support may be best focused for the most effective outcomes. A survey was also sent to RCWD cities to gather data on what is currently being done as well as gauge needs and support for enhanced sweeping.

A prioritization analysis was completed using geospatial data and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to overlap and rank various factors, for example the percent of tree cover, that can be used to understand where sweeping may be most valuable. Additionally, a few survey questions were selected by RCWD for incorporation into the prioritization analysis. The findings of this analysis are intended to be used by RCWD to understand current sweeping occurring throughout the District and identify where resources to assist in enhanced sweeping should be targeted. While all roads within



RCWD would benefit from enhanced sweeping, the reality of limited resources makes the identification of specific priority cities useful.

METHODS

QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA

After existing literature was reviewed and RCWD staff were consulted, six quantitative criteria were selected for the prioritization analysis. The criteria were selected to prioritize areas within the District that would benefit most from enhanced street sweeping initiatives, with benefits focused on water quality and flooding. Selected quantitative criteria include:

- the percent of tree canopy over roads,
- proximity to resources of concern (ROC),
- density of stormsewers,
- presence of flood-prone areas,
- average total phosphorus (TP) yields, and
- average total suspended solids (TSS) yields.

The presence of flood-prone areas was selected due to the nature of more pollutant load carried to surface water with flood events. Additionally, two cities indicated they prioritize flood-prone areas in responses to the survey sent to District cities. Each quantitative criterion is further described in Table 1, with the associated geospatial data layer that is used in the prioritization analysis to represent the criteria.

Table 1. Quantitative criteria used in prioritization analysis

Criteria	Layer	Scale
Tree canopy	2015 University of Minnesota Urban Tree Cover layer	City
Proximity to Resource of Concern (ROC)	District ROC	City
Stormsewer Network	Stormsewer lines	City
Flood-prone areas	District flood hazard layer	City
Total Phosphorus (TP) Ibs/acre/year	District modeling (2011)	Catchment
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) lbs/acre/year	District modeling (2011)	Catchment

SURVEY CRITERIA

In addition to selecting quantitative criteria for the prioritization analysis, the District aimed to consider prioritizing street sweeping effort to areas where there is a greater interest and need in the initiative. To facilitate this, a survey was distributed to District cities to better understand existing street





sweeping practices, perceived barriers to enhanced sweeping, and interest in future enhanced sweeping initiatives in partnership with the District. The survey was open from July 24, 2024, through August 7, 2024. Of the 28 cities in the RCWD boundary, 23 responded to the survey. The full list of survey questions is included in Appendix A. Responses to survey questions are provided visually in Appendix B, and in table form of individual responses in Appendix C.

Cities that did not respond to the survey include Columbia Heights, Mahtomedi, Willernie, May Township, and Circle Pines. Two responses were received from the City of White Bear Lake, White Bear Township, and New Brighton. One response from each of these cities was chosen to include in the prioritization analysis. These responses are those received from the Streets Supervisor of New Brighton, the Superintendent of Public Works for the City of White Bear Lake, and the Public Works Lead for White Bear Township.

After review of survey responses, District staff selected three questions and associated responses to be utilized as "survey criteria" in the prioritization analysis:

- How likely would the city be in engaging with Rice Creek Watershed District on enhanced sweeping efforts?
- How often does your city do street sweeping?
- Approximately how many miles of road does your city manage? Approximately how many miles of road does your city sweep?

DETERMINING QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA PRIORITIES

The District prioritization analysis was conducted to prioritize District street sweeping engagement efforts at the city-scale. To evaluate quantitative criteria on the city scale, a 20-foot buffer was placed on either side of the road network within the District and intersected with the geospatial data layer representing each quantitative criterion. Buffers were placed to serve as a proxy for the road, as the road layer is a single line down the centerline of the road. Then, the area of each intersecting polygon was calculated. The area of the intersected tree cover and road buffers were summed within cities and divided by the area of the road buffer within each city. Cities with the largest percent of roads modeled as covered or with stormsewers were categorized as a higher priority for that criterion while cities with less area were categorized as a lower priority for that criterion (Table 2). The area of the intersection road buffer and flood-prone buffer was summed within cities and divided by the total city area. Each criterion was clipped to the RCWD boundary, so characteristics outside the District did not influence the analysis.

RCWD maintains a geospatial layer with subwatersheds to District-identified "resources of concern" (ROCs). Public water polygons representing each ROC were clipped and a multi-ring buffer was placed around each ROC. The buffer had three levels:

- 1) under 0.25 miles from the ROC,
- 2) 0.25-1 mile from the ROC and
- 3) over 1 mile from the ROC.

Page 3 of 11



Then, the road buffer was intersected with these buffer zones, and any road segment under 0.25 miles was assigned a score of 3, roads in the 0.25 to 1 mile zone were assigned a score of 2, and roads outside the 1-mile zone were assigned a 1. All road segments, now with a score of 1, 2, or 3 depending on how close each is to a ROC, were averaged within cities. The cities in the top third were categorized as a high priority for this criterion, and the cities in the bottom third were categorized as a low priority.

TP and TSS yields are modeled at the catchment scale. The average yield was summarized within each catchment, and this was then averaged within each city. Again, the yields were split into thirds, with cities with the highest TP and TSS yields being a higher priority than the cities with lower modeled yields.

RANKING CITIES

Table 2 shows the range of values that were used to sort each city into a Priority A, B, or C for each quantitative and survey criterion. Priority A represents a higher importance for potentially focusing future street sweeping efforts. For five of the criteria, Priority A, B, and C reflect the top, middle, and bottom third of each percent, score, or yield for a criterion. About half the cities did not have any flood-prone areas, and fewer cities were placed into the A and B groups for this specific quantitative criterion.

