



The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District is committed to a leadership role in protecting, improving and managing the surface waters and affiliated groundwater resources within the District, including their relationships to the ecosystems of which they are an integral part. We achieve our mission through regulation, capital projects, education, cooperative endeavors, and other programs based on sound science, innovative thinking, an informed and engaged constituency, and the cost effective use of public funds.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 17, 2015
TO: MCWD Board of Managers Planning and Policy Committee
FROM: Brett Eidem, Cost Share Grant Administrator
RE: Cost Share Grants Evaluation Criteria Discussion

PROGRAM CRITERIA

In 2011, the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) began implementing the Cost Share program to help meet its clean water and public participation goals. The District provides financial assistance to government units, private property owners, non-profits, academic institutions and other interested parties for projects that expand the knowledge base of water resources management, provide educational opportunities through demonstrative projects within the watershed, improve stormwater management, reduce pollution, and enhance natural resources and green infrastructure.

BUDGET UPDATE

\$832,000.00 Cost Share 2015 Budget
This is the combined carryover of last year’s Cost Share Grants and Low Impact Development funds without any levy in 2015.

COST SHARE PROGRAM RESTRUCTURE

Staff will present the new evaluation criteria for the Cost Share Grant Program at the February 19th Planning and Policy Committee meeting. This is the final step needed to start reviewing cost share projects under the new structure outlined in the Board-approved 2015 Cost Share workplan. This structure was developed to enable staff to review projects based on their primary focus, and to incentivize a built education and outreach program around these demonstrational stormwater BMPs. This new structure will allow the District to gain greater benefits from these projects than what has been historically funded through the program. Staff will also use this meeting to discuss how the Cost Share program new evaluation criteria better aligns with the new MCWD Comprehensive Water Resource Management Plan. The program has evolved since 2011, and there is now a greater interest in the program, where staff has seen more applications and more consistently larger opportunities. In the attached document you will find an evaluation score sheet and detailed explanation of how to qualify for district funding based on the initiatives outlined in the score sheet. These align with the proposed changes to the program outlined in the 2015 Cost Share Program workplan. If you have any questions on the content provided prior to the meeting, please let me know.

Thanks,

Brett Eidem
Cost Share Grant Administrator
beidem@minnehahacreek.org
952-641-4523

MEETING DATE: February 19, 2015

TITLE: Approval of Cost Share Program Evaluation Criteria

RESOLUTION NUMBER: 15-XXX

PREPARED BY: Brett Eidem, Cost Share Grant Administrator

E-MAIL: beidem@minnehahacreek.org

TELEPHONE: 952-641-4523

REVIEWED BY: Administrator Counsel Program Mgr. (Name): Telly Mamayek
 Board Committee Engineer Other

WORKSHOP ACTION:

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

PURPOSE or ACTION REQUESTED:

Approve Cost Share Grant Program Evaluation Criteria as it pertains to the funding of cost share projects.

PROJECT/PROGRAM LOCATION:

District-wide

PROJECT TIMELINE:

- July 17, 2014- Program Analysis at Board workshop
- August 7, 2014- Workplan preliminary approval for budget purposes
- December 18, 2014- 2015 Workplan approved by full Board of Managers
- February 11, 2015- CAC review of Cost Share Program Evaluation Criteria
- February 19, 2015- Planning and Policy Committee review and recommendation to approve Cost Share Program Evaluation Criteria
- February 26, 2015- MCWD Board of Managers approval of Cost Share Program Evaluation Criteria

PROJECT/PROGRAM COST:

Fund name and number:

Cost Share Grant Program (3130)

Current budget:

\$832,000 (Combined 3130 and 3121 Funds)

BACKGROUND:

Staff had presented a cost share program update to the MCWD Board of Managers in July of 2014. Staff had shown what they felt was working and successful with the program and areas to become more efficient. This was centered on the idea to have a more detailed programming of projects to better align them with program and District goals.

Staff developed the new three category approach to review projects based on their primary focus: Homeowner, Community Engagement, and Green Infrastructure (which would include historically funded LID projects). Staff then met with the Board Operations and Programs Committee in August to propose the workplan for budgeting purposes, but to also delineate this new three category approach to reviewing projects. Staff presented to the full Board at the December workshop, to present the 2015 workplan with more detail on the restructure of the program. At this meeting, staff discussed the three categories in further detail, and explained that the Board would be presented with the detailed evaluation criteria for review and approval before this new structure would be unveiled to the public. Staff also presented the idea of merging both the cost share and Low Impact Development funds (3130 and 3121) under this three-category approach hierarchy.

