



Nine Mile Creek Discovery Point  
12800 Gerard Drive  
Eden Prairie, MN 55346  
(952) 835-2078  
[ninemilecreek.org](http://ninemilecreek.org)

## MEMO

**TO:** Nine Mile Creek Board of Managers  
**FROM:** Erica Sniegowski, Program and Project Manager  
Lauren Foley, Permit and Water Resources Coordinator  
**DATE:** November 13, 2019  
**RE:** Cost Share Program Updates and Request for Discussion

### Background

The District initiated a cost share program ([ninemilecreek.org/grants](http://ninemilecreek.org/grants)) in 2008. Since that time, the District has awarded approximately 200 grants. Staff continually evaluate programs for areas of improvement. Some of the recent updates to the cost share program include:

- Including the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) as part of the residential grant review process (2015)
- Allowing reimbursement of native cultivars in stormwater best management practices (2016)
- Implementing a cost share inspection program (2016)
- Increasing grant award amounts (2018)
- Implementing lifetime caps on the grant dollars per site (2018)
- Requiring a 50% match (versus 25%) for buckthorn removal and native restoration grants (2018)

Recent feedback from board, staff and the CAC has made it evident that the cost share application and review process needed to be evaluated. Inconsistent applications have made it difficult for the review committees to compare and review applications. Since the cost share application has never had a major redesign, staff is creating new applications. The new applications include project type specific forms (i.e. raingardens forms) that will lead applicants step by step through the required materials for submission. This should lead to better consistency between applications and reviewers being able to compare the applications with more ease. The CAC will review the new forms and provide comments to staff before the applications are used for the 2020 grant round.

For residential projects, starting in 2020, a sub-committee of the CAC will review the applications and provide recommendations to the board instead of the full CAC.

Staff are also creating an application evaluation worksheet to assist grant reviewers in ranking applications in a consistent manner. The worksheet will incorporate priority ranking of projects, which has not been used in the past. To create the priority ranking, staff examined the past restoration and shoreline buffer grants from 2012-2019 to better understand the characteristics of the projects that were being funded and not funded by the District.

### Request

Staff requests that the board review the attached Draft Cost Share Grant Evaluation Worksheet in order to discuss at the **December** board meeting the priority rankings included in the worksheet, specifically the:

- Priority ranking of buffer widths
- Priority ranking of projects on lakes, wetlands and Nine Mile Creek (over projects on constructed [stormwater ponds](#))
- Priority ranking of restoration projects based on size and percent of property restored

Finally, staff would like to recommend that a sub-committee is formed of two board members, CAC members and staff to discuss whether the District should have restoration grants as a separate grant track and how this would be implemented.

### **Attachments**

- Buffer Cost Share Metrics 2012-2019
- Restoration Cost Share Metrics 2012-2019
- Cost Share Grant Evaluation Worksheet (Draft)

Buffer Cost Share Metrics 2012-2019

Type	Year	Funding Status	Waterbody	Width (feet)	Length (feet)	Total (sq ft)
Residential	2019	Funded	Lake Cornelia	30	60	2755
Residential	2019	Funded	Lake Cornelia	5.5	65	358
Residential	2019	Funded	Lake Cornelia	4	81	324
Residential	2018	Funded	Knoll Pond	9	64	840
Residential	2018	Funded	Birchcrest Pond	10	82	820
Residential	2018	Funded	Lake Cornelia	25	90	2250
Residential	2018	Funded	Lake Nancy	5	11	55
Residential	2017	Funded	East Bay Pond	12.5	134	1700
Residential	2017	Funded	Knoll Pond	10	100	1000
Residential	2017	Funded	Lake Cornelia	9	70	630
Residential	2015	Funded	Nine Mile Creek	50	86	4500
Residential	2014	Funded	Knoll Pond	8	120	960
Residential	2013	Funded	Penn Lake	6	72	432
Residential	2013	Funded	Bristol Pond	8	150	1200
Residential	2013	Funded	Birchcrest Pond	6	81	486
Residential	2012	Funded	Junction Road Pond	20	60	1200
Residential	2012	Funded	Bristol Pond	50	90	4500
Residential	2014	Not Funded	Hawkes Lake	?	?	?
			<b>Average</b>	13.6		
Association	2019	Funded	pond	20	200	4000
Association	2017	Funded	pond	3	150	450
Association	2017	Funded	pond	15	115	1725
Association	2012	Funded	wetland	15	400	6000
Association	2019	Not Funded	stormwater pond	4	335	1340
Association	2018	Not Funded	stormwater pond	?	?	450
			<b>Average</b>	13.25		
Nonprofit	2016	Funded	East Bay Pond	50	150	8000
Nonprofit	2015	Funded	East Bay Pond	55	175	10000
Nonprofit	2014	Funded	wetland	5	250	1250
Nonprofit	2014	Funded	East Bay Pond	55	175	10000
Nonprofit	2013	Funded	Bush Lake	14.5	760	11000
City	2019	Funded	Lake Cornelia	30	3,993	119,790
			<b>Average</b>	34.9		

