

## ***FY2010-2011 Performance Management***

***Mission: The mission of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency is to work with Minnesotans to protect, conserve, and improve our environment and enhance our quality of life.***

### ***Visions:***

**Vision 1:** Minnesotans Take Responsibility to Protect Our Environment

**Vision 2:** Minnesota's Air Is Clean and Clear

**Vision 3:** Minnesota's Land Supports Healthy Ecosystems and Sustainable Land Uses

**Vision 4:** Minnesota Has Clean, Sustainable Surface and Ground Water

**Vision 5:** Excellence in Operations

### **GOALS:**

#### **Vision 1**

**Goal 1:** Minnesotans buy green products and services.

**Goal 2:** Minnesota businesses produce green products and provide green services by reducing or eliminating the use of environmentally harmful substances.

**Goal 3:** Minnesotans act on their environmental knowledge to support healthy ecosystems.

**Goal 4:** MPCA leads the way to minimize its environmental footprint and assist other public entities to do the same.

#### **Vision 2**

**Goal 1:** Minnesota's outdoor air quality will meet or improve upon all environmental and human health-related federal and state ambient air quality standards.

**Goal 2:** Minnesota's outdoor air quality will meet environmental and human health benchmarks for toxic and other air pollutants.

**Goal 3:** Minnesota reduces its contribution to regional, national, and global air pollution.

#### **Vision 3**

**Goal 1:** Ensure solid waste is managed to conserve materials, resources, and energy.

#### **Vision 4**

**Goal 1:** Assess the condition of Minnesota's ground water systems and provide information on the effectiveness of Best Management Practices to assist the Agency's efforts to prevent and reduce degradation of ground water and support ground water conservation.

**Goal 2:** Assess the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of Minnesota's lakes, streams, and wetlands to identify if designated uses are being met, and provide information on the condition of waters.

**Goal 3:** Protect and improve the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of Minnesota's lakes, streams, and wetlands.

#### **Vision 5**

**Goal 1:** Provide a safe and healthy workplace for all employees, volunteers, and visitors.

**Goal 2:** Manage agency operations to support the agency's environmental work and core operations in an effective and efficient manner.

**Goal 3:** Achieve excellence through application of appropriate tools and best practices.

**Goal 4:** Provide a reliable information management system that supports the agency and its partners in effective and efficient environmental work.

**Goal 5:** Maintain the agency's capacity to recognize and address emerging issues that fall within the agency's authority.

**Goal 2:** Minimize or reduce the release of contaminants to or from the land.

**Goal 3:** Restore land to productive use by managing risk from contaminated sites.

***Vision: Minnesotans Take Responsibility to Protect Our Environment***

**Goal R.1 Minnesotans buy green products and services.**

**Objective R1a) By January 1, 2013, provide green building assistance targeted at new or substantially reconstructed buildings to achieve a 25 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions using 2003 as a baseline.**

<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
1.1	EACM State = \$0.174 M compensation (comp)	Green building program working to educate builders, remodelers, suppliers, and designers to expand green buildings in MN. Also partnering with U of M Center for Sustainable Building Research and active in MN chapter of U.S. Green Building Council.	Select most effective measurement options to track effectiveness by October 1, 2009. Analyze if greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from buildings are possible at state level by October 1, 2009.	Efforts include Sustainable Communities (GreenStep Cities, GreenCorps and School sectors), Sustainable Businesses (SBEAP and MNTAP), and Transportation (VMTs and cleaner cars)
			MPCA grant for development of renewable energy curriculum for architect/design professionals; Train 1,400 professionals through re-ARCH offering ( <a href="http://www.research.umn.edu/index.html">http://www.research.umn.edu/index.html</a> )	Online training available through University of Minnesota. Seven factsheets developed.
			MPCA technical assistance support of Minnesota GreenStar Certified Green Homes and Remodeling program – a green building standard and certification program for existing and new homes. ( <a href="http://www.mngreenstar.org">http://www.mngreenstar.org</a> )	Presentations and connections from experts in the field. Energy to clean water for homes to buildings.
			MPCA grant supporting creation of Zero Emission Design/Carbon for use by design professionals to calculate the carbon impact Calculator of building design	Carbon calculator completed by University of Minnesota and available as downloadable spreadsheet. ( <a href="http://www.csbr.umn.edu/research/carboncalc.html">http://www.csbr.umn.edu/research/carboncalc.html</a> )
			Increase demand for green building through the Living Green Expo and the EcoExperience's EcoHouse by 15 percent by June 30, 2011	Living Green Expo moved to 3 <sup>rd</sup> party management Spring 2010. Have follow up survey to building experts on use. Data available in Summer 2011
			Partner with Minnesota Building Officials (ICC/AMBO) to offer green building courses. Train 100 local government officials each year about LEED and the MN Sustainable Building (B3) Guidelines.	Local Government: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided three full days of sustainable building topics training at the annual Region III ICC/AMBO Educational Institute this February. Total of 111 attendees over three days of green building sessions. Attendees registered separately for each day with six tracks to choose from.</li> <li>• USGBC-MN Sustainable Communities Forums –gave a presentation at one forum this past year. Trained 25 per forum with</li> </ul>

			<p>Train 700 building contractors and utility reps each year. Train 200 builders and remodelers to reduce construction waste used and generated in residential construction.</p>	<p>three forums this past year, for a total of 75 local government officials trained. Another forum is scheduled in April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CERTs presentation about MN GreenCorps local government energy conservation program – 100 attendees. Perhaps 25 were local government related. Perhaps another 25 were building related.</li> </ul> <p>Builders/Remodelers &amp; Utility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MN GreenStar member meeting, where Laura gave presentation to 25 builders/remodelers.</li> <li>• 205 at four Smart Remodeling workshops last May-June</li> <li>• Smart Remodeling workshop at Duluth Energy Design Conference had 75 registered, bad snowstorm reduced actual attendance to 50.</li> <li>• Two more Smart Remodeling workshops are planned for April 2011 in St. Paul and Brainerd.</li> <li>• Over 200 builders and remodelers trained at the green building/sustainability sessions we pushed to include at the Duluth Energy Design Conference and Expo.</li> </ul>
			<p>Build org. capacity with Mississippi Headwaters Chapter of the US Green Building Council and the Minnesota Green Communities Initiative.</p>	<p>Conducted a survey of intended change in behavior based on the Smart Remodeling Workshops. Participants reported that they intend to change their behavior and practice related to Smart Remodeling pollution prevention practices, with the following 10 items showing an average positive change of more than 1 point on a 5 point scale: testing-in and testing-out (detailed home performance analyses, both before &amp; after renovations) , using blower door tests at beginning and end of a project, evaluating combustion safety, identifying pollutant sources, using a whole-house system approach, integrating building performance with a green building checklist, evaluating ventilation, suggesting air-sealing to residential clients, and using past utility bills to assist with a project.</p> <p>63 remodelers signed up to provide us with remodeling project data on pollution prevention practices during the next year. In the initial phase of obtaining the information.</p>

**Objective R1b) By January 1, 2012, each household participating in a collection program produces 15 percent less household hazardous waste than in 2005.**

FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
	EACM State = \$1.2 M in grants to counties	Household Hazardous Waste Program (HHW) – education program, state contract auditing	<p>Increase participation in the HHW Program collection efforts. This will initially result in an increase of items brought to the collection sites as citizens remove them from their homes.</p> <p>Part II (R1b) involves educating citizens through the implementation of a marketing-based outreach effort. Educating the public about better purchasing choices should result in a decrease in volume per household. Expect greater than 60 Counties participating in Marketing based efforts by the end of FY 2011.</p>	<p>Developed a HHW marketing toolkit in July 2010 for a variety of media formats for the county household hazardous waste programs to customize to reflect their specific areas of emphasis.</p> <p>Developed a standardized database to track and report progress of these efforts. The database became operational in late June 2009.</p> <p>Report on calendar year – June 2011 should be first results reporting.</p>

**Objective R1c) By January 1, 2013, state and local governments increase the purchase of environmentally preferable products and services by 30 percent over 2006 levels.**

2.2	EACM State = \$0.282 M comp	The Environmentally Preferable Purchasing (EPP) Program promotes the procurement of goods and services that have the least impact on human health and the environment. Major activities include: 1) increasing availability of environmentally preferable products and services on state contract; 2) developing EPP tools (i.e. online EPP guide); 3) providing EPP assistance to public entities (i.e. workshops, pilot projects, research); and 4) working with Admin. to disseminate EPP related purchasing information.	This objective is measured by the value of environmentally preferable products available on state contracts based upon the following data: 2006 Level = \$286,725,261; 30% of 2006 level = \$86,017,578;  2013 Goal = \$372,742,839; <b>FY10-11 Goal = \$329,734,050</b>	Track the purchase of recycled content paper on state contract, dollars spent on environmentally preferable state contracts and percentage green spend on designated contracts.  We will also report percentage “green spend” on contracts that handful of vendors (i.e. Grainger), but we will track total spend vs. green spend. Currently, this type of tracking is only done by a work with MMD on requiring this type of reporting in future contracts.
3.3	EACM State = \$0.456 M compensation EACM State = \$1.2 M local assistance	<b>R1 TOTAL</b>		
<b>Goal R.2 Minnesota businesses produce green products and provide green services by reducing or eliminating the use of environmentally harmful substances.</b>				
<b>Objective R2a) By 2013 the amount of problem materials in the mixed municipal waste stream will be reduced by 20 percent from 1999 levels.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
1  0.9	Land State = \$0.182 M comp Land State = \$0.024 M operating	1. CFL Program and Fluorescent Light Programs	Lamps collected by HHW facilities - Minimum Projected 2010-2011, based on NEMA estimates of lamps available for recovery and current recovery trends:	Lbs of targeted problem materials removed from waste stream. • GTLO Tackle Exchange Program <b>ended 12/31/09</b> – Total pounds of lead collected from 2001 (inception) through 12/31/09 = 8,000 lbs.

9.2	EACM Fed = \$0.124 M comp EACM State = \$1.465 M comp EACM State = \$1.136 M operating EACM State = \$31.216 M local assistance (\$29M SCORE) EACM State = \$0.370 M loans	2. E-Waste Program	880,000 CFLs; 1,295,000 Other FLs. 33 million Lbs removed in first program year (FY08). For FY2010 and FY2011 it is estimated that there will be 20 – 25 million Lbs per year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MFZ Program <b>ended 12/31/09</b> – Total pounds of mercury recycled from inception of the program = 1,908 lbs.</li> <li>Mercury Switch Recovery efforts: CY2007 – 147.3 lbs Hg recovered; CY08 – 170.2 lbs Hg recovered ; CY09 – 99.2 lbs Hg recovered; CY2010 through 6/30 – 29.3 lbs Hg recovered.</li> <li>Electronic waste collected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SFY08 – 33.6 million lbs; 243% of obligation 13.8 (60% of lbs. sold)</li> <li>SFY09 – 30.3 million lbs; 131% of obligation 23.2 (80% of lbs. sold)</li> </ul> </li> <li>CFLs: CY2008 – 102,381 CFLs recycled (0.68 - 1.29 lbs Hg)</li> </ul>
<b>Objective R2b) By January 1, 2013, increase sustainable industrial manufacturing jobs from 9000 to 9600 and gross economic activity from this sector by 20 percent over 2004 levels, which are estimated at \$2.98 billion.</b> Supporting information: Minnesota's Recycling Industries: Economic Activity Summary				
2.0	EACMState=\$0.316 M comp EACMState=\$1.614 Mlocalassistance	1. Market Development program 2. Eco Industrial Development 3. Sustainable Tourism	<p>The baseline numbers are the only data points we have. 9000 jobs in 2004 and \$2.98 billion in gross economic activity. By September 2009 develop updated economic activity. By June 30, 2011, raise the jobs to 9200 and gross economic activity to \$3.12 billion, an increase of 200 jobs and \$149,000,000 in gross economic activity.</p> <p>MPCA technical assistance for Coalition for Eco Industrial Development (CEID), an industrial ecology network in the Twin Ports region.</p> <p>Provide industrial development expertise to Mayors Green Manufacturing Initiative, as well as legislative Green Jobs Task Force process.</p> <p>Develop methodologies to quantify job creation and economic activity of sustainable industrial development jobs activities (e.g., REMI modeling).</p>	<p><b>Reduced effort in this area.</b></p> <p>Staff were <b>re-deployed</b> to do solid waste centroid work, Ethanol compliance and assistance, and GreenStep Cities as higher priority work.</p>
<b>Objective R2c) By January 1, 2013, technical assistance at specific facilities will reduce the amount of pollution generated by 10 percent from 2008 levels.</b> Supporting information: Pollution Prevention Evaluation Report				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results

9.7	EACM State = \$2.301 M comp EACM State = \$0.48 M operating	MPCA supports the Minnesota Technical Assistance Program, which provides technical assistance to the state's businesses to help them reduce pollution and GHG and save energy.	MnTAP projects result in industry savings of at least 13,421,469 million kWh and 684,064 thermal units, with corresponding carbon dioxide emission reductions of 37 million pounds annually.	<p>Money saved by customers: \$3.1 million in 2008 and \$4.36 million in 2009. Calendar Year 2010 results due in April.</p> <p>Air reductions due to Small Business Assistance = 4,780 pounds of hazardous air pollutants. In addition to industrial stormwater able to avoid permits, also did with a few air emitters by eliminating or reducing the emissions.</p> <p>Actual reductions in the following reported at end of FY2011 for calendar year 2010. Early indications are that expected results were achieved.</p> <p>Water use, Energy use, Wastewater, Chemical use, SW generation, and HW generation.</p>
		1. MN Technical Assistance Program	1. (For 2006-2007*) Waste reduced 5,645,224 Lbs; Water conserved 18,285,800 gallons; Energy conserved 18,468,200 KWh, 402,600 BTU; Waste reused 11,491,800 Lbs; Cost savings \$4,775,250. For FY10-11 goal to achieve at least this.	
		2. MN WasteWise Grant	2. (For 2006-2007*) Waste reduced 674,300 Lbs; Waste reused 258,366 Lbs; Waste recycled 4,030,391 Lbs; Cost savings \$2,898,223.	
		3. Retired Engineers Technical Assistance Program (RETAP) No-cost energy and waste audits for small to mid-sized MN businesses and institutions by corps of retired professionals. 2007/08 clients include: Schools, commercial, manufacturing, institutions, and churches.	3. Assessments: 2006 – 14, 2007 – 20, 2008 – 32. Two-year client energy, resource and financial savings from calendar year 2006 and 2007 clients: Energy: 420,220 kilowatt hours; Water: 12,102,000 gallons; Solid Waste: 38 tons; and Dollars: \$98,695. For FY10-11, outcomes expected to be the same.	
		4. Small Business Assistance Program (SBEAP)	4. Calendar Year 2009 and 2010 for Small Business Environmental Assistance Program (SBEAP):  Assist 1200 of 3300 businesses apply for Industrial Stormwater No Exposure	