COST SHARE PROGRAM RESTRUCTURE

Staff has been developing a new structure for the program, to review projects based on their primary focus, and incentivize an education and outreach program around these demonstrational stormwater BMPs. Staff see this new structure as a way to gain greater benefits from these projects than what has been historically funded through the program. The program has evolved since 2011, and there is now a greater interest in the program, where staff has seen more applications and larger opportunities. When reviewing these projects, staff has found it difficult to review these projects with consistency through the existing evaluation criteria. The existing evaluation criteria are outlined below:

- a. Water Quality Improvement
 - Improves and protects water quality beyond levels achieved through regulatory requirements whenever possible
 - Reduces the rate and/or volume of runoff that drains off of the property
 - Promotes abstraction of precipitation and/or runoff
- b. Soil Erosion Control
 - Control erosion and reduce sedimentation to downstream waters
- c. Wildlife Habitat Improvement
 - Creates or improves wildlife habitat through native plantings or other restoration efforts that are consistent with the natural hydrology/geography
- d. Innovative Applications
 - Provides an innovative solution to a water resource related problem with the potential to be duplicated elsewhere
- e. Collaboration
 - Demonstrates strong partnerships and/or local citizen support
- f. Public Outreach
 - Applicant willingness to participate in public outreach opportunities after project completion
 - Publically visible site

These criteria have no set scale or grading to them, which leaves the evaluation of projects that may have different goals or focus under the same set of criteria. This has made it difficult for the consistent review of projects by staff, CAC and the Board of Managers. The new structure of the program, and its correlating evaluation criteria, sets a structure to review projects, giving both the applicants and the District a set of guidelines that have been researched and designed to develop projects. These new criteria will capitalize on stormwater management cost effectiveness with an established outreach program to take full advantage of outreach efforts and community capacity opportunities with each project the District funds. The intent of this structure is to educate the applicants on how these projects can play an integral role in watershed management, understanding where water flows, and how their project can play a part in creating larger behavior changes within the community. It will also maximize District benefits from cost share funds, creating higher quality projects and greater outreach initiatives from these projects.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALIGNMENT

Staff researched how new criteria align with the current MCWD Comprehensive Plan (6.9 Cost Share Programs).

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

“The primary purposes of these criteria are to: (a) provide for consistency in District review and selection of proposals for funding; and (b) direct District funds to projects and locations that will further the goals and priorities of the watershed management plan in an effective manner.”

Prior to this proposal, the Board discussed program changes requested by the previous cost share specialist in 2013. When the Board reviewed the cost share program at the February 14th, 2013 Board Meeting, it was stated in the minutes that the “cost share program is designed to achieve benefits beyond water quality improvements”, and “personnel to conduct the outreach is the critical element in making cost-share programs successful”.

Both the current and future District comprehensive plans were taken into account and heavily influenced what was incorporated into the evaluation criteria. By creating three categories for which incoming projects would be categorized to be reviewed, staff researched what were the biggest benefits possible from these projects and their cost effectiveness. This is how the scoring and grading of projects was organized and designed. Staff sees the future potential of funding projects at a 50-75% level with cap amounts in place will get applicants to further develop their projects before applying for cost share funding. This will help streamline the review process, and will also give applicants a more definitive guideline on their project’s desired goals. This will be reflected in the evaluation scoring of their project, and ultimately in the District financial incentives for their project.

Staff recognizes that the cost share program is an integral part of the future Comprehensive Plan two-track approach. The District will have geographic focus areas to create large-scale water resource improvements, and the cost share program can support this through collaboration, and the building of community capacity in these areas. Cost share projects in these areas have the opportunity to reach communities and create partnerships which support the next Plan. These projects can empower residents and organizations within the community by educating others on the importance of water resource management, and building support by leveraging other District initiatives within these strategic focal geographies. The other track is remaining responsive to opportunities District-wide, which is also an area where the cost share program can be successful. The cost share program has the ability to assist in funding our partners’ initiatives as opportunities arise, and providing technical support while aligning our goals with those of our partners to ultimately create higher quality projects.

Reporting Program Success

Outlined in the criteria is a reporting requirement. This is critical to the program being able to show how it is being successful. This will go beyond the existing reporting requirement of the functionality of the project, but will go further in depth on the education and outreach efforts incorporated into the project. This information will be obtained through an annual report completed by the applicant. Staff has looked into a financial strategy for funding larger-scale projects where this report would be very helpful in documenting the outreach success of each project. By phasing the District reimbursement over multiple years, there will be reporting requirements that would need to be met before the next installment of reimbursement would be released. Staff see opportunities in mapping these outreach efforts to visually show how we are creating behavior change and building civic infrastructure around water resource awareness within the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff and the CAC recommend approval of the cost share grant program evaluation criteria. Staff is asking the MCWD Board of Managers for approval of the evaluation criteria to start using in the review and recommendation of cost share funding.