Restoration Cost Share Metrics 2012-2019

Type	Year	Funding Status	Adjacent to waterbody?	property size (acres)	property area restored (acres)	property area restored (%)
Residential	2019	Not Funded	no	0.36	0.02	5.17
Residential	2019	Funded	yes-wetland	0.33	0.10	31.30
Residential	2019	Funded	no	0.50	0.14	27.55
Residential	2018	Funded	yes-wetland	0.99	0.25	25.51
Residential	2018	Funded	no-wetland downhill	0.51	0.14	28.36
Residential	2018	Funded	wetland	0.41	0.09	21.00
Residential	2018	Funded	no	0.33	0.02	6.96
Residential	2017	Not Funded	no	0.78	0.02	2.56
Residential	2017	Funded	no	0.27	0.05	18.71
Residential	2016	Funded	no- wetland downhill	0.57	0.35	61.22
Residential	2016	Not Funded	no		0.00	?
Residential	2015	Funded	no	1.12	0.14	12.30
Residential	2015	Funded	yes- wetland	1.14	0.28	24.17
Residential	2014	Not Funded	yes- nine mile creek	0.35	0.07	19.68
Residential	2014	Funded	no- wetland across the street	0.51	0.05	10.35
Residential	2014	Funded	yes- wetland	1.14	0.41	36.25
Residential	2014	Funded	yes- Lake Rose	0.94	0.34	36.63
<b>Average</b>					<b>0.18</b>	<b>26.06</b>

Association	2019	Funded	yes- wetland	7.82	1.50	19.18
Association	2018	Funded	no	5.96	2.50	41.95
Association	2018	Funded	yes- wetland	7.82	1.50	19.18
Association	2016	Funded	yes- glen lake	5.89	0.03	0.58
Association	2016	Funded	yes-wetlands	15.95	0.14	0.86
<b>Average</b>					<b>1.13</b>	<b>16.35</b>

City	2018	Funded	Mud Lake	6.34	0.5	7.89
Nonprofit	2017	Funded	no	5.56	1.03	18.53
Nonprofit	2017	Funded	Hawkes Lake	7.39	0.04	0.54
Nonprofit	2017	Funded	Hawkes Lake	7.39	0.16	2.17
City	2017	Not Funded	yes- Nine Mile Creek		?	?
Business	2016	Funded	no	32	3	9.38
City	2016	Funded	yes- Nine Mile Creek	25	0.6	2.40
City	2016	Funded	yes- wetland drains to Lake Rose	0.44	0.4	90.91
City	2015	Funded	yes- Nine Mile Creek	402	7.3	1.82
Business	2013	Funded	yes- Lake Smetana		?	?
Nonprofit	2018	Funded	yes- Bush Lake	4.21	0.5	11.88
<b>Average</b>					<b>1.50</b>	<b>16.17</b>



Nine Mile Creek Discovery Point  
 12800 Gerard Drive  
 Eden Prairie, MN 55346  
 (952) 835-2078  
 ninemilecreek.org

## COST SHARE GRANT EVALUATION WORKSHEET

### Purpose and Instructions

*Purpose:* This document provides uniform criteria for grant review and a record of individual reviews. Late applications are not accepted and will not be passed on to the review panel.

*Instructions for reviewer:* Fill in all applicable yellow fields for the grant application you are reviewing. Scores and notes will be used in the group review panel.