Once Priority A, B, and C groups were established for each quantitative and survey criterion, the priority groups were translated into numeric scores for purposes of creating comprehensive ranking scores that can consider quantitative and survey criteria, both separately and together. Priority A cities were assigned a ranking score of "3", Priority B a "2", and Priority C a "1." The score of each city for each criterion was summed to create a comprehensive score. Table 3 represents the final scores for each city considering quantitative criteria only. Table 4 represents final scores for each city considering both quantitative and survey criteria. The higher the score, the higher each contributing criteria ranked. The final score of each city is useful to understand the degree to which one city may be prioritized over another. The lowest possible score a city could have (a C ranking across all criteria) is a six for the purely quantitative criteria and a nine for the survey criteria.

Criteria	Priority A	Priority B	Priority C		
Quantitative Criteria					
Tree Canopy: Percent of road buffer that has tree canopy	18-53%	10-17%	3-9%		
Proximity to Resource of Concern: Averaged score in buffer rings around lakes	1.45-2.11	1.10-1.40	0.05-0.88		
Stormsewer Network: Percent of road buffer that has stormsewers	15-25%	7-14%	0-6%*		

Table 2. Range of each quantitative and survey criterion





Criteria	Priority A	Priority B	Priority C
Flood-prone areas: Percent of city area that is the floodplain buffer	1-6%	1%	0%
TP yields: Average lbs/acre/year within city catchments	0.25-0.53	0.12-0.21	0-0.11
TSS yields: Average lbs/acre/year within city catchments	53-120	31-52	0-30
Survey Criteria			
How likely would the city be in engaging with Rice Creek Watershed District on enhanced sweeping efforts?	Very Likely, Likely	Moderately Likely	Unlikely, No response
How often does your city do street sweeping?	0-2 / year	3-4 / year	5 or more / year, no response
			0 miles or no

*Stormsewer network geospatial data was not available for Columbus, Dellwood, Grant, Scandia, and May Township. This was deemed not very influential to the final prioritization, given that these are more rural cities. They were placed into Priority group C in the ranking.

DISCUSSION

As discussed, two variations of a prioritization scenario were developed. Figure 1 prioritizes cities based purely on the quantitative criteria. Figure 2 prioritizes cities based on both quantitative and survey criteria together. RCWD may utilize either of these maps, or maps showing rankings of each quantitative criterion (Appendix D) to make informed decisions on where to focus enhanced street sweeping support and effort. The cities that are a Priority A in either prioritization method include:

- Arden Hills
- Centerville
- Fridley
- Lino Lakes
- New Brighton
- Roseville
- White Bear Lake
- White Bear Township

The Cities of Mounds View and Circle Pines score in the higher priority range only when considering the quantitative criteria, while the City of Forest Lake only meets the higher priority range when including survey responses.

The final scores of each city are listed in Table 3 and Table 4. Both prioritization options, as well as the prioritization of cities for individual criteria (Appendix D) is intended to provide a metric for





considering allocation of RCWD resources on enhanced street sweeping initiatives. This analysis is not intended to be a decision matrix on whether to partner with a specific city. Cities that did not rank highly in the comprehensive prioritization analysis should still be considered for partnership on targeted enhanced street sweeping when opportunities arise. For example, the city of Columbus was placed into the Priority C group when only considering quantitative criteria, yet this City is a high priority when considering flood-prone areas alone (Appendix D) and may be prioritized higher for partnership as opportunities arise and factors are identified that are not reflective in the criteria used in this study.





Figure 1. City prioritization using quantitative criteria only





Figure 2. City prioritization based on quantitative and survey criteria





Table 3. Total city scores using quantitative criteria only

City	Score (Quantitative)	Priority (Figure 1)
Arden Hills	16	
New Brighton	15	
Fridley	15	
White Bear Lake	14	
White Bear Twp.	14	Δ
Mounds View	13	
Centerville	13	
Roseville	13	
Circle Pines	13	
Lino Lakes	13	
St. Anthony	12	
Columbia Heights	12	
Forest Lake	12	
Mahtomedi	12	
Hugo	12	В
Blaine	11	
Shoreview	11	
Dellwood	11	
Grant	11	
Falcon Heights	10	
Columbus	10	
Spring Lake Park	10	
Scandia	10	
Lexington	10	С
Willernie	9	
Lauderdale	8	
Birchwood Village	8	
May Twp.	7	

Table 4. Total city scores using quantitative criteria and survey criteria

City	Score (with Survey)	Priority (Figure 2)			
Arden Hills	21				
Lino Lakes	20				
White Bear Twp.	20				
Centerville	20				
New Brighton	20	Α			
Fridley	20				
White Bear Lake	20				
Roseville	19				
Forest Lake	19				
Scandia	18				
Mounds View	18				
Hugo	18				
Grant	18	B			
Spring Lake Park	17	D			
St. Anthony	17				
Falcon Heights	17				
Columbus	17				
Circle Pines	16				
Dellwood	16				
Shoreview	16				
Blaine	16				
Mahtomedi	15				
Columbia Heights	15	С			
Birchwood Village	14				
Lauderdale	14				
Lexington	13				
Willernie	12				
May Twp.	10				

Page 9 of 11





Figure 3. Selected survey responses, with prioritization categories. See Table 2 for how Figure 3A, D, E, and F were included in the District-wide prioritization. Maps in response to survey questions:

- A. How likely would the city be in engaging with Rice Creek Watershed District on enhanced sweeping efforts?
- B. Does your street sweeping program attempt to target/prioritize any areas? (Yes = A; No = C)
- C. Do you think the city would benefit from an enhanced street sweeping program?
- D. Approximately how many miles of road does your City manage?
- E. How often does your city do street sweeping?
- F. Gap between: Approximately how many miles does your city manage / sweep?

Note that cities that did not respond to the survey or did not respond to a question are shown as blank for 'no response'. However, in the analysis these cities were grouped into Priority C (Table 2).