Attachments:

1. 2015 Cost Share Program Workplan
2. 2015 Cost Share Program Evaluation Criteria

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NUMBER: 15-XXX

TITLE: **Approval of Cost Share Program Evaluation Criteria**

- WHEREAS, the Stormwater BMP Cost Share Program was established by the MCWD to provide grants to property owners to design and install best management practices that will reduce the volume and increase the quality of stormwater flowing offsite; and
- WHEREAS, the District's 2007 Comprehensive Water Resources Management plan also identifies expanding the knowledge base of water resources management and providing education opportunities through demonstrative capital projects within the watershed as key functions of the Cost Share Program; and
- WHEREAS, On July 17th, 2014, staff presented a program update to the Board of Managers on program benefits and recommendations for improving and continuing the program; and
- WHEREAS, on August 7th, 2014, staff presented the 2015 Cost Share workplan to the Board at a joint committee meeting, where staff proposed no levy for 2015 due to projected carryover from previous years; and
- WHEREAS, on December 18th, 2014, staff presented the 2015 Cost Share workplan to the Board of Managers for approval of program restructure to three category approach, along with approval of combining the Cost Share Fund (3130) and the Low Impact Development Fund (3121); and
- WHEREAS, on February 11th, 2015, staff presented cost share evaluation criteria to Citizens Advisory Committee, and they were in support of adopting new criteria; and
- WHEREAS, on February 19th, 2015, staff presented evaluation criteria to the MCWD Board of Managers Planning and Policy Committee, where the committee recommended approval of evaluation criteria by the full Board at the February 26th Board Meeting.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the MCWD Board of Managers finds the new Cost Share Program evaluation criteria aligns with the goals of the program put forth in the 2007 Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan, and approves the use of the new evaluation criteria to be used to review cost share applications moving forward.

Resolution Number 15-XXX was moved by Manager _____, seconded by Manager _____.
Motion to adopt the resolution ___ ayes, ___ nays, ___ abstentions. Date: _____.

Secretary

Date: _____

Minnehaha Creek Watershed District

2015 RECOMMENDED PROJECT/PROGRAM WORK PLAN

PREPARED BY: Brett Eidem/Cost Share Grant Administrator

DATE: December 8, 2014

<u>Project</u>	Cost Share/LID Programs (3130 and 3121)
<u>Description</u>	In 2011, the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) began implementing the Cost Share program to help meet its clean water and public participation goals. The District provides financial assistance to government units, private property owners, non-profits, academic institutions and other interested parties for projects that expand the knowledge base of water resources management, provide educational opportunities through demonstrative projects within the watershed, improve stormwater management, reduce pollution, and enhance natural resources and green infrastructure.
<u>Location</u>	District-wide and targeted areas
<u>Budget</u>	\$332,000.00 (Cost Share) and \$500,000.00 (LID)
<u>Program Details</u>	<p>Background: The Cost Share Program was formally established in October 2010 through an amendment to the District’s 2007 Comprehensive Plan. The program had originated in the District’s Permitting Department and focused on incentivizing stormwater BMPs on single family home properties (not regulated under the stormwater rule) and conversion of riprap to biological or bioengineered shorelines. In recognition of the educational value of the program, it was moved to the Education Department in 2012, and implemented by the Cost Share Grant Administrator in collaboration with other District departments. The program relies on reaching property owners who are willing to invest in projects that simultaneously accomplish both their personal goals and meet the water quality standards of the District according to the program criteria.</p> <p>The Low Impact Development (LID) grant program also originated in 2010, and was designed to incentivize implementation of water quality improvements where permit applicants were able to exceed rule requirements. This helped target priority areas and provide the District with opportunities to achieve load reduction goals as well as educate the public about water quality and stormwater runoff. Leveraging such opportunities was dependent on the ability of the District to proactively work with cities and property owners to identify opportunities and investigate alternatives during preliminary planning stages of the overall redevelopment. Since the original implementation of the program, the District has undergone an extensive rule revision process that has led to more protective rules that are generating improvements rather than simply maintaining the existing levels of water quality. Following the revision to District rules, program efficacy was reduced due to the limited availability of cost-beneficial opportunities to generate water quality/quantity improvements above those required by District rule.</p>

In July 2014, the MCWD Board of Managers discussed the purpose and scope of both the Cost Share and the Low Impact Development Grant Program funds. Staff explained that these programs have received a wide variety of applications over the years both in terms of the type of applicants (e.g. individual resident, municipalities, developers, churches, etc.) and the project benefits (e.g. water quality, education, demonstration, etc.). While all of these projects have value to the District, it can be difficult to compare such distinct projects against one another and determine a reasonable funding amount. Staff's recommendation was that the District creates different categories and criteria for evaluating the more education-focused vs. water-quality focused projects. The Board supported this direction.

In addition to providing education and water quality benefits, the grant programs play a significant role in carrying out the policy direction set by the Board in its policy framework, *In Pursuit of a Balanced Urban Ecology*, by promoting and facilitating project partnerships, allowing the District to remain responsive while focused in priority geographies, and the ability to act on opportunities created through redevelopment. Using the grant programs in this way will support the "two-track" approach envisioned for the District's 2017 Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan. While the District will cultivate a sustained focus and develop large-scale, high impact projects in priority areas, the Cost Share program will allow the District to remain responsive District wide, fostering opportunities for cost-effective partnerships.

Proposed Structure for 2015

Staff proposes merging the two funds (Cost Share-3130 and LID-fund 3121) to better align District finances to opportunities recognized by the Board as providing the greatest benefit. The funds will be administered by the Cost Share Program to provide organization and structure to the distribution of funds, having one ongoing balance and projection of what potential funds could be spent on potential opportunities. All District staff can propose the use of funds as opportunities and partnerships arise which will foster inter-departmental communication and staff collaboration on projects.