### Application Information

Name of Applicant or Organization:	
Address and City:	
Project Cost: \$	Amount Requested: \$

### Project Type

Circle one: Residential    Townhome/Condo/Lake Association    City/Commercial/Nonprofit

Circle one: Raingarden/Swale    Pervious Paver    Chloride    Restoration    Buffer    Other

### Eligibility Pre-Screening

- Are all the core application questions completed?.....Yes/No
- Are all project forms included?.....Yes/No
- Are all project forms completed?.....Yes/No

*If any of the above questions answered No, stop evaluation here.*

### Project Quality Part 1

Instructions: Rate all questions on a 0-2 scale.

- How satisfactory is the level of detail in the project application?   
\*0 is Very Unsatisfactory, 2 is Very Satisfactory
- How well does the project use/build partnerships or provide educational value?   
\*0 is Low, 2 is High
- How much visibility does the project provide for water or ecological stewardship, the District, or the cost share program?   
\*0 is Low, 2 is High
- How reasonable is the timeline and budget for the proposed work?   
\*0 is Unreasonable, 2 is Very Reasonable

Average score for Part 1 (sum of assigned points/4)	_____ /4 = _____
---	------------------

## Project Quality Part 2: Complete the table for the applicable project type.

### Shoreline Buffer

Project Type	Answer / Point value	Point Value Assigned
Does the project buffer a wetland, lake, or Nine Mile Creek?	No / 0 points Yes / 1 point	
Average Buffer Width (outward from water) for <u>residential projects</u>	0-4.9 feet / 0 points 5-9.9 feet / 1 point 10-16.4 feet / 2 points 16.5+ feet / 3 points	
Average Buffer Width (outward from water) for <u>other projects</u> : association, nonprofit, business, city projects	0-16.4 feet / 0 points 16.5-29.9 feet / 1 point 30-49.9 feet / 2 points 50+ feet / 3 points	
Average score for table (sum of assigned points/3)		_____/3 = _____

### Raingarden

Question	Answer / Point value	Point Value Assigned
Does the project capture water that would otherwise drain to a water resource via overland flow or a storm drain?	No / 0 points Yes / 1 point	
What is the source of runoff water?	Roof and/or green space / 0 points Roof or green space <u>and</u> impervious surfaces / 1 Impervious surfaces only / 2	
What amount of water is rain garden capturing?	>0-0.33 inch/ 0 points 0.34-0.66 inches / 1 point 0.67-0.99 inches / 2 points 1+ inches / 3 points	
Average Score for table (sum of assigned points/3)		_____/3 = _____

### Restoration

Question	Answer / Point value	Point Value Assigned
Does the project border a wetland, lake, or Nine Mile Creek?	No / 0 points Yes / 1 point	
What is the percent property area restored?	0-5% / 0 points 6-20% / 1 point 21-34% / 2 points 35%+ / 3 points	
<u>Residential Projects</u> : What is the size of the restoration?	0-0.02 acres / 0 points >0.02-0.5 acres / 1 point 0.5-1 acres / 2 points 1+ acres / 3 points	
<u>All Other Projects</u> (association, nonprofit, business, city): What is the size of the restoration?	0-0.1 acres / 0 points 0.11-1 acres / 1 point 1-3 acres / 2 points 3+ acres / 3 points	
Average score for table (sum of assigned points/3)		_____/3 = _____

*Pervious Pavers/Pavement*

Question	Answer / Point Value	Point Value Assigned
What size rainfall runoff will the practice reduce from the property?	>0-0.33 inch/ 0 points 0.34-0.66 inches / 1 point 0.67-0.99 inches / 2 points 1+ inches / 3 points	
What is the source of runoff water?	Roof and/or green space / 0 points Roof or green space <u>and</u> impervious surfaces / 1 Impervious surfaces only / 2	
Average score for table (sum of assigned points/2)		_____/2 = _____

*Chloride Reduction*

Criteria	Answer / Point Value	Point Value Assigned
Anticipated % decrease of chloride	0-5% / points >5-10% / 1 point >10% / 2 points	
What % of the chloride reduction will be in NMCWD?	0-10% / 0 points 11-50% / 1 point 51-100% / 2 points	
Average score for table (sum of assigned points/2)		_____/2 = _____

**Score Summary**

Section	Section Point Subtotal
Project Quality Part 1 (Average score)	
Project Quality Part 2 (Average score)	
	<b>Total:</b> _____

**Preparation for Review Panel**

On the following page, record any questions, concerns, or recommendations you would like to discuss during the group review panel. Please comment on the applicant's level of understanding of maintenance and willingness to undertake needed maintenance on the project.

Review panel discussion items: