Clean Water Council Meeting Agenda

Monday, February 27, 2023

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
 - Legislative update
- 9:30 Strategic Planning Exercise
 - MPCA Organizational Improvement Unit
- 10:45 BREAK
- **11:00** Strategic Planning Exercise (continued)
- 12:00 LUNCH
- 12:30 Monitoring, Assessment, Characterization & WRAPS in the Lower Minnesota West Watershed
 - Glenn Skuta, Watershed Division Director, MPCA
- 2:00 Adjourn

Immediately after: Steering Committee

Clean Water Council

January 23, 2023 Meeting Summary

Members present: John Barten (Chair), Steven Besser, Richard Biske, Richard Brainerd, Gary Burdorf, Tannie Eshenaur, Warren Formo, Justin Hanson, Kelly Gribauval-Hite, Rep. Josh Heintzeman, Frank Jewell, Jen Kader (Vice Chair), Holly Kovarik, Jason Moeckel, Jeff Peterson, Victoria Reinhardt, Patrick Shea, Glenn Skuta, Phillip Sterner, and Marcie Weinandt.

Members absent: Sen. Jennifer McEwen, Raj Rajan, Todd Renville, Sen. Carrie Ruud, Peter Schwagerl, and Jordan Vandal.

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

Regular Clean Water Council Business

- Introductions
- Approval of the January 23 meeting agenda and December 19 meeting summary, motion by Dick Brainerd, and seconded by Pat Shea. Motion carries.
- Chair and Council Staff update
 - o Policy & Budget and Outcomes Committee updates
 - o Staff update
 - The Council's recommendations have been submitted and they match the Governor's budget. The bill itself will include updated rider language. Paul will meet with committees and testify as needed.
 - At the Legislature a few water items are moving around, such as the lead service line replacement and inventory. A few bills have been related to PFAS, such as banning certain products. A bill was introduced in the Senate to support Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) at \$22 million.
 - Cash versus bonding has been discussed. The bonding bills get left at the end. This would include a lot
 of funding for water. Committee deadlines are earlier than they usually are (March 4). Bills that are
 not in the hopper soon may not get a hearing.
 - Rep. Lillie suggested a change of biennial to annual funding recommendations for the Clean Water Fund (CWF). There are pros and cons to this change.
 - Senate confirmation of state agency commissioners have been happening and happening early. This
 could mean the Council may get its new members confirmed as well. In June there will be several new
 members. Council members may be called up to be at the Legislature for confirmation.

Minnesota Drought of 2021, by Pooja Kanwar, Luigi Romolo, Dan Miller, Ellen Considine, Amanda Yourd, Carmelita Nelson, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) (*WebEx 00:38:00*)

- They will address the 2021 drought, through the DNR's perspective, by exploring science, planning and effects. Presenters will describe the DNR's planning, communication, and coordination efforts, permit suspensions, well interferences, and conservation efforts. The session includes a case study. Presenters will discuss lessons learned, challenges and opportunities, ending with a group discussion.
- There have been many droughts in the past (i.e., 1988). There is a perception of abundance and a complacency on water use in the state.
- Regarding policy, the commissioner shall establish a plan to respond to drought-related emergencies to
 prepare a statewide framework for drought response (Minn. Stat. 103G.293). The plan must consider
 metropolitan water supply plans of the Metropolitan Council. The plan must provide a framework for
 implementing drought response actions in a staged approach related to decreasing flows. Additionally,
 permits issued must provide conditions on water appropriation consistent with the drought response plan.
 The Minnesota Statewide Drought Plan was established in 1990 following the 1988 drought. There is an
 internally led drought planning team working with fellow state partners.
- The 2021 drought was the worst since 1988. It impacted lake levels, stream flows, permit suspensions, well interferences, livestock and rangelands, and recreation.
 - The drought started in the summer of 2020. June 2021 was the seventh driest and third warmest going back to 1895. The entire state of Minnesota was in drought. By July 31, things got even worst with half the

state in severe drought, and a small area in extreme drought. It impacted: hay shortages, corn, soybeans, reduced stream flows, lowered lake levels, and impacted tourism. Things became worse in August. It was the first instance of exceptional drought in Minnesota since the inception of the United States Drought Monitor (USDM) Drought Map. Over three quarters of the state was in severe drought or worse. There was some rainfall relief in late August, mostly in the southern part of the state. In September, the drought conditions usually lock up for winter, but the southern part of the state saw some more rainfall. There was also some rainfall in the northern part of the state, which was a relief moving into winter.

- There was a lot of snow in the northern part of the state. The spring was a slow melt and the drought ended in May 2022. It was the worst drought since 1988 for the state, and worse than 1988 for some areas. This was the first drought since 1988 that encompassed the entire growing season. However, impacts of drought continue. They could be two events or a continuation.
- June 2022 was very dry and warm in southern Minnesota. The state is never more vulnerable to drought than right after recovering from a drought, requiring close monitoring. Recovery also takes longer.
- By November 2022 the drought worsened due particularly in the seven-county metro. It impacts mostly lakes and rivers, although there were agricultural impacts too.
- Drought has a memory:
 - The drought of 2021 really started with drying in 2020 and less snow storage during the winter.
 - If water shortages are not replenished over the winter, it could impact the growing season.
 - Drought is a naturally occurring part of our climate.
 - Regardless of how wet and how moist the soils are, you are never more than four to six weeks away from the start of what could be the worst drought we've ever seen.
- Drought and well interference in northwest Minnesota: How drought relates to groundwater.
- The drought was worst in late August of 2021 with well interference complaints in the driest areas.
- Well interference occurs when pumping from one well (usually deeper) lowers the water level in another well below the pump. Water in the aquifer but the well can no longer reach the water. Drought leads to more well interference complaints, but lack of rainfall is not what causes most wells to run out of water. Depending on the area, it can take months or years for rain to recharge groundwater. So, a drought for a few months does not have a big, immediate impact on groundwater levels. However, ground water pumping at unusually high rates to keep crops, livestock, and lawns alive does have a big impact on groundwater levels. So high groundwater use can lead to well interference. Sometimes old, shallow wells can be impacted by drought, and this complaint is dismissed by the DNR, and it is the responsibility of the homeowner to repair or replace the well, but it is rare.
- Well repair or replacement typically costs between \$1,000 to \$10,000. In 2021, there were multiple elderly people who ran out of water dealing with other life events. It can be hard for people to bring in safe water to their home (drinking, cooking, bathing, etc.). Grants or low interest loans take time. Some well drillers drilled without knowing if they would be paid. Other homeowners went without water for weeks. Well owners often don't want to complain to the DNR.
- In 2021, seventy percent of calls were in western Minnesota where the aquifers are not as deep. The drought of 2021 placed unprecedented pressure on the groundwater use for agriculture. In many ways, it provided a lot of scientific data. More rigorous evaluation by DNR is needed to prevent well inference. Additionally, more collaboration and conservation is needed to leave water for future generations.
- Warren, Minnesota Case Study: The water supply for over six thousand people (two municipalities) was threatened during the drought of 2021. The aquifer system near the city is over-allocated. There is more water being pumped out of the ground than is going back in. When there is increasing use of limited aquifer systems, it calls for a creative regulatory solution from the DNR.
- Water appropriations and permit suspensions: If someone is going to pump over ten thousand gallons of water per day (or million gallons a year), it requires a permit. They were set in statute in 1937. This is to protect drinking water, our natural resources, as well as the current and future generations.
- Water supply demand challenges:
 - Implementation of water conservation measures: limited customer lawn watering, city parks watered every four days and golf course every two days, reduced splash pad hours, shut down all city irrigation systems except for a few ballfields, school districts turned off irrigation, contacted the ten largest users (all HOAs), banned bulk water sales, rebate program for water saving appliances and devices, implemented

rate increases for high water users, reduced water loss, water saving door hangers and mailers, as well as more cities are moving to smart meters.

