PROJECT REQUEST FORM Lower St. Croix Partnership – Watershed Based Implementation Funding

| To: | [Activity #] Subcommittee, Steering Committee | Date: |
|----------|---|-------|
| From: | [Project Sponsor] | |
| Subject: | WBIF Project Request: [Project Name] | |

Table of Acronyms

| CWMP: Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan | LSC: Lower St. Croix |
|---|--|
| SWCD: Soil & Water Conservation District | WD: Watershed District |
| WBIF: Watershed Based Implementation Funding | WMO: Watershed Management Organization |

Eligible Project Sponsors

A sponsoring agency is required for each submitted project. The sponsor fills out this request. That agency must be a party to the Joint Powers Agreement for the implementation of the Lower St. Croix Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan. The sponsor, if the project is selected for funding, will enter into a subcontract with the Chisago Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) for project funding.

Description of Project (brief paragraph)

Benefitted Waterbody Information (add rows for additional waterbodies if necessary)

| Target waterbody | |
|---|--|
| Waterbody area (acres) | |
| Watershed area (acres) | |
| DNR shoreline classification | |
| Description of the watershed and near-shore land uses | |
| Impairment status | |
| Protection or restoration | |

Project Details

| Project Name | |
|--|--|
| Project Sponsor | |
| Additional Project Partner(s) (other than sponsor) | |
| Project Location (lat/long, address, or description) | |
| DNR Level 8 Subwatershed | |
| Applicable WBIF Work Plan Activity | |
| Funding Specifically Allocated to this Project in Work | |
| Plan (if applicable) | |
| Estimated Construction Timeline | |
| Total Project Cost | |
| Estimated Lifetime Project Cost (incl. O&M) | |
| Requested Grant Funding | |
| Match provided, match source (cannot be state funds) | |

PROJECT REQUEST FORM Lower St. Croix Partnership – Watershed Based Implementation Funding

Pre-Project Identification

| Total phosphorus load entering target waterbody | |
|---|--|
| Total suspended solids load entering target waterbody | |
| Major sources of nutrient loading | |
| P reduction required to achieve water quality goal | |
| Completed projects, load reduction | |
| Alternative projects, load reduction | |

List of Informational Attachments/Templates Included With Form:

- 1. WBIF Project Request Process Flow Chart
- 2. CWMP Priority Waterbody Maps
- 3. CWMP Appendix C Project Targeting Criteria and Scoring Matrix (for Activities 2, 4, 5, 9)
- 4. Wetland Restoration Scoring Matrix (for Activity 6)
- 5. Internal Analysis Request for Funding (for Activity 7; filled out by applicant)
- 6. Internal Analysis Selection Criteria (for Activity 7; filled out by subcommittee)
- 7. Targeting Analysis Scoring Matrix (for Activity 8)

Required Attachments for Requesting Partner to Complete (check all that apply):

- □ Project Plans/Visual/Map (for all requests)
- Completed Appendix C Project Scoring Matrix (for Activities 2, 4, 5, 9)
- Completed Wetland Restoration Scoring Matrix (for Activity 6)
- □ Completed Internal Analysis Request for Funding (for Activity 7)
- Completed Internal Analysis Selection Criteria (for Activity 7)
- Completed Targeting Analysis Scoring Matrix (for Activity 8)

WBIF Work Plan Activity Color Coding Implementation - BMPs/Restoration Activities Implementation - Shared Services Prioritization & Analysis Administration

Submit this form and attachments to Angie Hong at (<u>ahong@mnwcd.org</u>) one week prior to the Steering Committee meeting.

PROJECT REQUEST FORM

Lower St. Croix Partnership – Watershed Based Implementation Funding

Steering Committee Roll Call Vote

Steering Committee roll call vote to recommend [Project Sponsor] project for Lower St. Croix Watershed Based Implementation Funding in the amount of \$_____ for the [Project Name].

| Organization | Aye | Nay | Absent |
|------------------------------------|-----|-----|--------|
| Anoka SWCD | | | |
| Brown's Creek WD | | | |
| Carnelian Marine St Croix WD | | | |
| Chisago County | | | |
| Chisago Lakes LID | | | |
| Chisago SWCD | | | |
| Comfort Lake Forest Lake WD | | | |
| Isanti County | | | |
| Isanti SWCD | | | |
| Middle St. Croix WMO | | | |
| Pine County | | | |
| Pine SWCD | | | |
| South Washington WD | | | |
| Sunrise River JP WMO | | | |
| Valley Branch WD | | | |
| Washington CD | | | |
| Washington County | | | |
| TOTAL (need majority vote to pass) | | | |

WBIF Project Request Process





Lower St. Croix Policy Committee approves the annual WBIF work plan and provides oversight for plan implementation.