RECOMMENDATIONS

The RCWD can use outcomes of this prioritization analysis as a metric in decisions regarding potential allocation of District resources on enhanced street sweeping initiatives with partnering cities. District resources could be used to support partner cities in enhanced street sweeping in several forms, including:

- Funding
- Equipment
- Planning assistance
- Staffing assistance, and
- Reporting assistance.

The highest "need" identified in survey responses was funding support. Using this as an example, the RCWD could use outcomes from this analysis to allocate overall street sweeping support funding as a percentage of need based on the prioritization. In this example, cities that ranked as Priority A may receive a higher percentage of District funding on enhanced street sweeping than Priority B cities, with Priority C cities receiving the smallest percentage. A District program policy document can be drafted to inform resource allocation decisions based on outcomes from this prioritization analysis. This document will be most effective by reflecting outcomes of Board and staff decisions on form and magnitude of desired RCWD resource support.







APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONS

You and Your City

- 1. What is your name?
- 2. What city are you representing?
- 3. What is your role/job title?
- 4. Using a sentence or two, describe any overlap of your role with stormwater management and municipal street sweeping.
- 5. How familiar would you say you are with your city's street sweeping efforts?
- 6. Approximately how many miles of road does your City manage?
- 7. Approximately how many miles of road does your City sweep?

Current Sweeping Program

- 1. How often does your city do street sweeping (choose all that apply)?
 - a. Once in the spring
 - b. Once in the fall
 - c. Once in the summer
 - d. Two times in spring
 - e. Two times in fall
 - f. More than two times in spring
 - g. More than two times in fall
 - h. Other:___
- 2. What type of equipment do you use (mechanical sweeper, regenerative air, vacuum, etc.)?
- 3. And how many sweepers do you have?
- 4. If your city does not own the equipment, where do you contract it from?
- 5. Does your street sweeping program attempt to target/prioritize any areas?
- 6. Why or why not?
- 7. Does your city collect data on swept material?
- 8. How does your city measure street sweeping benefits?



9. Briefly summarize any other detail to offer regarding your city's approach to street sweeping.

Optimizing the Program

- 1. What, if any, barriers do you see the city faces in improving the efficiency/effectiveness of its street sweeping?
- 2. What, if any, funding support would help remove above barriers?
- 3. What, if any, equipment would help remove barriers?
- 4. What, if any, planning support would help remove barriers?
- 5. What, if any, staffing support would help remove barriers?
- 6. What would you like to see adopted into the street sweeping program?

Enhanced Sweeping

- 1. Do you think the city would benefit from an enhanced street sweeping program?
 - a. Yes
 - b. Maybe
 - c. No
 - d. I don't know what enhanced sweeping is
- 2. How likely would the city be in engaging with Rice Creek Watershed District on enhanced sweeping efforts?
 - a. Very likely
 - b. Likely
 - c. Moderately
 - d. Not likely
 - e. Very unlikely
- 3. What kind of support would be most helpful?
 - a. Funding
 - b. Equipment
 - c. Planning
 - d. Staffing
 - e. Reporting
 - f. Other _____
- 4. Anything else you want us to know not covered here?



APPENDIX B. SURVEY RESPONSES – SUMMARIZED GRAPHICALLY

Appendix B plots survey responses visually. Full survey responses are included in the tables in Appendix C. Note that all responses are displayed in charts, and two responses were sent from New Brighton, White Bear Lake, and the Township of White Bear. Any question with fewer than 26 responses is due to some cities leaving some questions blank.

You and Your City

Cities



Miles





Miles (Continued...)



Current Sweeping Program

Sweeping Frequency





Equipment





Prioritization









Measuring Benefits





Optimizing the Program







Enhanced Sweeping







Enhanced Sweeping (Continued...)



APPENDIX C. SURVEY RESPONSES – TABLE

The tables below include responses to the survey sent out to District cities in July-August 2024. Survey questions are abbreviated to fit into a table format. Full survey questions are available in Appendix A. Responses are shown largely as received, although they were edited for typos, grammar, or where an answer was submitted in the wrong field. Select responses are summarized visually in Appendix B.

Table C-1. Survey responses part 1 of 4.

			How familiar			How often does your city do street sweeping?							
City	Role	Role in stormwateryeRolemanagement and streetsweepings	Allow your city's streetMiles of managed roadssweeping efforts?Miles of managed	Miles of swept roads	Once in the Spring	Once in the Fall	Once in the Summer	Twice in the Spring	Twice in the Fall	More than Twice in the Spring	More than Twice in the Fall	Other	
Birchwood Village	City Administrator		Somewhat familiar	?	All streets	Х	Х						
Blaine	Sewer-Storm Supervisor	I am in charge of the maintenance and day to day operations along will short- and long-term asset capital project investments. The City of Blaine also has a Stormwater Coordinator, Megan Hedstrom, duties are; MS4 permitting, resident outreach, programs, and grant writing.	Very familiar						Х			Х	Once throughout the summer
Centerville	City Administrator/City Engineer	As the City Engineer, I oversee our MS4 compliance in cooperation with our Public Works Director. MS4 compliance is a primary reason for our street sweeping program.	Very familiar	17	17	Х							
City Of Arden Hills	Public Works Superintendent	I oversee storm water and street sweeping operations.	Very familiar	31	31	х	Х						Summer sweeping as needed following storms.