- Many cities saw their highest peak demand days ever in June/July 2021. Some were near maximum pumping capacity.
- The drought caused increased water main breaks (soil-especially clay-dries out and shifts the pipes).
- Some cities had to use interconnections with other cities.
- There were complaints about high water bills (showed them the data).
- Well drillers struggled to keep up with the demand for water and shortage of pumps.
- o Lincoln-Pipestone and Zimmerman also had major water challenges.
- Experiences and lessons learned: Need to align water supply plans with drought plans, continue to drive demand down (even in times of abundance), compliance and enforcement can be challenging, expect the unexpected and plan for the worst-case scenarios, may need to incentivize for redevelopment of landscapes to be more waterwise, look to energy sector example of comparing usage with neighbors, as well as to set reasonable targets so cities balance budgets.
- Thoughts for the future: reduction of lawn irrigation and an increase in drought tolerant species, partnership is key to expanding programs and changing landscapes, need more demand reduction in residential and business sectors, irrigation meters for commercial and multifamily properties, investing in water saving rebate programs helps manage demand, consider EPA WaterSense fixture requirement for new constructions, more recycled water.
- Minnesota can be suspectable to water shortages. There is still ongoing well interference. There have been drought relief funds (\$13.35 million) for adverse effects of the 2021 drought (water and trees), as well as \$300,000 in funds for well interference.
- Lessons learned on communications, drought plans, well interferences, permit suspensions and conservation.
- Regarding the Drought Plan Revision, the DNR team would like to move forward with a revision. They are looking to add new components like mitigation strategies, vulnerability assessments, and hazard profiles. Additional items to update include subjective language, watershed basin scale, and stakeholder engagement. *Questions/Comments:*

• Jeff Peterson: Are there any projections for Minnesota that suggest droughts like these (or less severe) are more likely? *Answer:* In Minnesota the trend is that it is getting warmer and wetter. It is getting warmer in the winter right now. I would expect drought would be an issue in Minnesota regardless. Summer is expected to catch up with the winter, which will place a lot of stress on the amount of evapotranspiration. Drought would become more frequent. The severity of the drought is more impacted by the interannual variability and interseasonal variability. We should still expect June-July to be cooler.

- Victoria Reinhardt: If you have well interference, can you wait it out, or is there a necessary action that needs to be taken? *Answer:* Usually, people can hire a well driller to lower the pump, and sometimes that is impossible and so the driller needs to drill a new well instead. Some people do choose to wait it out. Some rural people know they have a well that has issues during the irrigation season.
- Victoria Reinhardt: Why is it so negative to report well interference to the DNR? *Answer:* People do share why they don't report. These reports are generally in small towns where people know everyone. People do not want to tell the DNR because they don't want to look like they are asking for a free handout, and they don't want their neighbor to think that either. People also do not want to bother their neighbors. People want to be self-sufficient. Neighbors sometimes mediate without the DNR, which is not documented.
- John Barten: Is the increase each decade in water use in the city of Warren due to population increase, or an increase in water use? *Answer:* Most of the overall increase has been from growth in the city. The city of Warren was doing more water conservation measures during the crisis.
- Jen Kader: Regarding the western providence well interference issues, the DNR wants to get ahead of these, so what are those prevention measures? What happens when you identify an area that will need more assistance? *Answer:* The DNR prioritizes those areas that can have extremes. They target monitoring stations to those areas to collect data. When new applications come in, as of 2014, the wells that are going to be drilled at a high capacity would notify the DNR. They provide a list of concerns and may be required to complete an aquifer test before proceeding.

- Phil Sterner: I would like to look at more work and education with grass-fed beef and free-range chickens, less corn and beans, with more sustainable plants along with no-till soils, these all make a difference. Additionally, looking at water use and conservation practices.
- Jason Moeckel, DNR: The University of Minnesota Extension is hosting <u>a three-day course on irrigation basics</u> with the Minnesota Irrigator Program (MIP) on March 1.
- Margaret Wagner: Here is a link to the Minnesota Irrigators Program: https://extension.umn.edu/courses-and-events/minnesota-irrigator-program. The Minnesota Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program has an irrigation endorsement for participating farmers. Certified farmers will receive the endorsement by attending this workshop, adopting new irrigation practices, and irrigation scheduling methods.
- Tannie Eshenaur, Minnesota Department of Health (MDH): Equity is really challenging here. Thinking about the people impacted by the well interference and having no water in a home is a health crisis.

Revisiting the 2020 Strategic Plan (WebEx 02:43:30)

- This first Strategic Plan was approved in April 2020, and there was always the expectation that the Council would revisit it. An additional handout of prompting questions can help direct some of the discussion.
- Areas of discussion:
 - What is complete?
 - What is missing?
 - o What metrics do we need or need to improve on to measure success?
 - When is the CWF the right tool and when is something else better?

Discussion:

- Dick Brainerd: What about the roadmap? Is there a plan to update it since 2014? *Answer*: It gave the state agencies some push to do better and looking more at systems rather than just projects. Currently there is no plan to update it. In many ways it accomplished its purpose to provide an idea of where they would end up. It was aspirational versus achievable. The Clean Water Fund Performance Report is updated more often. It has a whole slew of measures and a more comprehensive report on broader measures. The roadmap measures have been connected to the performance report measures, to link them together in a way.
- Rich Biske: Do the agencies feel like the program requests that have come through the CWFs, have represented the system change? Or do they represent the concept of trying to "buy our way out" of poor water quality. *Answer*: That feels like a loaded question. To answer, both are true. There are new programs that are about trying to be innovative. We continue to do the same things because they are showing improvement. There needs to be a shift to something that works more efficiently, and so the CWFs have helped research how to hit that critical mass. There are restoration success stories.
- John Barten: We are having an impact but have not reached that critical mass to move that change. The CWFs are having a positive effect. It would be great to extend it for another twenty-five years.
- Justin Hanson, Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR): Before the CWF, I noticed the SWCDs have focused on serving individuals with the watershed outcomes as secondary. In the last seven years or so, the CWFs have started to change the mission. The watershed planning has given districts a focus, they are doing community work. They are being intentional about changing their mission about what they do! Talking with other people around the country, doing this community scale work is not happening elsewhere.
- Holly Kovarik: Some watershed partnerships are in the middle of the planning phase, and they have changed over time. It is a focused effort based on the science. They want to invest in the system that has been developed. It is still early to start saying it isn't making progress, so it will take time to see the results revealed.
- Jason Moeckel: How do you plan to use the plan going forward? Some programs fit some of the goals well, when the state agencies are linking them with the program information. Others do not fit so well. Therefore, does the Council want a Strategic Plan that fits the programs well, or do you want that guides the kind of programs that come forward? Culvert replacements do not fit a strategy well, but we know it will help ecosystems and impairments.
- Paul Gardner: This discussion seems to be going towards the guiding values. There seems to be a desire to talk about when a regulatory approach would be better, and are the CWFs funding items because regulation is too hard? Similarly, should we define where CWFs will work faster than policy?

- Paul Gardner: Another question is often what role the Council should have regarding the renewal of the amendment. The Council has talked about listing items that will not get done if the amendment is not renewed, along with other targeted items, looking at not "buying our way" out.
- Glenn Skuta, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA): I think we are looking at how much money we will need to spend to get to better water quality. We should also be looking at what other money is already being spent on other areas. Looking it niches of spending, that the CWFs can fill that other funds do not (or can't/won't) fill. There are a lot of positive things that other funds are unable to fund, which the CWFs can fund. Therefore, we need to keep track of some of these items as well. Will there even be an impact if those funds disappear? That impact may be important. It may be a good idea to look at the total portfolio of items, to point out other big items impacted.
- Paul Gardner: The Environmental and Natural Resources Trust Fund expires soon. It is likely that proposals will come forward to place it back on the ballot. Does anyone know of any movement from that? So, the Council can adjust based on proposals out there?
- Rich Biske: Looking at the goals, are they confining or too loose? I think it may be better to go back and look at the goals. The goals should be legitimate, otherwise they can compromise the integrity of the plan. When I review the goals, I think they are good and do align with the statute. Do the strategies, cumulatively, are they enough to achieve the goals? If they are enough, they can be timed out. Therefore, if some are underperforming, what needs to happen (more resources, change timeline, review needs, etc.). There are some measurements included. There are some squishy strategies included too. Perhaps, the Council should look closely at the goals to reaffirm them. Then, any action or strategy (whatever the timeframe) should have meaningful contribution towards those goals, and the biannual recommendations should be considered in contribution to that goal(s) in their entirety, at least as a proposal looking forward. We can get lost in thinking of all the breadth and complexity of all the programs, without thinking of their cumulative impact for any one of the goals mentioned. There are only four goals, which is reasonable. Everything we talk about has a contribution to the goals in some way. The level of impact should be considered.
- Dick Brainerd: I think we need to keep in mind our stakeholders, so we make sure everyone is included.
- Jen Kader: We need to look at what we are wanting to define in this document. Regarding our audience, if we can't use it, and it is not helping to guide and inform our work, then it is pointless to have. Thinking about how to make it as something to guide, but not constrain, so it leaves it open. There needs to be more about the "how" for flexibility. There is some work needed to help in this area. Specifically, mentioning some programs that are impacting as examples, connecting them to these, and perhaps highlighting the strategic story. Currently it is a little muddled, looking at what is measured and not measured. It will be good to get more clarity on the next session regarding this document. Regarding the regulatory piece, we have the continued policy advice, but the strategies are looking at funding things in terms of budget recommendations. Therefore, the Policy Committee helps compliment the funding, and there is room to think about what can be achieved policy-speaking and then it can follow from a budget opportunity standpoint, to help get there.
- Tannie Eshenaur, MDH: I reflect on 2016 when the Policy Committee had a recommendation on drinking
 water protection, which led to the lead pipe report. It was paired with half a million-dollar appropriation. Now
 the lead work is founded in the report the Council asked for. It really changed the future of it. Response from
 Jason Moeckel: This was true for the buffers, which was not super smooth, but did similar work.