Projects will be routed through the Cost Share Grant Administrator, who will assist in identifying a review team to evaluate potential opportunities and create funding recommendations. Ultimately, the staff member who identifies the opportunity can take the lead on the project, and Cost Share staff will continue to take the lead on historically funded Cost Share Projects.

Consistent with the July 2014 discussion, staff recommends creating three main categories that will be used to review projects:

- Homeowner Projects
- Community Engagement Projects
- Green Infrastructure Projects

Each category will have its own evaluation criteria to allow staff to assess projects based on their primary focus, comparative to similar projects for cost benefit and value. These categories will serve as the basis of evaluation criteria for opportunities that have been applied for through the application process. In doing so, staff will have a more defined process to make recommendations that result in projects that will achieve the greatest benefit. There will be a preliminary dedication of funds every year for each category, however, funds may be reallocated as opportunities arise.

There will also be opportunities that, through this framework, demonstrate qualities of all three of these categories. By creating partnerships and developing opportunities far enough in advance, we can create projects that have a more holistic approach, incorporating stormwater management through new large scale infrastructure, taking into account public benefits through educational signage, and establishing community engagement through resident support in the neighborhood to invest in stormwater management on their own properties.

This approach is exemplified in a current partnership with the District and the City of Edina. Staff has collaborated with the city on their living streets initiative in the Arden Park neighborhood. This project includes construction of cost beneficial stormwater management facilities with their new road reconstruction. By also looking at opportunities in places of public recreation, like Arden Park, to demonstrate water resource management and educate the neighborhood through educational signage on these initiatives. They are also incorporating Master Water Stewards in the community outreach, building community capacity through education and awareness, as well as empowering individual residents to invest in stormwater BMPs on their own properties.

Cost Share Program Categories:

Homeowner Projects

The Homeowner category is an opportunity to educate the general public on the benefits of small scale stormwater management. Through the use of demonstrational construction projects, staff aims to develop educational awareness and gradual behavior change. While not the main focus of the category, these projects have the potential to improve water quality as a supplemental benefit to the educational criteria. Staff recommends keeping the base 50% cost share funding for a homeowner willing to install a stormwater best management practice on their property. Additional funding may be awarded for education /outreach components.

Staff proposes the following changes to the homeowner program:

- Require an entire site design showing where all stormwater runoff on the property drains. This will educate homeowners early in the process on what benefits the District sees in these projects and how to design and implement the most cost effective project on their property.
- Incentivize projects beyond the 50% funding cap by adding to the % of funding based on the visibility of the project, subwatershed and the amount of water quality treatment.
- Impose an annual deadline and review process. This will reduce staff review time, streamline funding agreement administration, and provide the opportunity to competitively review projects for maximum benefit to natural resources.

Homeowner Projects Guidelines

1. Eligible Entities: Residential property owners
2. Eligible Costs: Design, materials, labor (homeowner labor reimbursed at a rate of \$12/hour on residential projects only). (Funds may not be used to pay for capital equipment or for existing staff and overhead expenses.)

3. Regulatory Eligibility: Work required by regulations of any local, state or federal agency does not qualify.
4. Eligible Practices:
 - Stormwater Improvements
 - Shoreline/Streambank Stabilization using biological or bioengineering practices
5. Annual Deadline for Homeowner BMP projects (Master Water Steward projects and Shoreline/Streambank projects are exempt from this deadline)
6. Cost Share Percentage: 50% or more depending on the strength of the project
7. Cost Share Maximum:
 - Stormwater BMP: \$2,500*
 - Shoreline/Streambank Stabilization: \$5,000*
8. Approval Process:
 - Requests for funding greater than the above-stated maximums may be considered on a case-by-case basis and will require review by the Citizens Advisory Committee and approval by MCWD Board of Managers when requested funding is over \$5,000.
 - Homeowner projects requesting funding between \$1,000 and \$5,000 will only need funding recommendation by the CAC.
 - Any projects requesting funding in an amount less than \$1,000 can be approved by the District Administrator.

*Additional funding may be available based on extraordinary or well-beyond-standard education/outreach components.

Community Engagement Projects

This category will fund stormwater BMP projects with a primary focus on educational value. This category educates the general public on the benefits of stormwater management through constructing demonstrational projects. While these projects may also achieve improved water quality and reductions in volume, these benefits are secondary to education and awareness. Potential projects will be evaluated on category specific criteria, and other potential benefits, according to the following factors:

- This category of projects will have evaluation and reporting requirements to help measure the impact of the project's education and outreach components.
- These projects will consider the water quality benefits of the project, but will focus primarily on the opportunities for watershed management awareness, education, innovation and community engagement. By building a network of people in the community that understand the issue, care about it, and are empowered to take action, this additional community capacity can be used in the future to leverage larger scale opportunities to protect our natural resources.