			How familiar are you with					How	often does y	our city do	street swee	ping?	
City	Role	Role in stormwater management and street sweeping	your city's street sweeping efforts?	Miles of managed roads	Miles of swept roads	Once in the Spring	Once in the Fall	Once in the Summer	Twice in the Spring	Twice in the Fall	More than Twice in the Spring	More than Twice in the Fall	Other
City Of Columbus	Public Works Director	I am responsible for all of the roadways and stormwater management	Very familiar	50	3.75	x							
City Of Fridley	Director of Public Works	Operations are under my charge.	Very familiar	110	110				Х	Х			Average twice in the summer
City Of Lino Lakes	Streets & Stormwater Supervisor	I supervise the street sweeping program and much of the stormwater management program. There is much overlap between the two programs, they cannot be separated.	Very familiar	208	205	Х						Х	We sweep continuously throughout the fall until we cannot
City Of Moundsview	Superintendent of Public /works	I oversee the O&M of our storm water system.	Very familiar	46	370			Х	Х	Х			Leaves are swept first thing in the spring on all roads. After leaves are removed in the spring we sweep the entire city again for solids. We sweep after each large storm event in areas that have a lot of leaves on the asphalt. In the fall we sweep some roads up to 4 times its all dependent on tree coverage and tree species.



		Role in stormwater	How familiar					How	often does	our city do	street swee	oing?	
City	Role	Role in stormwater management and street sweeping	your city's street sweeping efforts?	Miles of managed roads	Miles of swept roads	Once in the Spring	Once in the Fall	Once in the Summer	Twice in the Spring	Twice in the Fall	More than Twice in the Spring	More than Twice in the Fall	Other
City Of Scandia	Director of Public Works	I organize and schedule the management of stormwater infrastructure and street sweeping.	Very familiar	73	10-20 miles since inception of grant funding in 2023 through Washington Conservation District	Х				Х			
City Of St. Anthony Village	Public Works Director	I oversee the city's management of the stormwater conveyance system and street sweeping operations.	Very familiar	25	25								Two to three times per quarter and after storm events
Dellwood	Council Member and Road Commissioner	None. We don't do street sweeping as a City.	Not at all familiar	Not sure.	0								None



			How familiar are vou with					How	v often does y	our city do	street swee	oing?	
City	Role	Role in stormwater management and street sweeping	your city's street sweeping efforts?	Miles of managed roads	Miles of swept roads	Once in the Spring	Once in the Fall	Once in the Summer	Twice in the Spring	Twice in the Fall	More than Twice in the Spring	More than Twice in the Fall	Other
Falcon Heights	Public Works Director / laborer	Implement/maintain pollution prevention operations of our stormwater conveyance system. We street sweep the entire road surface in the spring and as needed throughout the summer months. Intermittent sweeping events in the summer months mostly occur due to storm events that cause tree foliage to accumulate in our roadways. We sweep continually in the Fall until all the leaves are off the trees or until it begins to snow.	Very familiar	17.5	14.75	Х						X	As needed in the summer months. E.G. a storm event causes accumulation of debris in the roadways, or a construction project causes a buildup of dirt/sand/gravel in the roadway, when the trees drop all their seeds
Forest Lake	PW Director	I oversee entire public works, so I overlap into stormwater management and street sweeping.	Very familiar	130	100								Twice in Spring, then at least every month throughout the summer, and continuous sweeping until freeze up in the fall
Grant	Administrator/Clerk	N/A	Very familiar	75	0								Grant does not do any street sweeping
Hugo	Public Works Director		Very familiar	110	87	Х		Х		Х			
Lauderdale	City Administrator	I supervise public works and contract for street sweeping annually.	Very familiar	5	5 plus alleys	Х				Х			



		Role in stormwater	How familiar are you with	n Miles of				How	often does y	our city do	street swee	ping?	
City	Role	Role in stormwater management and street sweeping	your city's street sweeping efforts?	Miles of managed roads	Miles of swept roads	Once in the Spring	Once in the Fall	Once in the Summer	Twice in the Spring	Twice in the Fall	More than Twice in the Spring	More than Twice in the Fall	Other
Lexington	Public Works	Storm sewer and street maintenance is part of my job description.	Very familiar	10	10	Х		Х				х	As needed
	Streets Supervisor		Very familiar	70	70	Х						х	We continue to sweep bad areas in the summer. Not the entire city.
New Brighton	Public Works Superintendent	Public Works and Engineering work together to ensure we are meeting our MS4 requirements and operating an efficient stormwater conveyance system.	Very familiar	71.36	71.36			Х	Х			Х	
Roseville	Environmental Manager	Roseville completes 4-5 full city sweeps per year. I work with our Streets Maintenance Supervisor to collect samples.	Very familiar	122	122								4-5 full sweeps a year. One sweep with two machines, one leaf vacuum of curbs in the fall with a sweep, and other sweeps during the summer and clean up after storms.
Shoreview	Public Works Director	Overall management of the public works department that is responsible for the management of the city's stormwater system and sweeping of the city streets	Very familiar	93	93								A total of five times per year
Spring Lake Park	Director of Public Works	I am responsible for both	Very familiar	33	33		Х						



		Role in stormwater	How familiar are you with					How	often does y	our city do	street swee	ping?	
City	Role	Role in stormwater management and street sweeping	your city's street sweeping efforts?	Miles of managed roads	Miles of swept roads	Once in the Spring	Once in the Fall	Once in the Summer	Twice in the Spring	Twice in the Fall	More than Twice in the Spring	More than Twice in the Fall	Other
	Superintendent of Public Works	I oversee both Sewer with stormwater maintenance and Streets department with street sweeping maintenance.	Very familiar	114	114	Х				Х			
White Bear Lake	Environmental Specialist/Water Resources Engineer		Somewhat familiar	85	85	Х	Х						More than once in spring and fall if time and weather allow. Additional sweeping in the downtown area at numerous times throughout the season.
White Bear Township	Public Works Lead.		Very familiar	42.7	42.7	Х	Х						We sweep our roads around both lakes in the township.
	Field Maintenance Supervisor	I supervise the maintenance of both	Very familiar	43	43	Х	Х						Once a month around water bodies and streams



Table C-2. Street Sweeping Survey Responses part 2 of 4.

