Clean Water Council Meeting Agenda

Monday, November 21st, 2022

9:00 a.m. to 2 p.m.

IN PERSON with Webex Available (Hybrid Meeting)

9:00 Regular Clean Water Council Business

- **(INFORMATION ITEM)** Introductions
- **(ACTION ITEM)** Agenda - comments/additions and approve agenda
- **(ACTION ITEM)** Meeting Minutes - comments/additions and approve meeting minutes
- **(INFORMATION ITEM**) Chair and Council Staff update
    - **Policy & Budget and Outcomes Committee Updates**
    - **Staff update**
        - **Field Tour Ideas for 2023/Retreat Possibilities?**
        - **Clean Water Fund Communications Plan Follow-Up**
        - **State Budget Update/Election Impacts**
        - **Small Grants RFP**
        - **Topics for 2023 Presentations (Running list attached; please add)**
        - **Response to Public Comment**

9:30 (ACTION ITEM) 2023 Meeting Calendar

9:45 (ACTION ITEM) Policy Recommendations for FY24-25

10:15 BREAK

10:30 (DISCUSSION) Feedback on Preparing for November Budget Forecast

- **Includes Small Group Discussion**

11:45 LUNCH

12:15 (DISCUSSION) Plans for 2023

- **Running list of suggested presentation topics**
- **Revisiting the 2020 Strategic Plan**

December 19th Meeting: FINAL Approval of FY24-25 Clean Water Fund Recommendations

Clean Water Council
September 19, 2022 Meeting Summary

Members present: Steven Besser, Richard Biske, Richard Brainerd, Gary Burdorf, Tannie Eshenaur, Justin Hanson, Kelly Gribauval-Hite, Jen Kader (Vice Chair), Holly Kovarik, Sen. Jennifer McEwen, Jeff Peterson, Raj Rajan, Victoria Reinhardt, Todd Renville, Sen. Carrie Ruud, Peter Schwagerl, Patrick Shea, and Glenn Skuta.
Members absent: John Barten (Chair), Warren Formo, Rep. Josh Heintzeman, Frank Jewell, Patrick Shea, Phillip Sterner, Jordan Vandal, Marcie Weinandt.

To watch the WebEx video recording of this meeting, please go to https://www.pca.state.mn.us/clean-water-council/meetings, or contact Brianna Frisch.

Regular Clean Water Council Business

- Introductions
  - Jeff Peterson: The Minnesota Water Resources Conference will be on October 18-19.
- August 15 meeting agenda, motion for approval by Victoria Reinhardt, seconded by Raj Rajan. Motion carries.
- Chair and Council Staff update
  - Policy & Budget and Outcomes Committee Updates
  - Staff update
    - Please submit a conflict-of-interest form if you have not done so already.
    - There has been additional public input received since last meeting (updated items in table in meeting packet).
    - We would like to introduce the new communications staffer (0.15 full-time employee) Kathy Moore who has the water portfolio. They may have an event to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Clean Water Act that would include the Council.
    - The Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) board will sign off on the final RFP for the small grants proposal. The electronic newsletter will have more information on it.
    - November 1, the Secretary of State will send out vacancies for appointments. Appointments will probably be complete by April 2023.
    - Sales tax revenue continues to exceed expectations. However, anything can happen.

Tentative Approval of Clean Water Funds FY24-25 Recommendations Pending the November Forecast *(WebEx 00:38:00)*

- The pie charts of the proposed Clean Water Funds (CWFs) budget by category matches the water management framework. There is more funding for nonpoint source implementation. Only three percent of the CWFs are being used for research, evaluation, and tool development. Monitoring has stayed about the same but will see a bump due to the Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) sampling on a broader scale. The second pie chart compares the budget recommendations to the FY22-23 recommendations.
- Regarding implementation trends, there have been many competitive BWSR grants for projects when a watershed hadn't completed a watershed plan yet. As more plans are approved, the amount of funding going to these watersheds has been increasing significantly. The amount for competitive grants is declining.
- There is also a pie chart of the CWF budget broken down by agency. For FY24-25, BWSR is at 49 percent, Department of Agriculture (MDA) is at 14 percent, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) is at 14 percent, DNR is at eight percent, Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) is at seven percent, Public Facilities Authority (PFA) is at five percent, Metropolitan Council is at about one percent, the University of Minnesota (UMN) is less than one percent, and the LCC is less than one percent.

Discussion:

- Rich Biske: As these watershed plans are complete, does having a separate program influence whether a watershed uses that within their watershed basin allocation? If there was a specific easement program, would that also qualify for watershed basin funding? *Answer from Justin Hanson, BWSR:* The way it plays out starts with the watershed plan, the strategy isn't necessarily reflective of the grant, so that could bring in federal funding or allow an application for a specific projects and practices grant. The watershed groups can do that, applying for competitive funds still. Some of the programs are newer and may be in the pilot mode. If they are

part of the strategy, it can be from part of that budget. Others are doing other big projects on one-time funding.

- Jeff Peterson, UMN: I noticed there are no recommendations for the UMN programs for the "ICT recs" column on the spreadsheet. Is that a change, or should there be some numbers there? *Answer from Paul Gardner:* Yes, we will update. The spreadsheet was missing $2 million for the Stormwater BMP program and $1 million for the Geologic Atlas.
- Jen Kader: We are looking at trying to approve the recommendations today (tentatively, until the November forecast comes out), so if there were any areas anyone wanted to discuss, this meeting is a good opportunity to talk about it, before taking a vote.
- Jen Kader: Looking at the spreadsheet, we are at $337 million. If anyone is feeling strongly about any of the increases or decreases, now is a good time to discuss.
- Glenn Skuta, MPCA: Thinking ahead, looking at increased sales tax, the magnitude it would have on this would be a couple more million.
- Motion to tentatively approve the Clean Water Council recommendations, pending the November budget forecast by Steve Besser, seconded by Dick Brainerd. Motion approves unanimously.

Draft Clean Water Fund Communications Plan (feedback requested) *(WebEx 01:19:45)*

The BWSR and MPCA Communications have been working together on a draft for an interagency communications plan. This is to go over that plan. This document is in the meeting packet.

- There is a statutory requirement that the Clean Water Council must develop strategies for informing, educating, and encouraging the participation of citizens, stakeholders, and others. Public agencies are responsible for implementing the strategies.
- Currently, the agencies already produce quality content about the CWF programs. There is no agreed upon key message across the state government on CWFs. Also, local partners may not attribute CWFs.
- Stakeholders have shared that they do not see how the CWF programs fit together. Therefore, we need to streamline strategic communication actions across all administering agencies to deliver clear, consistent messaging about fund outcomes and achievements.
- The Council contracted with a MOD Communications for an audit and draft communications plan. There were some audit recommendations. First, there needs to be some key messages that all agencies are reinforcing about the value of the CWFs. Second, to set some communication goals. Then, place it all together in a five-year action plan.
- Among the audit recommendations:
  - There is a need to strengthen communications systems, which includes having a SharePoint location on the state's network for certain documents (i.e., logos, headers, etc.). This would provide storage for media stories about the CWFs.
  - Everything would be in one place.
  - Create consistency
  - Broaden audience base
  - Communicate with perceptions and core messages in mind.
- Key messages:
  - Minnesotan's value clean and healthy water – for our way of life, our health, vibrant communities, and strong economy.
  - The Clean Water Fund makes Minnesota a national leader in protecting healthy waters and restoring impaired rivers, lakes, or streams.
  - Continued investments in water quality are critical to preserve Minnesota's most important natural resource and protect against threats caused by population growth, increased pollution, and climate change.
- Interagency goals:
  - Goal 1 (internal): Create structures that ensure consistency in communications and access to information about Clean Water Fund outcomes.
  - Goal 2: Clearly demonstrate how Clean Water Fund investments improve water quality in Minnesota.
  - Goal 3: Increase participation in Clean Water Fund work and opportunities.

- Five-year action plan:
  - The agencies would: share materials in one digital location; include boilerplate in all CWF communications materials; use the CWF templates, graphics, and other branded assets regularly; regularly harvest and identify stories showing CWF outcomes; and lead a media event each year promoting an agency CWF success story.
  - Next steps:
    - Request Council members ask their groups to review goal three on organizations that can share CWF content.
    - The Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) will review the plan on Thursday. The Council would like a commitment of the ICT to quarterly meeting of ICT communication subteams and the commissioner "buy-in."