Community Engagement Projects Guidelines

1. Eligible Entities: Non-Profit Organizations, Institutions (private and public), Community Groups, Public Entities, Developers, Commercial Property owners or other
2. Eligible Costs: Design, materials, labor. (Funds may not be used to pay for capital equipment or for existing staff and overhead expenses.)

3. Regulatory Eligibility: Work required by regulations of any local, state or federal agency does not qualify.
4. Eligible Practices: Any stormwater improvement project or watershed management practice
5. Funding will have a primary focus on Community Engagement
6. Cost Share Percentage: dependent on the strength of the project and available funds for the year.
7. Approval Process:
 - Any funding over \$5,000 will need CAC review and Board Approval
 - Funding Maximum of \$100,000
 - Projects that qualify for funding over \$50,000 will be evaluated for project phasing, and reimbursement funding over a period of time. The District will look at ways to help to create a financing strategy, and a funding plan that would fit the needs of the grant recipient as well as allow for District financial planning for disbursement of funds yearly. These projects would also require a public hearing per State Statute Section 103B.251

Green Infrastructure Projects

This category will fund green infrastructure projects with a primary focus on improving the watershed, including but not limited to: volume reduction and removal of pollutants including phosphorus, chlorides and suspended solids. Projects in this category will also be reviewed with the potential for educational programming, but it will not be the focus or a requirement. Potential projects will be evaluated on category specific criteria, potential benefits according to the following factors:

- These projects are reviewed for their cost effectiveness and overall potential for improvements to the District’s water resources. Staff recommends evaluating these projects with a consistent scale for what cost beneficial water quality goals should be. This will compare potential projects to past projects funded through the LID Program for cost-benefit of the project in relation to pollutant removals and District priorities within the project area/subwatershed.
- Resources to develop Evaluation Criteria:
 - a. Wenck Pollutant Reduction Calculator- This calculator can quickly estimate the annual pollutant reductions from a proposed stormwater BMP based on BMP size, depth, impervious drainage to BMP, infiltration rate of soils and annual precipitation.
 - b. Cost Benefit Calculator (developed by Capital Region Watershed District). This calculator runs projects through a model that considers the drainage area and runoff type, BMP size and capacity, and potential ‘bonus’ for outreach to quantify the dollar value of these elements. While a project’s visibility and outreach potential will be considered, it is not the primary focus of the project.

Green Infrastructure Projects Guidelines

1. Eligible Entities: Non-Profit Organizations, Institutions (private and public), Community Groups, Public Entities, Developers, Commercial Properties or other

2. Eligible Costs: Design, materials, labor. (Funds may not be used to pay for capital equipment or for existing staff and overhead expenses.)
3. Regulatory Eligibility: Work required by regulations of any local, state or federal agency does not qualify.
4. Eligible Practices: Any stormwater improvement project or watershed management practice
5. Funding will have a primary focus on water resource improvement
6. Cost Share Percentage: dependent on the strength of the project and available funds for the year.
7. Approval Process:
 - Any funding over \$5,000 will need to be reviewed by the CAC and approved by the MCWD Board of Managers

Projects that qualify for funding over \$50,000 will be evaluated for project phasing, and reimbursement funding over a period of time. The District will look at ways to help to create a financing strategy, and a funding plan that would fit the needs of the grant recipient as well as allow for District financial planning for disbursement of funds yearly. These projects would also require a public hearing per State Statute Section 103B.251

2015 Cost Share Program Activities

Data Collection

Although the cost share program has historically funded projects that are considered beneficial, there has been a lack of data collected on how well they help the District meet its program goals. In 2014-2015, cost share staff and a MN GreenCorps member will be inspecting cost share projects across the District and recording their performance. There will be follow-up with all past grant recipients and recommendations on how to maintain optimal performance with their stormwater BMP. This, along with collection of any monitoring and reporting done by the grant recipient can help quantify the success of the project.

Targeted Subwatershed Prioritization

In an effort to provide more quantifiable and impactful benefits to District resources, Cost Share staff will coordinate with the District's Planning, Education/Communications and Permitting departments to specifically target high priority areas to achieve District goals. Staff will prioritize projects based on their potential for stormwater improvements, connection with existing capital projects and potential to simultaneously achieve overarching District, city and community goals (incentivized through overall funding %). These opportunity based projects will involve coordination by the Cost Share Grant Administrator with not only other District Staff but also with city representatives, property owners, consultants and the District Engineer, CAC and Board of Managers.