			<p>and 160 of these businesses obtain Industrial Stormwater permits.</p> <p>Assist a total 2500 businesses: 80% increase knowledge of regulations, 80% of increase knowledge Pollution prevention; 70% increase their regulatory compliance, 30% use P2 and BMPs.</p> <p>Reduce pollution generated because of SBEAP: Assistance numbers 750 air pollution, 1,600 hazardous waste, 870 solid waste, and 1,200 water.</p>	
<p><b>1.0</b></p> <p><b>0.9</b></p> <p><b>20.9</b></p>	<p><b>Land State = \$0.182 M comp</b></p> <p><b>Land State = \$0.024 M operating</b></p> <p><b>EACM Fed = \$0.124 M comp</b></p> <p><b>EACM State = \$4.082 M comp</b></p> <p><b>EACM State = \$1.616 M operating</b></p> <p><b>EACM State = \$32.830 M local assistance (\$29 M SCORE)</b></p> <p><b>EACM State = \$0.370 M loans</b></p>	<b>R2 TOTAL</b>		
<b>Goal R.3 Minnesotans act on their environmental knowledge to support healthy ecosystems.</b>				
<b>Objective R3a) Minnesotans maintain or increase their general environmental knowledge and environmental behavior scores from the baseline data presented in the 2002 Minnesota Report Card on Environmental Literacy.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
<p>10.7</p> <p>16.1</p>	<p>EACM Fed = \$1.786 M comp</p> <p>EACM Fed = \$0.978 M operating</p> <p>EACM State = \$2.5 M comp</p>	The MPCA conducts follow up surveys at regular intervals to collect information concerning the knowledge about,	The Third Minnesota Report Card on Environmental Literacy (2008) documents the results of the third statewide survey concerning the environmental literacy of adults in Minnesota. For the report cards, 1,000	<p>Environmental Education Advisory TaskForce <b>eliminated in CY2010</b>, due to reduced budget and higher priority work.</p> <p>Some staff were <b>re-deployed</b> to other Agency priorities (Project Management for TMDLs).</p> <p>Some staff were <b>re-assigned</b> to priority work for solid waste centroids and air toxics.</p>

	EACM State = \$1.399 operating	<p>attitudes toward, and behaviors related to the environment in Minnesota. These surveys are used with the previous report- and future reports-to track trends and changes in environmental literacy as Minnesota adults are surveyed again at various points in the future.</p> <p>1. Environmental Education Advisory Task Force (EEATF) is only statewide advisory group concerning environmental education. EE initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELM Grants: Environmental Field Days bring the classroom to the outdoors to experience learning in and around woods, grasslands, lakes and streams.</li> <li>• GreenPrint – A plan for organizations that deliver environmental education</li> </ul>	<p>Minnesota adults are surveyed by telephone for their knowledge about, attitudes toward, and behaviors related to the environment. The results are summarized in report cards, where responses are broken down demographically and compared to related survey questions in studies performed in Minnesota, by other states, and nationally. Minnesotans' knowledge of energy issues and greenhouse gas issues are contained in the 2008 report card. <b>See next row for goal 2010 report card.</b></p> <p>2002 baseline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 68% of MN adults had a score of “C” or greater in general environmental knowledge.</li> <li>• MN adults indicated positive change in environmental behavior</li> </ul> <p>2008 Results - Knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 63% of MN adults had a score of “C” or greater in general environmental knowledge.</li> </ul>	Grants were not issued.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate Change – The goal is to develop a comprehensive strategy for climate change education for all audience sectors in</li> </ul>	<p>2. 2008 Results – Behavior:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85% frequently recycle compared to 80% in 2002.</li> <li>• 41% “Buy locally grown foods on a regular basis”.</li> <li>• 90% “turn off lights and appliances</li> </ul>	<b>SEEK website is maintained</b> , but other activities reduced due to budget reduction and staff reassignments.



		<p>the state plan for EE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WE3 - The We3 Initiative is a project to develop educational resources, expertise, training, and on-going support and evaluation for a classroom centered, project-based approach for Environmental Education in MN K-12 classrooms with the theme of "We all Learn, We all Save, and We all Win!" (We3).</li> </ul>	<p>when not in use" compared to 89% in 2002).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30% use alternate transportation (car pool, bike, bus) compared to 19% in 2002.</li> </ul> <p><b>2010 goal - move to C+</b></p> <p>SEEK Website visited one-million nine-hundred and sixty-six thousand times from 7-1-2007 to 3-8-2009. Fy10-11 Goal increase visits by 25%.</p>	
		<p>2. SEEK (Sharing Environmental Knowledge) Web site - SEEK is partnerships of a wide variety of environmental educators in Minnesota, sharing resources and events with educators, citizens, students, and others interested in environmental education.</p> <p>3. 3rd Environmental Literacy Rpt Card.</p> <p>4. 3rd GreenPrint revisions and outreach</p>	<p>In 2010, develop baseline of Number of environmental educators and teachers who use the 'A GreenPrint for Minnesota' (state plan).</p> <p>In 2011, improve number using state plan by 10%.</p> <p>In 2010, develop baseline of Number of environmental educators and teachers who adopt 'The Environmental Literacy Scope and Sequence'.</p> <p>In 2011, improve adoption by 10%.</p>	<b>SEEK website is maintained</b> , but other activities reduced due to budget reduction and staff reassignments
<b>R3b) To achieve MPCA environmental outcomes, increase the number of citizens volunteering at, or for the MPCA by at least 10 percent annually from 2007 to 2013.</b>				
2.2	EACM State = \$0.311 comp	MPCA volunteers program	Over 500 citizen volunteers recruited and trained to support FY 08-09 Living Green activities (Living Green Expo and Eco Experience)	Citizen volunteers has remained relatively flat, goal was 3300 by end of FY2011 and current status is 2300. Involving more media campaigns for monitoring volunteers. Volunteers helping at county recycling and household hazardous waste collections are not counted.

			Blueprint for building capacity for volunteers prepared by MPCA Leadership Academy participant - Implement in 2010 for baseline. New AmeriCorps initiative planned for fall 2009 - Expect 100 participants	Volunteers through the GreenCorp will increase numbers, and the goal of encouraging citizens to be actively involved in achieving positive environmental outcomes. The use of volunteers should be explored on a broader level to see how we could encourage more volunteerism to assist in meeting our environmental goals—in all media.
<b>R3c) By 2013, Minnesota residents reduce their individual contribution to greenhouse gas emissions to 2005 levels.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
1.2	EACM State = \$0.161 comp	The MPCA has a number of actions designed to help Minnesotans reduce their GHG emissions. ReTAP program is designed to help LGUs/ schools save energy and reduce GHG emissions in their own operations.	The MPCA's Small Business Environmental Improvement Loan program offers low-interest loans for Auxiliary Power Units (APUs) and other idle reduction devices. Calendar 2008, the MPCA awarded 18 loans to install 29 APUs, which will avoid an estimated 334 tons of CO2 and save 29,800 gallons of diesel fuel in 2008. FY10-11 Goal - award 25 loans to install APUs.	Economic down turn made loans under this program difficult to move. About 5 loans were made and the Small Business staff continue to work with companies to find affordable ways to use APUs, which not only reduce emissions, but save money.
		Living Green Program	FY10-11 Maintain: 350,000 annual visitors to EcoExperience with 50 million living green media impressions (cost at less than 50 cents per visitor) 25,000 annual visitors to Living Green Expo, Minnesota's largest environmental event providing solutions for people to live better, healthier lives with less impact on the environment Informational website, Livinggreen.org 8,000 subscribers to Living Green 365 monthly e-newsletter Monthly living green segment on WCCO 830 radio	<b>Living Green Expo moved to 3<sup>rd</sup> party in Spring 2010</b> (reduced 4 FTE of work). Living Green 365 newsletter deployed electronically through use of GovDelivery (saved \$10,000).
<b>10.7</b> <b>19.5</b>	<b>EACM Fed = \$1.786 M comp</b> <b>EACM Fed = \$0.978 M operating</b> <b>EACM State =</b>	<b>R3 TOTAL</b>		

	\$2.972 M comp EACM State = \$1.399 operating			
<b>Goal R.4 MPCA leads the way to minimize its environmental footprint and assist other public entities to do the same.</b>				
<b>Objective R4a) By 2015, greenhouse gas emissions from MPCA facilities and its operations are reduced by at least 15 percent from 2005 levels.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
0.3 0.2 0.3	Air State = \$0.053 M comp Land State = \$0.033 M comp EACM State = \$0.08 M comp	The MPCA has a sustainability manager whose duties include reducing GHG emissions from agency operations statewide. The agency will be reporting its GHG emissions through The Climate Registry.	Report MPCA's GHG emissions through The Climate Registry by August 1, 2009. Verify by January 1, 2010. MPCA's leased space in Mankato has a solar panel power system and advanced daylighting that result in a 23 % reduction in electricity. Goal - similar savings in new leases for Marshall and Detroit Lakes by June 30, 2011. Implemented power management functions for computers and monitors - Goal to save 632,000 kWh per year and nearly \$50,000. MPCA's St. Paul office purchased 165,000 kWh of green power monthly (about 16 percent of energy used since November 2006) The MPCA's Brainerd office purchases 100 percent green power. Goal - all MPCA offices purchase at least 25% green power. MPCA is partnering with an inter-agency SMARTFLEET group to reduce the VMT of its staff commuting to the MPCA's St. Paul office, and is promoting more webinar-meetings.	Reduced amount of paper used by 32% from November 2009 reflecting shift in paper use from 6,360 sheets per person to 4,370 sheets per person (national average is 10,000)  Reduced fleet mileage by telepresence and carpooling – new database.  Reduced energy by 12% at St. Paul building (6% electric and 24% gas)  Saved \$15,271 dollars.  Reviewing how to increase telecommuting.
		Change MPCA operational practices related to: leased building energy efficiency, fleet vehicle miles traveled, source reduction of paper, and renewable energy production and	Complete 2005 -2008 GHG emissions data on MPCA operations is under development Compared to FY08, St. Paul building has reduced electricity consumption by 5% from 2005 levels, target is to accomplish 10% reduction by end of FY 10; agency fleet mileage has decreased by 0.5% per capita from 2005 levels, target is to reduce mileage by 10%	In negotiation with private vendor to use closed landfill for renewable energy (solar).  The MPCA is evaluating opportunities for wind turbines at certain closed landfill sites. Have assessed 13 landfills for opportunities for private-public partnership.

		diesel emission reduction at closed landfills.	and petroleum consumption by 25% by FY11; and reams of paper purchased has increased by only 0.02% per capita from 2005 levels with a target reduction of 10% by FY11. Renewable energy generation at closed landfills was 7,281,400 kWh in FY08. Wind generation assessments for a minimum of 5 closed landfills will be performed in FY09. Diesel emission reduction strategies will be implemented at the only 2 active closed landfill construction sites in FY10-11 (ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel, retrofits of eligible heavy-duty construction equipment)	
<b>Objective R4b) MPCA catalyzes public entities to take actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent between 2005 and 2015.</b>				
0.4	Water State = \$0.0622 M comp	Programs like the Retired Engineers Technical Assistance Program and the Climate Change Corps to assist local governments and schools in saving energy and reducing GHG emissions. As a member of IPPAT, the MPCA also works with state agencies to reduce GHG emissions.	<p>Examples of MPCA leadership include: “Minnesota Greenstar,” a green building standard and certification program designed specifically for Minnesota, giving builders and remodelers the tools to excel, and providing homeowners the knowledge with which to compare the performance of their homes. The MPCA has convened a multi-stakeholder group to address long term policy needs to meet the MCCAG solid waste management goals. The MPCA is also a member of the Interagency Pollution Prevention Advisory Team (IPPAT), composed of a number of state agencies.</p> <p>Consolidate by August 10, 2009, the Executive Orders relating to IPPAT's role in the environment and sustainability into 3 areas: building/energy, fleet management, and pollution prevention. By August 1, 2009, all agencies have created sustainability plans, and by June 30, 2011, plans are implemented.</p>	<p>Per Executive Order, sustainability plan drafted. Requires additional energy savings in regional offices and reduce fleet miles.</p> <p>Goal will shift in FY2012 and 2013 to focus on Air Toxics by using Retired Engineers to support Local Governments and schools in reducing energy.</p>

		<p>NextStep community-based sustainability program</p> <p>LGU climate change assistance</p>	<p>50,000 monthly site visitors, and over 3,200 subscribers, utilize MPCA's NextStep resources on sustainable development - FY10-11 Goal - improve by 15%.</p> <p>Utilize Retiree-led "Climate Change Corps," to assist LGUs and communities plan, act and measure reductions in their carbon footprint (30 LGUs) Technical to support LGU implementation of sustainable development best practices</p> <p>Technical assistance to create model ordinances for sustainable development, emphasizing greenhouse gas emissions reduction and other key environmental indicators</p> <p>Support creation of a conservation design scorecard, in cooperation with Northern Counties Lakes Collaborative and 1000 Friends of Minnesota, to be used by local government as it weights development proposals in rural Minnesota. By June 30, 2011, scorecard used by 25 local governments.</p> <p>Collaborate with MDH to help community health boards use Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) principles for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) to encourage complete, compact and connected communities that foster lower energy use and healthier citizens.</p>	<p>Climate Change Corps <b>not implemented</b> due to reduced funding.</p> <p>Focused on development of GreenCorps – students working with schools and communities on reducing school waste, saving energy and keeping water on the land.</p> <p>Collaborate with University of Minnesota-Morris to work in West Central Communities.</p> <p>Dept. of Agriculture, Dept of Health, and Dept of Natural Resources partner in GreenCorps development with results in training, guidance and ensuring measurable outcomes.</p> <p>University of Minnesota is assisting in developing measure for stormwater control resulting from urban foresting for municipalities. Keeping water on the land and reduced need for stormwater ponds.</p>
<p>0.3</p> <p>0.2</p> <p>0.3</p> <p>0.4</p>	<p><b>Air State = \$0.053</b></p> <p><b>M comp</b></p> <p><b>Land State = \$0.033</b></p> <p><b>M comp</b></p> <p><b>EACM State =</b></p> <p><b>\$0.08 M comp</b></p> <p><b>Water State =</b></p>	<b>R4 TOTAL</b>		