Adjournment (WebEx 04:01:39)

	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
2	-	Goal (What we will accomplish)	Details (How we will accomplish the goal)		Responsible Agency	Strategies (Methods to accomplish)	Status Report	Prioritization H, M, L
4				1	several agencies	Spend a minimum of five percent of the Clean Water Fund exclusively on drinking water as required in the State Constitution.	Paul made a rough calculation in 2021 about how much of the CWF was supporting drinking water source protection. That totalled around 19% of FY22-23 spending. The measurement was VERY rough.	
5				2	MDH	Support widespread and routine testing of private well water and help private well owners achieve safe limits at the tap, beginning with a pilot project in FY2020-2021.	Pilot is complete. Recommendations for the fund is that every private well owner in MN will get a free well test to test major contaminants at no cost to them. Over 10 years at 10% per year. Woo hoo!	
6				3	MDA	Prioritize implementation funding that supports the Ground Water Protection Rule, so no additional municipal water supply wells exceed the drinking water standard for nitrate.	This is proceeding as planned using the Nitrate in Groundwater line item in FY24-25 recommendations. Local advisory teams meeting.	
7				4	MDA	Implement the Nitrogen Fertilizer Management Plan (NFMP) to promote vegetative cover and advanced nitrogen fertilizer management tools to protect private wells in vulnerable areas.	This is also funded by the Nitrate in Groundwater line item.	
8				5	MDH	Protect the approximately 400,000 acres of vulnerable land surrounding drinking water wellhead areas statewide by 2034.	This is funded through the Source Water Protection line item in the FY24-25 CWF recommendations and previous recommendations. Work is in process.	
9	-			6 6a	MDH MDH	Source Water Protection Planning Conduct ongoing source water protection planning and implementation for the state's 500 vulnerable community public water systems; 	All first generations plans are complete. Fifty plans a year are updated.	
11	Goal 1:	Drinking water is safe for everyone,	 Protect public drinking water sources Ensure that users of public water systems have safe water 	6b	MDH	 Complete first generation source water protection plans for the remaining 420 community public water systems by 2025; 	Complete: 306 Remaining: 114	
12			Ensure that private well users have safe water	6c	MDH	 Complete revised source water assessments for all 23 surface water systems by 20252027; 	Progress on this activity was delayed by COVID – completion will be delayed by 2 years. Eight source water assessments should be complete by 2023. (source water assessments are like the Part 1 for wellhead protection; the basic hydrologic science of the surface water source.)	
13				6d	MDH	 Complete source water intake protection planning by 20272029; 	Progress on this activity was delayed by COVID – completion will be delayed by 2 years. Five source water intake protection plans should be complete by mid-2023. (source water protection plans are like the Part 2 for wellhead protection, the actions the system will take to protect the surface water at the intake.)	
14				6e	MDH	 Complete pilot source water protection planning for 10 non-community public water systems with at-risk populations by 2027. 	checking	

	А	В	C	D	E	F	G	Н
15				7	MDH	Provide financial assistance for source water implementation activities through grants to satisfy 50% of demand through 2034.	This is funded through the Source Water Protection line item in the FY24-25 CWF recommendations and previous recommendations. Work is in process.	
16				8	мс	Increase public water supply efficiency in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area by reducing groundwater use by 150 million gallons per day. year to accommodate future population growth. Sustain the quantity and quality of the resources through water reuse, alternative supplies, efficiency, technology, intergovernmental collaboration, and technical assistance.	Funded by two Clean Water Fund programs. On track or exceeding 150 million gallon per year goal.	
17				1	MDH	Complete Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies (GRAPS) for all major watersheds engaged in comprehensive watershed planning by 2025	To stay on track, MDH requires some extra staff capacity. The Council's FY24-25 Clean Water Fund recommendations include additional funding for three more people.	
18			 Protect groundwater from degradation. Support effective measures to restore degraded groundwater. Ensure groundwater use is sustainable Avoid adverse impacts to surface water features due to groundwater use 	2	UMN/DNR	Complete groundwater atlases for all Minnesota counties by 2029.	The Minnesota Geological Survey completes Part A of the county atlases and the DNR completes Part B for the groundwater portion. They are on track (I think).	
19				3	DNR	Achieve a goal of 1,600 state-owned and managed long-term groundwater monitoring wells statewide by 2034	Clean Water Fund appropriations provide support for 50 new wells per year. The state currently has about 1100 wells.	
20				4	MDH/BWSR	Prioritize the sealing of unused groundwater wells that present a risk to drinking water aquifers by 2034.	BWSR now provides the funding for well sealing instead of MDH. Not sure of a metric here.	
21	Goal 2:	Groundwater is clean and available to all in Minnesota		5	МРСА	Maintain a compliance rate for subsurface septic treatment (SSTS) systems at a minimum of 80 percent, and to attain a goal of 90 percent annually.	Annual reports show compliance consistently higher than 80% even as number of SSTS systems increases. FY24-25 recommendations include a boost in funding, including for low-income grants.	
22				6	DNR/MDA/MC	Adopt BMPs for water efficiency, water use reduction, and irrigation water management, , and prioritize them in areas of high water use intensity by agricultural irrigators, highly sensitive areas, Groundwater Management Areas (GWMAs), and highly vulnerable Drinking Water Source Management Areas (DWSMAs).	MDA uses the CWF to support an extension educator. MDA was able to get federal funds to develop a bigger project. DNR administers the GWMA and MDH works with community water suppliers, BWSR, and MDA on prioritizing BMPs in DWSMAs. Met Council offers grants to reduce lawn irrigation waste with updated irrigation controllers.	
23	23			7	мс	Identify significantly contributing groundwater recharge areas to the aquifers in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area by 2025, and develop protection and management strategies for these aquifers by 2034 to ensure continuous orderly and economic development.	Not started. Met Council to discuss in source water protection white paper for policy plan update but it is still discussed as a potential need.	

