

DATE: October 18, 2021

TO: Land & Water Conservation Board

FROM: Joanna Griffin, Runoff Management Grants Coordinator, WT/3

SUBJECT: Summary of Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water (UNPS) Management Program Planning Grant Scores – 2022 Funding Year

Section NR 155.19(2)(b), Wis. Adm. Code, lists the required key project components for sub-scores:

- a. Fiscal accountability and cost-effectiveness.
- b. Project evaluation and monitoring strategy.
- c. Evidence of local support and involvement.
- d. Consistency with department water basin priorities.
- e. Water quality need.
- f. Extent of pollutant control.
- g. Consistency of project with other resource management plans.
- h. Use of other funding sources.
- i. Application of the project to storm water requirements for the city of Racine.

In accordance with administrative code, UNPS Planning Grant application scores are based on the following competitive elements:

| | Max Points Available | (Max Points - Avg Points)/Total Points | Average Points 2022 Applications | Median Points 2022 Applications |
|---|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Project Purpose | | | | |
| 2-5. Extent of Pollution Control | 35 | 10% | 18.6 | 25 |
| Supporting Regulations (for new MS4s) | 8 | 4.8% | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Fiscal Accountability | | 9.9% | | |
| A. Timeline and Source of Staff | 10 | 1.1% | 8.2 | 9 |
| B. Financial Budget Table | 10 | 1.7% | 7.2 | 9 |
| D. Points for Additional Funding | 10 | 5.3% | 1.3 | 0 |
| E. Cost-Estimate Quality | 10 | 1.8% | 7.0 | 8 |
| 7. Project Evaluation | | 1.9% | | |
| Project Evaluation Strategy - Impact | 4 | 0.7% | 2.8 | 3 |
| Project Evaluation Strategy- Track Progress | 6 | 1.2% | 4.0 | 6 |
| 8. Water Quality Need | 30 | 2.1% | 26.6 | 30 |
| 9. Water Quality Need - Drinking Water Bonus | 7 | 2.6% | 2.7 | 1.8 |
| 10. Evidence of Local Support | | 4.3% | | |
| A. Government | 8 | 2.5% | 3.9 | 4.3 |
| B. Community | 8 | 1.8% | 5.0 | 6 |
| 11. Local Plan Consistency | 3 | 0.7% | 1.9 | 3 |
| 12. City of Racine | 1 | 0.6% | 0.0 | 0 |
| Total (without multiplier) | 150 | | 91.2 | 94.6 |
| Local Implementation Multiplier | 15 | 8.1% | 1.7 | 0.4 |
| Total (with Multiplier) | 165 | | 92.9 | 95.0 |

Applicants may score lower in some components but may not have the ability to improve scores in those sections because of location or permit status. Water quality need is one of the highest scoring components, and impaired waters receive the most points. Within the impaired water quality category, TMDLs receive the highest score. This is because a TMDL analysis provides additional information and



CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

helps target implementation. The application places equal importance on groundwater and surface water. Because the water quality need components are based on project location, applicants do not have the ability to modify those scores. See the Water Quality Need and the Drinking Water Bonus scoring tables below.

The MS4 questions are largely based on MS4 status, although scores can be improved by including more activities in the project scope. Most points (35) are awarded to new MS4 permittees, completing all planning activities needed to comply with their MS4 permit. Existing MS4 permittees in a TMDL area proposing to complete all activities required by their MS4 permit, including meeting TMDL requirements, are awarded 25 points. Within those categories, fewer points are awarded to MS4s that do not plan to complete all planning activities needed to comply with their permit. Applicants not covered by a MS4 permit and who voluntarily undertake one or more planning activities or applicants only completing a project categorized as “Information and Education” receive fewer points as well. Applicants can improve their scores by including all planning activities, not already in compliance, as part of the grant project or by completing all activities within the grant period. A summary of planning eligible planning activities is below.

There are other sections of the application form where applicants can provide better answers and improve their scores. The following components are areas of the application where many applicants have room to improve upon:

- Fiscal accountability
- Evidence of local support
- Local implementation multiplier

These areas have the largest percentage of the total (see table above). Increasing these scores will have a bigger impact than increasing the scores in other sections. In general, applicants should provide a clear and detailed budget. They can receive more points by asking for less than the funding cap (\$85,000) and less than the 50% cost-share rate. More points are awarded to projects if the local-share funds are already in an adopted budget. The timing of a municipal budget cycle does not always coincide with the grant cycle. Therefore, most applicants receive points for a proposed budget. Applicants will be awarded more points if they gathered letters of support from various types of stakeholders (citizen groups, community stakeholders, and municipal committees or councils).