Discussion:

- Dick Brainerd: What are you asking of organizations? *Answer:* What would be appealing to the organization regarding the CWFs, as well as what communication outlets are there to send information.
- Rich Biske: The agency snap shots like BWSR are good. Perhaps, local articles could be a part of that to connect it back.
- Gary Burdorf: The Association of Townships has a website that could be linked. They have a magazine too.
- Justin Hanson, BWSR: Any connection with Explore Minnesota like the local tourism? All their work is based on promotion, so there could be tie ins for it. There are mutual benefits for the Council.
- Paul Gardner: Perhaps we can work with Todd Renville and Steve Besser because the hunting and fishing groups are really good at publicizing the Outdoor Heritage Funds (OHF). Perhaps those groups are craving some content on the CWF side of things.
- Jen Kader: The other standard outdoor magazines could also be interested in this information.
- Rick Biske: The LSOHF requires a sign be placed after a project is complete. The Ag Water Quality Certification Program (AWQCP) is good at that. Especially in Greater Minnesota, it is really good to see those signs around.
- Justin Hanson, BWSR: Perhaps, making it easier for folks to have access to those signs is a step too.
- Jen Kader: Thinking about outside of the ICT, the partner organizations identified, could have some quarterly or biannually touch points, which could be beneficial. This could be with communications staff for those organizations that have them. Coordinating calendars or locating stories that already exist. Then, agency staff do not need any further staff time towards it.
- Justin Hanson, BWSR: There are certain stories that could be used again, because they fit into different categories. This helps share that information too. Highlighting the work, touching the different areas. If it is in a central location to repurpose, it would be handy to use.
- Kelly Gribauval-Hite: Looking at the sports fans area, mentioning the water reuse at the Allianz field, Target Field also has something similar. However, they also have field trips for elementary school children (not sure on other ages). Two of my kids have participated in it. They still talk about it to this day. So, kids and field trips, and how those kids talk about what they learned to their parents, is another area to consider as well.
- Jen Kader: Please read through the document. Bring forward any ideas and concerns at future meetings.

Discuss Scenarios/Process for Modifying CWF Recommendations Due to November Forecast (WebEx 02:51:00)
This is time to discuss if there is more funding or less funding when the November forecast comes out, and the actions the Council would plan to take.

- The deadline for the Council's Biennial Report was moved from December 1 to January 15. That leaves the Council considerable time to react to whatever happens with the November forecast. Thinking about different scenarios of more, less, or the extremes of those in funding. No one will know what the amount will be, so it is hard to predict. Planning helps the Council be prepared and make more concise decisions in a timely manner.
  - Reduction scenarios: the Council can review and take some funding off of a few programs, cut out a new program or two (not top priority), or if the new items are important the Council could reduce something that is scalable.
  - Increased funding scenario: the Council could scale up the scalable items or put more funding in the newer programs.

- The Council has a polite relationship with the ICT, so what advice should be given to them regarding these scenarios?

Discussion:

- Victoria Reinhardt: We want to celebrate this new timeline. We will know the November budget forecast ahead of time, which is wonderful. The Council is in a better position for these recommendations. There are usually some back-up programs identified. Then, if there is more funding available, there are programs already identified to add more funding. This can happen through the usual process (start with the Budget and Outcomes Committee) of a run through to identify what programs are high priority to receive additional funding, as well as those that could be reduced if there is less funding. This would be all ready to go. The BOC would put it together, and the Council would review it.
- Jen Kader: Previously, there was a request was to have the agency staff review the spreadsheet to make sure they had accurately identified the scalable programs. That would be helpful for the BOC and Council. To confirm it. *Answer:* I do not know if there was a total agreement on which programs were scalable.
- Jen Kader: Following Victoria's suggestion and having the BOC take this action first, what would you hope to see happen? As they are having that discussion. There are a few places that I would like to see a certain amount increased, that have been requested. Start there and move forward. Not just high priority, but perhaps high impact as well for the programs that would receive additional funding. Perhaps, programs that have greater demand. These are all good to keep in mind while having this discussion.
  - Paul Gardner: The BOC has tentatively approved a list of programs. Would the Council like to rule in at this time? There is a possibility of adding a new program as well, with the additional funds. There is some public input as well.
  - Rich Biske: It is great to think about additional funds. I would be more concern for any reductions. There are really good new programs, that have been considered before, and a reduction may impact new programs. It would set us back two more years. I would like to see more investments in the startup programs to help them get going well, to show impacts.
  - Jen Kader: There is a desire to protect these new programs from cuts, so there is not a general percentage cut across the board.
- The BOC will complete a review of the funds, reviewed by the full Council in the future. Additionally, areas they do not want to see cut, along with areas that could receive some cuts if there was a reduced budget. If new programs that are suggested, it would be highly unlikely to have a new program added, unless vetted. Programs could also not be funded, and potential transition plans if needed.

Adjournment *(WebEx 03:36:05)*

2023 Council Meeting Topic Suggestions

1. **Report from One HUC-8 watershed on several years of implementation projects** and comparing it to the WRAPS and One Watershed One Plan (BWSR and an SWCD)
2. **WRAPS Roundup**: Watershed Restoration & Protection Strategies (WRAPS) approved in the last 12 months (Glenn Skuta, MPCA
3. **Conservation Drainage Management** (Find speakers from 2022 Water Resources Conference)
4. **Linking drainage to One Watershed One Plan**
5. **Wakeboard impacts** on Shorelines
6. Review of **water reuse and groundwater recharge** efforts to address drought
7. **Removal of lock and dam on Mississippi River** by Ford Plant in St. Paul
8. Research on **groundwater governance** in the Midwest (new report from Freshwater), including work with tribal governments (Carrie Jennings, Freshwater)
9. **Five Takeaways to Advance Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Watershed Management,** Melanie Bomier, Carlton SWCD
10. **Stormwater retrofits at several metro Target stores**, (Paige Ahlborg, Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District
11. The Potential for Improving Water Quality and Habitat in Minnesota by **Repurposing Unprofitable Cropland with Perennial Vegetation,** Jason Ulrich, Shawn Schottler, Science Museum of MN, St. Croix Watershed Research Station (Water Resources Conference presentation, shows how one could prioritize protection strategies)
12. **Metropolitan Council's Priority Waters List**: A Tool for More Effective Water Resources Management (Water Resources Conference presentation by Emily Ressenger, Met Council)
13. **Minnesota Drought of 2021**, (Water Resources Conference presentation by Luigi Romolo, Dan Miller, Ellen Considine, Amanda Yourd, Carmelita Nelson from DNR)
14. **Assessing Agricultural Producers' Motivations to Participate in the Minnesota Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program** (Water Resources Conference presentation by Amit Pradhananga, University of MN)
15. **MPCA's environmental justice mapping tool**, including how recent updates increased areas of concern for environmental justice in Minnesota. The MPCA uses this tool to focus our work in areas where low-income Minnesotans, people of color and tribal members may experience more impacts, and to increase public engagement. (Quinn Carr, MPCA)
16. **Legacy and Future Direction of the 1989 Minnesota Groundwater Protection Act** (David Crisman, Minnesota Groundwater Association)
17. **Interagency surface water monitoring** (Bill VanRyswyk, Surface Water Subteam; shows who does what for monitoring and why)
18. **Groundwater Protection Rule update** (MN Department of Agriculture)
19. **Metro Area Water Supply Advisory committee (MAWSAC) recommendations** to support water supply sustainability in the metro (Met Council)
20. Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies **(GRAPS) using 3D modeling** (MN Geological Survey, MN Department of Health)
21. **Clean Water Partnership** grants (MPCA)

22. **Long-term trends in our lakes** (Leif Olmanson, who is using frequent satellite images of lakes to detect water quality changes; Gretchen Hansen, who is focusing on ecosystem changes: DNR; and/or MPCA
23. **Climate benefits of wetland and peat restoration and protection** (Peter Ciborowski, MPCA)
24. **Multiple benefits of grasslands**
25. **Culverts as a new idea**: Evaluation of Hydrological Change (Jason Moeckel, DNR)
26. **Neonicitinoids**: clothiandin, and imidaclopid (idea from Minnesota House of Representatives)
27. **Tire chemical and salmon/smelt in Lake Superior** (idea from Minnesota House of Representatives)
28. **Precision manure application/Manure storage grants** for water quality
29. **State Climate Change Framework**
30. **Update on the 2020 State Water Plan (EQB)**
31. **Technological advances in groundwater hydrology** (USGS) (examples: impact of climate change on groundwater recharge, lakes and rivers and lag time for groundwater quality BMPs, and the impact of groundwater on lakes.
32. **Water Quality Trading** (MPCA)
33. **State Resource Needs Report** (critical assessment of drinking water programs nationally; insight to current challenges and how states are coping with emerging issues; lack of national guidance; and COVID demands (Sandeep Burman, MDH public water supply unit)
34. **Minnesota Source Water Protection Collaborative** (MDH)
35. **Wellhead Protection for Every Vulnerable Municipal Water System Complete** (MDH)
36. **Zoning Issues with Lakeshore/Riparian Properties** (DNR)
37. **Groundwater Management Areas e.g., N & E Metro** (DNR)
38. **How wildlife/aquatic management areas intersect with watershed-based approach to address impaired waters** (Steve Besser request; concerned about prioritizing economic uses over fish and wildlife management; possible presentation on DNR management)

Meeting Dates for Clean Water Council for 2023

As Proposed on November 21, 2023

SHOULD WE IDENTIFY MEETINGS THAT SHOULD REQUIRE IN PERSON ATTENDANCE?