	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
24				1	MPCA	Fund the completion of Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) for all 80 major watersheds by 2023.	The MPCA has completed 78 of 80 WRAPS. The last two are expected to be approved in 2023, so this strategy will be COMPLETE. The MPCA supports "WRAPS 2" to review the previously approved one and still must complete TMDL reports on impairments under the WRAPS budget line item.	
25				2	BWSR	Fund the completion of comprehensive watershed management plans for all 80 major watersheds, including those under One Watershed One Plan, so that all plans are initiated by 2025.	Minnesota's 80 major watersheds have been consolidated into 60 total planning boundaries. Thirty-two have been approved; eight are in review; and 14 are in planning stage. Six have not started. We are ON TRACK.	
26				3	None specified	Protect 100,000 priority acres and restore 100,000 priority acres in the Upper Mississippi River headwaters basin with a combination of public and private funding to ensure high quality water by 2034	Not sure of progress, although TNC and BWSR may be tracking it.	
27				4	UMN/MPCA/MDA/other?	Invest in activities and research that can accelerate improvement in water quality through new approaches (e.g., perennial crops and other "landscape drivers", chloride management or alternatives, etc.).	We support the Forever Green Initiative (UMN/MDA), Smart Salting (MPCA), stormwater research innovations (UMN), and other? No metric here.	
28				5	None specified	Include climate impacts as one of multiple benefits of protection and restoration, and incorporate climate resilience into comprehensive watershed management plans.	Fuzzy!	
29		Surface waters are swimmable and		6	MDH/MPCA	Support effective science-based responses to emerging threats or contaminants of emerging concern.	Originally meant to show that we shouldn't drop everything to address politically-driven research requests based on media coverage. Possibly delete?	
30	Goal 3:	**This one is the most contentious or we are doing too much; everything is priority. Are we going to take anything	 Prevent and reduce impairments in surface waters Maintain and improve the health of aquatic ecosystems Protect and restore hydrologic systems Incorporate climate considerations into 	7	PFA	Support cities to upgrade wastewater treatment facilities to address specific water quality goals by reducing the discharge of nutrients and other pollutants based on total maximum daily loads (TMDL) and regulatory requirements	This is a description of the Point Source Implementation Grant (PSIG) program. We recommend funding for this every two years. PFA has the Project Priority List and Intended Use Plan that is a priority list of PSIG candidates so demand is high. There is Council discussion about whether this should be moved to the Legislature's bonding bill.	
31		off the list? Impact/Effort Matrix	planning for water quality	8	PFA	Support technical assistance and construction financing to help small communities replace failing septic systems with community subsurface systems	This is a description of the Small Community Wastewater program. We recommend funding for this every two years. Demand was higher a decade ago and the investment now is modest.	
32				9	MDA/BWSR	Achieve a goal of five million acres of row crop agriculture that use cover crops or continuous living cover by 2034.	Funding by the Clean Water Fund supports this strategy. We are likely off-track on this strategy despite many success stories like Forever Green, BWSR grants, soil health funding.	
33				10	MDA	Enroll 6,500,000 acres and 5,100 Minnesota farms in the Minnesota Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program (MAWQCP) by 2030.	The program currently has 1,294 farms enrolled covering 945,599 acres. MDA believes that we ON TRACK.	

	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
34				11	MDA	Fund technical assistance and local demonstration sites to assure that application of crop fertilizer uses the best available science.	This is funded through the MDA Technical Assistance Program and Nitrate in Groundwater Program. Programs work with 38 local government units on nitrate monitoring and reduction activities, and supports 25 edge-of-field water quality monitoring sites, 100 farm demonstration plots, and 30 field days and other events annually	
35				12	BWSR?	Support in-lake treatment and restoration activities that only address water quality impairments and are supported by comprehensive plans, including One Watershed One Plan	No specific metric available. Would need to ask BWSR how many Watershed Based Implementation Funding (WBIF) work plans include in-lake treatment and restoration.	
36				13	MPCA	Support state-federal cooperative programs, actions, and priorities outlined in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative's Action Plan.	This was meant to validate the St. Louis River restoration and future support for the Lake Area Management Program (LAMP). The St. Louis River funding will be complete in FY24- 25 and a request for LAMP did not go forward this time. Should we have a strategy that says we will prioritize outstanding resource value waters or ORVWs (Minn. R. 7050.0335)?	
37			• Build capacity of local communities to protect	1	сwс	Develop cultural competency on the Council to incorporate the strengths of diverse communities in Minnesota. Develop an inclusion plan by 2021 in consultation with the state's four ethnic councils (Councils for Minnesotans of African Heritage, Minnesota Council on Latino Affairs, Minnesota Indian Affairs Council, and Minnesota Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans), Women Caring for the Land/Women Food & Ag Network, Hmong American Farmers Association, Center for Health Equity at the Minnesota Department of Health, and others.	Staff has organized guest speakers in 2020-2022 on various equity topics. We did not complete an inclusion plan. We would need some outside help to figure out what that would look like, or could take a different but unidentifed approach. Staff took State-Tribal Relations training in 3/2020 and has benefitted from MPCA Equity Committee programming.	
38	Goal 4:	All Minnesotans value water and take actions to sustain and protect it	and sustain water resources • Encourage systems and approaches that support, protect, and improve water • Provide education and outreach to inform Minnesotans' water choices • Encourage citizen and community engagement on water issues • Incorporate the needs and assets of Minnesota's diverse communities	2	CWC/MPCA	Support agency efforts to inform, educate, and encourage the participation of citizens, stakeholders, and others in the protection and restoration of Minnesota's waters.16 Efforts should include the biennial Clean Water Fund Performance Report, traveling exhibits, more integrated presentation of projects and outcomes supported by the Clean Water Fund on state web sites, etc.	The Clean Water Fund supports We Are Water traveling exhibit. Council staff is working with Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) Communications Subteam on an interagency communications plan. (Currently working on revision of key messages.)	
39				3	cwc	Develop a set of questions by 2021 that can be used in occasional statewide surveys to determine the public's understanding of water resources and quality in Minnesota. The Council will work with agencies and/or the University of Minnesota on a cost-effective method of surveying Minnesotans regularly on the same questions through 2034.	Council staff worked with UMN Center for Survey Research to poll Minnesotans on views on water. There is no plan at the current time to continue that approach pending completion of the interagency communications plan.	
40				4	CWC	Plan for program resilience after expiration of Legacy Amendment in 2034 and discourage Clean Water Fund applicants from relying on 100% CWF funding.	This might not be apprpriate as a strategy, but could be part of Guiding Values and Requirements section of the plan.	

MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

Clean Water Council Strategic Plan Review

Kim Behrens and Kari Cantarero, Organizational Improvement Unit | February 27, 2023

CLEAN WATER COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

Strategic Plan Approved in 2020

Strategic Plan Review in 2023



Strategic Plan

CLEAN WATER COUNCIL



Protect and Restore Minnesota's Waters throughout Our Diverse State for Generations to Come

Strategic Plan

CLEAN WATER COUNCIL

Vision

- Minnesota will have fishable and swimmable waters throughout the state.
- Drinking water sources statewide will be protected, and drinking water at the tap for both public water system users and private well owners will be available and safe for all Minnesotans.
- Minnesotans will be aware of crucial issues impacting water quality and availability, and will understand the need for protecting, restoring, and conserving water.

Strategic Plan

CLEAN WATER COUNCIL

4 Goals38 Strategies



Drinking water is safe for everyone, everywhere in Minnesota

- Protect public drinking water sources
- Ensure that users of public water systems have safe water
- Ensure that private well users have safe water
- + 8 strategies

Groundwater is clean and available to all in Minnesota

- Protect groundwater from degradation.
- Support effective measures to restore degraded groundwater.
- Ensure groundwater use is sustainable
- Avoid adverse impacts to surface water features due to groundwater use
- + 7 strategies

Surface waters are swimmable and fishable throughout the state

- Prevent and reduce impairments in surface waters
- Maintain and improve the health of aquatic ecosystems
- Protect and restore hydrologic systems
- Incorporate climate considerations into planning for water quality
- + 13 strategies



All Minnesotans value water and take actions to sustain and protect it

- Build capacity of local communities to protect and sustain water resources
- Encourage systems and approaches that support, protect, and improve water
- Provide education and outreach to inform Minnesotans' water choices
- Encourage citizen and community engagement on water issues
- Incorporate the needs and assets of Minnesota's diverse communities
- + 4 strategies

A strategy is **effective** if it uses the resources you allocate according to your plan and delivers the expected results.

A strategy review is the process in which organizations discuss the progress of their goals and objectives and make the necessary adjustments for the upcoming year.

The Strategy Plan Review Parts

STRATEGY PLAN REVIEW: Year Three						
BIG PICTURE	COMMUNICATION					
REVIEW MISSION, VISION AND VALUES	REVIEW STRATEGIES	REVIEW MEASURES AND TARGETS	REVIEW INITIATIVES	IMPROVE REPORTS & COMMUNICATE CHANGES		

Key Questions

REVIEW MISSION, VISION AND VALUES	REVIEW STRATEGIES	REVIEW MEASURES AND TARGETS	REVIEW INITIATIVES	IMPROVE REPORTS & COMMUNICATE CHANGES
 Key Questions Is our big picture strategy still valid? Has the mission evolved in any way since 2020? Is our vision feasible, based on ambitious but achievable targets that will inspire and energize? Has what we stand for changed since 2020? 	 Key Questions Are our strategies still relevant? Do they still capture our high- level goals as an organization? Are the strategies impacted by technology, political, economic, or other factors? Do strategies still appropriately address each of the factors in a realistic and relevant way? Is everything captured? Are we overlooking any aspect of the factors? 	 Key Questions Does each strategy have measures associated with it? Do the measures still make sense going forward based on where the organization is today? Where do we need to create a metric or target? 	 Key Questions Which of the strategies are long-term projects that CWC is tracking? Note: Initiatives typically have a business plan, budget and other resources allocated to them. 	 Key Questions Are the reports we create meeting the needs of each audience? Are reports shared in each meeting? Are our reports formatted correctly? Do they show the information everyone needs to see in order to understand performance? Once the plan review is complete, who does this revised Strategic Plan need to be communicated to?

