Clean Water Council Meeting Agenda
Monday, April 16, 2012
9:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.
MPCA Board Room
520 Lafayette Road North, St. Paul

9:00-9:15 **Convene Full Council**

- Comments/additions to the agenda
- Approve 3/19/12 meeting minutes
- Council introductions, updates and conflict of interest notifications

9:15-9:30 **Steering Team Report** **Decision item**

- By-law vote
- August 19-20 field tour in Carver County, update

9:30-10:15 **A social science-based approach to civic engagement and stewardship in watershed management** **Information item**
Dr. Mae Davenport (University of Minnesota)

10:15-10:30 **Break**

10:30-11:30 **Refresher on open meeting and data practices law** **Information item**
Stacie Christensen (Minnesota Department of Administration)

11:30-12:00 **Water Governance study update** **Information item**
Suzanne Rhees, John Linc Stine (MPCA)

12:00-12:30 **Lunch**

12:30-2:00 **Discovery Farm program presentation and discussion** **Information item**
Tim Radatz (Minnesota Agricultural Water Resource Center), Scott Matteson (MDA)

2:00 **May meeting agenda / adjournment**

2:00~2:30 Council Steering Team

Next Meeting: May 21, 2012

Clean Water Council

Presenter Worksheet

Doc Type: Reporting

Instructions: The Clean Water Council (Council) is responsible for advising the Legislature and the Governor on state programs to restore and protect Minnesota's waters. Thank you for agreeing to present to the Council; we value your time and preparation. In order for members to gain a better understanding of your information, please fill out the following worksheet, answer all questions, and send via e-mail by clicking the submit button. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Maleitzke at 651-757-2549 or jennifer.maleitzke@state.mn.us.

Presentation Information

Presentation title: A Social Science-Based Approach to Civic Engagement and Stewardship in Watershed Management

Organization: Department of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota

Presenter name(s), titles, and short bio for presenter introduction

1. Mae A. Davenport, Ph.D., Associate Professor. Davenport is a social scientist whose research emphasizes community-based, participatory approaches in two primary areas: (1) human beliefs, attitudes and behaviors associated with natural resources and (2) community capacity for sustainable ecosystem, watershed, and protected area management.

2.

3.

Presenter needs (Please submit to staff one week in advance of Council meeting for member review or bring 30 copies to meeting.)

☐ Handout for Council

☒ PowerPoint presentation

☐ Other presenter needs: _____

Topic overview (A summary ***[limited to 250 words]*** of your presentation, including current status of topic, gaps, needs that address the gaps, other parties involved in the topic, and any related activities. This will be shared with Council members prior to your presentation.)

Resource managers and policy makers are increasingly recognizing the need for a watershed approach to water resource management. However, while biophysical research and monitoring has evolved at this new scale, assessments of the human, social and governance dimensions of water resource management continue to lag dramatically behind. Greater understanding of the capacity of local citizens, interest groups, and communities to engage in sustainable watershed management and to adapt to changing social-ecological conditions is needed. A social science-based approach to understanding civic engagement and stewardship in water resource management is needed to effectively support, manage and sustain healthy social and hydrologic systems. This presentation will examine a social science research study that assesses community capacity to engage in water resource management in two Minnesota watersheds. Study findings from recently completed landowner surveys and a series of stakeholder interviews will be presented and discussed. Study results support the notion that resource management agencies and local governments need to better understand landowners and other resource users to design more effective civic engagement, communication, education and outreach programs. Results also underscore the need for a more holistic and deliberate approach to building community capacity to engage in water resource management.

Additional questions, please respond as appropriate:

1. What research and tools are necessary to forward implementation of this topic:

   A social science research monitoring program is needed to assess both opportunities and constraints to sustainable water resource management in Minnesota. The methodologies and pilot tools are available but existing monitoring programs and consistent data are lacking. This program would inform water resource programming across the state.

   a. Are the research and/or tools currently funded by Clean Water Funds? ☐ Yes ☒ No

   b. If no, please provide an estimate of the cost of research/tools:

      The costs to develop a social science-based monitoring program to implement across the state could vary significantly. Initial costs to pilot such a program in select watersheds could range from $15,000 to $75,000 per watershed.

2. How do we ensure the right tools are used:

   Social science assessments should be conducted using the latest available theoretical knowledge and practical monitoring tools in the field.

3. Are there any capacity issues which need to be addressed? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, describe:

4. Are there any obstacles preventing outcomes and progress towards this topic's goals? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, describe:

Please include your top five key messages (A summary no more than three lines of text.)