Full Council (3rd Monday with Exceptions for Holidays)	**Budget & Outcomes Committee (1st Friday with Exceptions for Holidays)**	**Policy Committee (4th Fridays with Exceptions for Holidays)**
9 am to 12:30 pm (if by WebEx) 9 am to 2 pm (if in person)	9:30 am to 12:30 pm (if WebEx) 9:30 am to 2 pm (if in person)	9:30 am to 12:30 pm (if WebEx) 9:30 am to 2 pm (if in person)
January 23 (MLK Day 1/16)	January 6	January 27
February 27 (Prez Day 2/20)	February 3	February 24
March 20	March 3	March 24
April 17	April 7	April 28
May 15	May 5	May 19 (Memorial Day is 5/29)
June 26 (Juneteenth is 6/19)	June 2	June 23
July 17	**July 7** (change since Tuesday is the 4th?)	July 22
August 21	August 4	August 25
September 18 (Field Tour?)	September 8 (Labor Day is 9/4)	September 22
October 16	October 6	October 27 (MEA 10/19-20)
November 20 or 27? (Thanksgiving is 11/23)	November 3	November 17 (Thxgvg is 11/23)
December 18	December 1	December 22

Clean Water Council

DRAFT FY24-25 Policy Statements as of 18 November 2022

Advanced Drinking Water Protection [DRAFT]

The State of Minnesota should take additional action to protect drinking water sources.

1. Direct the Minnesota Department of Health to promote adoption of county ordinances that require well testing and a disclosure of the testing at the time a property is transferred, and develop model ordinances. Ordinances should reflect the contaminants of particular interest to the geology of a given county.
2. Use the Clean Water Fund to provide opportunities for all Minnesota private well owners to test their water for five major contaminants (nitrates, lead, arsenic, manganese, and bacteria).
3. Develop cost-effective strategies for private well owners to help mitigate wells that do not meet Minnesota health-based guidance for those five contaminants, with a particular focus on low-income households.

This policy statement supersedes the following policy statements included in previous biennial Council recommendations:

- Disclosure of Well Water Quality at Time of Sale [FY22-23]
- Advanced Drinking Water Protection [FY16-17]

Problem

Currently, about 1.2 million Minnesotans get their drinking water from groundwater through a private well. While the State plays a role in protecting drinking water sources, testing well water is generally treated as the responsibility of the property owner, and the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) recommends that it be done regularly (annually for **bacteria**; bi-annually for **nitrate**; at least once for **arsenic** and **lead**; and before a baby drinks the water for **manganese**). In limited cases, such as the Township Testing program of the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, the State provides the funding. However, many private well owners do not test their water. A 2016 Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) survey of private well owners found less than 20% of respondents had tested their well water at the frequency MDH recommends.

Once a well owner tests their water and gets the results, they are better able to know what steps they may need to take to ensure safe drinking water. However, currently owners are under no obligation to inform buyers of their property of any high contaminant levels in private drinking water supply system. Education is useful, but some mandates are necessary to increase testing, reporting, and protect the health of private well users. Minnesota Statutes 103I.235 requires sellers of real property to disclosure the existence of a well but not water quality results.

Solutions

1. The State should promote county ordinances to require well testing at time of transfer rather than using state statute. Not all five major contaminants are present in all geologies of the state (manganese, arsenic), so counties should have the flexibility to require testing for only those contaminants likely to be found in the county.

Example: Some lenders and loan programs already require testing

In a 2019 MDH survey of 243 real estate professionals, 46% of respondents said that the mortgage companies they work with always or usually require well water testing. Respondents explained that the following loan programs require well testing, but the testing parameters varies on what is tested: Veterans Affairs Home Loan, Federal Housing Administration[1], and USDA Home Loans.

Example: Dakota County has required well testing at property transfer since 1998

Dakota County Ordinance number 114 requires testing a private well for bacteria, nitrate, arsenic, and manganese (added in 2019) within in 12 months prior to a real estate transfer. The ordinance updates in 2019 also require that water quality issues are addressed through treatment or well replacement prior to sale.

2. Provide opportunity with CWF for every private well owner to test for five major contaminants and provide follow-up information on mitigation
3. Consider what funding could be applied to mitigation for qualifying income households using the SSTS low-income grant program model

Testing Example: MDH Pilot Program in 2021

On average, it costs about $150 to test for all five recommended contaminants. This makes testing prohibitive or at least unappealing to many well owners.

MDH is carrying out a pilot program with local partners in west central and southeast Minnesota to offer free testing as well as financial assistance for mitigation for eligible households. Household eligibility is determined by water quality results and socioeconomic factors the local partners defined. This approach also exists in the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's low-income grant program for subsurface sewage treatment systems (SSTS) and could serve as a model.

In Stevens, Grant, and Traverse Counties, Horizon Public Health received a grant for the program. Horizon distributed 114 test kits. Fifty-seven tests (or 50 percent) exceeded 10 micrograms per liter for arsenic. As of August 2022, 18 applicants have had reverse osmosis treatment installed as part of this program. Ten units were 100 percent covered by the grant, and eight were 75 percent covered. Twelve more households are interested in the 75% cost-share and are waiting on a quote from the vendor.

In Olmsted, Fillmore, Winona, Wabasha, and Goodhue Counties, Olmsted Soil and Water Conservation District took the lead. In this region, 50 percent of contacted households had never tested their water, are unsure when it was last tested, or haven't had it tested for at least 10 years. Fifty-five percent of those households had a well that was drilled before the well construction code came into being or did not know the age of the well. As of August 2022, 164 wells have been tested for nitrate, arsenic, and manganese. Twenty percent of the samples have been above 10 ppm for nitrate.

The grant has helped cover the cost to install 3 reverse osmosis systems, construct 5 new wells, and conduct repairs on another well to address nitrate.

[1] The FHA requirements can be found at 24 CFR 200.926d.

The Council proposes that in FY24-25, the Clean Water Fund be used to support free testing for 10% of Minnesota private well users each year, and that the program should continue for ten years.

There are home water treatment and other mitigation options (such as well repair and construction) to address water quality issues. The price for treatment varies based on the type of treatment and who installs it. Point-of-use reverse osmosis is an effective way to treat for all five contaminants and costs about $300 if you install it yourself or $1500 to have a water treatment professional install it. Annual maintenance is about $100. There are additional treatment options that range in price and application.[2]

The Council proposes that the State develop a cost-effective model that could assist well owners facing economic hardship so that they can access home water treatment. This approach could be supported by future Clean Water Fund recommendations or other State funding sources.

[2] Minnesota Department of Health, https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/water/wells/waterquality/index.html.

Minnesota Underground Utilities Mapping Project [Already approved by Council 28 July 2021]

Policy Statement

To create an accurate inventory of Minnesota's underground utility infrastructure, the Clean Water Council (CWC) recommends that the State of Minnesota develop an accurate map of all underground utilities installed in the state and require Minnesota's public and private sectors to support sharing of necessary data in a secure and confidential manner.

The underground utility infrastructure mapping project supports the Clean Water Council's efforts to reduce the risk to drinkable, fishable, and swimmable water.

Problem

Damage to Minnesota's underground utilities can disrupt critical water infrastructure (drinking water and wastewater) and contaminate groundwater and surface water. In addition, without accurate mapping, public safety is a concern, especially when work is being done near petroleum and hazardous materials pipelines.

Damage most often results from data that is incomplete, inaccurate, or only exists on paper. This limits the ability of public and private entities from sharing data and ensuring its accuracy over time.

Examples of utilities that require accurate mapping include, but are not limited to:

- Drinking water supply pipes
- Wastewater pipes
- Stormwater pipes and stormwater storage
- Petroleum pipelines
- Hazardous materials pipelines
- Telecom infrastructure, and
- Abandoned infrastructure that could transport aquatic invasive species.

Much of this data is held by the private sector, and therefore is not in the public sector's possession. It is imperative that the sharing of data can be accomplished in a secure and confidential manner.

Solution

Improving the accuracy of Minnesota's underground utility maps will reduce these risks. Gopher State One Call (GSOC) and the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Emergency Preparedness Committee (EPC) have formed the Underground Utility Mapping Project Team (UUMPT) to address this issue.

The mapping project works to improve locate efficiencies and accuracy, reduce damage to the state's underground infrastructure, and improve operational and construction safety by leveraging current and emerging GIS technologies through cross-community collaboration that develops best practices and promotes technology solutions.

With security and confidentiality being critical, the efforts will include protection of data from competitive intrusion and security threats using appropriate procedures and advancements in geospatial technology that facilitate sharing of data via secure and limited access.

Pharmaceutical Policy Statement [Approved by Clean Water Council on 02/28/2022]

[This statement revised a previous statement from the FY18-19 recommendations.]

Policy Statement

The Clean Water Council recommends that the State establish the following to reduce the discharge of pharmaceuticals into the waters of Minnesota:

1. Fund research on the pathways of pharmaceuticals into surface water and ground water, identify priority pharmaceuticals that pose the greatest risk to human health and aquatic life, identify and support practicable solutions to reduce their entry into Minnesota waters, and recoup reasonable costs through an industry-funded safe medication return program.
2. Adopt a "Safe Medication Return Program."
    - This legislation should provide flexibility by:
        - Utilizing the current collection infrastructure;
        - Requiring manufacturers to support public education and outreach activities; and to cover all administrative and support costs including, but not limited to: collection, compensation to authorized collectors, transportation, secure receptacles, and environmentally sound disposal of covered pharmaceuticals;
        - Allowing residents to take unused medications to drop-off locations or use a mailing envelope, both for free
        - Providing drop-off locations that are "equitable and reasonably convenient"
3. Require the words or symbols for "do not flush" be printed on all prescription pharmaceutical labels and remove any existing instructions to flush unused portions.