• Do strategies still align with our high-level goals in the same way as in 2020?



STEP 2 Prioritize Strategies

High Must do.

Medium

Need to do.

Low

Should do or could do.

STEP 3 Review Strategies

Α.	Factors that could impact current strategi				rategies	Decisions about current strategies					
	Economic	Environmental	Political	Technol	ogical	Other?	No chang	es Tweak	Major alteration	Delete	Changes to strategy
Β.	B. Measures and Targets How do we know we have achieved this current strategy?			Decisions about measures and targets							
				No changes	Alter the target	Major alteration	Delete	Changes to me	easures		
6		Initiatives			D	ecisions a	bout init	iatives			
L.	Which strateg	ies are iniatives t tracking?	hat we are	No changes	Adjust project	Major alteration	Delete or Add new	Changes to ini	tiatives		

goals



Timeline



Thank you!

Kim Behrens

Kim.behrens@state.mn.us

MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

Kari Cantarero

Kari.cantarero@state.mn.us

2/9/2023

02/09/23
This Document can be made available in alternative formats upon request

REVISOR

State of Minnesota

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES H. F. No. 1999

NINETY-THIRD SESSION

02/20/2023

Authored by Lillie The bill was read for the first time and referred to the Committee on Rules and Legislative Administration

1.1	A bill for an act	t						
1.2 1.3	relating to state government; appropriating money from clean water, parks and trails, and arts and cultural heritage funds.							
1.4	BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:							
1.5	ARTICLE 1							
1.6	CLEAN WATER F	UND						
1.7	Section 1. CLEAN WATER FUND APPROPRIAT	TIONS.						
1.8	The sums shown in the columns marked "Appropria	ations" are a	ppropriated t	to the agencies				
1.9	and for the purposes specified in this article. The app	propriations	are from the	clean water				
1.10	fund and are available for the fiscal years indicated f	or allowable	e activities u	nder the				
1.11	Minnesota Constitution, article XI, section 15. The f	igures "2024	4" and "2025	5" used in this				
1.12	article mean that the appropriations listed under the f	figure are av	ailable for t	he fiscal year				
1.13	ending June 30, 2024, or June 30, 2025, respectively	. "The first	year" is fisce	ıl year 2024.				
1.14	"The second year" is fiscal year 2025. "The biennium	" is fiscal ye	ears 2024 and	<u>d 2025. These</u>				
1.15	are onetime appropriations.							
1.16		APPI	ROPRIATI	ONS				
1.17		<u>Avail</u>	able for the	Year				
1.18		<u>En</u>	ding June 3	<u>30</u>				
1.19		<u>2024</u>		<u>2025</u>				
1.20	Sec. 2. CLEAN WATER FUND							
1.21	Subdivision 1. Total Appropriation §	<u>157,84</u>	<u>8,000</u> <u>\$</u>	157,450,000				

1

- 2.1 This appropriation is from the clean water
- 2.2 <u>fund. The amounts that may be spent for each</u>
- 2.3 purpose are specified in the following sections.
- 2.4 Subd. 2. Availability of Appropriation
- 2.5 Money appropriated in this article may not be
- 2.6 spent on activities unless they are directly
- 2.7 related to and necessary for a specific
- 2.8 appropriation. Money appropriated in this
- 2.9 article must be spent in accordance with
- 2.10 Minnesota Management and Budget MMB
- 2.11 *Guidance to Agencies on Legacy Fund*
- 2.12 *Expenditure*. Notwithstanding Minnesota
- 2.13 Statutes, section 16A.28, and unless otherwise
- 2.14 specified in this article, fiscal year 2024
- 2.15 appropriations are available until June 30,
- 2.16 2025, and fiscal year 2025 appropriations are
- 2.17 available until June 30, 2026. If a project
- 2.18 receives federal funds, the period of the
- 2.19 appropriation is extended to equal the
- 2.20 availability of federal funding.
- 2.21 Subd. 3. Disability Access
- 2.22 Where appropriate, grant recipients of clean
- 2.23 water funds, in consultation with the Council
- 2.24 on Disability and other appropriate
- 2.25 governor-appointed disability councils, boards,
- 2.26 committees, and commissions, should make
- 2.27 progress toward providing people with
- 2.28 disabilities greater access to programs, print
- 2.29 publications, and digital media related to the
- 2.30 programs the recipient funds using
- 2.31 appropriations made in this article.

2.32 Sec. 3. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE §

- 2.33 (a) \$350,000 the first year and \$350,000 the
- 2.34 second year are to increase monitoring for

19,290,000 \$

19,290,000

3.1	pesticides and pesticide degradates in surface
3.2	water and groundwater and to use data
3.3	collected to assess pesticide use practices. This
3.4	appropriation is available until June 30, 2028.
3.5	(b) \$3,000,000 the first year and \$3,000,000
3.6	the second year are for monitoring and
3.7	evaluating trends in the concentration of
3.8	nitrate in groundwater; promoting, developing,
3.9	and evaluating regional and crop-specific
3.10	nutrient best management practices, cover
3.11	crops, and other vegetative cover; assessing
3.12	adoption of best management practices and
3.13	other recommended practices; education and
3.14	technical support from University of
3.15	Minnesota Extension; grants to support
3.16	agricultural demonstration and implementation
3.17	activities, including research activities at the
3.18	Rosholt Research Farm; and other actions to
3.19	protect groundwater from degradation from
3.20	nitrate. This appropriation is available until
3.21	June 30, 2028.
3.22	(c) \$3,250,000 the first year and \$3,250,000
3.23	the second year are for the agriculture best
3.24	management practices loan program. Any
3.25	unencumbered balance at the end of the second
3.26	year must be added to the corpus of the loan
3.27	<u>fund.</u>
3.28	(d) \$1,500,000 the first year and \$1,500,000
3.29	the second year are for technical assistance;
3.30	research, demonstration, and promotion
3.31	projects on properly implementing best
3.32	management practices and vegetative cover;
3.33	and more-precise information on nonpoint
3.34	contributions to impaired waters and for grants

3.35 to support on-farm demonstration of

- 4.1 agricultural practices. This appropriation is
- 4.2 <u>available until June 30, 2028.</u>
- 4.3 (e) \$40,000 the first year and \$40,000 the
- 4.4 second year are for maintenance of the
- 4.5 Minnesota Water Research Digital Library.
- 4.6 Costs for information technology development
- 4.7 or support for the digital library may be paid
- 4.8 to the Office of MN.IT Services. This
- 4.9 <u>appropriation is available until June 30, 2028.</u>
- 4.10 (f) \$3,500,000 the first year and \$3,500,000
- 4.11 the second year are to implement the
- 4.12 Minnesota agricultural water quality
- 4.13 certification program statewide. This
- 4.14 <u>appropriation is available until June 30, 2028.</u>
- 4.15 (g) \$150,000 the first year and \$150,000 the
- 4.16 second year are for a regional irrigation water
- 4.17 quality specialist through University of
- 4.18 Minnesota Extension. This appropriation is
- 4.19 available until June 30, 2028.
- 4.20 (h) \$3,000,000 the first year and \$3,000,000
- 4.21 the second year are for grants to the Board of
- 4.22 Regents of the University of Minnesota to
- 4.23 <u>fund the Forever Green agriculture initiative</u>
- 4.24 and to protect the state's natural resources
- 4.25 while increasing the efficiency, profitability,
- 4.26 and productivity of Minnesota farmers by
- 4.27 incorporating perennial and winter-annual
- 4.28 crops into existing agricultural practices. This
- 4.29 appropriation is available until June 30, 2028.
- 4.30 (i) \$500,000 the first year and \$500,000 the
- 4.31 second year are for testing drinking-water
- 4.32 wells for pesticides and establishing a
- 4.33 mitigation program for water treatment of

- 5.1 <u>contaminated wells. This appropriation is</u>
- 5.2 available until June 30, 2028.
- 5.3 (j) \$1,750,000 the first year and \$1,750,000
- 5.4 the second year are for conservation
- 5.5 equipment assistance grants to purchase
- 5.6 equipment or items to retrofit existing
- 5.7 equipment that has climate and water quality
- 5.8 benefits. This appropriation is available until
- 5.9 June 30, 2028.
- 5.10 (k) \$1,500,000 the first year and \$1,500,000
- 5.11 the second year are for expanding the existing
- 5.12 state weather station and soil temperature
- 5.13 network to provide accurate and timely
- 5.14 weather data to optimize the timing of
- 5.15 irrigation, fertilizer, pesticide, and manure
- 5.16 applications and support land management
- 5.17 decisions. This appropriation is available until
- 5.18 June 30, 2028.
- 5.19 (1) \$750,000 the first year and \$750,000 the
- 5.20 second year are for grants for research and
- 5.21 demonstration sites and projects to evaluate,
- 5.22 develop, demonstrate, and promote regional
- 5.23 and animal-specific recommendations for
- 5.24 manure crediting and to develop or revise
- 5.25 manure best management practices through
- 5.26 University of Minnesota Extension. This
- 5.27 appropriation is available until June 30, 2028.