Targeted Subwatershed Outreach

The implementation of targeted projects in high priority areas relies on long term coordination with potential partners and development of relationships. For example, the District's MN GreenCorps member is partnering with the Freshwater Society to recruit new Master Water Stewards within the Six Mile Creek subwatershed. This work, along with a targeted approach to partnering on cost share projects on residential, community and institutional scales can help increase awareness, foster community engagement. This

	<p>may result in possibly leveraging the future decisions for natural resource protection and land use planning in the area of focus and beyond.</p> <p>In an effort to remain responsive to needs District-wide, Cost Share Program staff also will work with lake and neighborhood associations across the District to increase their capacity to take advantage of District Cost Share programs. Staff workload in 2015 will focus on creating these partnerships and planning future projects.</p> <p>Staff will also refer partners, communities and applicants to other state and regional grant funds. This will help stretch District grant funds, as well as involving more partners and funds in the project, ultimately strengthening the proposal.</p>
<u>Outcomes</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide citizen engagement and advocacy opportunities where citizens become participants in and advocates for stormwater management and clean water. Provide an avenue for community building surrounding water related issues. 2. Educate the public on actions that can be taken on an individual citizen scale to improve stormwater management, enhance natural resources and green infrastructure, expand the knowledge base of water resources management, and provide educational opportunities through demonstrative projects within the watershed. 3. Promote installations of stormwater BMPs, biological/bioengineered shoreline/streambank stabilization projects, and to reduce pollutant and volume loading to water resources. 4. Where appropriate, complement CIP program in achieving Planning department volume reduction and water quality goals. 5. Provide a flexible avenue to address project opportunities which may not be specifically identified through the Comprehensive plan or existing workplans.

Budget History

Budget/Levy History								
Year	Budget	Tax Revenue	Grants & Other	Total Revenue	Expenditures	Transfer (Out)	Transfer In	Carryover
2008	\$427,004	\$220,594	\$13,895	\$234,489	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$234,489
2009	\$427,004	\$8,598	\$527	\$9,125	(\$18,263)	\$0	\$0	\$225,351
2010	\$427,004	\$31,404	\$1,637	\$33,041	(\$4,710)	\$0	\$0	\$253,682
2011	\$380,286	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$13,800)	\$0	\$380,286	\$620,168
2012	\$380,286	\$65,324	\$1,059	\$66,383	(\$113,403)	\$0	\$300,000	\$873,148
2013	\$680,786	\$0	\$118,604	\$118,604	(\$405,339)	\$0	\$47,000	\$633,413
2014	\$680,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$239,778)*	\$60,000	\$500,000	\$893,635*
2015	\$832,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$832,000)*	\$0	\$0	\$0*

*estimated amounts.

Recommended 2015 Budget and Levy

Budget: \$ 832,000
 Levy: \$ 0

Cost Share Program Detailed Budget:

<u>Budget</u>		
	<i>Planning and Policy Development</i>	
	Contracted Services	
	Survey/Data Collection	
	Engineering/Consulting	
	Equipment/Supplies	
	Meetings/Seminars	
	Maintenance Plan Dev.	\$1,000
	Legal	\$3,000
	Other/Miscellaneous	
	sub-total	\$4,000
	<i>Project/Program Implementation</i>	
	Training	\$1,000
	Contracted Services	\$60,000
	Project Management	
	Property or Easement Acquisition	
	Engineering	\$30,000
	Supplies/Equipment	
	Construction	
	Landscaping/restoration	
	Legal	\$20,000
	Meetings/Seminars	\$1,000
	Monitoring/Lab Analysis/Inventories	
	Other/Miscellaneous	
	Permit Research	
	Permit Acquisition	
	Operations/Maintenance	
	Grants/Awards/Loans Given	\$702,000
	sub-total	\$814,000
	<i>Communications-Education-Stakeholder Involvement</i>	
	Training	
	Supplies/Equipment	
	Meetings/Seminars	\$1,000
	Printing	\$10,000
	Publishing	
	Postage	\$2,000
	Dues/Subscriptions	
	Other/Miscellaneous	
	Computer Services	\$1,000
	Contracted Services	
	Engineering/Consulting	
	Legal	
	Construction	
	Teacher Stipend	
	Grants/Awards/Loans Given	
	sub-total	\$14,000
	Total	\$832,000

**Cost Share Grant Evaluation Form
Homeowner Grant**

Name of Reviewer: _____

Date Reviewed: _____

Applicant:

Project:

Amount Requested: Final Score: ____ /100

75% Funding	50% Funding	Need Further Development	Does Not Qualify
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Homeowner/Residential Grant: must be designed to produce greater public awareness of ways to improve water quality.

Organization Type:			
Are the Goals of Project Clearly Outlined?			
<u>/50</u>	<i>Project Design (50pts)</i>		
Notes:	/20	Water Resource Improvement to MCWD	
	/5	Innovative Design	
	/5	Budget Detail	
	/10	Entire Site Concept Design	
	/10	Maintenance Plan	
<u>/40</u>	<i>Education & Outreach (40 pts)</i>		
Notes:	/20	Outreach Techniques	
	/20	Visibility of Demonstration	
<u>/10</u>	<i>Water Resource Prioritization (10 pts)</i>		
Notes:	/5	Proximity to Focal Geography of MCWD Initiatives	
	/5	Proximity to Impaired Waterbody	
<u>/10</u>	<i>Shoreline/Streambank Restoration (10 pts)</i>		
Total: /110			
100 -90pts 75% Funding	The proposal is among the very best; it exceeds expectations in many areas, was very clearly presented, is an excellent match for this funding, and should be funded. Maximum 75% funding, up to \$2,500 BMP, \$5,000 shoreline/streambank		
89-75 pts 50% Funding	The proposal is generally strong and is a good match for this funding. If enough funding is available, this proposal should be funded. A few concerns might need to be addressed. 50% funding, up to \$2,500 BMP, \$5,000 shoreline/streambank		
74-50 pts Needs Further Development	The proposal has some strengths but also several problem areas. Areas of concern would need to be addressed before further consideration of funding for this proposal.		
49-0 pts Does Not Qualify	This proposal is quite weak in many of the important areas. Concerns preclude recommendation of funding for this proposal.		
<i>Reporting</i>	<p style="text-align: right;">*Required Annual Reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inspection Form - Description and location of outreach techniques used - Number of people engaged and educated on the project - Has the project and outreach initiated other efforts on improving water quality and awareness 		
Past History: Has the applicant applied before?			