	\$0.0622 M comp			
<b>Vision: Minnesota's Air Is Clean and Clear</b>				
<b>Goal A.1 Minnesota's outdoor air will meet or improve upon all environmental and human health-related federal and state ambient air quality standards.</b>				
<b>Objective A1a) Reduce risks to humans and the environment by meeting all ambient air quality standards.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
29.2 2.7 0.7	Air State = \$4.616 M Comp Air State = \$2.926 M operating EACM Fed = \$.366 M comp EACM State = \$0.162 M comp EACM State = \$0.144 M operating Land State = \$0.15 M operating	Environmental Review (ER) Program	In FY10/11, the Environmental Review Program anticipates conducting the following EAW reviews: 10 industrial/other energy, 5 biofuel, 1 refinery and 1 mining project. Also 2 EISs; one each in the energy and biofuel categories.	Did not have expected EAW/EIS work. Continue to support DNR on environmental review projects for mining.  FY 2012-2013 Air Focus: Attainment status in jeopardy as EPA revises standards for Particulate and Ozone – FY2012 and 2013 expand partnerships to continue reductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed Federal Lead Nonattainment (Gopher Resources) – 2010 - Gopher Resources in Eagan is on track to reduce lead emissions and avoid this designation</li> <li>Exceeding current daily PM2.5 standard – 2008 -2010</li> <li>New ozone standard due in October 2010 – potential nonattainment</li> <li>New PM2.5 standard due in late 2011 – probable nonattainment</li> <li>Focus on combustion for energy generation for multi-pollutant reductions</li> <li>Continue to work with Clean Air Minnesota for non-point source reductions (see Diesel Emission Reductions).</li> </ul>
		Air Permitting	3700 air permits exist. Issue 260 operating permits (this includes Title V reissuances, Federal and State General Permits and Registration Permits) and 300 construction permits (this includes totally new construction and modifications to existing facilities).  Reductions expected in air pollutants by existing facilities annually by approximately 6,650,000 tons.  The construction permits (new construction and modifications) reduce air pollutants by approximately another 1,550,000 per year.  Special Air Permitting (Biofuels Projections FY10/11): New Construction = 6, Modifications = 20, Reissuance = 2  Mining: support the three ongoing EISs at DNR (Polymet, Keetac expansion, Mesabi Nugget); Finish: HibTac, United Taconite, ArcelorMittal air permits; Support MDH Taconite Worker Health Study; Fiber litigation	Additional work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain current geographic coverage of the air monitoring network</li> <li>New standards may require new monitoring sites or methods</li> <li>Regional Air Pollutants Strategy Team (RAPST) chartered – program plan with outcomes due April 1</li> <li>Work on technical and policy aspects for PM2.5 and Ozone standards and regional haze SIP implementation</li> <li>Permit and Environmental Review policy team set up to advise on facility review issues with PM2.5, SO2, and NOX standards</li> <li>Initial air monitoring data is below the new lead standard</li> <li>Maintain monitors for BioWatch Program on behalf of Homeland Security and Dept. of Health</li> </ul>
		Air Monitoring	Demonstrate attainment with National and State Ambient Air Quality	(See 2011 Air Quality in Minnesota for results : <a href="http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/component/option,com_docman/task,doc_view/gid,15395">http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/component/option,com_docman/task,doc_view/gid,15395</a> )



			<p>Standards, track trends and condition for CO, O<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, lead and TSP.</p> <p>a. Ambient air quality monitoring conducted at 45 Minnesota sites.</p> <p>b. Support provided for three tribe operated sites.</p> <p>c. Supported 8 National Acid Deposition Program sites.</p> <p>d. The ambient air quality monitoring system consistently exceeds the 90% data capture target established by the USEPA.</p> <p>e. Ambient air quality data submitted to USEPA databases as required by federal regulations.</p> <p>f. PM<sub>2.5</sub> Federal Reference Method (FRM) monitoring is conducted at 17 sites in Minnesota.</p> <p>Operate network to provide high-quality data for AQI forecasting and AIRNOW mapping programs.</p>	
<b>Objective A1b) Reduce overall emissions in Minnesota of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides (pollutants that contribute to fine particle formation) by 30 percent from 2002 levels by January 1, 2012, and by 40 percent by January 1, 2018.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
60.8  15.2	<p>Air State = \$8.725 M Comp</p> <p>Air State = \$3.585 M operating</p> <p>Air State = \$0.43 M loans</p> <p>EACM State = \$2.479 M comp</p> <p>EACM State = \$0.57 M operating</p>	<p>a. Implement the Northeast Minnesota Plan to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions as part of the state's response to Regional Haze requirements</p> <p>b. Apply state and federal rules to install pollution control technologies that result in SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub></p>	<p>Emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from all sources are tracked every three years as part of the National Emission Inventory. 2005 data indicates the following reductions from 2002 levels:</p> <p>2002 – 2005: 8% reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions.</p> <p>2002 – 2005: less than 1% reduction in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.</p> <p>Emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from permitted sources are tracked annually.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NO<sub>x</sub>: On track for 2018 target, may meet 2012 target</li> <li>SO<sub>2</sub>: Not projected to meet targets with pre-2010 assumptions</li> <li>Air Emission Reductions from Diesel Reduction (A1b, A1c &amp; A2a) opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retrofitting pre-2007 diesel engine reduces Particulate matter (2.5) emission by 25 percent.</li> <li>4 different funding sources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State funding of \$2.4 million for school buses</li> <li>Federal Public Vehicle Grant (\$625,000) (congested mitigation &amp; air quality grant) – fire trucks, street sweepers, snowplows</li> <li>Federal DERA grant (\$992,000) for school buses and heavy duty trucks</li> <li>Federal ARRA grant (\$1.73 million) for public and private fleets</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>2120 buses, 236,000 riders – all school buses will be done</li> <li>Original intended to do 200 snowplows, garbage trucks, street sweepers and fire trucks – will do 400 (40 will be MPLS)</li> </ul>

		<p>emission reductions</p> <p>c. Assist voluntary efforts to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emission reductions, esp. at large stationary sources and mobile sources</p> <p>d. Work with CAM to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from on-road mobile sources</p> <p>e. Provide accurate and timely emission inventories to track progress and calculate air fees</p>	<p>2005-2007 emissions were:</p> <p>SO<sub>2</sub> NO<sub>x</sub>:</p> <p>: 2005 147,248 tons</p> <p>2005 2006 133,949 tons</p> <p>129, 2007 133,220 tons</p> <p>972 tons</p> <p>2006 118, 227 tons</p> <p>2007 109, 008 tons</p> <p>Complete upgrade of new database to improve reporting and tracking.</p>	<p>and St. Paul fire trucks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assisting private fleet owners with grants and loans</li> <li>ARRA funds used to help 70 small and large public fleets, construction, long-haul trucks and marine boats (paddle boat) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>144 idle reduction</li> <li>75 trailer refrigeration units</li> <li>47 diesel oxidation catalysts – Shakopee and Leech Lake Band of Ojibway</li> <li>6 new engines</li> </ul> </li> <li>255 fuel-saving APUs (idling reduction) saves 225,000 to 325,000 gallons of diesel fuel each year and ~ \$1million.</li> <li>Environmental outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1 tons of ground level PM<sub>2.5</sub> diesel emissions reduced (=12,000 cars)</li> <li>71 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> (= 13,000 cars)</li> <li>2700 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> (= 550 cars)</li> <li>Reduced emission exposure to 236,000 students</li> <li>Reduced emissions on 3,170 vehicles</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Objective A1c) Reduce direct man-made emissions of fine particulate (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) by 15 percent from 2002 levels by January 1, 2012 and by 25 percent by January 1, 2018</b>				
0.9	Air Fed = \$0.579 M comp	a. Track federal legislation and rules for reductions in fine particles from mobile sources	Direct emissions of fine particles from all sources are tracked every three years as part of the National Emission Inventory. 2005 data indicates the following reductions from 2002 levels: 2002 – 2005: 2% reduction in fine particle emissions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modeling from Regional Haze effort projects that direct fine particles emissions will increase in 2012 and 2018</li> <li>Considerable uncertainty on magnitude of increase</li> <li>Modeling and emissions based on 2002 and 2005 data</li> <li>No analysis yet of 2010 changes at the federal level</li> </ul>
1.4	Air Fed = \$0.321 M operating Air State = \$.215 M comp Air State = \$0.342 M operating	<p>b. Partner with Minn. Department of Health to understand health impacts and sources of fine particles in Minnesota</p> <p>c. Implement emission reporting for direct fine particles from permitted sources</p> <p>d. Track sources of fine particles in Minnesota to seek opportunities for future reductions</p> <p>e. Seek reductions from</p>	<p>PM<sub>2.5</sub> continuous monitoring is conducted at 14 sites.</p> <p>Annual tracking of direct emissions of fine particles from permitted sources began in 2008 and the data will be available later in 2009.</p> <p>Complete upgrade of new database to improve reporting and tracking</p>	<p>Air Focus for 2012 – 2013 from federal activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New ambient standards and Transport Rule</li> <li>Analyze impacts of and implement upcoming federal regulations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Rule</li> <li>Major Boiler MACT</li> <li>Revised NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> standards</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Corrective actions with partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diesel reduction efforts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SmartWay Transport Partnership</li> <li>Blue Skyways/Project Green Fleet</li> <li>Biodiesel</li> </ul> </li> <li>Regional Haze SIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northeast MN plan aimed at NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> reductions</li> <li>Best Available Retrofit Technology</li> <li>Chartered Regional Air Pollutant Strategy Team (RAPST) to address PM<sub>2.5</sub> and ozone precursors</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		permitted sources		
<b>Objective A1d) Reduce overall emissions in Minnesota of volatile organic compounds (pollutants that are toxic and contribute to ozone formation) by 20 percent from 2002 levels by January 1, 2012, and by 30 percent by January 1, 2018.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
1.8	Air State = \$0.284 M comp Air State = \$0.097 M operating	a. Apply state and federal rules to install pollution control technologies that result in air toxic (VOC) and NOx emission reductions. b. Assist in voluntary efforts to reduce air toxics (VOCs) and NOx emission reductions, especially at smaller stationary sources and mobile sources c. Work with Clean Air Minnesota to reduce VOC and NOx emissions from on-road mobile sources d. Provide accurate and timely emission inventories to track progress and calculate air fees	Emissions of VOCs from all sources are tracked every three years as part of the National Emission Inventory. 2005 data indicates the following reductions from 2002 levels: 2002 – 2005: 3% reduction in fine particle emissions.  Annual tracking of direct emissions of fine particles from permitted sources for 2005 and 2006 2005 26,073 tons 2006 24,611 tons 2007 24,625 tons  Complete upgrade of new database to improve reporting and tracking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projected to meet the goals (need 20% by 2012 and at 15% 2011)</li> <li>Based upon pre-2010 assumptions</li> </ul> </li> <li>Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address VOCs as part of a multi-pollutant effort focused on combustion for energy production</li> <li>Work with Clean Air Minnesota for non-point source reductions</li> <li>Operate pollution prevention programs to encourage VOC reductions</li> <li>Proposed new strategy: Encourage VOC reduction through P2 efforts in permitting process; PAD will provide technical assistance as appropriate</li> </ul> </li> <li>FY2012-2013 focus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Included ozone in the scope of the Regional Air Pollutant Strategy Team (RAPST) to focus on VOC emission characterization and control</li> <li>Focus on combustion for energy production as significant VOC source links to air toxics reductions (Goal A2)</li> <li>Process outlined in Goal A2 will address VOC control</li> <li>Additional federal controls in the pipeline</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
0.9 93.2 2.7 15.9	Air Fed = \$0.579 M comp Air Fed = \$0.321 M operating Air State = \$13.84 M comp Air State = \$6.953 M operating Air State = \$0.43 M loans	<b>A1 TOTAL</b>		

	EACM Fed = \$0.366 M comp EACM State = \$2.641 M comp EACMState= \$0.714M operating Land State = \$0.15 M operating			
<b>Goal A.2 Minnesota's outdoor air quality will meet environmental and human health benchmarks for toxic and other air pollutants.</b>				
<b>A2a) The MPCA will target reductions in statewide risk from air toxics by:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculating cancer and non-cancer risks in statewide ambient air using modeling and ambient monitoring by July 1, 2009.</li> <li>• Identify the pollutants that largely contribute to cancer and non-cancer risk by July 1, 2009.</li> <li>• Developing strategies to reduce emissions and concentrations of these risk drivers by July 1, 2010.</li> </ul>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
4.4	<b>Air State = \$.763 M comp</b> <b>Air State = \$0.243 M operating</b>	a. validate and refine MnRISks modeling data b. implement use of MnRISks modeling to understand cancer and non-cancer risks c. continue to improve processes and develop techniques and tools to better understand cumulative risks from air sources	Tracking milestones and progress toward meeting the target dates	<p>Cancer and non-cancer risks in statewide ambient air have been calculated using modeling and ambient monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollutants that most contribute to risk have been identified: Modeled: Acrolein, Diesel PM, Dioxins/Furans, PAHs; Monitored: Formaldehyde, PM2.5</li> <li>• Air Pollution Reduction Strategy project Phase I nearly complete</li> <li>• Transition from individual pollutant focus to source categories / groups</li> <li>• Prepare for next phase - systematically synthesize information for use</li> <li>• Develop list of potential strategies that can be utilized now</li> <li>• Begin interaction w/ External groups</li> <li>• Timing – next couple of months</li> </ul> <p>Next step: develop strategies that when implemented would result in reductions in statewide risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emissions from wide variety of sources. Major contributors to identified pollutants are the non-point sources (area and mobile)</li> <li>• Currently no explicit framework exists to engage the broad &amp; diverse group of stakeholders</li> <li>• Regulatory structure for larger facilities (i.e. point sources)</li> <li>• Unclear on how best to address non point and mobile sources</li> <li>• Use lessons learned– Minnesota River &amp; Mercury TMDL Teams –need a clear technical story to effectively engage others in designing reduction strategies. Knowledge , information and experience needed to formulate the technical story for these air pollutants is housed in a number of divisions &amp; programs within the Agency.</li> <li>• Phase 1 Technical Team are on technically sound ground to identify the pollutants, sources and /or geographic areas to focus efforts on by characterizing air pollution problems using existing &amp; readily available data, identifying information gaps, benefits &amp; trade-offs.</li> <li>• Key themes identified – combustion of fossil fuels and biomass are the most important sources of pollutants of concern, multiple pollutants can be reduced by controlling important sources, the link between emission and ambient concentrations needs to be understood better, secondary formation is important for many of these pollutants, and a list of general strategies to employ.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FY 2012-2013</li> <li>• Support diesel reductions such as retrofits shown in A1b</li> <li>• Update MNRiskS (2005 emissions, AERMOD, improve EI)</li> <li>• Target emission sources of top pollutants</li> <li>• Complete and build upon Air Pollution Reduction Strategy</li> <li>• Develop structured framework to address top pollutants and pursue options for reducing targeted emissions (stakeholders, technical advisory group)</li> <li>• Develop strategies for communication to address risk such as Phillips neighborhood pilot project</li> </ul>
<b>Goal A.3 Minnesota reduces its contribution to regional, national and global air pollution.</b>				
<b>Objective A3a) Reduce mercury emissions from Minnesota air sources to meet TMDL air emission target of 789 lbs/year. Track concentrations of mercury in fish tissue to better understand how changes in state, national and international mercury emissions affect fish mercury concentrations.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
2.0	Air State = \$0.343 M comp Air State = \$0.08 M operating	<p>a. EPA approved MN statewide Hg TMDL – future activities involve implementing stakeholder recommendations for inventory, control plan development and new source offsets.</p> <p>b. Refine mercury inventory baseline for accurate tracking of future mercury emissions to meet TMDL implementation plan.</p>	<p>Implement Mercury TMDL implementation plan.</p> <p>Measure: continued tracking of Hg emissions from individual emitters and sectors, as defined in the Hg TMDL.</p> <p>In 2005, the most recent data available, total statewide emissions were estimated at 3,314 pounds. Complete new inventory by October 1, 2009.</p> <p>By January 1, 2011, complete rulemaking for mercury monitoring and emission reporting rule to track progress in achieving the reductions in the Hg TMDL.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Projected mercury emissions 2005 – 2025 – has not changed. Emissions may rise temporarily between goals, or reductions may occur earlier than the target date.</li> <li>▪ Mercury Emissions Reduction Act of 2006, Phase I <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Boswell 3 and Sherco 3: 83-90% mercury control anticipated</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Nearly complete proposed rule language requiring existing facilities to submit and implement reduction plans and improve emission estimates</li> <li>▪ Working with two facilities to implement guidance for new and modified facilities</li> </ul> <p>FY2012 – 2013 Adaptations needed to meet A3a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed implementation plan to meet the final mercury reduction target</li> <li>• Track progress with 2008 inventory (Summer 2011) – new database completed</li> <li>• Finalize rulemaking on reduction plans and emission estimates for existing facilities</li> <li>• Continued improvements of emission estimates at poorly quantified sources (mostly unpermitted)</li> <li>• Improved mercury product removal from scrap</li> <li>• Continue to implement guidance for new and modified sources</li> <li>• Consider refinements based on experience with current projects</li> </ul>
<b>Objective A3b) Reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Minnesota by 15 percent from 2005 levels by January 1, 2015 and by 30 percent by January 1, 2025, as set in the Next Generation Energy Act of 2007.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
8.1	Air State = \$1.396 M comp Air State = \$0.349 M operating EACM Fed = \$0.08 M comp	<p>Inventory/Registry Development</p> <p>a. Develop and improve MPCA GHG Inventory to track emissions against</p>	<p>Comprehensive Greenhouse Gas Inventory to track releases from multiple sources to report on progress for targets in the Next Generation Energy Act of 2007.</p>	<p>Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No new information with 2010 review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2005 to 2006 emissions declined approx 2 million tons – about on track with goal</li> <li>▪ 2007 EPA inventory shows uptick; 2008 EPA inventory shows a decrease</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ The largest declines were in transportation, commercial, and residential sectors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Probably due to high energy prices</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>EACMFed=\$0.022 M operating EACM Fed = \$0.244 M grants EACM Fed = \$0.244 loans EACM State = \$0.432 M comp EACM State = \$1.5 M grants</p>	<p>emissions. b. Participating in development of The Climate Registry. High global warming pollutant control a. Developed a reporting system and website as required in legislation. b. Writing report to legislature on control of HGWP gases. Support strategy development a. Participated in Center for Climate Strategies Process to design plan to implement legislature goals. b. Participating in Midwest Governor's efforts to develop cap and trade program. c. Track and participate in EPA rulemaking efforts. d. Incorporate GHG review in agency permitting and Environmental Review (ER) activities</p>	<p>Currently reported as part of biennial legislative report 2004 GHG Emissions: ~160 million short tons 2005 GHG Emissions: ~161 million short tons. Implement guidance for GHG review in Environmental review for all projects by January 1, 2010. Participate in EPA rulemaking proposals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Future direction uncertain – positive federal actions and recession should add to reductions from state renewable energy efforts</li> <li>Biannual trend report; annual update to point source inventory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trend report in December 2010</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Adaptations needed to meet A3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue alternate year inventory updates and continuous methodology improvements</li> <li>Continue interagency adaptation, energy supply, and sequestration workgroups</li> </ul> </li> <li>Adaptations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement federal regulations – Reporting and Permitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on efficient incorporation into MPCA programs and outreach</li> </ul> </li> <li>Integrate at least point source GHG inventory into electronic inventory improvement project - CEDR</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Objective A3c) Reduce visibility impairment in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness by three percent from the 2000-2004 baseline conditions by January 1, 2012 and by six percent by January 1, 2018.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
1.9	Air State = \$0.321 M comp	a. Respond to comments received	The Northeast Minnesota Plan established a target of 29,000 tons of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional haze SIP submitted in December 2009 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Still waiting EPA approval</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	Air State = \$0.03 M operating	through the 2008 public comment period for the draft State Implementation Plan (SIP) b. Establish Best Achievable Retrofit Technology levels for remaining sources included in the SIP c. Submit the State Implementation Plan to USEPA Region 5 for approval d. Work with facilities subject to the SIP to meet emission reduction targets e. Implement the Northeast Minnesota Plan	SO <sub>2</sub> and NO <sub>x</sub> reductions by 2018 from large point sources. In 2007, SO <sub>2</sub> and NO <sub>x</sub> emissions were reduced by 3,097 tons at facilities covered by the Northeast Minnesota Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SIP includes emission reduction goal of 30% SO<sub>2</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> reduction from NE Minnesota, BART, and other reductions</li> <li>Minnesota will not reach “natural conditions” at rate recommended by EPA</li> <li>The decrease in haze/improvement in visibility in 2004 occurred across CENRAP and the Northern Class I areas. The BWCAW showed a large decrease in nitrate. The increase in 2005 levels also occurred across CENRAP.</li> </ul> <p>FY 2012- 2013 efforts for Objective A3c</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement Regional Haze SIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utility SO<sub>x</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction</li> <li>Seeking pilot testing emission reduction projects at mining companies</li> </ul> </li> <li>Northeast Minnesota Emissions are tracked via spreadsheet on MPCA <a href="#">website</a></li> <li>Emission reduction progress report due to EPA in 2014, with update of reduction strategy due in 2018 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate adaptation strategies will be considered as part of these two processes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
12 0.8 2.6	<b>Air State = \$2.060 M comp</b> <b>Air State = \$0.11 M operating</b> <b>EACM Fed = \$0.08 M comp</b> <b>EACM Fed = \$0.022 M operating</b> <b>EACM Fed = \$0.244 M grants</b> <b>EACM Fed = \$0.244 M loans</b> <b>EACM State = \$0.432 M comp</b> <b>EACM State = \$1.5 M grants</b>	<b>A3 TOTAL</b>		

***Vision: Minnesota’s Land Supports Healthy Ecosystems and Sustainable Land Uses***

**Goal L.1 Ensure solid waste is managed to conserve materials, resources, and energy.**

Objective L1a) By January 1, 2025, achieve a total reduction of 75 million metric tons of greenhouse gas attributed to changes in waste generation, materials conservation, and resource management practices.				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
0.3 7.9	EACM Fed = \$0.048 M comp EACM State = \$1.396 M comp EACMState=\$0.332 Moperating	MPCA program components Solid Waste and Waste as a Resource	<p>Recognizing the potential to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through changes in the management of mixed municipal solid waste (MMSW), the Minnesota Climate Change Advisory Group (MCCAG) has set a goal to reduce per-capita waste generation 3% by 2025, and also achieve a 75% diversion of waste from land disposal by 2025 through a 60% recycling rate and a 15% composting rate. Complete the MPCA stakeholder process by December 31, 2009, to develop strategies within the four geographical centroids that generate 70% of the state's solid waste in order to achieve the GHG reduction goals as set by MCCAG.</p> <p>The strategies being developed by the MPCA stakeholder process for reducing GHG emissions through changes in the management of MMSW, which is scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2009, include reaching the following five chronological goals: 1) By 2011, achieve a recycling rate of 2011 recycling rate of 50%; 3) By 2012 Vision: Minnesota's Land Supports Healthy Ecosystems and Sustainable Land Uses 50%; 2) By 2011, achieve a 2012, achieve a composting rate of 10%; 4) By 2020, achieve a waste generation per capita growth of 0%; 5) By 2025, achieve a decrease in waste generation per capita growth of 3%, and an increase in the recycling rate to 60% and the composting rate to 15%.</p>	<p>L1a is exceeding the goal. MSW disposal is down 10%. Because of recession, generators buying less &amp; manufacturers using fewer resources. Source reduction has greatest impact on GHG reduction and compounding effect in the early years.</p> <p>Focus on 4 centroids, where 70% of the MSW is generated: 1) Metro Centroid (Metro Solid Waste Policy Plan; Governance) 2) Duluth, 3) Rochester, 4) St. Cloud Centroids – Project Development (recycling, composting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed the Metro Solid Waste Plan</li> <li>• Work with Metro Counties on options to Enforce Mandatory Processing statute</li> <li>• Develop 6-8 projects - 3 centroid regions</li> <li>• Complete Agency solid waste vision</li> </ul> <p>Track grant projects to see if compost outcomes achieved. Elk River grant to save \$316,000 in waste system by achieving 20% reduction in waste generation, 6% increase in recycling and doubling the about of composting by increasing household participation from 322 to 1000. Proctor School grant to increase waste reduction by 22 %, recycling by 25 %, and initiate composting.</p> <p>These grants will be completed in 2012 with results available then.</p> <p>WLSSD received a grant to improve their composting pad used by businesses and increase their education and participation.</p>
Objective L1b) Reduce the number of households who burn their waste onsite (and the resulting dioxin and other pollutants and associated wildfire risks) by 75 percent from the 2005 baseline by January 1, 2013.				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or	Measures/Outcomes	Results

		Program		
	Resources as shown for L1a	MPCA program components Solid Waste, compliance/enforcement and Waste as a Resource	# of open burning enforcement actions # of resource web hits (factsheets, PSA's, etc.) Repeat 2005 statewide burn barrel survey in 2010. Develop legislative strategy by August 2009: # of household reductions achieved per year # of counties with "no-burn" resolution in place and counties involved in active reduction/education efforts through PCA grants, etc. # of tons dioxin/furan emitted/year Goal: 50 counties have no burn ordinance (currently 27 of 87 counties)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2010 survey is completed. MPCA staff is currently processing and validating this information.</li> <li>Preliminary data shows that a combination of education, outreach and enforcement lead to the reduction in open garbage burning.</li> </ul>
0.3 7.9	EACM Fed = \$0.048 M comp EACM State = \$1.396 M comp EACMState =0.332Moperating	L1 TOTAL		
<b>Goal L.2 Minimize or reduce the release of contaminants to or from the land.</b>				
<b>Objective L2a) Significant Compliance is achieved annually at 90 percent of solid waste facilities.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
34.7  2.4	Land State = \$5.843 M comp Land State = \$2.45 M operating Land State = \$0.504 M transfer to MDH EACM State = \$0.333 M comp EACMState=\$0.108 Moperating	Solid Waste permitting, facility inspections, ground-water monitoring system review, compliance and enforcement  Environmental Review	5 landfill environmental assessment worksheets  400 inspections at 393 facilities (MSW landfills, demo/industrial sites, transfer, composting)  FY10-11 - 73 MSW/Demo permit transactions, 17 Industrial transactions and 30 transfer station transactions. (Xcel Red Wing, Ottertail Power, Verso, SKB, Xcel Sherco, Xcel A.S. King  Numbers of facilities with Ground Water (GW) intervention limit exceedances corrected.  Number of facilities with GW releases exceeding GW standards (HURLs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance with groundwater standards is met at less than 90% of solid waste facilities. However, the exceedances are all from unlined portions of landfills. There has been an increase in landfills exceeding Intervention Limits, at least in part due to new exceedances from demolition landfills.</li> <li>Landfills were required to start reporting landfill gas emissions with the annual report.</li> <li>Satisfactory progress increasing number of MSW landfills with active gas control</li> <li>There were groundwater contaminant releases exceeding an intervention limit for groundwater standards at 28 facilities. 22 of those facilities are exceeding a Health Risk Limit.</li> </ul> <p>FY 2012 – 2013 efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to collect information on landfill gas emissions through annual reports; may need to revise type of information requested to be consistent with federal GHG reporting rules. Continue to work with facility owners wishing to install active gas collection systems.</li> <li>MDH periodic changes to the HRLs can affect a landfill's compliance status, regardless of whether the groundwater contamination levels change. Will need to evaluate results from demolition landfills.</li> </ul>

			<p>Potential GHG emissions Number of facilities with gas collection systems GHG emissions destroyed (flared) GHG emissions converted to BTUs Reduction in the amount of GHG emitted</p> <p>Decrease in landfills with releases/exceedances BTUs of renewable energy generated from landfill gas.</p>	
<b>Objective L2b) On an annual basis, 90 percent of above and underground storage tanks will be in significant operational compliance.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
8.3 24.3 3	<p>Land Fed = \$0.994 M comp</p> <p>Land Fed = \$0.386 M operating</p> <p>Land State = \$3.965 M comp</p> <p>Land State = \$1.982 M operating</p> <p>EACM State = \$0.547 M comp</p> <p>EACM State = \$054 M operating</p>	Training, citations, outreach, site visits, rule development, and communication efforts to regulated tank owners.	In calendar year 2008 the tanks program did 2651 inspections and 889 enforcement actions. Currently the tanks program is achieving approximately a 50% compliance rate due to inspections of tank systems not visited for over 10 years.	<p>Status metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of waste/product that was properly managed as opposed to potentially being released to the environment.</li> <li>Currently 1.5 yrs into 3-yr inspection cycle will establish baseline.</li> </ul> <p>Large regulated universe w/ownership changing hands (e.g. gas stations)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Tanks program continues to refer more leak sites and earlier leak sites to the LUST program, continues to work on the 3-year inspection frequency and expects that the rate of compliance continues to climb. The economic downturn had an especially large impact on small gas station and tank operating facilities. Foreclosures and shutdowns have impacted the current compliance rate.</li> <li>Need communication effort to reach owners at the time of purchase and provide guidance. Need metric to determine compliance improvement.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective L2c) On an annual basis, 90 percent of hazardous waste generators and facilities will be in significant compliance.</b>				
16.6 16.9 0.5	<p>Land State = \$2.076 M comp</p> <p>Land State = \$1.076 M operating</p> <p>EACM Fed = \$2.828 M comp</p> <p>EACM Fed = \$0.922 M operating</p> <p>EACM State = \$0.088 M comp</p> <p>EACM State = \$0.044 M operating</p>	Inspections, outreach efforts, enforcement actions, healthcare initiative work, pollution reduction efforts, and audit development	In calendar year 2008 the HW program did 261 inspections and 124 enforcement actions, with an approximately 90% compliance rate.	<p>FY2012-2013 efforts</p> <p>Establish metric lbs of HW prevented from potentially escaping to the environment (metric under development)</p> <p>Focus on SQGs in significant areas such as priority watersheds, PFC-related issues, and areas of identified noncompliance.</p>
<b>Objective L2d) By 2011, household hazardous waste (HHW) collection participation increases by 20 percent above the 2005 baseline.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or	Measures/Outcomes	Results

		Program		
3.1	EACM State = \$0.486 M comp EACM State = (\$0.006) M operating	HHW Program – education program, state contract auditing	HHW Collection Participation: 2005 – 228,790; 2006 – 241,590; 2007 – 265,269. FY10 Goal = 307,000. FY11 Goal = 367,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participation rates are increasing quicker than expected.</li> <li>Launched a marketing campaign in March 2010 with a goal to increase participation at HHW facilities. The campaign was released statewide on July 1, 2010. Focus is on bringing in “first time” participants to the programs.</li> <li>Met the objective in 2008 (at 30% for 2009 calendar year)</li> <li>Need to develop the environmental outcomes achieved as a result of increased HHW collection participation.</li> </ul>
8.3 75.6 16.9 9	<b>Land Fed = \$0.994 M comp</b> <b>Land Fed = \$0.386 M operating</b> <b>Land State = \$11.864 M comp</b> <b>Land State = \$1.982 M operating</b> <b>Land State = \$0.504 M transfer to MDH</b> <b>EACM Fed = \$2.828 M comp</b> <b>EACM Fed = \$0.922 M operating</b> <b>EACM State = \$1.454 M comp</b> <b>EACM State = \$0.2 M operating</b>	<b>L2 TOTAL</b>		
<b>Goal L.3 Restore land to productive use by managing risk from contaminated sites.</b>				
<b>Objective L3a) Reduce the number of sites in the Superfund Program at a rate of 10 sites per year.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
5.9 19.7	Land Fed = \$0.953 M comp Land Fed = \$0.699 M operating Land State = \$4.025 M comp Land State = \$10.788 M operating Land State = \$0.800 M transfer to MDH	Superfund program	Complete assessment/preliminary investigations at approximately 240 sites over the biennium, including 122 potential vapor sites.  24 fire fighting foam sites.(Alexandria Fire Dept., Bemidji Fire Dept., Brooklyn Center Fire Dept., Burnsville Fire Dept., Claremont Fire Dept., Cottage Grove Fire Dept., Fridley Fire Dept., Goodview Fire Dept., Harmony Fire Dept., Hastings Fire Dept., Kenyon Fire Dept., King's Cove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of sites and status: investigation (23), active remediation (13), operation and maintenance (51) or closed (8)</li> <li>Risks associated with the site: population within 500 feet, size of contaminated groundwater plumes, public water supply areas within ¼ mile, and surface water features within ¼ mile</li> <li>Land returned to productive use in acres (5,844 acres)</li> </ul> FY2012 – 2013 focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures initially presented as snapshot of current period</li> <li>Measures will be expanded to show cumulative for program and expected achievements</li> <li>Green remediation will be incorporated in all L3 objectives for the next strategic review</li> </ul>

			Marina, Luverne Fire Dept., Marathon Refinery, MSP Airport, Myrtle Fire Dept., North St. Paul Fire Dept., Pierz Fire Dept., Pine Bend Refinery, Preston Fire Dept., Richfield Fire Dept., Rochester Fire Dept., South Central College, Up North Plastics)  Complete response actions at 20 sites over the biennium.(Blaine Municipal Well Contamination, Boise Cascade Paint Waste Dump, Brainerd Former City Dump, Fridley Commons Park Well Field, General Mills, Highway 96 Dump, Isanti Solvent (AKA Charles Schumaker Farm), Koppers Coke, Lehillier, Nutting Truck and Caster Company, 3M Oakdale Disposal Site, 3M Woodbury Disposal Site, Winona Groundwater Contamination, Mankato Plating Co, Peter Pan, Ritari Post & Pole, Gopher Oil Co. Delaware, Brooklyn Park Dump (SF), Former Pilgrim Cleaners, Southview & 10th St)	
Objective L3b) Attain a net decline in the number of sites in the Petroleum Tank Release Program of 150 sites per year.				
15.5	Land Fed = \$2.116 M comp	Petroleum Remediation Program	Investigate, evaluate risk, clean-up as needed and close 350 sites per year.	See L3a above.
21.5	Land Fed = \$0.584 M operating Land State = \$3.674 M comp Land State = \$13.354 M operating		100% of PRP reports reviewed within 120 days.  265 cleanups completed annually at federally regulated sites.  < 10% of open RP sites without progress for 2 year.  Complete one municipal water supply replacement contaminated by petroleum per year.  1000 acres of petroleum contaminated land restored to productive use per year.	
Objective L3c) Complete 100 percent of the construction and 100 percent of the land use plans for all 112 landfills in the Closed Landfill Program by 2012.				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or	Measures/Outcomes	Results



		Program		
22.8	Land State = \$4.723 M comp Land State = \$32.186 M operating Land State = \$3.150M capital outlay Land State = \$0.125 M grants	Closed Landfill Program	<p>Complete 9 construction projects at Mille Lacs County, WLSSD Duluth and Albert Lea/Edgewater Dump, plus work at WDE Andover, East Mesaba, Chippewa County, Anoka Ramsey, Isanti-Chisago and Paynesville and 50% of Washington County Landfill.</p> <p>Collect and destroy 26 million pounds of methane per year in landfill gas collection systems</p> <p>Prevent 9 million gallons per year of landfill leachate from reaching ground-water systems by operating collection systems for leachate and groundwater pump and treat systems</p> <p>Complete 7 landuse plans in FY 10 and 15 landuse plans in FY11 to reduce human exposure to risks around landfills.</p>	<p>Closed landfill construction on target to complete work at all landfills in program by end of 2015. Land use plans important to local communities to guide growth near closed landfill</p> <p>12,716,762 gallons of leachate pumped in Fy2010. The goal was exceeded.</p> <p>There are 21 landfills with gas extraction and gas-to-energy systems in place to destroy methane. During FY2010, 24,210,831 pounds of methane were destroyed. This was slightly under the target.</p> <p>Closed landfill program report found at: <a href="http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/component/option.com_docman/task.doc_view/gid.15396">http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/component/option.com_docman/task.doc_view/gid.15396</a></p>
<b>Objective L3d) Facilitate the redevelopment of contaminated properties through issuance of 200 assurance letters per year, consistent with standards established to protect human health and the environment.</b>				
6.4 17.6	Land Fed = \$1.111 M comp Land Fed = \$0.381 M operating Land State = \$3.153 M comp Land State = \$0.878 M operating	Voluntary Investigation and Clean Up Program	2000 acres of contaminated land returned to productive use over the biennium, resulting in jobs created and increased property taxes	Reduction in staff and resources due to decrease in activity. Appears to be impacted by economy.
27.8 81.6	Land Fed = \$4.180 M comp Land Fed = \$1.664 M operating Land State = \$15.575 M comp Land State = \$57.206 M operating	<b>L3 TOTAL</b>		

	Land State = \$0.800 M transfer to MDH Land State = \$3.150 M capital outlays Land State = \$0.125 M grants			
<b><i>Vision: Minnesota Has Clean, Sustainable Surface and Groundwater</i></b>				
<b>Goal W.1 Assess the condition of Minnesota's groundwater systems and provide information on the effectiveness of Best Management Practices to assist the Agency's efforts to prevent and reduce degradation of groundwater and support groundwater conservation</b>				
<b>Objective W1a) Assess the ambient condition of Minnesota's groundwater, focusing on vulnerable aquifers in nonagricultural areas.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
1.5 4.0 3.5 1.7	Water State = \$0.230 M comp Water State = \$0.004 M operating Water State = \$0.750 M comp Ground water assessment Water State = \$1.500 M operating Ground water assessment EACM Fed = \$0.615 M comp EACM State = \$0.270 M comp	Ambient monitoring effort to measure the status and trends of non-agricultural pollutants in vulnerable aquifers.	Base Effort -Sample 100 existing wells per year for VOCs, nitrate and chloride.  Clean Water Fund -Install 60 new wells by June 30, 2011 (on track to install 150 over 5 years) in key locations to allow us to better characterize effects of land use on groundwater quality. - Increase sampling effort to 150 wells/year by June 30, 2011. -Expand the sample analysis to include endocrine disrupting chemicals at a subset of wells (≥20%). -Enhance on-line availability of ambient data. -Complete 4-5 groundwater models each year for TMDLs/watershed plans.	Progress: <b>Contracts for well installation are executed.</b>  Executing a 5-year plan to improve the assessment of Minnesota vulnerable aquifers by enhancing the monitoring well network in sand and gravel aquifers.  Providing technical support for TMDL studies by developing groundwater models.  Monitoring will begin as scheduled.
<b>Objective W1b) By December 31, 2012, and every five years thereafter, report on the condition of Minnesota's groundwater.</b>				
1.6 0.2 0.2	EACM Fed = \$0.254 M comp EACM State = \$0.034 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.031 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.364 operating	Analyze data collected by MPCA and other agencies to identify trends in groundwater quality and emerging issues.	The focus for the FY2010-2011 biennium will be on monitoring/data collection to support the update of the Ground Water Condition Report scheduled for calendar year 2012.	No metrics applicable for this objective until the five-year groundwater condition report is completed in 2012.

Objective W1c) By December 31, 2010, identify Best Management Practices employed by programs to prevent or reduce groundwater degradation, highlight those for more data is needed to evaluate effectiveness, and develop a plan for plan for addressing the data gaps.				
0.2	EACM Fed = \$0.031 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.364 M operating	Work with MPCA program areas to identify gaps in available information about BMP effectiveness and create a plan to fill those gaps.	-- Complete survey of existing BMPs by January 1, 2010. -- Identify data gaps by June 30, 2010. -- Develop a plan for addressing data gaps by December 31 2010	This objective will not have metrics to report until more work is competed on the groundwater conditions and other preparation work has been completed.  Program areas included in the study include: stormwater infiltration systems, demolition landfills, manure storage facilities, SSTs systems, land application of wastewater or industrial by-products.
1.5 5.3 1.9	Water State = \$0.230 M comp Water State = \$0.004 M operating EACM Fed = \$0.900 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.364 M operating EACM State = \$0.304 M comp	New Clean Water Fund Groundwater Assessment Water State = \$0.750 M comp GW assessment Water State = \$1.500 M operating GW assessment	W1 TOTAL	
Goal W.2 Assess the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of Minnesota's lakes, streams, and wetlands to identify if designated uses are being met, and provide information on the condition of waters.				
Objective W2a) By December 31, 2017, sample and assess Minnesota's 81 major watersheds to determine if they meet designated aquatic life, recreation and consumption beneficial uses, and to identify pollutant load trends.				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
4.9 1.1 1.0 5.3	Water State = \$0.754 M comp Water State = \$0.642 M operating Water State = \$0.082 M comp Clean Water Assessment Water State = \$0.293 M operating Clean Water Assessment Land State = \$1.300 M pfc projects EACM Fed = \$0.159 M comp EACM State =	Intensive watershed monitoring, major watershed load monitoring, probabilistic stream monitoring and Minnesota Milestone monitoring to assess the health of Minnesota's watersheds on a 10-year cycle and track trends over time.	Base Effort -- Monitor 15 major watershed outlets each year. -- Monitor 100 stream sites each year for biological, physical and chemical parameters. -- Monitor Minnesota Milestone chemistry sites in two basins each year. -- Complete a probabilistic stream survey every 5 years to provide in-depth information about Minnesota's streams and track changes in stream health over time.  Clean Water Fund -- Monitor at least 66 major watershed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While sampling is on the track, we have not kept up with watershed reporting and assessment (W2d).</li> <li>A model watershed report developed by contract is under review will help others write future reports more efficiently.</li> <li>Specific quantitative measures should be developed following the winter 2011 assessments, with additional input from staff and managers.</li> <li>Possible operational metric: <u>Use</u> of ambient data in support of other programs/activities (TMDLs, etc.).</li> </ul>

	\$0.873 M comp EACM State = \$0.128 M operating		outlets/main stem sites (cooperative effort with DNR, Met. Council, USGS and others). -- Monitor 200 stream sites in FY2010 and 400 stream sites in FY2011 for biological, physical and chemical parameters.	
<b>Objective W2b) By January 1, 2017, gather water quality data and assess 100 percent of the lakes 500 acres and larger; at least 25 percent of the lakes between 100 and 499 acres; and continue to expand the Citizen Lake and Citizen Stream Monitoring Programs by five percent per year.</b>				
7.0 33.0  1.0 8.7	Water State = \$1.088 M comp Water State = \$3.400 M comp Assessment Water State = \$4.750 M operating Assessment Water State = \$2.650 M grants Assessment EACM Fed = \$0.189 M comp EACM State = \$1.382 M comp	Lake assessment monitoring, citizen/local monitoring programs and pass-through funding.	Base Effort -- Sample 40 lakes per year for clarity, nutrients and algae. -- Provide support for 1,200 citizen lake volunteers and 800 citizen stream volunteers.  Clean Water Fund - Sample 30 lakes in FY2010 and 60 lakes in FY2011 for clarity, nutrients and algae. - Pass through \$500,000 in FY2010 and \$2 million in FY2011 for local/citizen assessment monitoring efforts. - Sample fish and surface waters from 20 Minnesota lakes for endocrine disrupting chemicals.	Status: On track <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lake assessment goals are being met. In fact, we have already exceeded our 2017 goal of monitoring and assessing 25% of lakes 100-499 acres.</li> <li>• Some volunteer participation dropped from 2007 to 2008 because Clean Water funding has created more local opportunities for citizens to become involved (i.e., SWAGs).</li> </ul>
<b>Objective W2c) Beginning in 2010, evaluate the overall state-wide quality of Minnesota's wetlands using probabilistic surveys every three years to determine if wetland programs are meeting the goal of no net loss of wetland quality and assist the Department of Natural Resources and the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources in their evaluation of wetland quantity.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
3.3  1.0 2.3	New FTE Water Fed = \$0.062 M comp Water Fed = \$0.359 M operating Water State = \$.503 M comp Water State = \$1.134 M operating EACM Fed = \$0.149 M comp	Probabilistic wetland monitoring on a three year cycle	- Sample 60 wetlands for plants and invertebrates by December 31, 2009, for a total of 180 wetlands sampled during the 3-year monitoring cycle. Sampling is funded by an EPA grant.	On track

	EACM State = \$0.410 M comp			
<b>Objective W2d) By April 1, 2010, and every two years thereafter, identify impaired waters, report that information to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency according to their requirements, and provide information about impaired and unimpaired waters to Minnesotans.</b>				
1.5 1.7 0.1 0.3	Water Fed = \$0.196 M comp Water Fed = \$0.056 M operating Water State = \$.265 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.016 M comp EACM State = \$0.048 M comp	Impaired waters listing.	- Public notice initial draft TMDL list in fall 2009. - Submit 2010 final draft TMDL list to EPA by April 1, 2010, for EPA approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment process redesign was piloted for 5 watersheds. Redesign enhancements being developed based on pilot outcomes and to be instituted in 2011 assessments.</li> <li>Template watershed report being drafted for one watershed. Remaining watershed reports to follow in 2010-2011.</li> <li>Specific quantitative measures should be developed following the winter 2011 assessments.</li> </ul>
1.5 16.9 3.1 16.6	<b>Water Fed = \$0.258 M comp Water Fed = \$0.415 M operating Water State = \$2.609 M comp Water State = \$1.776 M operating Land State = \$1.300 M pfc projects EACM Fed = \$0.513 M comp EACM State = \$2.713 M comp EACM State = \$0.128 M operating</b>	<b>W2 TOTAL</b>		
34.1	<b>Water State = \$3.482 M comp Assessment Water State = \$5.043 M operating Assessment Water State = \$2.650 grants</b>	<b>New Clean Water Fund Assessment and Monitoring</b>		
<b>Goal W.3 Protect and improve the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of Minnesota's lakes, streams and wetlands.</b>				
<b>Objective W3a) By May 1, 2011 and every three years thereafter, review Minnesota's water quality standards to incorporate standards that reflect current science and information.</b>				

FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
4.7 3.3 2.7	Water State = \$0.728 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.517 M comp EACM State = \$0.466 M comp EACM State = \$0.116 M operating	Set water quality standards. Rule revision for new standards.	By May 1, 2011 adopt into rule water quality standards update according to schedule, scope and APA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2011 Triennial Review scope and schedule established and accepted by EPA. Triennial review proceeding with draft Technical Support Documents nearly completed. Final revised schedule not yet formalized but 6 months - 1 year delay anticipated.</li> <li>• Nondegradation approach being finalized and to be released for stakeholders and public review in the next month. SONAR and rule drafting to begin August 2010. Final rule revision adoption expected March 2012.</li> <li>• Triennial Review process mapping to be initiated in the next 6 months – 1 year; coaching assistance may be needed.</li> <li>• Specific quantitative measures, beyond the current “meeting activity schedule”, are needed.</li> <li>• Developed measures should reflect the varying complexity of particular rule revisions (i.e. magnitude differences for less and more complex rule revisions).</li> </ul>
<b>Objective W3b) Wastewater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) facilities do not contribute to the impairment or degradation of state waters.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
69.5 35.3 18.4	Water Fed = \$0.02 M operating Water State = \$10.690 M comp Water State = \$2.591 M operating EACM Fed = \$6.061 M comp EACM State = \$2.990 M comp EACM State = \$1.089 M operating	TMDL and NPDES program activities. Improved coordination between impaired waters and NPDES permitting programs to ensure that water quality restoration plans and activities are completed efficiently and effectively. Point Source Wastewater NPDES Program activities include permitting, facility inspections, compliance data review, training, technical assistance, compliance and enforcement.  Environmental Review	Efforts to reduce NPDES impacts to impaired waters. • 15 EPA approved TMDL reports currently establish 228 individual waste load allocations for NPDES permitted dischargers. Of these, 10 TMDL reports establish: → 177 individual waste load allocations for Fecal Coliform bacteria or Total Suspended Solids. → NPDES permit effluent limits for these pollutants are set at concentrations below the applicable water quality standards ensuring that the discharges do not contribute to the impairments. • Five of the approved TMDL reports establish: → 51 individual waste load allocations for Total Phosphorus or Ammonia Nitrogen which require NPDES permitted sources to reduce pollutant loads to impaired waters. • Statewide mercury TMDL establishes a methodology for establishing whether any NPDES permitted discharger is a significant contributor to local impairments. Projected through calendar year 2011: • 98 TMDL projects are currently	Two TMDL permit related measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TMDL related pollutant load reductions required and achieved</li> <li>• Wastewater effluent pollutant reduction</li> </ul> TMDL pollutant load status 1. Ammonia reductions required and achieved on Chippewa River Unionized Ammonia TMLD (2004) and Montevideo WWTPs. Facility upgraded and river is no longer impaired. 2. Phosphorus reductions required and achieved for Lower Minnesota River Watershed Dissolved Oxygen TMDL (2004) and the West Fork Des Moines River Watershed TMDL (Heron Lake). a. Minnesota River phosphorus reductions by the requirements of the Minnesota River General Phosphorus permit. Trades between point source dischargers are counted as permit actions. b. Heron Lake reductions based on the Okabena, Brewster and Lakefield WWTP permits which included 1 mg/L total phosphorus effluent limits when they were reissued in FY2010. 3. Mercury reductions required and achieved are related to the Statewide Mercury TMDL (2007).  FY2012 – 2013 Efforts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collecting this data continues to be very time consuming and difficult. The new daily values delta project that is to be completed in calendar 2011 will allow us to do a more accurate and quicker analysis of the data.</li> <li>• Partial funding for this project has been preliminarily approved by EPA. Because this project is critical for the TMDL, Stormwater, and Wastewater programs, if the EPA funds are not received, we intend make this project a priority and use Agency staff.</li> </ul>



			<p>underway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80 TMDL projects are scheduled to be completed by calendar year 2011</li> </ul> <p>Municipal and industrial NPDES contributions to the impairments addressed by these TMDL projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the Lake Pepin TMDL alone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>→ 726 NPDES permits are in the lake's drainage; including</li> <li>→ 209 NPDES permits in the three metro major watersheds</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>FY10-11: 10 wastewater Environmental Assessment worksheets</p> <p>FY10-11 Mining permits: Minntac, Northshore - Peter Mitchell, Cliffs Erie - Dunka, Cliffs</p>	
		<p>Point Source Wastewater NPDES Program activities include permitting, facility inspections, compliance data review, training, technical assistance, compliance and enforcement.</p>	<p>Overall compliance rate for NPDES permitted facilities in 2008 was 94.3% w/major facilities at 96.7 %. Goal is 90%.</p> <p>Output to achieve the compliance rates were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assure 90% of permits are current and 92.9% permits are current (including mining and biofuels). In FY10, maintain 10% backlog need to issue 549 permits (171 are 1 general permit). With current staffing backlog may increase to 20% in FY10. Need to issue 350 permits in FY11.</li> <li>• Issued 66 construction permits in 2009. Project 75 in FY10, 24 of them being Stimulus projects</li> <li>• Funded 51 projects in 2008 expect this to increase in FY10 because of stimulus projects</li> </ul> <p>2008 worked with 10 new unsewered communities, total of 79 are in some state of progress, and funded 10 projects. Project similar for FY10-11</p> <p>Issued 377 sewer extension permits</p>	

			<p>during 2008 – expect a slight decrease in FY10-11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Completed 441 inspections in 2008. Project similar in FY10-11.</li> <li>•Completed 118 enforcement actions with total penalties of \$333,171. Project similar #'s for FY10-11.</li> </ul>	
<b>Objective W3c) By January 1, 2014, strengthen local programs to reduce the percentage of subsurface soil treatment systems (SSTS) characterized as failing or imminent threats to public health and safety from 39 percent to less than five percent.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
11.7 3.6	<p>Water State = \$1.952 M comp Water State = \$0.397 M operating Water State = \$0.172 M grant EACM Fed = \$0.607 M comp EACM Fed = 0.692 M operating</p>	<p>SSTS program - manage 25% of the State's wastewater ~500,000 wastewater treatment systems through local units of government. Activities to strengthen local programs include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Communicate SSTS program successes/needs/status</li> <li>2. Assist implementation and provide technical support for new 2008 updated SSTS rules.</li> <li>3. Establish a new Product Registration Process</li> <li>4. Provide support to improve and maintain the knowledge, skills, and abilities of SSTS Professionals, through an effective licensing and training program</li> <li>5. Administer an</li> </ol>	<p>By completing the new activities combined with recent rule updates to strengthen local programs it is our expectation to increase the rate of fixing SSTS failing or imminent threats to public health from about 2% to about 5% per year to meet the 2014 target.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Annually summarize/communicate local government SSTS data, through the SSTS Annual Report, and other information, to develop an accurate picture of SSTS success/needs/status.</li> <li>2. Provide admin. startup training in 2009.</li> <li>3. Product Registration process running as required by 2010 with a goal of 20 products listed in 2009.</li> <li>4. Provide continued support to the Agency licensing and certification program.</li> <li>5. Monitor and track SSTS compliance issues and provide communication to local programs</li> <li>6. Complete phase I and II of SSTS Advanced Design "Guidance" in 2009. Allows certified ADs to complete designs up to 10,000 gpd.</li> <li>7. Expect that 70 % counties will have new updated ordinances that will have</li> </ol>	<p>Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SSTS inventories conducted. Legislative directive to complete SSTS inventories for the entire state via direct or indirect methods within 10 years. Completing the inventory provides a more accurate measure of SSTS characterized as failing or imminent health threats and will allow us to track our progress to the &gt; 5% goal.</li> <li>▪ Progress to eliminate untreated sewage discharges. This is a new measure. The baseline of gallons of untreated sewage discharges remaining is a best guess effort that will be refined as we gain more information.</li> </ul> <p>Status: Needs acceleration to meet 2014 deadline</p> <p>FY2012-2013 Adaptations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Utilize report recommending a plan for statewide SSTS inspections and inventories and</li> <li>▪ The existing taskforce with counties, realtors, and the onsite industry to develop and implement methods to reduce the number of SSTS that are ITPH and enforce all SSTS violations.</li> <li>▪ If CWF are directed toward these efforts it will allow for additional resources and assistance to LGUs to increase their efforts.</li> <li>▪ Assess redirecting more Municipal wastewater staff effort towards the unsewered effort.</li> </ul> <p>Report found at: <a href="http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15476">http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15476</a></p>

		<p>effective and visible compliance and technical assistance presence.</p> <p>6. Partner in funding assistance programs to seek and fix failures.</p> <p>8. Financial assistance to counties to administer their SSTS program</p> <p>9. Resolve issues relating to SSTS and the need for other professional licensure</p>	<p>stronger design and enforcement requirements.</p> <p>8. Need to inspect 250,000 systems to determine Statewide status of septic systems. Assume 5 biennia to address annual cost @ \$150 per inspection would cost \$3,814,353.</p> <p>9. Assuming that of the 434,000 systems in Minnesota, 35% in noncompliance @ \$7,100/system = \$1,078,490,000. The 10-Year Plan assumed that 5% of the funding for upgrades from state sources, or \$53,924,500.</p>	
		<p>SSTS Program.</p>	<p>Actions to assure that wastewater systems and land application are done to prevent surface and ground water contamination are:</p> <p>a. straight pipes – work with LGUs on compliance issues. Maintain +90% fix it rate for non-compliant systems.</p> <p>b. license violations – issue 12 APOs per year; issue 1 Order of Sanctions per year. Penalties and license revocation will procure compliance with 98% of licensees.</p> <p>c. tank fee violations –follow-up with delinquent fees will procure critical funding owed to the state.</p> <p>d. complaint response – respond to 200 complaints per year regarding SSTS practices statewide..</p> <p>e. technical assistance – respond to 1500 calls per year for technical information and rule interpretation. Inquiry response procures better understanding of rules which further results in improved environmental</p>	