City	Role	How familiar are you with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Type of Equipment	How many Sweepers do you have?	If contracting equipment, where from?	Do you prioritize areas?	Prioritization: Why or Why Not?	Do you collect data on material?	How do you measure benefits?	Any other details regarding your city's approach to sweeping
Birchwood Village	City Administrator	Somewhat familiar	We hire a contractor	We hire a contractor	Schifsky	No	We do all the streets	No		
Blaine	Sewer-Storm Supervisor	Very familiar	regenerative air sweepers	4		Yes	Old growth neighborhoods create more organic litter	Yes		
Centerville	City Administrator/City Engineer	Very familiar	Vacuum sweeper.	0	City of Hugo	No	Most areas are routed through stormwater ponds.	Yes	We log how many tons of sweepings are collected.	
City Of Arden Hills	Public Works Superintendent	Very familiar	Mechanical sweeper	1	NA	Yes	We prioritize "lake routes" first.	Yes		
City Of Columbus	Public Works Director	Very familiar	Elgin sweeper	None	Hire it out	Yes	We sweep curb and gutter streets	No		We sweep curb and gutter to keep debris out of the storm sewers
City Of Fridley	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	1 X Mechanical sweeper, 1 x Regenerative air sweeper, 1 x leaf loader (vacuum - coming in 2025)	2, will be 3 in 2025, see above.		Yes	CCWD performed a prioritization study and recommended areas to target.	Yes		We use contractors in spring and fall for first and last sweeps. We turf sweep in our maintained parks.
City Of Lino Lakes	Streets & Stormwater Supervisor	Very familiar	Mechanical	one		Yes	Areas with greatest need first, tree canopy/tree litter is an important criterion		We keep track of volume of sweepings each time the sweeper is used	



		How familiar								
City	Role	are you with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Type of Equipment	How many Sweepers do you have?	If contracting equipment, where from?	Do you prioritize areas?	Prioritization: Why or Why Not?	Do you collect data on material?	How do you measure benefits?	Any other details regarding your city's approach to sweeping
City Of Moundsview	Superintendent of Public /works	Very familiar	Regen sweeper	1	We could use a mechanical sweeper, I would like two sweepers	Yes	High tree density and high rain garden density areas get swept more often		How many loads we dump and how many miles we sweep each year	We are aggressive with our sweeping practices because of the amount of rain gardens and ponds we are trying to protect. We are aggressive with our street sweeping because it protects our environment for residents and future residents.
City Of Scandia	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	Mechanical Sweeper	0	Washington County Public Works	Yes	Yes, in relation to the grant funding and roadways near lakes.	No		We manage street sweeping to the best of our ability using contracted sweeping services which are limited in availability and timing during the peak sweeping season.
City Of St. Anthony Village	Public Works Director	Very familiar	Mechanical Sweeper	1		No	We sweep the entire city each round	No		
Dellwood	Council Member and Road Commissioner	Not at all familiar	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	No		
Falcon Heights	Public Works Director / laborer	Very familiar	Crosswind Regenerative Air Street Sweeper	1		Yes	Intermittent sweeping events in the summer months might be localized to specific areas in the city E.G. storm event, densely treed areas where lots of tree seeds will drop, construction project might create a mess in the roadway	Yes		Aside from the environmental benefits of street sweeping, there is a certain measure of appreciation from our residents for keeping their streets clean/presentable
Forest Lake	PW Director	Very familiar	All of Above	1 regen, 1 mechanical, 1 vacuum	N/A	Yes	High canopy areas and areas without BMPs		lbs of phosphorus removed	



City	Role	How familiar are you with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Type of Equipment	How many Sweepers do you have?	If contracting equipment, where from?	Do you prioritize areas?	Prioritization: Why or Why Not?	Do you collect data on material?	How do you measure benefits?	Any other details regarding your city's approach to sweeping
Grant	Administrator/Clerk	Very familiar								
Hugo	Public Works Director	Very familiar	Regenerative Air	1		Yes	Developed areas with curb and gutter are prioritized higher that rural streets	No		
Lauderdale	City Administrator	Very familiar	N/A	0	Mike McPhillips	No	Cover whole city the same.		We only track tonnages removed.	Simply sweep all streets and alleys three times per year.
Lexington	Public Works	Very familiar	Regenerative Air	0	MN Street Works	No	All streets are cleaned equally	No		In between sweeping events the storm sewer catch basins are cleaned from debris after rainfall. City streets are swept as needed.
New Brighton	Streets Supervisor	Very familiar	Air and Mechanical Sweeper	2		Yes	Have a few businesses in town that drag a lot of dirt onto the pavement	Yes		We sweep once in the spring and usually twice in the fall weather permitting. We screen our sweeping pile using a trommel in the spring. The screened dirt gets hauled to Pine Bend landfill.
	Public Works Superintendent	Very familiar	Mechanical Sweeper (Elgin), Regenerative Air Sweeper (Tymco)	2		Yes	We sweep areas that have more leaves and are more prone to flooding more often.	Yes		We sift to separate our sweepings. we have found that it is economical to separate our sweepings into three piles (sand, organics, and trash). This way it is easier and cheaper to dispose of the sweepings.
Roseville	Environmental Manager	Very familiar	Mechanical and Regenerative Air	2 (+ 1 as a backup)		Yes	Water quality, local drainage/flooding issues.	Yes		Roseville started working on collecting samples during the summer to see what is being collected. If sampling during the year doesn't provide any information, we will only test in the spring and fall.