START Partner has project/study in mind

Partner fills out **Project Request Form** and submits to applicable subcommittee (see back)



Applicable subcommittee reviews Project Request Form against established funding criteria and decides whether to recommend project/study to Steering Committee

If applicable subcommittee approves, Project Request Form must be submitted to Angie Hong at least 1 week in advance of next Steering **Committee meeting***



Partner completes project/study, then fills out the Invoice Template, filling in all applicable fields and submits to Craig Mell.



Chisago SWCD Board approves project/study for funding. Craig notifies Partner once funding request is approved and works out a sub-agreement with the Partner.

Steering Committee discusses and votes on project. Craig Mell fills in voting table within **Project Request Form and** submits to the Chisago SWCD Board (Fiscal Agent) for approval at next regularly scheduled meeting.



*If applicable. partner board may need to outline **BWSR-approved** cost-share policies for project prior to steerina committee vote.



NOTE: see page 4 of this document for guidance on projects requiring an expedited "fast track" approval process



FINISH

Craig Mell and Emily Heinz review completed Project Invoice and work with Partner to address any issues. **Craig Mell processes reimbursement at Chisago** SWCD's next regularly scheduled board meeting.

WHO IS A 'PARTNER?'

Eligible entities/applicants are limited to the 16 local government unit (LGU) partners that signed on to the joint powers agreement for implementation of the Lower St. Croix Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan. Non-included entities/individuals can work with one of the 16 partners to submit an application.

LOWER ST. CROIX PARTNERS

- Chisago County
- Isanti County
- Pine County
- Washington County
- Anoka SWCD
- Pine SWCD Chisago SWCD
 - Brown's Creek WD
 - Carnelian-Marine St. **Croix WD**
- Comfort Lake-Forest Lake WD
- South Washington WD
- Middle St. Croix WMO
- Sunrise River WMO
- Valley Branch WD

LOWER ST. CROIX SUBCOMMITTEE LEAD CONTACTS:

Washington SWCD

Isanti SWCD

| Activity 1: Basin Ag. Outreach Program Lead | Jay Riggs | jriggs@mnwcd.org |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Activities 2, 4, 9: Structural and Non-Structural Ag BMP Implementation + Technical/Engineering Lead | Craig Mell | craig.mell@mn.nacdnet.net |
| Activity 3: Shared Services Educator Lead | Angie Hong | angie.hong@mnwcd.org |
| Activities, 4, 5, 9: Structural and Non-Structural Urban BMP Implementation + Technical/Engineering Lead | Mike Isensee | mike.isensee@cmscwd.org |
| Activity 6: Wetland Restoration Implementation Lead | Becky Wozney | becky.wozney@anokaswcd.org |
| Activity 7: Internal Analyses Lead | Susanna Wilson Witkowski | susanna.wilson@chisagocounty.us |
| Activity 8: Targeting Analyses Lead | Jay Riggs | jriggs@mnwcd.org |

LOWER ST. CROIX PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS:

Jay Riggs Craig Mell Mike Isensee **Jamie Schurbon Becky Wozney** Susanna Wilson Witkowski **Emily Heinz Angie Hong Barbara Heitkamp**

jriggs@mnwcd.org craig.mell@mn.nacdnet.net mike.isensee@cmscwd.org jamie.schurbon@anokaswcd.org becky.wozney@anokaswcd.org susanna.wilson@chisagocounty.us emily.heinz@clflwd.org angie.hong@mnwcd.org bheitkamp@mnwcd.org

RELEVANT LINKS:

Project Website: www.lsc1w1p.org **Project Request Form: TBA**

PROJECT REQUEST FORM DEADLINES

Project request form and attachments must be submitted to Angie Hong at (ahong@mnwcd.org) one week prior to the Steering Committee meeting. Note that project requests must be discussed with the applicable subcommittee prior to submittal to the Steering Committee. Contact the subcommittee lead for a schedule of subcommittee meetings. The fiscal agent, Chisago SWCD, approves funding at one of its regular meetings on the second Tuesday of the month.