Key message #1:

Monitoring human and social conditions, drivers, and consequences are critical to effective water resource protection, restoration and enhancement.

Key message #2:

Several reliable social science methods and tools for gathering, analyzing, and synthesizing data exist. These data can be readily applied by resource managers to improve civic engagement, communication, education and outreach programs.

Key message #3:

The research study presented demonstrates the wide range of information that can be gathered to better understand conservation behaviors, civic engagement, and watershed governance. This information will help resource managers develop programs that are tailored to the needs of local communities, as well as the needs of local water resources.

Key message #4:

Key message #5:

Submit Reset

Clean Water Council

Presenter Worksheet

Doc Type: Reporting

Instructions: The Clean Water Council (Council) is responsible for advising the Legislature and the Governor on state programs to restore and protect Minnesota's waters. Thank you for agreeing to present to the Council; we value your time and preparation. In order for members to gain a better understanding of your information, please fill out the following worksheet, answer all questions, and send via e-mail by clicking the submit button. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Maleitzke at 651-757-2549 or jennifer.maleitzke@state.mn.us.

Presentation Information

Presentation title: Water Governance Evaluation Project

Organization: PCA

Presenter name(s), titles, and short bio for presenter introduction

1. John Linc Stine, Deputy Commissioner
   As Deputy Commissioner, John Linc Stine serves as overall agency manager, and leads MPCA reform efforts including permit streamlining, chemical regulatory reform and assisting with water policy and governance. Prior to joining the MPCA, John served as Assistant Commissioner at the Department of Health and in various water and trails-related positions at DNR.

2. Suzanne Rhees, Water Governance Evaluation Coordinator
   Suzanne is coordinating this project on a half-time mobility assignment from the DNR, where she is a planner in the Parks and Trails Division. She also has extensive background working with local governments as a planning consultant developing comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances.

3.

Presenter needs (Please submit to staff one week in advance of Council meeting for member review **or** bring 30 copies to meeting.)

☐ Handout for Council

☒ PowerPoint presentation

☐ Other presenter needs: _____

Topic overview (A summary ***[limited to 250 words]*** of your presentation, including current status of topic, gaps, needs that address the gaps, other parties involved in the topic, and any related activities. This will be shared with Council members prior to your presentation.)

The Water Governance Evaluation project was authorized by the Legislature during the 2011 special session. The statute specifies that the PCA, along with other water-related agencies and the University of Minnesota, "shall evaluate water-related statutes, rules, and governing structures to streamline, strengthen, and improve sustainable water management." A report is due to the legislature by January 15, 2013.

Water governance in Minnesota has been studied and evaluated since well before the 1972 Clean Water Act set the stage for state pollution control and clean water responsibilities. Minnesota's unusual water governance structure, in which at least six state agencies are charged with distinct but overlapping water management roles, has resulted in numerous efforts to "streamline" water governance.

The Legacy Amendment and the Clean Water Fund have served as powerful incentives for state agencies to collaborate and improve the integration of their programs. However, at the local level, the complexity of programs and permit requirements often frustrates landowners and local governments.

The study is still in the information-gathering and issue identification phase, and we are actively seeking input, opinions and ideas.

Additional questions, please respond as appropriate:

1. What research and tools are necessary to forward implementation of this topic:

   Project tasks include a literature review of the many previous water management and policy studies, a timeline of water-related state and federal legislation, rules and programs, a survey of permitting, and a series of interviews with lead agency staff and other experts.

   a. Are the research and/or tools currently funded by Clean Water Funds? ☐ Yes ☒ No

   b. If no, please provide an estimate of the cost of research/tools:

      The project budget is $75,000, covering staff time and some additional research assistance through the University.

2. How do we ensure the right tools are used:

   We have tried to match research tools to staff capacity and the limited time frame of this project. Additional research may follow and build on this effort.

3. Are there any capacity issues which need to be addressed? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, describe:

   See above.

4. Are there any obstacles preventing outcomes and progress towards this topic's goals? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, describe:

   There are many political and systemic obstacles to major reforms in water governance, and results are unlikely to occur within the time frame of this study. However, more modest reforms and short-term improvements may be achievable as a result of this study.

Please include your top five key messages (A summary no more than three lines of text.)

Key message #1:

Many inconsistencies exist among state agency goals for water management, as established by the enabling statutes for each agency. Programs came into being at different times, under differing mandates, so it isn't surprising that they are not always consistent. Wetlands regulation is a case in point.