5.28 Sec. 4. POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

- 5.29 (a) \$9,050,000 the first year and \$9,050,000
- 5.30 the second year are for completing needed
- 5.31 statewide assessments of surface water quality
- 5.32 and trends according to Minnesota Statutes,
- 5.33 <u>chapter 114D.</u>

24,187,000 \$

\$

24,188,000

- 6.1 (b) \$6,350,000 the first year and \$6,350,000 6.2 the second year are to update watershed 6.3 restoration and protection strategies, which 6.4 include total maximum daily load (TMDL) studies and TMDL implementation plans 6.5 according to Minnesota Statutes, chapter 6.6 114D, for waters on the impaired waters list 6.7 approved by the United States Environmental 6.8 6.9 Protection Agency. (c) \$1,000,000 the first year and \$1,000,000 6.10 6.11 the second year are for groundwater assessment, including enhancing the ambient 6.12 6.13 monitoring network, modeling, evaluating trends. 6.14 (d) \$750,000 the first year and \$750,000 the 6.15 6.16 second year are for implementing the St. Louis 6.17 River System Area of Concern remedial action plan. 6.18 6.19 (e) \$1,500,000 the first year and \$1,500,000 the second year are for national pollutant 6.20 6.21 discharge elimination system wastewater and stormwater TMDL implementation efforts. 6.22 6.23 (f) \$3,550,000 the first year and \$3,550,000 the second year are for enhancing the 6.24 county-level delivery systems for subsurface 6.25 sewage treatment system (SSTS) activities 6.26 6.27 necessary to implement Minnesota Statutes, sections 115.55 and 115.56, for protecting 6.28 6.29 groundwater. This appropriation includes base 6.30 grants for all counties with SSTS programs. Counties that receive base grants must report 6.31 the number of properties with noncompliant 6.32
- 6.33 systems upgraded through an SSTS
- 6.34 replacement, connection to a centralized sewer
- 6.35 system, or other means, including property

- 7.1 <u>abandonment or buyout. Counties also must</u>
- 7.2 report the number of existing SSTS
- 7.3 compliance inspections conducted in areas
- 7.4 under county jurisdiction. The required reports
- 7.5 must be part of the established annual
- 7.6 reporting for SSTS programs. Of this amount,
- 7.7 at least \$900,000 each year is available to
- 7.8 counties for grants to low-income landowners
- 7.9 to address systems that pose an imminent
- 7.10 threat to public health or safety or fail to
- 7.11 protect groundwater. A county receiving a
- 7.12 grant under this paragraph must submit a
- 7.13 report to the agency listing the projects funded,
- 7.14 <u>including an account of the expenditures.</u>
- 7.15 (g) \$650,000 the first year and \$650,000 the
- 7.16 second year are for activities and grants that
- 7.17 <u>reduce chloride pollution.</u>
- 7.18 (h) \$337,000 the first year and \$338,000 the
- 7.19 second year are to support activities of the
- 7.20 Clean Water Council according to Minnesota
- 7.21 Statutes, section 114D.30, subdivision 1.
- 7.22 (i) \$1,000,000 the first year and \$1,000,000
- 7.23 the second year are for a grant program for
- 7.24 sanitary sewer projects that are included in the
- 7.25 draft or any updated *Voyageurs National Park*
- 7.26 Clean Water Project Comprehensive Plan to
- 7.27 restore the water quality of waters in
- 7.28 Voyageurs National Park. Grants must be
- 7.29 awarded to local government units for projects
- 7.30 approved by the Voyageurs National Park
- 7.31 Clean Water Joint Powers Board and must be
- 7.32 matched by at least 25 percent from sources
- 7.33 <u>other than the clean water fund.</u>
- 7.34 (j) Any unencumbered grant balances in the
- 7.35 first year do not cancel but are available for

	02/09/23	REVISOR	CKM/RC	23-02976
8.1	grants in the second year. Notwithstandir	1 <u>g</u>		
8.2	Minnesota Statutes, section 16A.28, the			
8.3	appropriations in this section are available	e		
8.4	until June 30, 2028.			
8.5 8.6	Sec. 5. <u>DEPARTMENT OF NATURAI</u> <u>RESOURCES</u>	<u> </u>	<u>12,780,000</u> <u>\$</u>	<u>12,780,000</u>
8.7	(a) \$2,550,000 the first year and \$2,550,00	000		
8.8	the second year are for streamflow monitor	ring.		
8.9	(b) \$1,450,000 the first year and \$1	000		
8.10	the second year are for lake Index of			
8.11	Biological Integrity (IBI) assessments.			
8.12	(c) \$455,000 the first year and \$455,000	the		
8.13	second year are for assessing mercury an	d		
8.14	other fish contaminants, including PFAS			
8.15	compounds, and monitoring to track the st	atus		
8.16	of impaired waters over time.			
8.17	(d) \$2,150,000 the first year and \$2,150,0	000		
8.18	the second year are for developing target	ed,		
8.19	science-based watershed restoration and			
8.20	protection strategies and for technical			
8.21	assistance for local governments.			
8.22	(e) \$2,000,000 the first year and \$2,000,0)00		
8.23	the second year are for water-supply planr	iing,		
8.24	aquifer protection, and monitoring activity	ties		
8.25	and analysis.			
8.26	(f) \$1,600,000 the first year and \$1,600,0	000		
8.27	the second year are for technical assistant	ce to		
8.28	support local implementation of nonpoin	t		
8.29	source restoration and protection activities	and		
8.30	targeted forest stewardship for water qua	lity.		
8.31	(g) \$650,000 the first year and \$650,000	the		
8.32	second year are for applied research and to	ools,		
8.33	including maintaining and updating spati	al		
8.34	data for watershed boundaries, streams, a	ind		

- 9.1 water bodies and integrating high-resolution
- 9.2 digital elevation data and for assessing the
- 9.3 effectiveness of forestry best management
- 9.4 practices for water quality.
- 9.5 (h) \$25,000 the first year and \$25,000 the
- 9.6 second year are for maintaining and updating
- 9.7 <u>buffer maps and for technical guidance on</u>
- 9.8 <u>interpreting buffer maps for local units of</u>
- 9.9 government implementing buffer
- 9.10 requirements. Maps must be provided to local
- 9.11 units of government and made available to
- 9.12 landowners on the Department of Natural
- 9.13 <u>Resources website.</u>
- 9.14 (i) \$100,000 the first year and \$100,000 the
- 9.15 second year are for accelerating completion
- 9.16 of or updates to county geologic atlases and
- 9.17 supplementing water chemistry or chemical
- 9.18 <u>movement studies.</u>
- 9.19 (j) \$300,000 the first year and \$300,000 the
- 9.20 second year are for increasing native
- 9.21 freshwater mussel production capacity and
- 9.22 restoring and monitoring freshwater mussel
- 9.23 <u>restoration efforts.</u>
- 9.24 (k) \$500,000 the first year and \$500,000 the
- 9.25 second year are for implementing water
- 9.26 storage projects on state-administered land to
- 9.27 enhance water quality and ecological benefits.
- 9.28 (1) \$1,000,000 the first year and \$1,000,000
- 9.29 the second year are for providing technical
- 9.30 and financial assistance for county and local
- 9.31 governments to replace failing or ineffective
- 9.32 culverts using modern designs that restore
- 9.33 <u>floodplain connectivity, biological</u>
- 9.34 connectivity, and channel stability. This

