

## Appendix A: Prioritization Criteria and Rating System

### Priority Criteria:

1. Size (large to small)
2. Water quality (low to high)
3. Aesthetics and nuisance abatement
4. Shoreline owner involvement (high to low)
5. Public access and use (high to low)

### Rating System:

Table 1

Size	Points Awarded	Water Quality	Points Awarded
Large (10+ acres)	4	303(d) Impaired Waters List	4
Medium (5-10 acres)	3	Drains directly to impaired water or a water body which meets water quality goals and is in protection mode	3
Small (2.5-5 acres)	2	Data shows that water body does not meet applicable state or watershed water quality goals	2
Tiny (1-2.5 acres)	1	No data	0

Using Table 1, determine the number of points given to a water body by adding the points awarded for size and points awarded for water quality status. Ponds that are less than one acre will not be eligible for management by the city. Use the total points to find the service level from Table 2.

Table 2

Service Level	Points Required
High	7-8
Medium	5-6
Low	3-4
None	0-2

The service level of the water body may be raised one level based on:

- forming a lake group or association with 50% or more of the shoreline owners participating, or
- providing significant public access and use

Water bodies may only move up one category, even if they have both association and public access.

### Water Quality Standards:

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has set lake water quality goals for total phosphorus (TP), chlorophyll-a (Chl-a), and Secchi depth readings. Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) strives to meet those goals, or more lake-specific goals set using their water quality model. Nine Mile Creek Watershed District has set water quality goals for each of their four management levels. In cases where a specific lake or pond has not been categorized by the watershed district, the MPCA water quality standard will be used. Secchi disc readings and samples must be collected and analyzed for TP and Chl-a at least eight times over a season (April through October). Samples collected more frequently

than one every two weeks will not be considered one of the required eight. Water quality data that is more than 15 years old will not be used for this ratings system.

Table 3

	MPCA and MCWD (MCWD model goals may vary, site-specific goals will overrule general goals)		Nine Mile Creek Watershed District			
	Shallow (< 15 feet deep, ≥ 80% littoral)	Deep	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV
TP (mg/L)	≤ 60	≤ 40	≤ 45	45-75	75-105	> 105
Chl-a (mg/L)	≤ 20	≤ 14	≤ 20	20-40	40-60	> 60
Secchi disc depth (meters)	> 1	> 1.4	≥ 2.0	1.0-2.0	0.6-1.0	< 0.5
TSI*			≤ 50	51-60	61-70	> 71

\*TSI = Trophic State Index, determined by levels of TP, Chl-a, and Secchi depth readings.

**Examples:**

1. A 303(d) Impaired Water, 2.5 acre pond:  
 Size = Small, 2 points  
 Water quality = 4 points  
 Total points = 6  
 Initial service level = Medium

Formation of a lake association with more than 50% of shoreline owners participating would raise the service level to High.

2. A 1.5 acre pond, no water quality data:  
 Size = Tiny, 1 point  
 Water quality = No data, 0 points  
 Total points = 1 point  
 Initial service level = None

Formation of a lake association with more than 50% of shoreline owners participating would raise the service level to Low.

3. A 6 acre pond, no water quality data  
 Size = Medium, 3 points  
 Water quality = No data, 0 points  
 Initial service level = Low

In this case, if a shoreline owner wanted to collect water quality data, and that data showed that the water body did not meet the goals, the total points would rise to 5 and the service level to Medium. If shoreline owners then established a lake association, the service level would rise to High.

4. A 4 acre pond, no water quality data, with significant public use  
 Size = Small, 2 points  
 Water quality = No data, 0 points  
 Total = 2 points  
 + Public use (raise one level from None)

Initial service level = Low

Formation of a lake association would not raise the service level for the pond as will be raised due to public use. Collecting data that shows the water body does not meet water quality goals would add 2 points, which would bring the base service level to Low. The public use would then raise it to Medium.

**Appendix B: Management Service Levels**

Service Level	City-funded activities						Additional Elective Services*		
	Whole lake algae treatment (as permitted/required)	Invasive aquatic plant treatment	Lake study (up to 2 lakes per year)	Aquatic vegetation treatment for public recreation	City staff support (see list)	DNR Permits and Facilitation	Aquatic vegetation management	Alternative methods	DNR permits and facilitation
High	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Medium	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Low	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
None	At City's discretion, lowest priority						No	No	No

Any individual property owner may perform aquatic plant treatment in front of their property.

With 50% shoreline owner agreement, groups can perform whole-pond treatments without city funding or participation.

**All DNR and other regulations apply.**

City staff support activities:

- Association/group formation
- Education
- Facilitate data collection
- Facilitate group projects
- Technical resource

Alternative methods:

All alternative methods (such as barley straw, floating treatment wetlands, etc.) are elective services. There may be some cost share available from the city.

\*Cost of elective services are special assessed to property tax bill. This option requires a lake association as described in the policy.