Key message #2:

The "patchwork" of local governments, SWCDs, watershed districts and other local entities can be confusing to landowners and applicants, although the system makes more sense to those "inside it."

Key message #3:

Substantial progress has been made in coordination and collaboration among state agencies, through structures such as the CWC, Clean Water Fund Interagency Teams, and water data integration. At the local level, the proposed environmental omnibus bill (HF 2164) would allow improved coordination of water management plans.

Key message #4:

Several parallel but separate efforts are underway that involve water governance, including an assessment of the EQB's role and of environmental management in general; the U of MN Water Resources Center's initiatives following up on the 2011 Water Sustainability Framework; and the Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program. We are tracking these efforts.

Key message #5:

The Clean Water Council is one of the key groups that will be asked to review and provide input to this project. We hope to brief the CWC and seek your input at regular intervals.

Submit Reset

Clean Water Council

Presenter Worksheet

Doc Type: Reporting

Instructions: The Clean Water Council (Council) is responsible for advising the Legislature and the Governor on state programs to restore and protect Minnesota's waters. Thank you for agreeing to present to the Council; we value your time and preparation. In order for members to gain a better understanding of your information, please fill out the following worksheet, answer all questions, and send via e-mail by clicking the submit button. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Maleitzke at 651-757-2549 or jennifer.maleitzke@state.mn.us.

Presentation Information

Presentation title: Discovery Farms Minnesota - Monitoring Nutrient Movement In Agricultural Landscapes

Organization: Minnesota Agricultural Water Resources Center and Minnesota Department of Agriculture

Presenter name(s), titles, and short bio for presenter introduction

1. Tim Radatz, Research Specialist, MAWRC
   Tim Radatz is a Research and Outreach Specialist for Discovery Farms Minnesota and the UW-Discovery Farms Program. Tim joined the Discovery Farms Minnesota and UW-Discovery Farms Program in 2010 and is involved in data collection and interpretation.

2. Scott Matteson, Hydrologist, MDA
   Scott Matteson is a hydrologist with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture. Scott joined MDA in 2010 and coordinates the Discovery Farm Minnesota activities that are the responsibly of MDA. Scott is involved in the installation and maintenance of equipment at the farms, training local partners on monitoring protocols and data management of flow and water quality data.

3.

Presenter needs (Please submit to staff one week in advance of Council meeting for member review **or** bring 30 copies to meeting.)

☐ Handout for Council

☒ PowerPoint presentation

☐ Other presenter needs: _____

Topic overview (A summary ***[limited to 250 words]*** of your presentation, including current status of topic, gaps, needs that address the gaps, other parties involved in the topic, and any related activities. This will be shared with Council members prior to your presentation.)

This presentation will provide a overview of the Discovery Farm Minnesota program. Tim Radatz will discuss the purpose, goals, organizational structure, funding, outreach activities and descriptions of the farms that are currently in the program. Scott Matteson will discuss how the monitoring is conducted, along with a summary of the first year of data collected from several of the farms.

Additional questions, please respond as appropriate:

1. What research and tools are necessary to forward implementation of this topic:

   a. Are the research and/or tools currently funded by Clean Water Funds? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   b. If no, please provide an estimate of the cost of research/tools:

2. How do we ensure the right tools are used:

3. Are there any capacity issues which need to be addressed? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, describe:

4. Are there any obstacles preventing outcomes and progress towards this topic's goals? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, describe:

Please include your top five key messages (A summary no more than three lines of text.)

Key message #1:

Discovery Farms Minnesota is a producer-led effort to gather field-scale information on sediment and nutrient losses over a range of landscapes and diverse farm enterprises in Minnesota.

Key message #2:

A Discovery Farm is an operating farm cooperating in systematic collection of accurate information on water leaving the farm via surface or subsurface runoff.

Key message #3:

Discovery Farms Minnesota is a partnership between agricultural organizations, individual growers, and state and local government.

Key message #4:

Runoff from field scale watersheds occurs over a short duration. To properly monitor runoff and characterize sediment and nutrient losses, sophisticated automated equipment is a necessity.

Key message #5:

Water quality and quantity at field scale sites is highly variable, both temporally and spatially. Several factors impact runoff water quality, including farming practices, crop type, topography, soils and precipitation. Long term monitoring (5+ years), 365 days a year, is often necessary to properly characterize runoff at a Discovery Farm.

Submit Reset