The WBIF grant expires December 31, 2023. The following table shows deadlines through the end of 2023.

| Project Request Deadline | Steering Committee Meetings |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 1 week before Steering Committee Meeting) | (every 4th Wednesday of the month) |
| October 20, 2021 | October 27, 2021 |
| November 17, 2021 | November 24, 2021 |
| December 15, 2021 | December 22, 2021 |
| January 19, 2022 | January 26, 2022 |
| February 16, 2022 | February 23, 2022 |
| March 16, 2022 | March 23, 2022 |
| April 20, 2022 | April 27, 2022 |
| May 18, 2022 | May 25, 2022 |
| June 15, 2022 | June 22, 2022 |
| July 20, 2022 | July 27, 2022 |
| August 17, 2022 | August 24, 2022 |
| September 21, 2022 | September 28, 2022 |
| October 19, 2022 | October 26, 2022 |
| November 16, 2022 | November 23, 2022 |
| December 21, 2022 | December 28, 2022 |
| January 18, 2023 | January 25, 2023 |
| February 15, 2023 | February 22, 2023 |
| March 15, 2023 | March 22, 2023 |
| April 19, 2023 | April 26, 2023 |
| May 17, 2023 | May 24, 2023 |
| June 21, 2023 | June 28, 2023 |
| July 19, 2023 | July 26, 2023 |
| August 16, 2023 | August 23, 2023 |
| September 20, 2023 | September 27, 2023 |
| October 18, 2023 | October 25, 2023 |
| November 15, 2023 | November 22, 2023 |
| December 20, 2023 | December 27, 2023 |



FAST TRACK PROJECT GUIDELINES (FORMERLY REFERRED TO AS EMERGENCY PROJECTS)

The following guidance is intended for instances in which a partner or subcommittee identifies a project that is considered an emergency project requiring an expedited timeline. Emergency projects may be necessary to mitigate significant environmental damage. Partners and/or subcommittees will use best judgement to classify a project as an emergency. The purpose of this guidance is to avoid approving funding after project construction has begun. WBIF grant allocations will be approved prior to project implementation. In general, the following guidance entails expediting the process outlined in the flow chart on page 1.

Guidance for emergency projects - requesting partner/project sponsor follow these steps:

1. Immediately fill out the Project Request Form.

2. Contact the following Planning Team members to submit the Project Request Form, explain the reasoning why project must be fast-tracked, and coordinate associated meetings/documents:

a. Applicable subcommittee lead: Work with subcommittee lead to schedule a special subcommittee meeting.

b. Angie Hong: Work with Angie to schedule a special Steering Committee meeting.

c. Craig Mell: Work with Craig to begin contracting with fiscal agent and schedule special meeting of fiscal agent (Chisago SWCD board).

3. Follow the flow chart on page 1 with an expedited timeline, as coordinated with the applicable Planning Team members.

Attachment 2 - Priority Waterbody Maps Barr Footer: ArcGIS 10.7.1, 2020-02-25 14:38 File: I:\Projects\23\13\1011\Maps\Reports\1W1P_E020Update\Figure 5-1 Vulnerable Groundwater imAgricultural Areas.mxd User: RCS2