The last part of the grant application provides an optional opportunity to obtain additional points based on program implementation. Permitted MS4s should already have these programs in place. Non-Permitted MS4s should provide documentation for those programs that are in place at the time of the application submittal date. Additional points will only be given if all activities (pollution prevention information and education program, tracking storm water construction and post-construction permitting activities, and nutrient management plan) are in effect and sufficient documentation was provided. We are proposing scoring clarifications in this section for the next cycle of UNPS planning grant applications.

Lastly, scores may increase or decrease, based on how the questions were answered. Some questions on the application forms require a narrative response and are more qualitative. Scores are based on the following: Was the question answered? To what extent was the question answered (i.e. how much detail was provided, were all components addressed, was the answer clear)?

| WATER QUALITY NEED SCORING | |
|---|---------------|
| Surface Water Categories | Points |
| EPA-Approved TMDL or DNR-approved TMDL and submitted to EPA | 30 |
| Wisconsin Statewide Nutrient Reduction Strategy – Top Watershed for Phosphorus | |
| Vulnerable Healthy Watersheds | |
| TMDL in Development | 25 |
| 303(d)/Impaired water listed for Total Suspended Solids (TSS) or Total Phosphorus (TP), caused by nonpoint source pollution | |
| Outstanding & Exceptional Water Resources (ORW/ERW) | |
| 303(d)/Impaired water listed for pollutant other than TSS/TP, caused by nonpoint source | 20 |
| Other Areas of Special Natural Resource Interest (ASNRI) | |
| Surface Water Quality | 10 |
| Groundwater Categories | Points |
| Exceeds Groundwater Enforcement Standard (ES) | 30 |
| Statewide Nutrient Reduction Strategy – Top Watershed for Nitrates | |
| Exceeds Groundwater Preventative Action Limit (PAL) | 25 |
| Groundwater Susceptible to Contamination by Ag NPS Pollutants | 10 |

| DRINKING WATER BONUS SCORING | |
|--|---------------|
| Drinking Water Bonus - Groundwater | Points |
| Wellhead protection area of a municipal well | 7 * |
| Within 1,200 feet of a municipal well for which a wellhead protection area is not delineated | |
| Within 1,200 feet of an "Other-Than-Municipal" water supply well | |
| Within 1,200 feet of a Non-Transient water supply well | |
| Within 200 feet of a Transient water supply well | 3 * |
| None of the above | 0 * |
| Drinking Water Bonus – Public Drinking Water Supply Source Water Assessment Areas | Points |
| Lake Winnebago | 7 * |
| Oak Creek | |
| Root River | |
| St. Louis and Nemadji Rivers | |
| Fish Creek | 6 * |
| Menominee River | |
| Milwaukee River | |
| Sauk Creek | |
| Sheboygan and Onion Rivers | |
| Twin Rivers | 5 * |
| Pike River and Pike Creek | |
| Kewaunee and Ahnapee Rivers | 3 * |
| Manitowoc River | |

ELIGIBLE PLANNING ACTIVITIES & DELIVERABLES

| Eligible Planning Activity | Urban Planning Deliverables |
|--|---|
| Urban Storm water/Erosion Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Storm water quality management plan for meeting developed urban area performance standards or TMDL allocations |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Storm sewer system map |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning and development of local programs for urban runoff control |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipal pollution prevention |
| Urban Stormwater Utility Formation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Storm water utility creation, update, or feasibility study |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation, update, or feasibility study of dedicated revenue source for storm water quality management program other than storm water utility. |
| Information & Education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information and education plan development |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information and education implementation |
| Storm water/ Erosion Control Ordinances | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post-construction storm water management ordinance |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erosion Control ordinance |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDDE Ordinance |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LID Ordinance |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other ordinance impacting the quality of runoff from urban areas |
| Other Urban Planning Activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligible urban planning activities other than those listed in this above in this column |