	02/09/23	REVISOR	CKM/RC	23-02976
10.1	appropriation is available for up to two			
10.2	additional years.			
10.3 10.4	Sec. 6. <u>BOARD OF WATER AND SOI</u> <u>RESOURCES</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>78,064,000</u> <u>\$</u>	78,063,000
10.5	(a) \$39,500,000 the first year and \$39,500,	000		
10.6	the second year are for grants to impleme	ent		
10.7	state-approved watershed-based plans. The	ne		
10.8	grants may be used to implement projects	<u>s or</u>		
10.9	programs that protect, enhance, and resto	re		
10.10	surface water quality in lakes, rivers, and			
10.11	streams; protect groundwater from			
10.12	degradation; and protect drinking water			
10.13	sources. Projects must be identified in a			
10.14	comprehensive watershed plan developed	1		
10.15	under the One Watershed, One Plan progr	ram		
10.16	and seven-county metropolitan groundwa	<u>iter</u>		
10.17	or surface water management framework	s as		
10.18	provided for in Minnesota Statutes, chapt	ers		
10.19	103B, 103C, 103D, and 114D. Grant recipi	ents		
10.20	must identify a nonstate match and may u	ise		
10.21	other legacy funds to supplement projects	<u>5</u>		
10.22	funded under this paragraph. This			
10.23	appropriation may be used for:			
10.24	(1) implementing state-approved plans,			
10.25	including within the following watershed			
10.26	planning areas: Bois de Sioux - Mustinka	2		
10.27	Buffalo-Red River, Cannon River, Cedar	<u>-</u>		
10.28	Wapsipinicon, Chippewa River, Clearwat	ter		
10.29	River, Cottonwood-Middle Minnesota, C	row		
10.30	Wing River, Des Moines River, Greater			
10.31	Zumbro River, Hawk Creek - Middle			
10.32	Minnesota, Kettle and Upper St. Croix, L	ac		
10.33	qui Parle-Yellow Bank, Lake of the Wood	ds,		
10.34	Lake Superior North, Le Sueur River, Le	ech		
10.35	Lake River, Long Prairie River, Lower			

- 11.1 Minnesota River East, Lower Minnesota River
- 11.2 West, Lower St. Croix River,
- 11.3 Middle-Snake-Tamarac Rivers, Mississippi
- 11.4 River Brainerd, Mississippi River Headwaters,
- 11.5 Mississippi River St. Cloud, Mississippi River
- 11.6 Winona/La Crescent, Missouri River Basin,
- 11.7 Nemadji River, North Fork Crow River, Otter
- 11.8 Tail, Pine River, Pomme de Terre River,
- 11.9 Rainy-Rapid River, Rainy River Headwaters
- 11.10 Vermilion River, Rainy River-Rainy
- 11.11 Lake/Lower Rainy River, Red Lake River,
- 11.12 Redeye River, Root River, Roseau River, Rum
- 11.13 <u>River, Sand Hill River, Sauk River, Shell Rock</u>
- 11.14 and Winnebago River, Snake River, South
- 11.15 Fork of the Crow River, St. Louis River, Thief
- 11.16 River, Two Rivers Plus, Upper and Lower Red
- 11.17 Lake, Upper Minnesota River, Upper
- 11.18 Mississippi Grand Rapids, Watonwan River,
- 11.19 Wild Rice Marsh, and Yellow Medicine
- 11.20 <u>River;</u>
- 11.21 (2) seven-county metropolitan groundwater
- 11.22 or surface water management frameworks;
- 11.23 <u>and</u>
- 11.24 (3) other comprehensive watershed
- 11.25 management plan planning areas that have a
- 11.26 board-approved and local-government-adopted
- 11.27 plan as authorized in Minnesota Statutes,
- 11.28 section 103B.801.
- 11.29 The board must establish eligibility criteria
- 11.30 and determine whether a planning area is ready
- 11.31 to proceed and has the nonstate match
- 11.32 <u>committed.</u>
- 11.33 (b) \$8,500,000 the first year and \$8,500,000
- 11.34 the second year are for grants to local
- 11.35 government units to protect and restore surface

- 12.1 water and drinking water; to keep water on
- 12.2 the land; to protect, enhance, and restore water
- 12.3 quality in lakes, rivers, and streams; and to
- 12.4 protect groundwater and drinking water,
- 12.5 including feedlot water quality and subsurface
- 12.6 sewage treatment system projects and stream
- 12.7 <u>bank</u>, stream channel, shoreline restoration,
- 12.8 and ravine stabilization projects. The projects
- 12.9 <u>must use practices demonstrated to be</u>
- 12.10 effective, be of long-lasting public benefit,
- 12.11 include a match, and be consistent with total
- 12.12 maximum daily load (TMDL) implementation
- 12.13 plans, watershed restoration and protection
- 12.14 strategies (WRAPS), or local water
- 12.15 management plans or their equivalents. Up to
- 12.16 <u>20 percent of this appropriation is available</u>
- 12.17 for land-treatment projects and practices that
- 12.18 benefit drinking water.
- 12.19 (c) \$5,500,000 the first year and \$5,500,000
- 12.20 the second year are for accelerated
- 12.21 implementation, local resource protection,
- 12.22 enhancement grants, statewide analytical
- 12.23 targeting or technology tools that fill an
- 12.24 identified gap, program enhancements for
- 12.25 technical assistance, citizen and community
- 12.26 outreach, compliance, and training and
- 12.27 certification.
- 12.28 (d) \$1,250,000 the first year and \$1,250,000
- 12.29 the second year are:
- 12.30 (1) to provide state oversight and
- 12.31 accountability, evaluate and communicate
- 12.32 results, provide implementation tools, and
- 12.33 measure the value of conservation program
- 12.34 implementation by local governments; and

- 13.1 (2) to prepare, in consultation with the
- 13.2 commissioners of natural resources, health,
- 13.3 agriculture, and the Pollution Control Agency,
- 13.4 and submit to the legislature by March 1 each
- 13.5 even-numbered year a biennial report detailing
- 13.6 the recipients and projects funded and the
- 13.7 results accomplished under this section.
- 13.8 (e) \$2,000,000 the first year and \$2,000,000
- 13.9 the second year are to provide assistance,
- 13.10 oversight, and grants for supporting local
- 13.11 governments in implementing and complying
- 13.12 with riparian protection and excessive soil loss
- 13.13 requirements.
- 13.14 (f) \$2,500,000 the first year and \$2,500,000
- 13.15 the second year are for a working lands
- 13.16 <u>floodplain program and to purchase, restore,</u>
- 13.17 or preserve riparian land and floodplains
- 13.18 adjacent to lakes, rivers, streams, and
- 13.19 tributaries, by conservation easements or
- 13.20 contracts to keep water on the land, to decrease
- 13.21 sediment, pollutant, and nutrient transport;
- 13.22 reduce hydrologic impacts to surface waters;
- 13.23 and increase protection and recharge for
- 13.24 groundwater. Up to \$200,000 is for deposit in
- 13.25 <u>a conservation easement stewardship account</u>
- 13.26 established according to Minnesota Statutes,
- 13.27 section 103B.103.
- 13.28 (g) \$2,500,000 the first year and \$2,500,000
- 13.29 the second year are for permanent
- 13.30 conservation easements on wellhead protection
- 13.31 areas under Minnesota Statutes, section
- 13.32 103F.515, subdivision 2, paragraph (d), or for
- 13.33 grants to local units of government for fee title
- 13.34 acquisition to permanently protect
- 13.35 groundwater supply sources on wellhead