Problem

Pharmaceuticals are used to treat, cure, diagnose, and prevent disease and ailments in humans, agricultural animals, and companion animals. The use of pharmaceuticals is expected to increase in response to increasing demand. These chemicals are designed to be biologically active and potent at low doses. Pharmaceuticals enter the environment through many pathways including:

- Improper disposal of unused medications (both in home and at care facilities)
- Runoff from manure on agricultural fields or feedlots
- Effluent from health care facilities, medication manufacturing and other industrial sources
- Excretion from normal use in humans (e.g., not all of the drug is fully metabolized in the body)

Pharmaceuticals are commonly detected in Minnesota surface water, groundwater and sediment. The concentrations detected are low relative to other contaminants, but they can have negative impacts on the environment, especially aquatic species. It is extremely difficult and costly to remove these chemicals from wastewater and drinking water. Preventing entry to the environment, such as through improving prescription practices and minimizing input from waste streams is the best way to avoid potential impacts of pharmaceuticals.

In addition to the environmental impact of waste pharmaceuticals being discharged into the waters of Minnesota, there is also a public safety benefit to environmentally sound disposal. Prescription drugs

left unused by the intended recipient, which are not disposed of properly, can be misused by others and have serious or fatal consequences. Seven out of ten people who start abusing prescription drugs get them from the medicine cabinets of friends and family. Among children, the most common cause of accidental poisoning is from ingesting drugs. In addition, periodic cleaning of the medicine cabinet reduces the likelihood that adults, especially the elderly, will take the wrong medication, wrong dose or use expired medications.

Current Efforts by State Agencies with Clean Water Fund (CWF)

With funding from CWF, the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) conduct research, public education, monitoring and collecting waste pharmaceuticals throughout the State, and environmental surveillance. Both agencies work closely with other State agencies, local entities such as local law enforcement, county & city public health departments, and local pharmacies to keep unwanted pharmaceuticals from reaching our waters.

Minnesota Department of Health:

Pharmaceutical Rapid Assessments: Using a novel method, MDH has established conservative screening values (above which the risk of negative human health affects increases) for 119 pharmaceuticals commonly prescribed in the U.S., and monitored for in the environment.

Outreach & education grants: Grants go to local governments, non-profits, watersheds districts, and academic institutions to raise awareness of pharmaceuticals and other contaminants of emerging concern (CEC), expand outreach on pharmaceutical take-back opportunities, and reduce the presence of CECs in the environment through behavior change.

Educational resources: The Department creates resources for local entities that facilitate outreach to communities and provide a consistent message throughout the State on the health and environmental risks of pharmaceuticals and other CECs.

One Health Antibiotic Collaborative: The MDH leads a team of experts from Minnesota Department of Agriculture, MPCA, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Board of Animal Health, Board of Veterinary Medicine, University of Minnesota, pharmacy and dentistry groups, physicians, agricultural representatives, and other experts to ensure that Minnesotans use antibiotics in a manner to reduce antibiotic resistance and protect the environment. http://www.health.state.mn.us/onehealthabx/

Unregulated Contaminants Monitoring Project (UCMP): In the Unregulated Contaminants Monitoring Project, MDH sampled approximately 70 community systems across Minnesota for a wide spectrum of unregulated contaminants, including pharmaceuticals. MDH tested for over 150 pharmaceuticals at participating systems supplied by surface water and systems potentially impacted by wastewater.

Drinking Water Ambient Monitoring: MDH is establishing a Drinking Water Ambient Monitoring program to operationalize surveillance of unregulated contaminants in drinking water sources, such as pharmaceuticals. Ambient monitoring data drives the identification, management, and elimination of high-risk sources of contamination to drinking water sources. This program will help MDH and public

water systems anticipate potential threats from unregulated contaminants and will inform future source water protection efforts.

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Monitoring of pharmaceuticals and other contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) in surface and groundwater: The MPCA monitors pharmaceuticals and other CECs in surface water and groundwater to determine their presence and prevalence in the environment. Currently, the MPCA monitors about 140 chemicals comprised of pharmaceuticals, hormones, anti-corrosives, and other industrial or commercial chemicals in surface and groundwater. Among those, most frequently detected pharmaceuticals in surface water are: antidepressants (amitriptyline, fluoxetine, and sertraline), and iopamidol (an x-ray contrast agent). The January 2021 study, "Pharmaceuticals and Chemicals of Concern in Minnesota Lakes, shares the results of sampling in 50 randomly selected lakes. The study shows that contaminants of emerging concern are widespread in the state.

Investigation of sources of pharmaceuticals and other CECs to the environment and evaluate their potential effects on aquatic life: MPCA conducts focused investigations to determine sources of pharmaceuticals to the environment and understand potential actions to reduce them: pollution prevention, best management practices, rules. Often MPCA collaborates with university and federal researchers in these studies to use genomics and other new techniques to assess potential effects on fish and other aquatic life. MPCA has also developed a semi-automated approach for summarizing known information about the behavior and potential impacts of specific pharmaceuticals and CECs on aquatic life, resulting in an Aquatic Toxicity Profile (ATP). The ATPs provide a basis for comparing one chemical versus another.

Outreach & education materials: The agency provides support to local governments, pharmacies, law enforcement and other agencies to raise awareness on the impacts of pharmaceuticals in the home and in the environment, and to support proper disposal of unneeded pharmaceuticals.

Registration and tracking of waste pharmaceutical collection locations in the state: The MPCA works with local law enforcement, pharmacies, Native American Tribes and other state and federal agencies to encourage the installment of secure bins to dispose of unwanted pharmaceuticals. The MPCA oversees over 350 collection sites and collects data from them annually. Since 2010, these programs have voluntarily collected over 550,000 pounds of waste pharmaceuticals. The MPCA is working with the Department of Human Services on a federal grant to place approximately 25 collection boxes in underserved areas of the state in 2018.

PFAS

Policy Statement

The Clean Water Council recommends that the Clean Water Fund be a partial source of funding to implement the Minnesota's comprehensive PFAS Blueprint. Of the ten key issue areas prioritized in the Blueprint, there are three in which the Clean Water Fund would both fulfill both the Clean Water Legacy Act and the Blueprint.

- **Quantifying PFAS risk to human health**
- **Limiting PFAS exposure from drinking water**
- **Reducing PFAS exposure from fish and game consumption**

Problem

The PFAS Blueprint sizes up the problem this way.

> Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, commonly known as PFAS, are an enormous family of chemicals and now pervasive in the environment. Called "forever chemicals", they do n3333ot breakdown and can bioaccumulate in both humans and other living organisms, with some known to be toxic. Minnesota requires a strategic, coordinated approach to protecting families and communities.

A substantial financial settlement with 3M provides $850 million in funding for resource damage from PFAS in the state[3], including $700 million in providing safe drinking water in the east Twin Cities metro area. However, the Blueprint identifies significant knowledge gaps about additional problems:

> A key challenge in understanding and regulating PFAS is identifying their uses, presence in the environment, and impacts on health and ecosystems. Available sampling techniques and established analytical methods characterize less than one percent of all PFAS in the environment. There are gaps in our understanding of the effects of PFAS on human and environmental health including a lack of toxicity studies available. Without toxicity studies, it is not possible to complete health risk assessments used to determine safe levels of human exposure. The breadth and diversity of PFAS pollution, coupled with a lack of research on health impacts, complicates the development of regulatory and non-regulatory approaches to managing PFAS.

Other State Efforts

In addition to the 3M settlement, the State of Minnesota has worked on PFAS issues on several fronts.

- Minnesota Department of Health (MDH): Using toxicity assessments, the department has developed health-based guidance values for drinking water and fish consumption for several PFAS compounds.
- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA): The agency tested for PFAS in lakes and streams as early as 2004.

Current Uses of the Clean Water Fund

State agencies currently use the Clean Water Fund to investigate PFAS.