			<p>f. compliance inspection – conduct 30 inspections of licensees statewide per year. Compliance inspections identify violators and procure better environmental practices and agency credibility</p> <p>g. Ensure good ordinances and effective local administration.</p>	
<b>Objective W3d) NPDES Stormwater sources do not contribute to the impairment or degradation of state waters</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
49.6  1.1	<p>Water State = \$7.726 M comp Water State = \$2.564 M operating</p> <p>Water State = \$0.450 M Joint Power Agreements EACM State = \$0.214 M comp EACM State = \$0.161 M operating</p>	Manage MS4 stormwater program	<p>1. a. Complete review, public notice, and approval of 233 regulated MS4s' SWPPPs by 6/30/09. b. Complete review and approval of 15 MS4 nondegradation plans by 6/30/09, remaining 15 by 12/31/09. Ensure SWPPPs are modified as necessary to incorporate measures to address nondegradation. c. Review and approve assessments and SWPPP modifications for all MS4s' discharges to Outstanding Resource Value Waters (ORVWs). d. Review 233 annual reports per year, and track progress in meeting permit requirements and SWPPP milestones. e. Now through April 2011, develop revised MS4 general permit with more specific requirements to replace current permit, which expires 5/1/11.</p> <p>2. a. Audit two regulated MS4 stormwater programs per month during FY10 (24 total), increase FY11 so all regulated MS4s audited within 7 years. b. FY10-11, all MS4s actively managing their Stormwater systems, as judged from SWPPPs, annual reports, nondeg + ORVW reviews (and in FY10, audits + TMDL load reduction tracking)</p> <p>3. a. Develop and implement scaled-back,</p>	<p><b>Three strategic review measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulated Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) actively manage their Stormwater systems.</li> <li>Construction Stormwater (CSW) projects control sediment and erosion in compliance with permit, at the design stage and during construction.</li> <li>Volume of sediment discharge potentially prevented by CSW program</li> <li>Use GreenStep cities calculators to determine outcomes and improve reporting efficiencies</li> <li>Baselines established; continue to measure</li> <li>CSW compliance during construction remains low</li> <li>Use results and add measures to guide program adaptations</li> <li>Track progress in MS4s' engagement annually, vs. this 2009 baseline</li> <li>Complete audits of MS4s in addition to the annual reports data</li> <li>Use this data, together with other considerations, to help set communication, compliance, and assistance priorities for the Stormwater program.</li> </ul>

			simplified tracking system for MS4 BMP implementation and estimated load reductions in FY10. b. Ensure that regulated MS4s meet any FY10-11 load reductions called for in TMDL implementation plans and revise their SWPPPs (currently ~70 MS4s are subject to TMDL reductions, but nearly all 233 could be by the end of 2011.)	
		Manage Construction stormwater program	<p>a. By 7/1/09, determine a baseline rate at which CSW SWPPPs meet key permit requirements, and establish targets for both % of projects reviewed (currently ~2%) and future improved "on paper" compliance rates.</p> <p>b. FY10-11, conduct 25 random and targeted audits of CSW SWPPPs</p> <p>c. Online Construction permit = 2008 Q1: 28%, Q2: 27%, Q3: 33%, Q4: 45%.</p> <p>d. Promote on-line application to achieve &gt;75% usage rate by end of FY11.</p> <p>e. By 7/1/09, determine a baseline rate of in-field compliance with the CSW general permit; establish higher targets for both % of projects inspected and improved compliance rates. In calendar years 2006-2008, 49% of projects were inspected by LGUs in 10 counties (2,254 sites), and 11% of projects in the other 77 counties were inspected by MPCA (1,089 sites).</p> <p>f. Add at least a 10% number of random and targeted inspections of CSW project sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High CSW compliance rate for plans (SWPPPs) vs. low compliance in the field suggest the needs to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build a more reliable baseline for design-stage compliance: Add to the limited data set of SWPPP audits as time allows</li> <li>Further assess why compliance decreases so much from the plan to the job site, then adapt program delivery where possible</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>2013 CSW permit: turbidity monitoring</p>
		Manage Industrial stormwater program	<p>After general permit issuance (targeted by 1/1/10), track permit coverage extended (~1,600 current permittees/applicants plus est. 3,000-5,000 new), no-exposure certifications (~2,100 current plus unknown number new), and benchmark monitoring (all permittees, quarterly beginning year 2) and effluent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial Stormwater measures under development, including benchmark and discharge monitoring newly required by April 2010 permit</li> <li>Continue to use Small Business assistance staff to engage potential sites in avoiding permit need by implementing best management practices that avoid permit need</li> <li>Develop outcome metric based on BMP calculators – maximum runoff examples.</li> </ul>

			<p>limit monitoring (8 of 29 sectors) data submitted.</p> <p>FY10 and the first half of FY11 will be fully consumed by ISW permit issuance, development of on-line permit application and quarterly monitoring data submittal, and technical/ compliance assistance to the many new permittees. In second half of FY11, establish procedures and targets for ISW audits, inspections, compliance rates, and verification of no-exposure certifications.</p> <p>In FY10-11: a. complete ISW BMP manual by 12/31/10. b. produce additional ISW guidance as needed and as resources allow. c. continue work by U of M and others to provide clear procedures for stormwater BMP selection, BMP operation and maintenance, accurate monitoring of variable discharges, thermal and pollutant load determination, and quantification of load reductions.</p>	
<b>Objective W3e) Ensure that manure does not contribute to the impairment or degradation of state waters.</b>				
28.3	Water State = \$4.387 M comp Water State = \$.642 M operating	Feedlot Permitting and Compliance	23,000 active registered feedlots; 1,100 are NPDES (>1,000 animal units); project that compliance rate at NPDES sites will remain above 95% for both FY10 & FY11; Project completion of Level II land application inspections at approximately 50% of NPDES sites by FY10 & 60% of NPDES sites by FY11; project MPCA staff will conduct ~ 1000 inspections in both FY10 & FY11 (construction, land application, NPDES sites and non-NPDES sites)	Improved land application compliance rates within watersheds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance trends will take a few years to identify and resolve</li> <li>Operational Measure: land application inspections @ all NPDES sites by 2015 (~1100 sites)</li> <li>Counties moved from e-LINK to DELTA this year. Will aide ability to track accomplishments/activities. Streamline reporting for counties. Eliminate need to submit reports.</li> <li>Measure needed to reflect priorities for sensitive area focus as opposed to watershed.</li> </ul>
2.7 .02	Water State = \$4.648 M pass-thru to BWSR EACM Fed = \$0.384 M comp EACM State = \$0.039 M comp	Environmental Review	<p>FY10-11 - delegated counties will conduct approximately 3000 inspections (construction, land application and non-NPDES sites) and issue ~ 200</p>	<p>Fy2012-2013 Efforts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include information on the MPCA's Watershed approach in new County Feedlot Officer (CFO) Feedlot Training program.</li> <li>Develop new metrics with counties based on Watershed approach</li> <li>Training on tracking outcomes from land application inspections.</li> </ul>



			construction permits (non-NPDES sites) FY10-11 - 22 feedlot environmental assessment worksheets	
<b>Objective W3f) To provide a framework to guide water quality protection and impaired waters restoration efforts, develop watershed management and implementation plans for the 81 major watersheds by 2018.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
4.3  4.9	Water State = \$0.665 M comp Water State = \$0.655 M Watershed Pilot projects EACM Fed = \$0.730 M comp	Develop a watershed planning and management framework plan using 2 pilot major watershed scale plans (Buffalo R. and Cannon R.) and 1 pilot Metro sub-watershed scale plan (Elm Cr.).	2010-11 Biennium projected outcomes The watershed planning and management framework plan will be completed. All 3 watershed pilots will be either completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On track to initiate 100% of TMDL Studies on a ten year cycle and complete within 3 years of initiation.</li> <li>On track to secure EPA approval of 100% of TMDL studies within 5 years of initiation.</li> <li>On track to approve 100% of TMDL implementation plans within one year of TMDL study approval.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective W3g) Restore impaired waters to meet designated uses.</b>				
2.0  40.8  45.0  23.9  1.3	Water Fed = \$0.338 M comp Water Fed = \$0.603 M operating Water Fed = \$9.010 M grants Water State = \$32.360 M comp Water State = \$1.016 M operating Water State = \$2.996 M CWP projects Water State = \$5.060 M loans Water State = \$4.800 M TMDL comp Water State = \$4.305 M TMDL operating Water State = \$14.053 M TMDL projects EACM Fed = \$11.670 M comp EACM Fed = \$2.896	Complete TMDLs and TMDL implementation plans according to Impaired Waters List schedule.	Of all the 1090 2008 impaired waters listings for conventional pollutants, 25% will have completed TMDL studies, and 50% will have TMDL studies underway, so about 75% of the impaired waters listings will have TMDL studies completed or underway. Also, 20% of the 2008 listings will have TMDL implementation plans completed. The PCA will meet the US EPA's TMDL completions pace expectations of completing TMDLs for 60 listings per year.  (showing the work for TMDL completions, 145 done + 20 more to be done this year to meet this year's EPA goal, +60/yr of biennium = 285 done by end of 10-11 biennium/1090 = 26% 410 underway -140 ends 270 + projects x 4 listings) = 270 + 260 = 530/1090=48.6% for completed imp plans, 145 TMDLs completed now +60 more in 1 <sup>st</sup> year = 205/1090 =18.8%	Status: On track <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need new watershed database to track the number of waterbodies delisted due to implementation activities and to what level was achieved..</li> </ul>

	M operating EACM State = \$3.950 M comp			
2.0	Water Fed = \$0.338 M comp		FTE 45 New Clean Water Fund TMDL Water State = \$4.800 M TMDL comp	
208.9	Water Fed = \$0.623 M operating		Water State = \$4.305 M TMDL operating	
	Water Fed = \$9.010 M grants		Water State = \$14.708 M TMDL projects	
	Water State = \$32.360 M comp			
73.7	Water State = \$8.315 M operating			
23.7	Water State = \$4.820 M grants			
	Water State=\$2.996 MCWP projects			
	Water State = \$5.060 M loans			
	EACM Fed = \$11.670 M comp			
	EACM Fed = \$3.588 M operating			
	EACM State = \$3.950 M comp			
	EACM State = \$1.366 M operating			
		<b>W3 TOTAL</b>		

***Vision: Excellence in Operations***

**Goal E.1 Provide a safe and healthy workplace for all employees, volunteers and visitors.**

**Objective E1a) Provide a safe workplace; free from work-related accidents and injuries by addressing safety issues and continuously improving agency practices.**

FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
1	Admin State = \$0.146 M comp Admin State = \$0.27 M operating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote an engaging Agency-wide safety committee</li> <li>Promote an engaging Agency-wide safety culture</li> <li>Incorporate OSHA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>75% member attendance at monthly safety committee meetings</li> <li>Agency leadership will sign a PCA Safety Pledge which will be posted by leadership.</li> <li>Post semester divisional incidence rates comparative to the zero goals and the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshop design done and first pilots finished.</li> <li>Arrange for medical monitoring cycle for staff, using annual plan approach. [last year's experience all sites were under the \$5,000 margin]</li> <li>Commence 8 hour refresher course RFP/contract; all others to be done under annual plan.</li> <li>By July 2011 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety management system designed, communicated and implemented</li> <li>Adjust workshops so that all supervisors can participate</li> <li>Divisions support Agency zero injuries goal through approaching and maintaining a zero incidence rate for their division.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		incidence rates as a division level benchmark to indicate level of workplace safety • Collect and monitor lost work time due to work related injuries. Establish an action plan to reduce work-related lost time.	Agency's benchmark incidence rate for the previous year • Semester hours of lost work time will decline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency lost time hours reduced allowing for more efficient use of staff time.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E1b) Staff has access to required training, including refresher training, including all new employees within probation period or before performing those duties where training is a prerequisite.</b>				
3	Admin State = \$0.437 M comp Admin State = \$0.098 M operating	Maintain an annual training calendar, post all completed training, develop alternative training & delivery methods e.g., web cast, online, webex, etc.).	Mandatory training available to 100% of new employees within probationary period, training records are current quarterly, increase training available via alternative methods by 10% by December 31, 2009.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>75% of staff safety training surveys are submitted and entered into the LMS by June 30, 2010.</li> <li>100% of mandatory training available to staff before 2010 field season.</li> <li>Increase training available via alternative methods by 10% by December 31, 2009 and each year thereafter, until 50% is reached.</li> </ul> <p>Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Metrics on track but goals not reached</li> <li>Have training plan in process – will have better sense of our delivery soon.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E1c) Promote participation in employee wellness activities by sponsoring appropriate workplace and non-workplace activities.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
	Admin State = \$0.002 M operating	Wellness committee	Expand wellness committees from St. Paul to all regions by January 1, 2010. Staff participation in all locations at 25% by January 1, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kept an agenda of activities and informational topics so staff has opportunities to change behaviors and enjoy improved quality of life.</li> <li>Fitness room administrative protocol ready by July 2011 should it be acceptable.</li> </ul>
4	Admin State = \$0.583 M comp Admin State = \$0.37 M operating	<b>E1 TOTAL</b>		
<b>Goal E.2 Manage agency operations to support the agency's environmental work and core operations in effective and efficient manner.</b>				
<b>Objective E2a) Maintain a human resources system that supports the agency's management of its employees in performing work of the agency.</b>				
7	Admin State = \$1.019 M comp Admin State = \$0.032 M operating Admin State = \$0.007 M capital outlay	Provide human resources support in workforce planning, consultation, training, labor relations, staffing services, and	*80% of vacancies filling in less than 52 working days. *90% of job audits completed within 20 working days. *Reduce the number of new employees that leave agency within 2 years. *75% of employee workplans and performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate workforce planning with emerging agency business plan; final version workforce plan approach by July 24, 2010.</li> <li>Final agency workforce plan to be completed by June, 2011.</li> <li>Keep HR issues well understood and well documented; enable good decision-making and good communication regarding hiring practices and other staff changes such as reassignments or layoffs.</li> <li>Design and deliver training to supervisors in a series of presentations on HR topics.</li> </ul>

		performance management to agency management.	review completed in FY10. 80% in FY11.	
<b>Objective E2b) Using appropriate benchmarks, improve the linkage of the agency's strategic plan budget workplans and progress evaluation systems toward achieving environmental goals.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
	No staff. Part of existing work.	Staff provide assistance in the development of the agency Strategic Plan, the Environmental Performance Partnership Agreement, workplanning, measurement development, the Performance Reviews, and the Environmental Results Management System	1 strategic plan update every other year 2 performance processes per year 1 Environmental Performance Partnership Audit (EnPPA) work plan every four years 1 EnPPA self assessment per year	<p>Benchmarking completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>against other state environmental agencies (PCA did well).</li> <li>against other state fiscal transparency webpages (PCA 1<sup>st</sup> among state environmental agencies, State of MN in lower 1/3 of States)</li> <li>Adopt appropriate best practices identified in benchmarking as fiscal webpage project proceeds. SWIFT implementation July 1, 2011. Standardize agency processes for fee collection, fiscal reporting, procurement, etc.</li> <li>By July 1, 2012, assuming SWIFT is fully functional, first real time fiscal to work reporting on web</li> </ul> <p>Performance Reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic and Operational performance reviews completed on schedule and as planned</li> </ul> <p>Business Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program reviews completed for the business plan. High level focus areas are being identified. First agency business plan completed in November 2010.</li> <li>Business plan will advance E2b by filling the gap describing agency and program level strategies and actions to fulfill the Strategic Plan. Program Plans (for all programs) and a workforce plan are the new products resulting from this effort.</li> <li>Business/program reviews for next biennium shifted six months to allow for outcomes development for biennial budget presentations.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E2c) Using appropriate benchmarks improve the system of managing agency's resources consistent with our priorities.</b>				
	No staff. Part of existing work.	Same as E2b above.	Same as E2b above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business plan should drive the budget toward meeting Agency focus areas.</li> <li>Anticipate the new SWIFT system will assist us in having financial information available real time.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E2d) Ensure the agency maintains consistent and current administrative policies and practices.</b>				
20.4	Admin State = \$3.755 M comp Admin State = \$0.124 M operating	Manage agency business support functions across agency	<p>Each year policies review and updated</p> <p>Improve electronic sharing of work to address staff reductions by September 1, 2009.</p> <p>Address building related issues</p> <p>Standardize business communications policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No policy has data older than 2 years of current year.</li> <li>Track issues, date raised, resolution, and date resolved.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E2e) Manage agency fiscal resources such that agency budgets are reflective of its priorities and financial information is available in real time.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
27.5	Admin State = \$4.565 M comp Admin State =	Manage agency funds	<p>By April 1, 2009, implement internal audit function.</p> <p>FY10-11, conduct 5 audits per quarter (2</p>	Align annual spending plan with agency strategic plan working closely with management and leadership teams to guide the allocation of financial resources. Provide financial information in a transparent manner on the MPCA web site.