City	Role	How familiar are you with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Type of Equipment	How many Sweepers do you have?	If contracting equipment, where from?	Do you prioritize areas?	Prioritization: Why or Why Not?	Do you collect data on material?	How do you measure benefits?	Any other details regarding your city's approach to sweeping
Shoreview	Public Works Director	Very familiar	Mechanical Sweeper And Regenerative Air	1 - Mechanical and 1 - Regenerative Air		Yes	Sections of permeable pavement is swept monthly	Yes		
Spring Lake Park	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	Mechanical	0	McPhillips sweeping	No	We don't have the budget to buy a machine to do that or have a contractor target one area besides citywide		It is used to clean up leaf debris in the fall and catch any debris from going into ponds during that one sweep	We are looking for grants now to purchase a sweeper. We don't have the budget to buy one or receive a dollar-for-dollar grant. We have personnel to sweep weekly and focus on critical areas if we had the equipment.
White Bear	Superintendent of Public Works	Very familiar	Regenerative Air	1		Yes		Yes		We try to run the sweeper as much as possible, but due to the heavy workloads this is not always possible.
Lake	Environmental Specialist/Water Resources Engineer	Somewhat familiar	Regenerative Air	1		Yes	Downtown WBL			RWMWD contracts for additional sweeping in a high priority area within the City.
White Bear Township	Public Works Lead.	Very familiar	Mechanical And Regenerative Air.	1	We have one and rent from City of Hugo	Yes			Checking and cleaning or storm basins.	We want to purchase a new sweeper but have no funding.
	Field Maintenance Supervisor	Very familiar	Mechanical And Regenerative Air	1	Use a regenerative air from a nearby municipality	Yes	Impaired waters	No		



 Table C-3. Street Sweeping Survey Responses part 3 of 4.

		How familiar are vou			What would help	o remove barriers?		What would you like to see in the sweeping program?
City	Role	with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Barriers to Efficiency / Effectiveness of sweeping	Funding	Equipment	Planning Support	Staffing Support	
Birchwood Village	City Administrator	Somewhat familiar	Cost	Unknown	Not applicable			Coordinate with other cities to reduce costs and get economies of scale
Blaine	Sewer-Storm Supervisor	Very familiar	Future costs of equipment					
Centerville	City Administrator/City Engineer	Very familiar	Not owning our own sweeper means we are at the mercy of our vendor's schedule.	Funding would help, perhaps allowing us to rent from a different vendor that might accommodate our schedule better.	A watershed-owned sweeper	Efforts to identify areas that would be strong benefit to cost ratios for additional sweeping.	Same as 16.	Targeted sweeping done or funded by watershed.
City Of Arden Hills	Public Works Superintendent	Very familiar	None	None	We have what we need.	None	None	Funding for disposal of sweepings. Screening and landfilling trash can get expensive. a location for multiple cities to get rid of sweepings would be helpful for all of us I believe.
City Of Columbus	Public Works Director	Very familiar	None	Any extra funding helps with the budgeting process	We will always contract this out	None	None	Simple rules



011		How familiar are you			What would help	o remove barriers?		What would you like to see in the sweeping program?
City	Role	with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Barriers to Efficiency / Effectiveness of sweeping	Funding	Equipment	Planning Support	Staffing Support	
City Of Fridley	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	Cost and jurisdictional barriers. Disposal is costly and sites are remote.	Additional funding for the City's stormwater utility in any fashion would help mitigate cost. Funding from other MS4s to perform sweeping for example, on their roadways, would be welcome, and provide a higher level of service. A local disposal site would mitigate cost as well.				
City Of Lino Lakes	Streets & Stormwater Supervisor	Very familiar	We have only one sweeper. An additional sweeper would go a long way to increase our efficiency	Funds are always a factor. Convincing council and decision makers there is a need for funding for additional resources	An additional sweeper		An additional employee dedicated to streets sweeping	Community education (i.e., fall sweeping is not a leaf pick up program). A mechanism to ensure private roads are being swept.
City Of Moundsview	Superintendent of Public /works	Very familiar	Getting a second sweeper, a mechanical sweeper but we cannot afford it	\$300,000 for a new mechanical sweeper \$41,000 for a new soil screener for the sweepings	A second sweeper, a mechanical sweeper, a soils screener for sweeping waste disposal	Make the grants easier to get for smaller cities. Small cities do not have grant writers or employees with time to go through a lot of the grant processes. Smaller cities in general do not have the tax basis to afford a second sweeper and soil screens		



		How familiar are you			What would help	o remove barriers?		What would you like to see in the sweeping program?
City	Role	with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Barriers to Efficiency / Effectiveness of sweeping	Funding	Equipment	Planning Support	Staffing Support	
City Of Scandia	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	Cost of equipment and availability of limited staff. Contractors are busy during the peak season and timing is difficult along with cost.	Funding would help with equipment purchases, but with limited staff the utilization of additional equipment would be limited as well.	As our City is primarily open ditch and limited curb and gutter a street sweeper is not the most beneficial mechanism to remove debris from the road and/or ditch. Equipment that would help would be a leaf vacuum and 10,000-12,000lb excavator.	Unknown at this time.	Additional staff would be the most beneficial to increase our efforts of street sweeping and ditch cleaning.	Additional staff support and access to a municipal dump site which will accept material the City removes in close proximity.
City Of St. Anthony Village	Public Works Director	Very familiar	The cost of screening the trash out of the dirt collected, disposal fees, and sweeper equipment replacements. We don't have a way to quantify the amount of debris collected.	Funding to pay for the dirt screener, dumping fees, brooms for the sweeper, and a scale.	A scale on site.			
Dellwood	Council Member and Road Commissioner	Not at all familiar		If there was funding, we may consider doing street sweeping.				
Falcon Heights	Public Works Director / laborer	Very familiar	Maintenance cost and future replacement cost of street sweeper	Grant money to supplement replacement cost for new street sweeper				
Forest Lake	PW Director	Very familiar	Disposal of sweepings	Funding to purchase sweepers for Cities to do the work	City has all needed equipment at this time	Assist in the planning of the updated routes/frequency	Would like assistance with applying for grants to purchase new sweeper in the future	N/A