- **Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CEC) Program**: The Minnesota Department of Health administers this program, which provides health-based values for contaminants that are not currently federally regulated. Of the more than 100 contaminants evaluated, five are PFAS

[3] https://3msettlement.state.mn.us/

compounds. MDH reports that this process (including possible re-evaluation as new data emerge) can take up to two years. Each year the CEC Initiative seeks nominations of contaminants to evaluate. In FY2021, 14 of 24 nominations were for PFAS compounds. The initiative has also developed the Alternative Risk Assessment Methodology (ARAM) Project to use alternative risk assessment methods that appears effective with shorter-chain PFAS compounds when there is scant toxicology information available. (Blueprint, p. 53)

- **Statewide PFAS Monitoring Project:** MDH is testing every community water system in the state for PFAS. The goal of this project is to evaluate whether Minnesotans are exposed to PFAS at levels above health-based guidance values in drinking water. MDH is posting the status and results of the testing on an Interactive Dashboard for PFAS Testing in Drinking Water, which shows whether testing results are below or above available guidance values. This project received partial funding from the CWF and an EPA Multi-Purpose Grant, and sampling is taking place between 2021-2023. The MPCA and MDH coordinated efforts in earlier phases of the project when MDH prioritized sampling at systems with nearby PFAS sources or detections.
- **Fish Contamination Assessment**: The DNR has sampled for PFAS on a sporadic basis in fish tissue. More routine assessment that will allow for statewide fish consumption guidelines will not be possible without additional funding. It appears that PFAS contamination in fish is pervasive. According to the Blueprint, "84% of the Metro lakes and 22% of the Non-metro lakes sampled to date had fish with detectable levels of PFOS. Of the lakes with a known PFAS source nearby, all lakes had fish with detectable levels of PFOS, in both Metro and Nonmetro waters."
- **Ambient Groundwater Well Network**[4]: This program is supported by the Groundwater Assessment program at MPCA and sampled for PFAS in 2013 and 2019. It provides "an early warning system for PFAS migration into drinking water aquifers." The MPCA monitors for contaminants of emerging concern at about 40 wells annually. The MPCA and MDH coordinated efforts for the Statewide PFAS Monitoring Project, particularly in earlier phases of the project when MDH prioritized sampling at systems with nearby PFAS sources or detections. According to the Blueprint:

> Funding from the CWF allowed the MPCA to install shallow monitoring wells in key areas where existing wells were not available, such as residential areas that use subsurface sewage treatment systems for wastewater disposal, and commercial or industrial areas. This funding also allowed the MPCA to expand the list of chemicals it routinely analyzed in water samples to include CECs. MPCA has also been able to do some specific, non-routine, sampling for PFAS. In 2013, with limited targeted follow-up in 2017, MPCA was able to include 13 PFAS analytes in the analysis of groundwater samples. The results of PFAS monitoring are available in a report on MPCA's website. This report shows that PFAS were detected in most groundwater in the state….

Solution

Additional funding in FY24-25 from the Clean Water Fund would increase the capacity to monitor and assess PFAS in Minnesota.

[4] Groundwater monitoring | Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (state.mn.us)

- **Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CEC):** The Department of Health has requested an increase in CWFs for FY24-25 to $10.4 million over the FY22-23 appropriation of $2.4 million. This increased capacity of the CEC Initiative would allow for more evaluation of PFAS compounds for health-based values.
- **Fish Contaminant Assessment**: The DNR currently samples fish tissue in 178 lakes and 12 rivers for mercury and PCBs at the FY22-23 appropriation of $350,000. The Clean Water Council has recommended an increase to of $910,000 for FY24-25 to allow DNR to sample fish routinely for PFAS.
- **Groundwater Monitoring**: The MPCA has been able to sample for PFAS on an *ad hoc* basis in 2013 and 2019, but additional funding would allow continued and consistent support for the effort over time. The Clean Water Council has recommending spending $2.0 million over the FY22-23 appropriation of $1.9 million.
- **River and Lake Monitoring**: The MPCA sets aside a portion of River and Lake Monitoring CWF appropriations for partner requests. In FY24-25, the Clean Water Council is recommending an increase in funding for this program to add targeted PFAS monitoring and additional lake monitoring in lake-heavy watersheds at local partner request. The goal would be to determine if Class 1 waters are meeting their designated use. PFAS monitoring costs $300-400 per sample.

Chloride Reduction: De-Icer [approved by Council for FY22-23]

Revised Policy Statement

The Clean Water Council recommends that the State of Minnesota implement the following actions to reduce chloride in Minnesota surface and groundwater:

- Fund the **Smart Salting applicator training and certification** program, and the MPCA's **chloride reduction budget** to support the development and maintenance of tools, resources, policies, trainings and assistance programs to reduce chloride pollution.
- Request that the Legislature give the MPCA the **authority to charge a fee** for chloride training.
- Provide **liability protection** for the Smart Salting program certified private winter de-icing applicators for reduced salt applications.
- Provide **research funds to develop new technology and alternatives** to chloride-containing de-icing chemicals, and best management practices.
- Encourage and support the **adoption of the MPCA's Chloride Reduction Model Ordinance Language** by local governmental entities.
- Have the MPCA convene and lead a stakeholder process to develop recommendations for **new labelling requirements** on bags of de-icing chemicals sold in Minnesota.

Problem

Chloride is a naturally occurring ion found in low levels in Minnesota surface and groundwater. Salt used for winter de-icing and water softening contain chloride. Chloride is not toxic in small concentrations. However, above 230 mg per liter (about one teaspoon in 5 gallons of water), chloride becomes toxic to freshwater fish and other aquatic life under long-term exposure. Once chloride enters our surface water (lakes, streams, and wetlands) and groundwater, it is not feasible and extremely expensive to remove it.

Winter de-icing salts are among the primary sources of chloride in Minnesota waters.

In the Twin Cities Metro Area (TCMA) winter maintenance activities use approximately 365,000 tons of chloride de-icer per year. The de-icing salts eventually wash into nearby lakes, streams and wetlands. Recent monitoring shows increasing chloride concentrations in surface water and shallow groundwater. Since it is very difficult and expensive to remove chloride from our surface and groundwater once it gets into water, reducing chloride at the source is necessary.

- **Inconsistent labeling** for de-icers creates confusion for consumers. De-icers can be labeled as "eco-friendly" or as an alternative to salt, but they may pose other problems for water quality. Currently there is not a standard for labeling de-icers for their potential threats to water quality.

Solution

1. **Training and Certification**. Continue the Smart Salting applicator training and certification program: The MPCA has a training program for private and public salt applicators, such as snow removal contractors and snowplow drivers. This has been a very successful program and has assisted winter maintenance programs in reducing salt application rates by 30% to 70%, without compromising public safety. The TCMA Chloride Management Plan and Statewide Chloride Management Plan include the Smart Salting training program as the top implementation strategy to reduce salt use in the winter. In the past, MPCA conducted this training with federal

funds, but those funds are temporary. The estimated operating cost for the training program in FY22 is $350,000/year. To qualify for the liability protection to private salt applicators, the applicator must complete Smart Salting training program to be certified. The State should continue to provide adequate funding to the MPCA's **Chloride Reduction Program** budget to support the development and maintenance of tools, resources, policies, trainings and assistance programs like MnTAP to assist communities in their effort to reduce chloride pollution.

2. **Allow the MPCA to Charge a Fee**. Currently the MPCA does not have the authority to charge a fee for the training that would defray some of the cost. Legislative authority will be required. There is more demand for these chloride reduction training than the MPCA can meet. By charging a fee to willing customers, the agency can meet the demand.
3. **Liability Protection**. Provide liability protection to certified private salt applicators against slip and fall lawsuits: The notion here is that private applicators certified through the Smart Salting program would be able to apply for liability protection. The private applicator industry and local stakeholders strongly support this proposal. Various groups introduced bills to this effect in the last three legislative sessions and it has passed several committees and one house; however, none was enacted into law.
4. **Research Funding for Alternatives**. Make research funds available to develop new technology and alternatives to chloride-containing de-icing chemicals. Research on new technologies and alternative de-icing solutions may allow for a shift in snow and ice management that protect water resources while maintaining public safety. A full list of needed research areas can be found in Section 5 of the TCMA Chloride Management Plan.
5. **Adopt Local Chloride Reduction Ordinances**. Encourage and support the adoption of the MPCA's Chloride Reduction Model Ordinance Language by local governmental entities. The model ordinances provide guidance for creating and implementing ordinances that will assist with reducing chloride pollution. The proposed new municipal stormwater general permit for the State (also known as the MS4 general permit) would require adoption of several of these ideas. The four focus areas in the guidance include:
    a. Occupational Licensure for Winter Maintenance Professionals
    b. Deicer Bulk Storage Facility Regulations
    c. Land Disturbance Activities
    d. Parking Lot, Sidewalk and Private Road Sweeping Requirements
6. **De-icing product labeling requirements**. The MPCA should convene and lead a stakeholder process to develop recommendations for new labeling requirements on bags of de-icing chemicals sold in Minnesota. The goal of this effort will be to convene a knowledgeable group of stakeholders from a variety of sectors to create language that will ensure that consumers are provided accurate and necessary information about the de-icing products they are purchasing and applying to Minnesota's environment. Some key areas that should be evaluated include, but would not be limited to:
    - Require complete ingredients list with percentages provided
    - Third party certification requirements for any statements about the products' environmental, pet and human safety
    - Provide "practical' temperature ranges (not temperature ranges that can only be achieved in a lab setting or over a time period of weeks for melting to occur)

- Report possible negative impacts of the product on surfaces, vegetation, water quality, and other
- Safety protocols for handling the products
- Guidance for proper application that includes:
    - Snow and Ice removal prior to application
    - Application rates that are based on research
    - Suggested equipment for proper application and proper spread patterns
    - Conditions in which product will not be effective or may create unsafe surfaces

Chloride Reduction: Water Softening [already approved by Council for FY22-23]

Policy Statement

The Clean Water Council recommends that the State of Minnesota implement the following actions to reduce chloride in Minnesota surface and groundwater:

- **Provide financial support and technical assistance to municipalities to reduce chloride discharges** and allow flexibility for how municipalities achieve these reductions.
- **Update the state plumbing code** to effectively prohibit the installation of new water softeners in Minnesota that use timers rather than on-demand regeneration systems.
- **Fund a program** for activities, training, and grants that reduce chloride pollution. Grants should support upgrading, optimizing, or replacing water softener units.

