|  |
| --- |
| **A. Requesting Partner and Contact** |
| Partner Name | Project Contact | Contact Phone | Contact Email |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B. Project Information** |
| Project Name |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **C. Protocol or Technique** |
| ***[ ]*** SWA [ ]  Feasibility Study ***[ ]***  Street Sweeping Prioritization ***[ ]***  Base Data Generation ***[ ]***  Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Assessment Type: ***[ ]*** Urban [ ]  Rural/Agricultural ***[ ]*** *Combined*Urban/Rural |

|  |
| --- |
| **D. Gatekeeper Criteria – Please Review, Internalize, and Check** |
| [ ]  | **Priority Location:** The proposed activity is located in a priority location listed in the Implementation (See Table 5.1). |
| [ ]  | **Priority Activity:** The activity is listed as a high or medium priority for Watershed Based Implementation (See Section VI.E). |
| [ ]  | **Protocol:** The activity will follow established protocols (see notes below). |
| [ ]  | **Agreement*:*** Partner will enter into agreement with Chisago SWCD to provide services/product and meet deadlines in the agreement***.***  |

**Program Tracking**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Steering Committee** | **Chisago SWCD** |
| [ ]  Date: | [ ]  Date: |

**Protocol Notes:**

Gatekeeper Criteria (from CWMP Section VII.B. on page 95):

3. An analysis is complete and/or data are gathered to target and prioritize specific projects where they will have most benefit using the analyses components below\*; or the project is outside an area with a completed prioritization but has a similar cost benefit as a previously analyzed project and benefits the same water resource as the completed analysis. \*\*

\*Minimum components of targeting and prioritizing analyses (e.g., SWA (see sidebar on CWMP page 95), diagnostic study, feasibility study):

* Spatial analysis that includes pollutant delivery evaluation to the targeted waterbody
* Desktop analysis that includes historical aerial photo review
* Water quality modeling or monitoring for load reduction analysis
* Field evaluation for BMP feasibility and potential
* Cost benefit analysis completed in two ways. First, based on amount of WBIFs/pound total phosphorus removed, and second based on the total project cost/pound total phosphorus removed, both annualized for the anticipated life of the project based on accepted standards (The first calculation would be important if a project includes significant funding partners. For instance, in the case of some very large projects, such as urban retrofits, a private entity or local government may contribute significant funds. In those cases, the cost benefit to state taxpayers contributing to WBIFs would be much lower than the cost benefit of the total project.)

Sweeping plans will be developed utilizing GIS with the following steps: 1. identify direct drainage to priority catchments, 2. Identify current sweeping frequency in the direct drainage catchments, 3. Identify canopy cover density (low, medium, high) based on tree canopy assessment protocol, 4. Identify increased sweeping frequency in late spring, early summary and fall in medium and high-density canopy cover areas directly draining to priority water resources, 4. Produce color coded street maps that indicate sweeping frequencies in late spring, early summer, and fall; summarize recommended enhanced sweeping curb miles, and identify total cost estimate for implementing enhanced street sweeping.