		How familiar are vou				What would you like to see in the sweeping program?		
City	City Role with c st sweet eff	with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Barriers to Efficiency / Effectiveness of sweeping	Funding	Equipment	Planning Support	Staffing Support	
Grant	Administrator/Clerk	Very familiar	We do not have the equipment or staff or funding					
Hugo	Public Works Director	Very familiar	It's always tough to find the time, in terms of manpower.				More FTE	
Lauderdale	City Administrator	Very familiar	Rising cost. Contractor said the material is growing harder to dispose of.	Cover rising costs.	N/A	Explore the issue of material reuse and why contractors who previously repurposed are starting to not over fear whether the spoils are clean enough.	NA	
Lexington	Public Works	Very familiar						Our program works well.
New	Streets Supervisor	Very familiar	Planting of boulevard trees. Just more leaves to clean up. Maybe selecting trees that do not have runner roots that heaves up the sidewalk and curbs.					
Brighton	Public Works Superintendent	Very familiar	The ability to dispose of the sweepings is our greatest barrier. We would sweep more often, but it is time consuming to sweep, sift, and haul out the sweepings.					



City Role How city's street sweeping efforts?		How familiar are you				What would you like to see in the sweeping program?		
		with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Barriers to Efficiency / Effectiveness of sweeping	Funding	Equipment	Planning Support	Staffing Support	
Roseville	Environmental Manager	Very familiar	None. Roseville is always looking to improve and do things more efficiently.	Funding always helps. We are already tech'ed out with our machines (GPS, etc.), but a funding to make sampling easier would be nice.	Nothing at this time.	Technical review of our sweeping areas in the district to create a map of priority areas for water quality, efficient material collection, etc.	Staff to sweep streets or to collect material samples.	Roseville has a robust program. Any program improvements would have to be experimental at this point, which I am all for.
Shoreview	Public Works Director	Very familiar	Long lead times for replacement parts or repairs for equipment and lack of staff time.	Additional funding would allow the city to hire a contractor to complete sweeping if equipment is down or staff are not available	Cannot think of anything at this time	Cannot think of anything at this time	Cannot think of anything at this time	Cannot think of anything at this time
Spring Lake Park	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	Monetary barriers. We just can't afford or prioritize such an expense with our limited budget when we have more pressing needs.	If we were to receive 1, 2 or 3 grants combined to have one purchased for us	A sweeper	A yearly look ahead to find 100% grant money either through a single grant or multiple agency grants.	Having staff for finding and helping to write the grants	Dedicated area sweeping as we are within the Priority A Source Water Protection Area for Mpls/St. Paul along with more city-wide sweeping to keep hazards from getting to the ponds and streams in the first place
White Bear	Superintendent of Public Works	Very familiar	None at this time, unless we hire more personal and the cost of sweepers.	Having grant dollars to pay for contract sweeping helps a lot.	Helping with grant dollars to purchases new sweepers due to the increasing cost of the equipment.	None at this time.	To add more staff would help be more efficient in sweeping efforts.	To be able to make 2-3 rounds of sweeping per season.
Lake	Environmental Specialist/Water Resources Engineer	Somewhat familiar	Staff time and money					Consider contract sweeping similar to the RWMWD program
White Bear Township	Public Works Lead.	Very familiar	A new sweeper would be nice.	Grant Money!	Air sweeper would be nice.	Budget Money	None.	Reminders!



	fa ar	How familiar are vou			What would you like to see in the sweeping program?			
City	Role	with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Barriers to Efficiency / Effectiveness of sweeping	Funding	Equipment	Planning Support	Staffing Support	
	Field Maintenance Supervisor	Very familiar	Not owning a regenerative air	Grant money to purchase a regenerative air	Regenerative Air			



Table C-4. Street Sweeping Survey Responses part 4 of 4.

	Role	How familiar are you with your city's street sweeping efforts?	Would your city benefit from an enhanced sweeping program?	How likely are you to partner with RCWD on enhanced sweeping?	What kind of support would be most helpful?						
City					Funding	Equipment	Planning	Staffing	Reporting	Other	
Birchwood Village	City Administrator	Somewhat familiar	l don't know what enhanced sweeping is	Moderately likely	х	Х		х	Х		
Blaine	Sewer-Storm Supervisor	Very familiar	Maybe	Likely						Unsure at the moment	
Centerville	City Administrator/City Engineer	Very familiar	Yes	Very likely	х	х	Х				
City Of Arden Hills	Public Works Superintendent	Very familiar	Maybe	Moderately likely	Х			х			
City Of Columbus	Public Works Director	Very familiar	No	Unlikely	Х						
City Of Fridley	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	Maybe	Very likely			Х				
City Of Lino Lakes	Streets & Stormwater Supervisor	Very familiar	Maybe	Likely		Х	Х	Х			
City Of Moundsview	Superintendent of Public /works	Very familiar	No	Likely	Х	Х		Х			
City Of Scandia	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	Maybe	Very likely		x		Х			



	Anything else you want us to know?
•	
	Sweeping in areas where there is significant erosion can be helpful. Oddly, paving dirt parking lots or badly potholed lots can be helpful. Paving doesn't usually sound like a good water quality move, but it can have a big effect.
	No
	Not at this time.

		How familiar	Would your		What kind of support would be most helpful?					
City	Role	are you with your city's street sweeping efforts?	city benefit from an enhanced sweeping program?	How likely are you to partner with RCWD on enhanced sweeping?	Funding	Equipment	Planning	Staffing	Reporting	Other
City Of St. Anthony Village	Public Works Director	Very familiar	Yes	Very likely	Х	х			Х	
Dellwood	Council Member and Road Commissioner	Not at all familiar	l don't know what enhanced sweeping is		Х		х			
Falcon Heights	Public Works Director / laborer	Very familiar	Maybe	Likely	Х					
Forest Lake	PW Director	Very familiar	Yes	Very likely	Х	Х	Х			
Grant	Administrator/Clerk	Very familiar	l don't know what enhanced sweeping is	Unlikely	Х	х	х	х	Х	
Hugo	Public Works Director	Very familiar	Yes	Moderately likely	Х	Х		Х		
Lauderdale	City Administrator	Very familiar	l don't know what enhanced sweeping is	Likely	Х				Х	
Lexington	Public Works	Very familiar	No	Unlikely	Х					
New Brighton	Streets Supervisor	Very familiar	Maybe	Likely		Х	Х			



Anything else you want us to know? The city is one year 6 of enhanced street sweeping. Useful life of regenerative sweeper is 10 years and City is hoping to get a new sweeper funded in 2028 along with updated routes/frequency.