Problem

Chloride is a naturally occurring ion found in low levels in Minnesota surface and groundwater. Salt used for winter de-icing and water softening contain chloride. Chloride is not toxic in small concentrations. However, above 230 mg per liter (about one teaspoon in 5 gallons of water), chloride becomes toxic to freshwater fish and other aquatic life under long-term exposure. Once chloride enters our surface water (lakes, streams, and wetlands) and groundwater, it is not feasible and extremely expensive to remove it.

Residential water softeners among the primary sources of chloride in Minnesota waters.

The discharge of chloride from residential water softeners can end up in surface waters even after wastewater treatment. Reducing the need for chlorides in water treatment is a priority in Minnesota. However, there are obstacles to achieving chloride reduction.

- **Timer water softeners** are still available. Newer on-demand water softeners are more efficient than older models because they add salt when water demand requires it. However, water softeners are still on the market in Minnesota with a timer that will use salt at regular intervals whether the water requires it or not to remove hardness.
- If public water suppliers upgrade to central softening of water, excessive wastewater discharges of chloride may persist due to continued use of residential water softeners when they are no longer necessary to reduce hardness.

Solution

1. **Support municipal efforts to reduce chloride**. The State should provide adequate funding to provide municipalities financial resources to reduce chloride discharges. This includes funding programs offered through the Minnesota Public Facilities Authority and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's water softening grant program.
2. **Update the Plumbing Code**. The plumbing code would effectively prohibit the installation of new water softeners that use a timer using one of two options.
    a. Ion Exchange water softeners used primarily for water hardness reduction that, during regeneration, discharge a brine solution shall be of a demand initiated regeneration type equipped with a water meter or a sensor [based on a Wisconsin model]; or

   b. All water softening or conditioning appliances installed must meet the following criteria [based on a California model]:
      i. The appliance activates regeneration by demand control.
   c. An appliance installed on or after January 1, [insert desired year], shall be certified by a third party rating organization using industry standards to have a salt efficiency rating of no less than 4,000 grains of hardness removed per pound of salt used in regeneration. (This is the recommendation that MPCA suggests in Property Management training and in the Statewide Chloride Management Plan.)
3. **Fund activities, training, and grants that reduce chloride pollution**. The MPCA has several tools available to help municipalities reduce chloride pollution. Grants can be used to support rebates that homeowners and businesses can use to upgrade, optimize, or replace their water softening equipment.

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
	Monitoring, Assessment, and Characterization					
DNR	**Aquifer Monitoring for Water Supply Planning:** Collect and analyze critical aquifer level data and groundwater flow dynamics, develop groundwater models and work with stakeholders to address sustainability management and planning through groundwater management areas and other forums.	$4,150	$3,700	$ 3,700	$4,000	8.11%
DNR	**Fish Contamination Assessment:** Sample mercury and other contaminants in fish to determine fish consumption advisories, impairment status, and trend markers for those sites.	$270	$350	$ 350	$910	160.00%
DNR	**Lake IBI assessment:** Support MPCA's lake water quality assessments with by providing data and interpretation about fish and plant populations.	$2,500	$2,000	$ 2,000	$2,900	45.00%
DNR	**Buffer Map Maintenance:** Update and maintain maps of public waters and ditch systems that require permanent vegetation buffers.	$200	$50	$ 50	$50	0.00%
DNR	**Stream flow monitoring:** Collect stream flow data, which is used to calculate pollutant loads for MPCA's water quality assessments. Sample bedload at select stations to analyze sediment transport in streams.	$4,000	$4,000	$ 4,000	$5,100	27.50%
MDA	**Monitoring for Pesticides in Surface Water and Groundwater:** Ongoing monitoring using clean water funded laboratory instruments which provides increased capability and greater capacity for pesticide monitoring. Clean Water funding has allowed the MDA to increase the number of detectable pesticides, increase the sensitivity of detection of certain pesticides, and increase the overall number of samples that can be analyzed on an annual basis.	$700	$700	$ 700	$700	0.00%
MDA	**Pesticide Testing of Private Wells:** Provide free pesticide testing of private wells in areas where groundwater may be at risk for elevated pesticide concentrations. Testing focuses on the herbicide cyanazine which is no longer used in Minnesota but its degradates are being detected at concentrations above the drinking water standard in some areas.	$2,000	$870	$ 870	$1,000	14.94%
MDH	**Drinking Water Contaminants of Emerging Concern Program**: Continue to protect human health by developing guidance and providing expert technical assistance on emerging contaminants so that timely and targeted health information is available for decision-making by state programs and the public. Increase capacity for health risk assessment and the Public Health Laboratory's equipment and staffing to support implementation of the Minnesota PFAS Blueprint. Work will include expanded capability in laboratory methods, researching and conducting rapid assessments, full chemical reviews, and participating in studies that measure the occurrence of emerging contaminants. Prevention efforts also include outreach and education that focuses on education, strategies, and behavioral actions	$3,400	$2,400	$ 2,400	$10,400	333.33%

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
MDH	**Private Well Initiative**: Ensure 1.2 million private well users have safe drinking water by: better understanding and explaining the occurrence and distribution of contaminants in private wells in Minnesota; expanding education and outreach to private well users about well testing, treatment, and well protection; and building partners' capacity to support private well users. Develop and implement a 10-year plan to offer free, voluntary testing to private well owners.	$1,500	$0	$ -	$3,000	NEW
MPCA	**River and Lake Monitoring & Assessment**: Statewide lake and stream/river monitoring foundational to assessing water quality, the development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS), Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies (GRAPS), which inform One Watershed One Plans (1W1P). Intensive watershed monitoring includes biological, chemical, and habitat monitoring in watersheds to assess the water conditions, pollutant load monitoring to track trends, and large river sampling every 5 years. Assessments determine if waters are impaired and serve as a basis for further analysis of watershed problems, protection options, and overall watershed planning efforts. FY24/25 request would add targeted PFAS monitoring and additional lake monitoring in lake-heavy watersheds at local partner request.	$16,000	$14,432	$ 14,432	$18,300	26.80%
MPCA	**Groundwater assessment:** Monitor and enhance ambient groundwater well network to collect critical water quality data needed for drinking water protection and surface water impact analysis, including modeling to support TMDL stressor identification and contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) in a subset of monitoring wells.	$2,364	$1,900	$ 1,900	$2,000	5.26%
MPCA (pass thru)	**Red River Watch (Red River Watershed Board)**			$ 300		-100.00%
MPCA (pass thru)	**Grants to the Friends of the Minnesota Valley** for river watch activities			$ 100		-100.00%
	Monitoring, Assessment, and Characterization total	**$37,084**	**$30,402**	**$30,802**	**$48,360**	
	Watershed & Groundwater Restoration/Protection Strategies					
DNR	**Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies:** Work with state and local partners to provide expertise, data, analysis, and support for major watershed studies and the development of watershed restoration and protection strategies.	$3,800	$3,800	$ 3,800	$4,300	13.16%

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
MDH	**Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies**: Scale up the Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategy process to match local partner needs for 1W1P development, data/information delivery, staff capacity, training/education, and strategy development. Pilot three positions in SWCD technical service areas to support local groundwater protection implementation activities.	$1,100	$1,126	$ 1,126	$1,500	33.21%
MDH	**Source Water Protection**: Support source water protection planning and implementation in communities served by groundwater and surface water. Continue Drinking Water Ambient Monitoring Program to monitor and address emerging threats in source waters. Continue coordinating and integrating source water protection activities with comprehensive watershed planning efforts	$5,494	$7,884	$ 7,884	$8,000	1.47%
MPCA	**Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (includes TMDL development):** In 2008, the MPCA launched a watershed approach to systematically and comprehensively conduct the state's water-quality monitoring, and restoration and protection planning needs on a 10-year cycle. Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPs), including TMDLs, are developed with local partners to set strategies for impaired waters and unimpaired waters by setting reduction and protection goals, milestones and measures to guide state and local government implementation efforts. Funding also supports updating watershed models as new monitoring data become available.	$15,100	$13,451	$ 13,451	$13,000	-3.35%
	Watershed & Groundwater Restoration/Protection Strategies total	**$25,494**	**$26,261**	**$26,261**	**$26,800**	
	Comprehensive Local Watershed Management					
BWSR	**Water Management Transition (One Watershed One Plan):** Accelerate implementation of the State's Watershed Approach through the statewide development of watershed-based local water planning that is synchronized with Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) and Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies (GRAPS) by providing technical assistance, program oversight, and grants to local governments consistent with MInnesota Statutes 103B.801.	$4,000	$5,808	$5,808	$5,000	-13.91%
	Comprehensive Local Watershed Management total	**$4,000**	**$5,808**	**$5,808**	**$5,000**	
	Nonpoint source implementation					

