

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
Can score points for #1 or #2, but not both.			
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			20 / 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