Attachment 3 - Project Targeting Criteria

Appendix C: Project Targeting Criteria and Scoring Matrix

Lower St. Croix River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan

October 2020

| Criteria and Points for Ranking Agricultural and Urban BMPs for Watershed Based Funds as referenced in Section VII.B. | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| 1 | Lake Restoration & Protection | The project addresses total phosphorus on a priority lake (See table on page 2) | LPSS Priority Class* is "Impaired" or "Highest" = 5 LPSS Priority Class is "High" | | |
| | | | or "Higher" = 3 | | |
| | ſ | Can score points for #1 or #2, but not both. | I | | |
| 2 | Stream Restoration | Project is located near stream reach and will address stream impairment or Lake St. Croix total phosphorus impairment) | Within ¼ mile = 5 Within ½ mile = 3 | | |
| 3 | Groundwater | Project improves groundwater quality/quantity (examples: soil health, nutrient management, pesticide reduction, recharge, infiltration, reuse) | Yes = 3 No = 0 | | |
| 4 | Readiness | Concept plans, cost estimates, and landowner agreements/easements are complete 3 or 0 | Yes = 3 No = 0 | | |
| 5 | Urgency & Opportunity | Is the project contingent on securing funding now? (Example, BMP is part of a larger project that will move forward with or without the BMP; opportunity would be lost if not funded and implemented now) | Yes = 1 No = 0 | | |
| 6 | Cost effectiveness | Level of cost benefit when compared to all projects analyzed in particular SWA or similar targeting analysis. | Top 1% = 10 Top 10% = 7 Top 25% = 5 Top 50% = 3 < 50% = 0 | | |
| 7 | Partners & Funding | Partnership and collaboration with agencies, organizations, or other groups is being leveraged or utilized by this project (Are there multiple partners providing funding, in-kind support, or other assistance or involvement?) | Yes = 1 No = 0 | | |
| 8 | Multiple Benefit | Project provides added benefit of habitat improvements (aquatic, riparian, upland, wetland). Note: water quality improvements are not considered habitat improvements for this criterion. | Yes = 1 No = 0 | | |
| 9 | Multiple Benefit | Project provides added benefit of education (examples: signage, demonstration project) | Yes = 1 No = 0 | | |
| 10 | Multiple Benefit | Project improves water quality while also addressing flooding concern (examples: pond, wetland restoration, or floodplain expansion) | Yes = 1 No = 0 | | |
| | | TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE | 26 | | |

*Lakes of Phosphorus Sensitivity Significance (LPSS) - May 24, 2019: A ranked priority lake list based on sensitivity to additional phosphorus loading and the significance of that sensitivity.

Developed by: Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Department of Natural Resources, and Board of Water and Soil Resources

Lake Phosphorus Sensitivity Significance, LPSS Priority Class = Grouping of waterbodies based on the lake phosphorus sensitivity significance priority score, which is a function of phosphorus sensitivity, and lake size, lake total phosphorus concentration, proximity to MPCA's phosphorus impairment thresholds, and watershed disturbance. Classes relate to the state's priority of focusing on "high quality, unimpaired lakes at greatest risk of becoming impaired."

| Lake ID | Name | LPSS Priority Class |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 2002600 | Linwood | Impaired |
| 2003400 | Martin | Impaired |
| 13004200 | Birch | NA |
| 13000100 | Blooms | NA |
| 1300120 | Chisago | Higher |
| 13006800 | Fish | Highest |
| 13008301/13008302 | Goose (North & South) | Impaired |
| 13004102 /13004101 | Green/Little Green | Highest |
| 13003300 | Little | Impaired |
| 13003201 | North Center Lake | Impaired |
| 13003500 | North Lindstrom | Higher |
| 13006901/13006902 | Rush (East & West) | Impaired |
| 13002700 | South Center | Impaired |
| 13002800 | South Lindstrom | Higher |
| 30000800 | Hoffman | NA |
| 30001200 | Horseleg | Highest |
| 30000300 | Horseshoe | Highest |
| 30000700 | Lower Birch | NA |
| 58011700 | Rock | Impaired |
| 82004900 | Big Carnelian | Higher |
| 82005204 | Big Marine | Highest |
| 82004500 | Clear | Higher |
| 82003400 | East Boot | Impaired |
| 82000400 | Edith | Higher |
| 82010600 | Elmo | Higher |
| 82001400 | Little Carnelian | Higher |
| 82002500 | Louise | Impaired |
| 82003300 | Mays | High |
| 82002000 | McKusick | High |
| 82004600 | Square | Highest |
| 82003100 | Terrapin | High |

Attachment 4 - Wetland Restoration Scoring Matrix



Project Selection Criteria Activity 6 – Wetland Restoration

The Activity 6 Subcommittee will use the following criteria to rank and select wetland restoration projects to be recommended to the Steering Committee. Submit an application to <u>becky.wozney@anokaswcd.org</u>. The Deadline for applications is June 30, 2022. The Wetlands Subcommittee will review projects and make recommendations to the Lower St. Croix Advisory Committee, which in turn makes a recommendation to the Policy Committee. Final funding decisions are made by the Chisago SWCD. Final funding decisions are expected by September 30, 2022. Construction must be complete by December 31, 2023.