## Appendix C: Prioritization List

The water bodies below have been assessed based on the stated criteria. The list is not comprehensive, and more water bodies may be added. Water bodies may be reclassified using updated information.

### Size Categories:

1. Large (10+ acres)
  - Lake Cornelia
  - Mud Lake
  - Lake Edina
  - Mirror Lake
  - Arrowhead Lake
  - Indianhead Lake
  - Highlands Lake
  
2. Medium (5-10 acres)
  - Otto Pond
  - Melody Lake
  - Lake Pamela
  - Hawkes Lake
  - Harvey Lake
  - Swimming Pool Pond
  - Long Brake Trail Pond
  - Lake Nancy
  - Point of France Pond
  - Creek Valley
  - Unnamed (near Parkwood & Knoll)
  - Unnamed (Schaefer & Harold Woods)
  
3. Small (2.5-5 acres)
  - Cote Pond
  - Unnamed (near Nine Mile Village Townhomes)
  - Unnamed (south of Cote & Long Brake Tr)
  - Birchcrest Pond
  - South Pond
  - Hyde Park Pond
  - West Garrison Pond
  - Unnamed (south of Mirror Lake)
  - Unnamed (Blake Rd & Knoll Dr)
  - Annaway Pond
  
4. Tiny (1-2.5 acres)
  - Many
5. Less than 1 acre
  - All others

## Water Quality Categories:

1. 303(d) Impaired Waters List
  - Lake Cornelia
  - Lake Edina
2. Drains to an Impaired Water
  - Lake Nancy
  - Lake Pamela
  - Swimming Pool Pond
  - O'Shaunessy Pond
3. Data shows water body does not meet water quality goal
  - Lake Arrowhead
  - Melody Lake (?)
  - Others?
4. No data, or data does not show that the water body does not meet the water quality goal
  - All others

## Public Access:

1. Public Access and Use:
  - Lake Cornelia
  - Lake Pamela
  - Mud Lake
  - Highlands Lake
  - Creek Valley Pond
  - Forslin Pond
2. Private
  - All others

## Shoreline Owner Involvement:

\* no official lake associations or groups have been formed as of 2/24/14; this list informally includes water bodies that stakeholder participants live on and may form groups in the future.

- Lake Pamela
- Cote
- Melody
- Between Danen's Dr and Nob Hill Dr
- Garrison
- Harvey Lake
- Lake Nancy
- Arrowhead Lake
- Lake Cornelia
- Porter Pond
- Birchcrest
- Hyde Park Pond
- Indianhead Lake
- Hawkes Lake
- Otto Pond

**Appendix D:  
Prioritization Chart**

The prioritization list is not comprehensive, and more water bodies may be added. Water bodies may be reclassified using updated information.

Water Body	Size				Water Quality				Increased Service Level			
	Tiny 1	Small 2	Medium 3	Large 4	No data 0	Data showing water body does not meet goals 2	Drains directly to a 303(d) Impaired Water 3	303(d) Impaired Waters List 4	Total Points	Public access and use - raise one service level	50% shoreline owner involvement - raise one service level	Service Level
Lake Cornelia				4				4	8	Yes		High
Mud Lake				4					4	Yes		Low
Lake Edina				4				4	8			High
Mirror Lake				4					4			Low
Arrowhead Lake				4		2			6		Yes*	High
Indianhead Lake				4	0				4		Yes*	Medium
Highlands Lake				4					4	Yes		Medium
Otto Pond			3		0				3			Low
Melody Lake			3			2			5		Yes*	High
Lake Pamela			3				3		6	Yes		High
Hawkes Lake			3		0				3			Low
Harvey Lake			3		0				3			Low
Swimming Pool Pond			3				3		6			Medium
Long Brake Trail Pond			3		0				3			Low
Lake Nancy			3				3		6			Medium
Point of France Pond			3		0				3			Low
Creek Valley			3		0				3			Low
Unnamed (near Parkwood & Knoll)			3		0				3			Low
Unnamed (Schaefer & Harold Woods)			3		0				3			Low
Cote Pond		2			0				2			None
Unnamed (near Nine Mile Village Townhomes)		2			0				2			None
Unnamed (south of Cote & Long Brake Tr)		2			0				2			None
Birchcrest Pond		2			0				2			None
South Pond		2			0				2			None

**Appendix D:  
Prioritization Chart**

The prioritization list is not comprehensive, and more water bodies may be added. Water bodies may be reclassified using updated information.

Water Body	Size				Water Quality				Increased Service Level			
	Tiny	Small	Medium	Large	No data	Data showing water body does not meet goals	Drains directly to a 303(d) Impaired Water	303(d) Impaired Waters List	Total Points	Public access and use - raise one service level	50% shoreline owner involvement - raise one service level	Service Level
Hyde Park Pond		2			0				2			None
West Garrison Pond		2			0				2			None
Unnamed (south of Mirror Lake)		2			0				2			None
Unnamed (Blake Rd & Knoll Drive)		2			0				2			None
Annaway Pond		2			0				2			None