Comments and Notes:

Cost Share 2015 Detailed Evaluation Criteria
Homeowner Grant Evaluation Criteria

Project Design- 50 Points

- Water Resource Improvement to MCWD (cost benefit)
 - o Proposed project captures greater than 50% of site runoff
 - o Reduces flow, promotes infiltration, reduces erosion
 - o Creates habitat and promotes pollinator plants
- Innovation- something we haven't funded before, innovative use of stormwater BMPs, first of its kind in the region/state, multi-functionality, re-use system
- Budget- Detailed cost estimate of project (construction and outreach efforts)
- Entire Site Concept Design- A concept diagram showing where all of the stormwater drains off the site
- Maintenance- having a detailed maintenance plan and recommended schedule

Education and Outreach- 40 Points

- Outreach Techniques
 - o Educational Signage
 - o Host an Event- block party, raingarden workshop, celebration with tour of BMPs onsite
 - o Innovative outreach techniques- use of social media, promotion of stormwater management
- Visibility of demonstration and Ed opportunities to the public
 - o Does the project encourage community involvement or community service by neighbors or other organizations

Water Resource Prioritization- 10 Points

- Proximity to Focal Geography of MCWD Initiatives
 - o How can the project complement other District initiatives/future projects
- Proximity to an impaired waterbody
 - o How does the project address impairments

Shoreline/Streambank Restoration- 10 Points

- Additional 10 points for biological and bioengineered shoreline/streambank projects, which are uniquely difficult and which the MCWD particularly wishes to encourage

Cost Share Grant Evaluation Form
Community Engagement Grant

Name of Reviewer:
 Date Reviewed:

Applicant:

Project:

Amount Requested: **Final Score:** ____ /100

75% Funding <input type="radio"/>	50% Funding <input type="radio"/>	Need Further Development <input type="radio"/>	Does Not Qualify <input type="radio"/>
---	---	--	--

Community Engagement Grant: must be designed to produce greater public awareness of ways to improve water quality. These projects use a stormwater BMP as a demonstration to educate the public to build community capacity to grow knowledge and support of stormwater management in the community.

Organization Type:			
Are the Goals of Project Clearly Outlined?			
/30		<i>Project Design (30pts)</i>	
Notes:	/10	Water Resource Improvement to MCWD	
	/5	Innovative Design	
	/5	Budget Detail	
	/10	Maintenance Plan	
/60		<i>Education & Outreach (60 pts)</i>	
Notes:	/20	Influence within Community	
	/25	Outreach Techniques	
	/10	Visibility of Demonstration	
	/5	Leveraging Other Grant Funds	
/10		<i>Water Resource Prioritization (10 pts)</i>	
Notes:	/5	Proximity to Focal Geography of MCWD Initiatives	
	/5	Proximity to Impaired Waterbody	
Total: /100			
100 -90pts 75% Funding	The proposal is among the very best; it exceeds expectations in many areas, was very clearly presented, is an excellent match for this funding, and should be funded. Maximum 75% funding, up to \$100,000 *project will need Board approval for funding requests over \$5,000 and a public hearing if funding request is over \$50,000		
89-75 pts 50% Funding	The proposal is generally strong and is a good match for this funding. If enough funding is available, this proposal should be funded. A few concerns might need to be addressed. 50% Funding, up to \$100,000 *project will need Board approval for funding requests over \$5,000 and a public hearing if funding request is over \$50,000		
74-50 pts Needs Further Development	The proposal has some strengths but also several problem areas. Areas of concern would need to be addressed before further consideration of funding for this proposal.		
49-0 pts Does Not Qualify	This proposal is quite weak in many of the important areas. Concerns preclude recommendation of funding for this proposal.		
<i>Reporting</i>	*Required for all Community Engagement projects, needed before phased reimbursement is released - Description and location of outreach techniques used - Number of people engaged and educated on the project - Has the project and outreach initiated other efforts on improving water quality and awareness - Opportunities for monitoring - Inspection Form		
Past History: Has the applicant applied before?			