Required:

- 1. Must be in the priority watershed. Areas of particular concern are direct drainage to St. Croix, Sunrise River corridor, Rock Creek corridor and subwatersheds identified in Figure 5-5 of the LSC CWMP.
 - \Box Yes \Box No
- 2. Not be a wetland banking project for financial gain.

🗆 Yes 🗆 No

3. Not associated with correcting a wetland violation.

🗆 Yes 🗆 No

- Evaluated by a STEPL EPA model or similar. Provide results in application.
 □ Yes □ No
- Grant funds will only be used for construction, not design/engineering.
 □ Yes □ No
- 6. Someone must be willing to maintain project for 10 years.

Scored:

- 7. Vetted in a prioritization study (High-10, Medium-7, Low-4 (see Figure 5-5))
- 8. **Phosphorus reduction**. Applicant must specify method used to estimate pollutant reduction (Over 10 lbs-20 points, 5-10 lbs-10 points, 1-5 lbs-5 points, less than 1 lb-0 points)
- 9. _____ out of 10 Timeliness. Date of anticipated construction.
- 10. _____ out of 10 Site readiness. Owner signed a project contract. Legal hurdles, such as those associated with public ditches or flowage easements, consent from mortgage company, are not a concern.

- 11. _____ out of 5 Finances. Amount of match and is it secured?
- 12. ____ out of 5 Finances. Will the project only occur if this grant is awarded?
- 13. ____ out of 5 Location. Is there direct benefit to priority receiving waters? Or is there possible other treatment between the project and receiving waters?
- 14. _____ out of 5 **Cost/Benefit.** Is the project configured to maximize treatment? (for example, cost/benefit of multiple smaller wetlands vs one large)
- 15. _____ out of 5 Likelihood of success. Invasive species, landowner conflicts, someone with appropriate equipment and skills is accepting maintenance, etc.
- 16. ____ out of 75 **TOTAL**

References: Minnesota Stormwater Manual <u>Available stormwater models and selecting a model -</u> <u>Minnesota Stormwater Manual (state.mn.us)</u>

Figure 5-5



Attachment 5 - Internal Analysis Request for Funding

PARTNERSHIP

Request for Funding Activity 7 – Internal Analyses

Activity 7 Description

The 2021 Lower St. Croix 1W1P Watershed Based Implementation Funding grant includes calculating internal loading of phosphorus on two lakes estimated at \$25,000 each. Work is anticipated to be completed by a consultant. This request for funding describes how parties can be considered for the funds.

Qualifying Project Applicants

A lead or sponsoring agency is required for each submitted project. That agency must be a party to the Joint Powers Agreement for the implementation of the Lower St. Croix Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan. The sponsor, if the project is selected for funding, will enter into a subcontract with the Chisago Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) for project funding.

Process for Requesting Funding

- Call for projects (due Oct 31) The Internal Loading Subcommittee will send an initial request for projects to all qualifying entities. Responses must only include the lake and description of work anticipated. All respondents will receive a complete list of responses and any subcommittee feedback so they can decide if they wish to apply. Deadlines, both for the call for projects and application will be provided.
- Application (due Dec 15) Fill out the application below, along with the Project Request Form attached, and submit to Susanna Wilson Witkowski <u>Susanna.Wilson@chisagocounty.us</u>. The application requires securing a contractor's quote for the work.
- 3. **Internal Loading Subcommittee review.** The subcommittee will provide a recommendation to the Steering Committee.
- 4. **Steering Committee review.** The Steering Committee provides a recommendation to the grant fiscal agent, Chisago SWCD.
- 5. **Sponsors of successful projects will execute a subcontract with Chisago SWCD.** Grant funds expire Dec. 31, 2023.