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
BWSR	**Implementation Funding for Watersheds with Approved Comprehensive Watershed Plans (Watershed-based Implementation Funding):** A non-competitive, performance based program to implement projects on a watershed scale that protect, enhance, and restore surface water quality in lakes, rivers, and streams, protect groundwater from degradation, and protect drinking water sources. Projects must be identified in a water or comprehensive watershed plan developed by local governments and approved by the Board of Water and Soil Resources. This may include those under the One Watershed, One Plan Program or under the seven-county metropolitan groundwater or surface water management frameworks as provided for in Minnesota Statutes, chapters 103B, 103C, 103D, and 114D.	$26,966	$43,564	$43,564	$79,000	81.34%
BWSR	**Accelerated Implementation:** Enhance the capacity of local governments to accelerate implementation of projects and activities that supplement or exceed current state standards for protection, enhancement, and restoration of water quality in lakes, rivers, streams, and groundwater. Activities include: 1) increase technical assistance through regional technical service areas (TSAs), 2) technical training and certification, 3) leveraging federal program dollars, and 4) using analytical targeting and measurement tools that fill an identified gap.	$8,000	$9,682	$9,682	$11,000	13.61%
BWSR	**Conservation Drainage Management and Assistance:** Implementation of a conservation drainage/multipurpose drainage water management program in consultation with the Drainage Work Group to improve surface water management by providing supplemental funding under the provisions of 103E.015.	$1,700	$1,700	$1,700	$2,500	47.06%
BWSR	**Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)**			$5,600		-100.00%
BWSR	**Critical Shoreland Protection-Permanent Conservation Easements:** To purchase permanent conservation easements to protect lands adjacent to public waters with good water quality but threatened with degradation. Focus is on the headwaters of the Mississippi Basin for protection of tributaries and the Mississippi River, to provide source water protection for numerous Twin Cities and rural communities along the Mississippi River.	$3,000	$2,468	$2,468	$3,000	21.56%
BWSR	Capacity Grants to Soil and Water Conservation Districts		$0	$24,000		-100.00%
BWSR	**Wetland restoration easements:** Funds will acquire permanent conservation easements and restore wetlands in priority areas statewide. Will hold water in upper watershed areas for de-nitrification, rate, and volume control.	$0	$5,660	$5,660	$10,000	76.68%
BWSR	**Measures, Results and Accountability:** To provide state oversight and accountability, evaluate and communicate results, support program and outcomes development, provide reporting tools, and measure conservation program implementation of local governments, develop and distribute technical guidance, develop and submit associated legislative reports.	$2,000	$2,500	$2,500	$2,500	0.00%

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
BWSR	**Buffer Law Implementation:** Provides program oversight and grants to support local governments in their implementation of the statewide buffer law.	$5,000	$3,872	$3,872	$4,000	3.31%
BWSR	**Working Land and Floodplain Easements:** Easements to set aside sensitive land in riparian corridors to address water quality, including rate and volume concerns. Based on a conservation plan, participating landowners will have options to establish flood hardy understory, establish trees, haying/grazing, silviculture, silvopasture, agroforestry with payment structure based on the proposed use.	$0	$3,872	$3,872	$6,000	54.96%
BWSR	**Surface and Drinking Water Protection/Restoration Grants:** (Projects and Practices) Competitive grant program and incentive funding to protect, enhance and restore water quality in lakes, rivers and streams and to protect groundwater and drinking water by implementing priority actions in local water management plans. Up to 20% of funds dedicated to drinking water protection activities.	$32,000	$22,266	$22,266	$17,000	-23.65%
BWSR	**Watershed Partners Legacy (WPL) Grants:** Program is for water quality improvement projects to protect, enhance, and restore water quality in lakes, rivers, and streams and protect groundwater from degradation. This program provides matching grants to local, state, and national nonprofit organizations, tribal governments, and other government partners. Projects will be evaluated and prioritized based on alignment with state-approved and locally-adopted comprehensive watershed management plans or related scientific information.	$0	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	0.00%
BWSR	**Enhancing Landower Adoption of Soil Health Practices for Drinking Water & Groundwater Protection:** The program provides both applied research by the Minnesota Office for Soil Health and implementation of cover crop practices and conservation tillage to achieve water quality benefits as prioritized in comprehensive watershed management plans.	$0	$4,000	$4,000	$14,227	255.68%
BWSR	**Lake Superior Basin SWCDs BIL Leverage Funding:** Funding to Lake Superior Basin SWCDs to leverage Great Lakes federal dollars antici[ated from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law	$0	$0	$0	$2,000	
DNR	**Nonpoint source restoration and protection activities:** Support local planning and implementation efforts, including: One Watershed, One Plan, systematic conservation planning, technical assistance with implementation, and targeted forest stewardship for water quality.	$2,000	$2,500	$2,500	$3,200	28.00%
DNR	**NEW Mussel Restoration Pilot Program:** Increase mussel production at Lake City facility and field test restoration in three HUC8 watersheds.	$0	$0	$0	$600	NEW
DNR	**NEW Culvert replacement Incentive Program:** Financial and technical assistance for Counties and other local governments to help replace culverts using modern design for floodplain connectivity, biological connectivity and channel stability. Funds would be authorized and available until spent (this is important because it takes time to line this work up). Target would be about 20 projects at $125K per project, up to 30% cost share. 2 FTE for Technical Support. Potential to leverage Federal infrastructure funding.	$0	$0	$0	$3,000	NEW

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
DNR	**Water Storage** - A pilot for a new program to identify, acquire property interest, restore/enhance and potentially engineer drained wetlands in the watersheds of impaired lakes in southern and western MN that have high fish or wildlife habitat and recreation value. Primary purpose for wetland acquisition and restoration is for water quality and quantity, with habitat benefits secondary. Examples of lakes are: Heron; Shetek; Sarah; Fox; Wakanda.	$0	$0	$0	$1,000	NEW
MDA	**AgBMP Loan Program:** This program provides revolving low interest loans for eligible activities that reduce or eliminate water pollution. The program is administered by local governments, has very low transaction costs, and repayments fund additional projects.	$150	$150	$150	$15,000	9900.00%
MDA	**MN Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program:** The MAWQCP is a first of its kind partnership between federal and state government and private industry. This innovative and nationally recognized voluntary program targets water quality protection on a field by field, whole farm basis. It comprehensively identifies and mitigates agricultural risks to water quality and protects and restores water resources, improves and expands soil health, and builds and quantifies climate resiliency in Minnesota agriculture.	$6,000	$6,000	$6,000	$7,000	16.67%
MDA	**Technical Assistance:** Technical assistance helps ensure accurate scientific information is available and used to address water quality concerns from agricultural practices. Funding is used to evaluate the effectiveness of conservation practices, support on-farm demonstrations and enhance outreach and education to the agricultural community and local government partners. Includes activities such as Discovery Farms MN, Root River Field to Stream Partnership, and support for agricultural retailers working with the 4R Nutrient Stewardship Certification program.	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	0.00%
MDA	**Conservation Equipment Assistance:** Funding will provide assistance to both SWCDs and farmers to purchase equipment or items to retrofit existing equipment that has climate and water quality benefits including conservation tillage equipment and cover crop seeding equipment. This proposal would compliment soil health cost-share programs by providing the equipment needed to implement practices.	$0	$0	$0	$4,000	NEW
MDA	**Expand Ag Weather Station Network:** Expand the existing state weather station and soil temperature network to provide accurate and timely weather data to optimize the timing of irrigation, fertilizer, pesticide and manure applications and support land management decisions. This will result in improved surface water and groundwater quality and support efforts to improve soil health.	$0	$0	$0	$3,000	NEW
MC	**Water demand reduction grant program:** Provides grants to assist municipalities in metro area with implementation of water demand reduction measures to ensure the reliability and protection of drinking water supplies.	$750	$1,250	$1,250	$1,500	20.00%
MPCA	**Great Lakes restoration project:** Funds are used to leverage federal dollars to restore the St. Louis River area of concern so beneficial use impairments can be removed.	$1,500	$1,500	$1,500	$1,500	0.00%

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
	Nonpoint source implementation total	**$92,066**	**$114,984**	**$144,584**	**$195,027**	34.89%