Comments and Notes:

Cost Share 2015 Detailed Evaluation Criteria

Community Engagement Grant Evaluation Criteria

Project Design- 30 Points

- Water resource impact to MCWD (cost benefit)
 - o Proposed project captures greater than 50% of site runoff
 - o Reduces flow, promotes infiltration, reduces erosion
 - o Creates habitat and promotes pollinator plants
 - o Entire site design, with detailed breakdown of BMPs and correlating removals of each
- Innovation- something we haven't funded before, innovative use of stormwater BMPs, first of its kind in the region/state, multi-functionality, re-use system
- Budget- Detailed cost estimate of project (construction and outreach efforts)
- Maintenance- having a detailed maintenance plan and recommended schedule

Education and Outreach- 60 Points

- Influence within Community
 - o Delineating who within the organization will execute education and outreach efforts
 - o Partnerships
 - Schools, other organizations- establishing classroom curriculum around water quality education
 - Collaborations- working with other organizations on the same water quality project
 - o Community Capacity- Does the project encourage community involvement or service by local citizens?
- Outreach Techniques
 - o Educational Signage- Project specific/ Connections to other District Efforts
 - o Host an Event-utilizing partnerships to host an event that incorporates stormwater management awareness and creates a foundation for building community capacity to impact the problem of water pollution
 - o Innovative Outreach Techniques- Use of cutting edge technology, something we haven't funded before, first of its kind in the region/state, utilizing social media
- Visibility- How easily can passersby understand what the project is and how it works
- Leveraging other funds- is project utilizing other grant dollars or resources to accomplish project goals

Water Resource Prioritization- 10- Points

- Proximity to Focal Geography of MCWD Initiatives
 - o How can the project complement other District initiatives/future projects
- Proximity to an impaired waterbody
 - o How does project address impairments through BMPs or education

Reporting- Required for Community Engagement projects

- o Description of outreach techniques used and their location
- o Number of people educated and engaged on the project
- o Has the project and outreach initiated other efforts on improving water quality and awareness
- o Opportunities for monitoring
- o Inspection Report

**Cost Share Grant Evaluation Form
Green Infrastructure Grant**

Name of Reviewer:
Date Reviewed:

Applicant:

Project:

Amount Requested: Final Score: ____ /100

75% Funding <input type="radio"/>	50% Funding <input type="radio"/>	Need Further Development <input type="radio"/>	Does Not Qualify <input type="radio"/>
---	---	--	--

Green Infrastructure Grant: must result in greater natural resource improvements.

Organization Type:			
Are the Goals of Project Clearly Outlined?			
<u>/70</u>	<i>Project Design (70pts)</i>		
Notes:	/45	Water Resource Improvement to MCWD	
	/5	Innovative Design	
	/5	Budget Detail	
	/15	Maintenance Plan	
<u>/15</u>	<i>Education & Outreach (15 pts)</i>		
Notes:	/10	Outreach Techniques	
	/5	Visibility of Demonstration	
<u>/15</u>	<i>Water Resource Prioritization (15 pts)</i>		
Notes:	/5	Proximity to focal geography of MCWD initiatives	
	/10	Proximity to impaired waterbody	
Total: /100			
100 -90pts 75% Funding		The proposal is among the very best; it exceeds expectations in many areas, was very clearly presented, is an excellent match for this funding, and should be funded. Maximum 75% funding *project will need Board approval for funding requests over \$5,000 and a public hearing if funding request is over \$50,000	
89-75 pts 50% Funding		The proposal is generally strong and is a good match for this funding. If enough funding is available, this proposal should be funded. A few concerns might need to be addressed. 50% Funding *project will need Board approval for funding requests over \$5,000 and a public hearing if funding request is over \$50,000	
74-50 pts Needs Further Development		The proposal has some strengths but also several problem areas. Areas of concern would need to be addressed before further consideration of funding for this proposal.	
49-0 pts Does Not Qualify		This proposal is quite weak in many of the important areas. Concerns preclude recommendation of funding for this proposal.	
Reporting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inspection Report - Opportunities for monitoring 	
Past History: Has the applicant applied before?			

Comments and Notes:

Cost Share 2015 Detailed Evaluation Criteria
Green Infrastructure Grant Evaluation Criteria

Project Design – 70 points

- Focus on water quality improvements
 - o Cost benefit of project compared to past funded projects through the Low Impact Development program
 - o Entire site design, with matrix of pollutant removals for overall cost
 - o Soil Erosion Control
 - o Creates habitat and promotes pollinator plants
- Innovation- something we haven't funded before, innovative use of stormwater BMPs, first of its kind in the region/state, multi-functionality, re-use system
- Maintenance- having a detailed maintenance plan and recommended schedule
- Budget- Detailed cost estimate of project (construction and outreach efforts)

Education and outreach - 15 Points

- Monitoring benefits of project overtime
- Visibility of demonstration and education opportunities to engage the public
- Educational signage
- Events hosted to promote project

Water Resource Prioritization- 15 Points

- Proximity to Focal Geography of MCWD Initiatives
 - o How can the project complement other District initiatives/future projects
- Proximity to an impaired waterbody
 - o How does project address impairments through BMPs
 - o Prioritize impairments within subwatershed