Required Internal Analyses Elements

The following are required outputs of the internal analyses. The intention is to position projects for state competitive grant implementation funding. These elements are from the 2022 BWSR Clean Water Fund RFP. Please ensure consultant quotes for the work include all these elements.

a. Lake and watershed information (at a minimum, include morphology and depth, summary of water quality information, and assessment of AIS);

- b. Description of internal load vs external load nutrient reductions;
- c. History of projects completed in the watershed, and their associated nutrient reductions, as well as other in-lake activities if applicable.
- d. Cost benefit analysis of options considered;
- e. Projected effective life of the proposed activities;
- f. Expected water quality outcome;
- g. Plan for monitoring surface water quality to assure the project's total phosphorus goal will be achieved during the project's effective life, and
- h. For activities related to rough fish (example, carp) the feasibility study must also include:
 - a. Methods used to estimate adult and juvenile carp populations;
 - b. Description of the known interconnectedness of waterbodies;
 - c. Identified nursery areas;
 - d. Methods used to track carp movement;
 - e. Proposed actions to limit recruitment and movement; and
 - f. Proposed actions to reduced adult carp populations.

Eligible Waterbodies

Activity 7 – Internal Phosphorus Analyses Project Funding Application

Project Summary

| Sponsoring Entity | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Project Name | |
| Project Location (lake name) | |
| Lake DNR ID # | |
| Applicable WBIF Work Plan Activity | Activity 7 – Internal Analyses |
| Estimated Completion Timeline | |

Lake Summary

| Mean and max depths | |
|--|--|
| Recreational uses | |
| Impairment status and description of degree of | |
| impairment: | |
| Describe any previous internal loading projects: | |

- 1. Waterbody to be analyzed is a Priority A or B lake in the LSC CWMP (Table 5-4, see following pages)? □ Yes □ No
- 2. Waterbody has had a TMDL, WRAPS, or similar study that identified internal loading as an important pollutant source to be addressed? □ Yes □ No
- 3. When would the internal analysis be completed? (grant funds expire 12/31/2023)?
- 4. Describe plans and any financing to implement internal load treatment based on findings from the internal analyses report.
- 5. To what extent has watershed external loading of phosphorus been addressed? Measurable outcomes such as pounds of pollutant reduced compared to the needed reductions are appreciated. (If possible, provide an estimated percentage of the watershed loading that could be reasonably be addressed, and has been. And, if a project identification and prioritization study is done, how many of those projects have been installed and could still reasonably be installed?)
- To what extent is addressing internal loading a critical part of successfully meeting the waterbody's water quality goals? Please include information from any TMDL or similar study.
- 7. Please attach a consultant's quote for performing the internal loading analysis.

Attachment 6 - Internal Analysis Selection Criteria



Project Selection Criteria Activity 7 – Internal Phosphorus Analyses

The Activity 7 Subcommittee will use the following criteria to rank and select internal phosphorus analyses to be recommended to the Steering Committee.

Required:

- 1. Waterbody to be analyzed is a Priority A or B lake in the LSC CWMP (Table 5-4)?
 - 🗆 Yes 🗆 No
- 2. Waterbody has had a TMDL, WRAPS, or similar study that identified internal loading as an important pollutant source to be addressed?

🗆 Yes 🗆 No

Scored:

- 3. When would the internal analysis be completed? (note: grant funds expire 12/31/2023).
- 4. Describe plans and any financing to implement internal load treatment based on findings from the internal analyses report.
 - Score:

Score from 0-5. Highest scores for projects with secured or likely funding within 2 yrs.

5. To what extent has watershed external loading of phosphorus been addressed? If possible, provide an estimated percentage of the watershed loading that could be reasonably be addressed, and has been. And, if a project identification and prioritization study is done, how many of those projects have been installed and could still reasonably be installed?

Score: Score from 0-10. 10 = 100%% of reasonably possible watershed sources or projects addressed. 5 = 50% of all reasonably possible watershed sources addressed. 0 = 0%.

6. To what extent is addressing internal loading a critical part of successfully meeting the waterbody's water quality goals?

Score:_____ Score from 0-5.

Highest scores for waterbodies where TMDLs or other information indicates that addressing internal loading is critical to meeting water quality goals.

7. Other factors in the committee's professional judgement.

Attachment 7 - Targeting Analysis Scoring Matrix [forthcoming]