E1. Capital Improvements Implementation Process

The District’s implementation plan includes a capital improvement program (CIP) which identifies and describes structural solutions and internal control measures over $100,000 to attain the District’s goals. A capital improvement is “a physical improvement that has an extended useful life.” (Minn. Rules 8410.0020, subpart 3.)

A project identified in the CIP may need further review as to technical feasibility, cost and financing, consistency with local needs and other policy considerations before a formal decision to proceed to construction is made. This appendix describes the development and evaluation steps that will occur, as needed, before the District will commit resources to a project, as well as the process for the District’s ongoing review and updating of the CIP.

While RPBCWD will be the lead agency for implementing the activities, the District will seek partners and cooperate with Local Governmental Units (LGUs), agencies, property owners and organizations as opportunities arise. As projects become better-defined, so will the estimated project costs and responsibilities of the RPBCWD and the other participating agencies/organizations. The District will pursue collaborative and grant opportunities to reduce the portion of the total cost borne by the District.

E1.1 Procedures

Before implementing a capital project or committing levied funds to its design or construction, the District will perform feasibility work to identify an effective design concept; develop confidence that the property agreements, permits and approvals to build and maintain it can be obtained; and establish a project cost estimate. Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §103B.251, the District then will provide notice of a public hearing before the Board of Managers. The Board will consider the presentation of District staff and engineer, as well as input offered by partners and interested parties. On the basis of that information, the Board will decide whether the project should be established. The general process the RPBCWD follows when looking to implement a capital project is shown schematically in Figure E1-1.
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In the course of feasibility work for a project, the District expects to maintain close coordination with the host LGU. LGU support for a project will be an important consideration in the District decision to advance a project and the District expects that, in all but the unusual case, the District will seek a resolution of support or equivalent project concurrence from the applicable LGU(s).

In addition, before the Board approves final design of such a project, the District will hold at least one public information meeting at a location near the project site, and will work with the LGU to identify the appropriate scope of notice to property owners near the project and publish notice in an appropriate local newspaper.

The District will review the CIP on an ongoing basis throughout the implementation of the plan. This review will allow the District to reassess described projects from a technical perspective, but also will involve broader policy considerations such as shifts in District priorities, decisions as to annual budget and levy levels, and the prospect of state and federal grant funds or financing. For this reason, projects may be added to and deleted from the CIP from year to year, in accordance with the procedures described below.

The District will review its CIP annually, as a part of its budgeting process. The District will review the status of all capital projects and their priority for budget and levy purposes, and will allocate funds for the following year accordingly.

Every two years, the District will review its capital improvement program and its capital project priorities more comprehensively, on a District-wide and a subwatershed basis, to meet the requirements of Minnesota Rules 8410.0150, subpart 3.E. For this biennial review the District will transmit by June 30 of that year the most recent version of its 10-year CIP to Hennepin and Carver Counties and all of the cities within the District for a 30-day review and comment opportunity.

Minnesota Rules 8410.0140 and Section 9.14 of this Plan describe the procedures to amend the Plan. An amendment will be required when the District elects to proceed beyond feasibility or conceptual design to advance a capital improvement that is not in the CIP.
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1. Is the Project in the Plan? If not, prepare plan amendment.

2. Feasibility Study:
   a. Problem assessment; development of alternative solutions;
   b. Conceptual design of recommended/preferred alternative;
   c. Assessment of likelihood of obtaining property access, permits;
   d. Maintenance requirements;
   e. LGU support;
   f. Cost estimate, including operation and maintenance costs

3. Project Ordering:
   a. Informational meeting; stakeholders
   b. Notice of public hearing;
   c. LGU resolution of support;
   d. Cooperative agreement with project partners;
   e. Public hearing;
   f. Confirmation of project funding, budget authorization;
   g. Resolution to establish improvement project

4. Project Design:
   a. Detailed design, cost estimate;
   b. Specifications for bidding

5. Property Access:
   a. Temporary construction access license or easements;
   b. Permanent easement or fee title;

6. Permits and Environmental Review:
   a. EAW (mandatory or voluntary);
   b. Agency, LGU Permits
   c. Adoption of Final Design:
d. Presentation to Board of Managers;

e. Board approval and authorization to proceed to bid

7. **Bidding, Award of Contract**

   a. Solicitation of bids;
   
   b. Bid opening;
   
   c. Board review and award of contract;
   
   d. Contract execution;
   
   e. Notice to proceed

8. **Project Construction and Close-out**

   a. Construction observation
   
   b. Review request for information (RFIs) and submittals
   
   c. Process change orders
   
   d. Process payment applications
   
   e. Develop punch list
   
   f. Construction documentation summary