	\$11.206 M operating		being fund oriented, 2 being program grants/loans/contract oriented, 1 of fiscal activities)  Put in place revised biennial budget process: - By October 1, 2009, complete first project prioritization and funding policy. - By September, 2010, complete first biennial budget under new process	Note: Fiscal accountability website is currently static. There are three stages planned. The currently posted Financial Accountability web-pages are stage 1. A version with drill down capability is stage 2 and a live version is stage 3. All stages should be easy to use and conveys our message. Dependent on SWIFT and linkages to updated legacy databases.
<b>Objective E2f) Develop measures for agency-wide compliance and enforcement efforts so that they remain relevant and current in context of the overall strategic plan.</b>				
1	Admin State = \$0.226 M comp	Compliance and Enforcement management (individual program efforts in appropriate media area)	By December 31, 2009, complete process review of APO timeliness  By June 30, 2010, address standardized training needs for all new and existing staff.  By December 31, 2010, complete multi-media assessment for efficiency and travel reductions.	Complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant operational level process improvements will be reported at next operational review.</li> <li>Must improve current enforcement measurement practices with new approaches – outcomes needed on environmental benefits.</li> </ul> Planned <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business plan effort will provide direction to the Agency for 2-3 years and context for measurement.</li> <li>Review how enforcement is measured and how compliance in high risk areas obtained.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E2g) Increase employee engagement levels by three percent for each biennial survey/action planning cycle across the agency.</b>				
	No staff. Part of existing work.	Complete survey of all employees by May 2009, beginning in 2010 survey 100% of employees annually to assess engagement levels, analyze and post survey results by division.	3% annual improvement in number of employees actively engaged, and 5% annual improvement in employees participating in the survey. To date 3 divisions have been surveyed with 5 more to be surveyed.	Status: On track <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5% annual improvement in employees responding to engagement survey.</li> <li>3% annual improvement in number of employees actively engaged.</li> </ul>
54.1	Admin State = \$9.615 M comp Admin State = \$11.321 M operating Admin State=\$0.007 M capital outlay	<b>E2 TOTAL</b>		
<b>Goal E.3 Achieve excellence through application of appropriate tools and best practices.</b>				

Objective E3a) Routinely review agency performance and division dashboard measures and adjust strategic goals and priorities based on the data and best practices as directed by senior managers.				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
	No specific assigned staff.  Part of existing work.	Same as E2b and E2c above.	Same as E2b and E2c above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update communication plan annually before the beginning of each fiscal year – Focus on priority areas – FY2012 – 2013 will be air toxics and risks and watershed management</li> <li>Excellence Forum discussion discuss metrics on efficient agency.</li> </ul>
Objective E3b) Develop and implement a communications strategy that advances the agency goals.				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
1.5 0.5 9.5	EACM Fed = \$0.205 M comp EACM State = \$0.074 M comp EACM State = \$0.016 M operating Admin State = \$0.1384 M comp Admin State = \$0.08 M operating	Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase media outreach</li> <li>Redesign PCA Web site</li> <li>Develop and implement Web 2.0 technology such as WebEx conferencing, podcasting, social networking, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Web redesign completed and OEA/MPCA completely integrated by agency goals. 1 2009</li> <li>Increase media coverage for program progress and outcomes by 10%</li> <li>Create faster, more accessible information focused on agency priorities, pollution prevention, and outcomes</li> <li>Increase knowledge of PCA programs and goals; engage partners, stakeholders and citizens in PCA priorities</li> </ul>	FY2012-2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Move all public notices to web delivery (reduction in cost \$50,000)</li> <li>Pilot ability for citizens to comment on line (efficiency – reduces multiple handling of documents and information) – reduction in cost (\$10,000)</li> <li>Move News Releases to Online ability (reduction in cost \$10,00)</li> <li>Develop communication plan on Air toxics and Watershed results</li> <li>Improve usability of web for citizens</li> </ul>
Objective E3c) Develop and implement an education and outreach strategy that advances the agency goals.				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
2.0	Admin State = \$0.291 M comp	External education and outreach activities	By September 1, 2009 develop strategies.  By March 2010, data for Sr. Managers	<b>Staff reprioritized to other work</b> – TMDLs, GreenCorps, Solid Waste Centroids Using outreach skills as supports environmental work.
Objective E3d) Measure pollution prevention results within targeted agency programs.				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
1.0 0.5	EACM Fed = \$0.131 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.142 M operating EACM State = \$0.193 M comp	Pollution Prevention program	By September 1, 2009 develop strategies to measure coordinated efforts with other programs.  By March 2010, data ready for Operational review by Sr. Managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FY2010, due to shifts in staff and program planning began integration of prevention tools into media areas where implemented.</li> <li>For example, stormwater use of prevention activities led to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1,000 businesses qualified for no exposure exclusion and thus, were not required to obtain Industrial Stormwater Permit.</li> <li>Businesses able to avoid \$2,000,000 in permit fees (over 5 year life of permit).</li> <li>Reduction in Stormwater releases from approximately 2,590 acres.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Continue in FY2012 – 2013 to incorporate this work into strategies under existing media forum objectives to integrate</li> </ul>



	EACM State = \$0.05 M operating		Meet EPA grant objectives and timelines.	pollution prevention as a tool, along with others such as compliance and enforcement, to achieve environmental outcomes.
4.0 2.5 1.0 12.5	Air State = \$0.07 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.336 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.142 M operating EACM State = \$0.267 M comp EACM State= \$0.066 operating Admin State = \$1.821 M comp Admin State=\$0.158 M operating	E3 TOTAL		
<b>Goal E.4 Provide a reliable information management system that supports the agency and its partners in effective and efficient environmental work.</b>				
<b>Objective E4a) Provide timely access to environmental data so that 100 percent of our environmental data that is located in databases is available publicly.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
0.3 1.0	Water State = \$0.0467 M comp Admin State = \$0.146 M comp	Environmental Data Access and What's in my Neighborhood	By December 31, 2009 complete Phase 1 of What's in My Neighborhood data tool by having all facilities available to public using GIS mapping tools and linked to EDA.  By December 31, 2009 complete groundwater data connection in EDA system.  FY11 goals include records availability for What's in My Neighborhood tool and improved data displays based on citizen input and use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement Data Governance Strategy by 6/1/2010 and report on status of Agency Data Governance every year thereafter.</li> <li>For agency programs, report the transparency, inclusiveness, completeness, relevance, accuracy, neutrality, comparability, timeliness, ability to audit and clarity of databases.</li> <li>Assessment of data quality and data completeness not completed. This will be incorporated into the Data Governance Strategy in 2011</li> <li>What's in My Neighborhood update requires completion of other databases so linkages can be made to electronic files and information held in the Air emissions database, GreenStep Cities, Watershed database, and Industrial stormwater, as key upgrades.</li> <li>Legacy databases need review on how to migrate to current platforms and applications – critical to completely moving to electronic applications and reporting.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E4b) Provide an environmental context for 75 percent of our data that is publicly accessible.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
	No staff. Part of	Data management	By December 31, 2009 complete survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of data provided with environmental context estimated at 40%.</li> </ul>

	existing work.		<p>of citizens on how to present context of raw data in available reports for selections.</p> <p>By December 31, 2010, pilot external user driven reports containing meaning of data.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement a repeatable scoring process that is used to assess each major agency database. This scoring will measure the level of data quality maturity (i.e. documentation, security, reliability, accessibility, etc.) In place by 6/1/2010.</li> <li>Percentage of Data Champions who by survey respond that they have either made progress or have not lost ground in data stewardship over the past quarter. On track - 70% made progress, 90% have active data stewards</li> <li>Establish by 6/1/2010 an integrated data governance system and IT governance system that sets directions, standards and prioritizes initiatives for management of environmental data and delivery of IT services.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E4c) Provide IT services that enable staff to deliver environmental services more efficiently and effectively such that 90 percent of the IT services are provided within agreed upon timeframes.</b>				
23.6	<p>Admin State = \$3.437 M comp</p> <p>Admin State = \$4.478 M operating</p>	<p>Wide variety of IT services. A robust service catalog along with specific metrics are still being developed, but two key indicator metrics are the average amount of time during work hours and outside of work hours that multiple components of our computer systems are operational.</p>	<p>FY09 average up time for IT systems during work hours to date is 99.92%. Our target is 99.5%, so we exceeded the target. Up time outside of work hours has no target since no staff are on duty during this period.</p> <p>Even so, our up time in FY09 has been 97.28%. FY10-11 – maintain uptime, support agency's move to enterprise e-mail system, new database development needs in air and TMDL programs.</p>	<p>Focus of Enterprise technology strategy – where to focus resources. Legacy databases on non-sustainable platform and moving network services to data co-location center.</p> <p>Additional efficiency and effectiveness measures needed by IT staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete a multi-level Services Catalog;</li> <li>Decide on metrics; and</li> <li>Acquire baseline data.</li> </ul> <p>Three current metrics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>System up-time ;</li> <li>Help Desk responsiveness ;and</li> <li>System security.</li> <li>Develop one metric for each top level in the Service Catalog by June 30, 2011.</li> <li>Provide Senior Managers measures on how well service is delivered &amp; the value service.</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E4d) Develop the capability for paperless operation for 75 percent of the agency's major services.</b>				
FTE	Budget (in Millions)	Major Activities or Program	Measures/Outcomes	Results
	No new staff. Part of existing file management work.	Enterprise electronic Document Management	<p>By December 31, 2009 complete retention schedule for all documents including web-based.</p> <p>By December 31, 2009 e-mail records stored in electronic document retrieval.</p> <p>By December 31, 2010, workflow for review of HR documents, EPA grants, purchase orders complete.</p> <p>By June 30, 2011, complete invoice, purchase order, payment completely electronic.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize Web 2.0+ technologies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>October 2010, implementation plan for email subscription service completed (i.e., GovDelivery)</li> <li>Public notices (permits, rules, board meetings) published on the web and receive comments electronically</li> <li>Interactive stakeholder involvement real time</li> <li>Collaboration – real time through telepresence and non-real time using shared networks for technical document reviews, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Fiscal transactions electronically (i.e. no paper invoices sent or received)</li> <li>Grant applications done electronically</li> <li>Appropriate E-signature for programs</li> <li>Internal work order approvals, vacancy management, enforcement reviews utilizing workflows</li> <li>Eliminate Central Paper File Systems by FY 2013. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;10,000,000 documents in electronic document system</li> <li>100% of engineering plansheets microfilmed</li> <li>Retention Schedule approved; need to apply</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20 projects completed (e.g., AQ Permitting/Stack testing, stormwater)</li> <li>22 project in progress (e.g. feedlots, enforcement workflow, hazardous waste, rules, human resources, contracts)</li> <li>Working on distributed scanning</li> <li>Developed workflow – sewer extension permitting all electronic</li> </ul> <p>By FY 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redesign mail processing center:</li> <li>Establish 3<sup>rd</sup> floor file prep, scanning and copying center</li> <li>Eliminate centralized paper file systems on 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors</li> <li>Improve Training Options</li> <li>Incorporate document/records management into e-government processes upfront</li> </ul>
<b>Objective E4e) Design a records management system that incorporates 60 percent of paper records into an electronic document management system.</b>				
<b>FTE</b>	<b>Budget (in Millions)</b>	<b>Major Activities or Program</b>	<b>Measures/Outcomes</b>	<b>Results</b>
1.0 1.0 1.0 4.0	Land State = \$0.087 M comp EACM Fed = \$0.167 M comp EACM State = \$0.173 M comp EACM State = \$0.248 M operating Admin State = \$0.582 M comp	Electronic Records Management	Reduce paper file storage by 30% in June 30, 2010 and 50% by June 30, 2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of records in electronic document system: 520,217</li> <li># of Electronic Records System Internal users. Moved from 30 in 2006 to 711 in 2010</li> <li>11 workflows to reduce paper use and improve efficiencies completed (Sanitary Sewer Extension Permits nearing complete paperless from submittal to issuance)</li> <li>Determined ability to use e-signature</li> <li>41 projects completed – Programs nearly completely paperless from submittals to review to final decisions.</li> <li>Electronic records Kiosk set up for public to review files. Next step to make them available on the web in FY2012.</li> <li>Distributed scanning to start Spring 2011</li> </ul>
0.3 1.0 1.0 1.0 28.6	<b>Water State = \$0.0467 M comp</b> <b>Land State = \$0.087 M comp</b> <b>EACM Fed = \$0.167 M comp</b> <b>EACM State = \$0.173 M comp</b> <b>EACM State = \$0.248 M operating</b> <b>Admin State = \$4.165 M comp</b> <b>Admin State = \$4.478 M operating</b>			
<b>Goal E.5 Maintain the agency's capacity to recognize and address emerging issues that fall within the agency's authority.</b>				

	No new staff. Part of existing technical staff work.	Annual report to Legislature; State of the Environment reports every 5 yrs; Ongoing actions for key emerging issues: PFCs, Endocrine Disrupting Compounds, Pharmaceuticals.	Reports submitted by deadlines; regulatory practices adapted based on learning	<p>Deadlines were met: Monitoring reports for Endocrine Disrupting Compounds completed June 2010 and is found on the MPCA website: <a href="#">Endocrine-Disrupting Compounds - Minnesota Pollution Control Agency</a>.</p> <p>Next reports due July 2011.</p>
--	--	---	--	--