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
	Point source implementation					
MPCA	**Chloride reduction efforts:** This program provides critical support to communities by providing grants to offset costs to reduce their chloride discharges via water softeners, a critical step in meeting statewide chloride reduction goals. The FY24-25 request adds additional grant funding because there are more communities now that must implement their chloride reduction plan. These implementation funds result in a direct reduction of chloride to our state waters.	$500	$520	$520	$1,300	150.00%
MPCA	**Wastewater/stormwater TMDL implementation**: **Combines what had been two appropriations formerly for NPDES support (WRAPS and TMDLs) with accelerating stormwater permit compliance.** These two historical appropriations will be combined in FY24-25 for streamlining as the two bodies of work overlap. Proper management of stormwater and wastewater is crucial to achieving the goals of TMDLs. Funding for these program areas supports point source implementation and represents the minimum amount of funding needed to provide technical assistance tools to local units of government and to support staffing to accelerate work in stormwater and wastewater permitting programs that protect lakes and streams. Additional funding is requested for FY24-25 to restore cuts from the past couple of biennia to stormwater project funding that allows continued development of the Stormwater Manual which is used by both unregulated and regulated cities, and to support creating connections between point and nonpoint source implementation programs.	$2,200	$2,200	$2,200	$3,000	36.36%
PFA	**Point Source Implementation Grant (PSIG) Program:** Provides grants to help cities upgrade water infrastructure treatment facilities to comply with TMDL wasteload requirements and more stringent water quality-based effluent limits for phosphorus, chlorides, and other pollutants. The PFA administers the program in partnership with the MPCA.	$18,000	$15,936	$15,936	$18,000	12.95%
PFA	**Small Community Wastewater Treatment Program:** Provides grants and loans to assist small unsewered communities with technical assistance and construction funding to replace non-complying septic systems with community subsurface sewage treatment systems (SSTS). The PFA administers the program in partnership with the MPCA.	$250	$200	$200	$200	0.00%
	Point source implementation total	**$20,950**	**$18,856**	**$18,856**	**$22,500**	
	Groundwater/Drinking Water Implementation					

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
BWSR	**Targeted Wellhead/Drinking Water Protection:** For conservation easements on wellhead protection areas under Minnesota Statutes, section 103F.515, subdivision 2, paragraph (d), or for grants to local units of government for ensuring long-term protection of groundwater supply sources in wellhead protection areas. Priority to be placed on land that is located where the vulnerability of the drinking water supply is designated as high or very high by the commissioner of health, where the drinking water supply is identified as Mitigation Level 1 or 2 by the Minnesota Groundwater Rule, where monitoring has shown elevated nitrate levels, where drinking water protection plans have identified specific activities that will achieve long-term protection, and/or on lands with expiring Conservation Reserve Program contracts.	$4,000	$5,000	$5,000	$6,000	20.00%
MDA	**Irrigation Water Quality Protection:** Nitrogen contributions to groundwater under irrigated agriculture can be significant in some parts of Minnesota. Funding is for an irrigation water quality specialist via a contract with U of M Extension. This position develops and provides education on irrigation and nitrogen best management practices (BMPs) and supports the development of irrigation scheduling guidance for Minnesota irrigators.	$300	$270	$270	$300	11.11%
MDA	**Nitrate in Groundwater:** Funding to implement Minnesota's Nitrogen Fertilizer Management Plan and Groundwater Protection Rule for preventing and responding to nitrate contamination of groundwater from nitrogen fertilizer use. Includes support for: well testing, BMP promotion, demonstration, and adoption; Extension staffing; local advisory teams to work with farmers and crop advisors in areas with elevated nitrate in groundwater, conducting computer modeling to evaluate specific agricultural practices and; technical support and on-farm demonstrations such as Rosholt Farm.	$5,170	$5,170	$5,170	$6,000	16.05%
MDH	**Future of Drinking Water**: Develop a statewide Drinking Water plan that includes public health policies and an implementable action plan with milestones and measures to address threats to public and private drinking water supplies in Minnesota, This effort also includes implementation of a number of recommendations from the University of Minnesota's "Future of Drinking Water report."	$500	$500	$500	$500	0.00%
MC	**Metropolitan Area Water Supply Sustainability Support:** Metropolitan Council will continue implementing projects that address emerging drinking water supply threats, provide cost-effective regional solutions, leverage inter-jurisdictional coordination, support local implementation of water supply reliability projects, and prevent degradation of groundwater resources.	$2,000	$1,838	$1,838	$2,500	36.02%
MPCA	**Enhanced County inspections/SSTS corrective actions:** Support technical assistance and County implementation of SSTS program requirements (M.S. 115.55) including issuing permits, conducting inspections, identifying and resolving non-compliant SSTS, and revising and maintaining SSTS ordinances. The FY24/25 request would increase available grant funds to counties to assist families with low income make septic system upgrades	$6,750	$5,824	$5,824	$7,500	28.78%

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
MPCA	**National Park Water Quality Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park**			$1,400	$2,000	42.86%
	Groundwater/Drinking Water Implementation total	**$18,720**	**$18,602**	**$18,602**	**$24,800**	33.32%
	Local Implementation total (NPS, PS, GW/DW)	**$131,736**	**$152,442**	**$182,042**	**$242,327**	

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
	Research, Evaluation and Tool Development					
BWSR	**Tillage and Erosion Survey:** Program to systematically collect data and produce statically valid estimates of the rate of soil erosion state-wide and tracking the adoption of high residue cropping systems in the 67 counties with greater than 30% of land in agricultural row crop production.	$850	$724	$724	$850	17.40%
BWSR	**Technical Evaluation:** For a technical evaluation panel to conduct restoration evaluations under Minnesota Statues, section 114D.50, subdivision 6.	$168	$84	$84	$200	138.10%
DNR	**Applied research and tools**: Maintain and update LiDAR-derived elevation data and tools; develop fine-scale watershed models; assess relationships among disturbance patterns, BMP applications, and water quality in forested watersheds.	$1,400	$1,065	$1,065	$1,300	22.07%
DNR	**County geologic atlases:** Work with the Minnesota Geological Survey to accelerate completion or updates to County Geologic Atlases that provide critical groundwater and geology information to local governments.	$300	$0	$0	$300	returned to previous levels
MDA	**Research Inventory Database:** The Minnesota Water Research Digital Library (MNWRL) is a user-friendly, searchable inventory of water research relevant to Minnesota. It provides "one-stop" access to all types of water research, including both peer-reviewed articles and white papers and reports.	$100	$80	$80	$80	0.00%
MDA / U of MN	**Forever Green Agricultural Initiative (U of MN):** Develops new perennial and winter annual crops and associated cropping systems that preserve and enhance water quality, and supports the development of new supply chains that provide profitable markets for these crops. Funding will support the Forever Green Initiative in areas related to research, implementation, and partnership development.	$4,300	$4,000	$4,000	$6,000	50.00%
MDA	**Agricultural Research/Evaluation:** Research will focus on evaluating, developing and demonstrating regional and animal-specific recommendations for manure crediting, and to develop or revise manure best management practices (BMPs). Water quality benefits and greenhouse gas emission reductions can be achieved by proper crediting for the nutrient value of various types of manure.	$0	$0	$0	$1,500	NEW
MDH	**Recreational Water Quality Online Portal:** Develop a statewide portal for beach monitoring results, closures, and public health notifications. Evaluate monitoring results to determine best practices for beach monitoring at Minnesota lakes, ensuring decisions are science-driven, protect the public's health, and help make sure that Minnesota's waters continue to be swimmable for all to enjoy.	$0	$0	$0	$600	NEW
U of MN	**Stormwater BMP Performance Evaluation & Technology Transfer**			$ 1,500	$2,000	33.33%
U of MN	**Geologic Atlas with Dept. of Natural Resources**			$ 900	$1,000	11.11%
U of MN	**Quantifying the Multiple Benefits of Clean Water Investments**			$ 190	$0	-100.00%
U of MN	**Study water's role in transporting chronic wasting disease prions**			$ 1,378	$0	-100.00%

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25
	Research, Evaluation and Tool Development total	**$7,118**	**$5,953**	**$9,921**	**$13,830**	
MPCA	**Clean Water Council budget**	$220	$550	$550	$675	22.73%
LCC	**Legislative Coordinating Commission**	$9	$8	$8	$8	0.00%
	Administration total	**$229**	**$558**	**$558**	**$683**	
	FY24_25 budget total	**$205,661**	**$221,424**	**$255,392**	**$337,000**	

FY24-25 CWF proposed budget

Agency	Activity	Enacted Budget FY2020-21 (000s)	Recommended budget FY2022-23 (000s)	Enacted Budget (FY22-FY23)	CWC's recs FY2024-25 (000s)	Percent Increase from FY22-23 to FY24-25

Clean Water Council Budget and Outcomes Committee
Planning for the November Forecast

The November 4th BOC meeting went through the spreadsheet line by line and identified programs that it wanted protected in case of a deficit. The next step is to share and finalize this list with the full Council on November 21st. We didn't really do anything yet on what to do with the surplus.

Clean Water Fund Programs TO PROTECT

	VERY STRONG desire to protect recommended appropriations for these programs
BWSR	Wetland Restoration Easements
BWSR	Critical Shoreland Protection-Permanent Conservation Easements
MDH	Private Well Initiative **(10-year cycle of private well testing for 5 contaminants)**
DNR	Fish Contamination Assessment **(PFAS response)**
MPCA	River and Lake Monitoring **(PFAS Response)**
MDH	Contaminants of Emerging Concern **(PFAS Response)**
DNR	Mussel Restoration Pilot Program

	General support to protect recommended approprations for these programs
DNR	Water Storage
MDH	Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies
BWSR	Enhancing Landowner Adoption of Soil Health Practices for Drinking Water and Groundwater Protection
DNR	Aquifer Monitoring
MDA	AgBMP Loan Program
DNR	Index of Biological Integrity
MPCA	Chloride Reduction
MDA	Forever Green Initiative
MPCA	Voyageurs Project
MDH	Beach Portal