		How familiar	Would your		What kind of support would be most helpful?						
City	Role	are you with your city's street sweeping efforts?	city benefit from an enhanced sweeping program?	How likely are you to partner with RCWD on enhanced sweeping?	Funding	Equipment	Planning	Staffing	Reporting	Other	
	Public Works Superintendent	Very familiar	l don't know what enhanced sweeping is	Very likely	Х		Х	Х	Х		
Roseville	Environmental Manager	Very familiar	Yes	Very likely	Х		Х	Х			
Shoreview	Public Works Director	Very familiar	Maybe	Very likely	Х		х		х		
Spring Lake Park	Director of Public Works	Very familiar	Yes	Very likely	Х	Х					
	Superintendent of Public Works	Very familiar	Yes	Likely	х	Х					
White Bear Lake	Environmental Specialist/Water Resources Engineer	Somewhat familiar	Yes	Very likely	Х	Х		Х		Contract sweeping similar to the RWMWD program.	
White Bear Township	Public Works Lead.	Very familiar	Maybe	Moderately likely	х			Х		Weather is a big factor.	



Anything else you want us to know?

Roseville is all for looking at this more, and Roseville would be happy to pilot anything the district comes up with.

I am working with Justine Dauphinais from Coon Creek Watershed currently on getting some grants written through BWSR Clean Water Fund. Any help or support stating that we have a need for a sweeper to do more enhanced sweeping and reporting would be great. CCWD and hopefully the city of MPLS. will supply a letter of support for our need to protect drinking water downstream. Thank you for the interest in our needs.

No

Nope

		How familiar Would you			What kind of support would be most helpful?						
City	Role	are you with your city's street sweeping efforts?	city benefit from an enhanced sweeping program?	How likely are you to partner with RCWD on enhanced sweeping?	Funding	Equipment	Planning	Staffing	Reporting	Other	
	Field Maintenance Supervisor	Very familiar	Yes	Very likely	Х	Х					



Anything else you want us to know?



APPENDIX D. QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA MAPS



Figure D-1. Prioritization of cities based on the proximity to a resource of concern quantitative criterion



Figure D-2. Prioritization of cities based on the flood-prone areas quantitative criterion



Figure D-3. Prioritization of cities based on the tree cover quantitative criterion



Figure D-4. Prioritization of cities based on the Total Suspended Solids (TSS) yield quantitative criterion



Figure D-5. Prioritization based on the Total Phosphorus (TP) yield quantitative criterion



Figure D-6. Prioritization based on the stormsewer network quantitative criterion

Administrator Review Process

Based on the duties and responsibilities contained in the Watershed District Administrator position description, here's a sample performance evaluation form for the position. This form will assess the Administrator's effectiveness in key areas such as leadership, management, communication, financial oversight, and collaboration. It uses a rating system along with space for comments, goals, and development suggestions. This version does not consider the weighting given to the duties/responsibility headings found in the position description.

Watershed District Administrator Performance Evaluation

Employee Information:

- Name: _____
- **Position Title:** Watershed District Administrator
- Evaluation Period: From ______ to _____
- Evaluator Name: ______
- Evaluation Date: ______

Rating Scale

- **1** = Needs Improvement
- 2 = Meets Expectations
- **3** = Exceeds Expectations
- 4 = Outstanding

1. Leadership and Coordination

Lead inter-organizational partnerships, collaboration, and communication:

- Facilitates and implements strategic watershed planning efforts
 Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4
 Comments:
- Coordinates activities with cities, counties, and other partners
 Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4
 Comments: _______

2. Project and Program Management

Direct planning, development, and implementation of key projects and programs:

- Manages regulatory programs (permit applications, wetland conservation, MS4)
 Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4
 Comments:

3. Financial Management

Manage the District's finances, including budgeting and long-term financial stability:

- Develops and oversees the annual budget and monthly financial reporting Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4
 Comments:
- Manages project and program budgets effectively Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4
 Comments:
- Secures appropriate grants and funding for District programs Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4 Comments:

4. Staff and Consultant Management

Oversee the management and coordination of staff, consultants, and office operations:

- Effectively manages consultants and external contractors Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4 Comments: ______

5. Board Interaction and Support

Provide guidance and coordinate activities with the Board of Managers:

- Prepares and facilitates Board meeting agendas and workshops Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4 Comments: ______
- Advises the Board on policy development, Watershed Management Plan, and strategic priorities
 Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4

Comments: _____

6. Communication and Public Engagement

Serve as the main spokesperson and represent the District's interests:

- Oversees public outreach and communication efforts effectively
 Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4
 Comments: _______

7.	Overall	Performance	Summary
----	---------	-------------	---------

•	Strengths:							
٠	Areas for Improvement:							
•	Overall Rating: []1[]2[]3[]4 Comments:							
8. Dev •	velopment Goals & Recommendations Goals for the Next Evaluation Period:							
•	Training or Development Recommendations:							
Evalua Date:	ator Signature:							
Emplo	yee Signature (Acknowledging receipt of evaluation):							
Date:								

This form provides a structured approach to evaluating the performance of the Watershed District Administrator across multiple key areas. You can modify or add any additional elements specific, for example, to the goals or work plan established during the evaluation period.