- 14.1 protection areas or for otherwise ensuring
- 14.2 long-term protection of groundwater supply
- 14.3 sources as described under alternative
- 14.4 management tools in the Department of
- 14.5 Agriculture Minnesota Nitrogen Fertilizer
- 14.6 *Management Plan*, including using
- 14.7 <u>low-nitrogen cropping systems or</u>
- 14.8 implementing nitrogen fertilizer best
- 14.9 management practices. Priority must be placed
- 14.10 on land that is located where the vulnerability
- 14.11 of the drinking water supply is designated as
- 14.12 high or very high by the commissioner of
- 14.13 <u>health, where drinking water protection plans</u>
- 14.14 have identified specific activities that will
- 14.15 achieve long-term protection, and on lands
- 14.16 with expiring conservation reserve program
- 14.17 contracts. Up to \$200,000 is for deposit in a
- 14.18 conservation easement stewardship account
- 14.19 established according to Minnesota Statutes,
- 14.20 section 103B.103.
- 14.21 (h) \$100,000 the first year and \$100,000 the
- 14.22 second year are for a technical evaluation
- 14.23 panel to conduct restoration evaluations under
- 14.24 Minnesota Statutes, section 114D.50,
- 14.25 subdivision 6.
- 14.26 (i) \$1,750,000 the first year and \$1,750,000
- 14.27 the second year are for assistance, oversight,
- 14.28 and grants to local governments to transition
- 14.29 local water management plans to a watershed
- 14.30 approach as provided for in Minnesota
- 14.31 Statutes, section 103B.801.
- 14.32 (j) \$1,000,000 the first year and \$1,000,000
- 14.33 the second year are for technical assistance
- 14.34 and grants for the conservation drainage
- 14.35 program, in consultation with the Drainage

- 15.1 Work Group, coordinated under Minnesota
- 15.2 Statutes, section 103B.101, subdivision 13,
- 15.3 and including projects to improve
- 15.4 multipurpose water management under
- 15.5 Minnesota Statutes, section 103E.015.
- 15.6 (k) \$1,500,000 the first year and \$1,500,000
- 15.7 the second year are to purchase permanent
- 15.8 conservation easements to protect lands
- 15.9 adjacent to public waters that have good water
- 15.10 quality but that are threatened with
- 15.11 degradation. Up to \$150,000 is for deposit in
- 15.12 <u>a conservation easement stewardship account</u>
- 15.13 established according to Minnesota Statutes,
- 15.14 section 103B.103.
- 15.15 (1) \$425,000 the first year and \$425,000 the
- 15.16 second year are for grants or contracts for a
- 15.17 program to systematically collect data and
- 15.18 produce county, watershed, and statewide
- 15.19 estimates of soil erosion caused by water and
- 15.20 wind, along with tracking adoption of
- 15.21 conservation measures, including cover crops,
- 15.22 to address erosion. This appropriation may be
- 15.23 <u>used for grants to or contracts with the</u>
- 15.24 University of Minnesota to complete this
- 15.25 <u>work.</u>
- 15.26 (m) \$500,000 the first year and \$500,000 the
- 15.27 second year are for developing and
- 15.28 implementing a water legacy grant program
- 15.29 to expand partnerships for clean water.
- 15.30 (n) \$5,000,000 the first year and \$5,000,000
- 15.31 the second year are for permanent
- 15.32 conservation easements to protect and restore
- 15.33 wetlands and associated uplands. Up to
- 15.34 **\$300,000 is for deposit in a conservation**
- 15.35 easement stewardship account established

16.1	according to Minnesota Statutes, section
16.2	<u>103B.103.</u>
16.3	(o) \$6,038,500 the first year and \$6,038,500
16.4	the second year are for financial and technical
16.5	assistance to enhance adoption of cover crops
16.6	and other soil health practices to achieve water
16.7	quality or drinking water benefits. The board
16.8	may use grants to local governments and
16.9	agreements with the United States Department
16.10	of Agriculture, AgCentric at Minnesota State
16.11	Center for Excellence, and other practitioners
16.12	and partners to accomplish this work. Up to
16.13	\$450,000 is for an agreement with the
16.14	University of Minnesota Office for Soil Health
16.15	for applied research and education on
16.16	Minnesota's agroecosystems and soil health
16.17	management systems. This appropriation is
16.18	available until June 30, 2028, and may be
16.19	extended to leverage available federal funds.
16.20	(p) The board must contract for delivery of
16.21	services with Conservation Corps Minnesota
16.22	for restoration, maintenance, training, and
16.23	other activities under this section for up to
16.24	\$750,000 the first year and up to \$750,000 the
16.25	second year.
16.26	(q) The board may shift grant, implementation,
16.27	or easement funds in this section and may
16.28	adjust the technical and administrative
16.29	assistance portion of the funds to leverage
16.30	federal or other nonstate funds or to address
16.31	oversight responsibilities or high-priority
16.32	activities identified by the board consistent
16.33	with local water management plans.

	02/09/23	REVISOR	CKM/RC	23-02976
17.1	(r) The board must require grantees to sp	ecify		
17.2	the outcomes that will be achieved by th	ie		
17.3	grants.	_		
17.4	(s) The appropriations in this section are	2		
17.5	available until June 30, 2028, except gra	unt or		
17.6	easement funds are available for five yes	ars		
17.7	after the date a grant or other agreement	is		
17.8	executed. Returned grant funds must be			
17.9	regranted consistent with the purposes o	<u>f this</u>		
17.10	section.			
17.11	Sec. 7. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	<u>\$</u>	<u>11,296,000</u> <u>\$</u>	11,904,000
17.12	(a) \$4,746,000 the first year and \$5,354,	,000		
17.13	the second year are for developing			
17.14	health-based, Minnesota-specific water			
17.15	guidance for contaminants found or anticip	pated		
17.16	to be found in Minnesota drinking water	<u>;, to</u>		
17.17	certify private laboratories to conduct ana	lyses		
17.18	for these contaminants, and to increase t	he		
17.19	capacity of the department's laboratory t	<u></u>		
17.20	analyze for these contaminants.			
17.21	(b) \$1,500,000 the first year and \$1,500,	,000		
17.22	the second year are for ensuring safe drir	nking		
17.23	water for private well users, including stud	lying		
17.24	the occurrence and magnitude of contami	nants		
17.25	in private wells; developing guidance an	nd		
17.26	conducting outreach and education about	twell		
17.27	testing and mitigation; awarding grants to	local		
17.28	governments; and designing voluntary			
17.29	interventions to reduce health risks to pr	rivate		
17.30	well owners.			
17.31	(c) \$3,750,000 the first year and \$3,750,	,000		
17.32	the second year are for protecting source	es of		
17.33	drinking water, including planning,			
17.34	implementation, and surveillance activit	ies		

	02/09/23	REVISOR	CKM/RC	23-02976
18.1	and grants to local governments and pub	olic		
18.2	water systems.			
18.3	(d) \$750,000 the first year and \$750,000	the		
18.4	second year are to develop and deliver			
18.5	groundwater restoration and protection			
18.6	strategies on a watershed scale for use in	local		
18.7	comprehensive water planning efforts, to	<u>0</u>		
18.8	provide resources to local governments	for		
18.9	activities that protect sources of drinking	2		
18.10	water, and to enhance approaches that imp	prove		
18.11	the capacity of local governmental units	to		
18.12	protect and restore groundwater resourc	es.		
18.13	(e) \$250,000 the first year and \$250,000	the		
18.14	second year are to develop public health			
18.15	policies and an action plan to address th	reats		
18.16	to safe drinking water, including develop	ment		
18.17	of a statewide plan for protecting drinking	ng		
18.18	water that incorporates select			
18.19	recommendations from the University o	<u>f</u>		
18.20	Minnesota's Future of Drinking Water re	port.		
18.21	(f) \$300,000 the first year and \$300,000	the		
18.22	second year are for developing a statewi	de		
18.23	recreational water portal that includes an	<u>1</u>		
18.24	inventory of public beaches and information	<u>ition</u>		
18.25	about local monitoring results and closu	res		
18.26	and that provides information about preve	nting		
18.27	illness and recreational water stewardsh	i <u>p.</u>		
18.28	(g) Unless otherwise specified, the			
18.29	appropriations in this section are available	le		
18.30	<u>until June 30, 2027.</u>			
18.31	Sec. 8. METROPOLITAN COUNCIL	<u>\$</u>	<u>1,875,000</u> <u>\$</u>	<u>1,875,000</u>
18.32	(a) \$1,125,000 the first year and \$1,125,	000		
18.33	the second year are to implement project	s that		
18.34	address emerging threats to the drinking	water		

CKM/RC

- 19.1 <u>supply; provide cost-effective regional</u>
- 19.2 solutions; leverage interjurisdictional
- 19.3 coordination; support local implementation of
- 19.4 water supply reliability projects; support the
- 19.5 growing needs of community water suppliers
- 19.6 facing challenges, including PFAS,
- 19.7 groundwater appropriation limitations, system
- 19.8 reliability and resilience, and increased
- 19.9 regional growth; and prevent degradation of
- 19.10 groundwater resources in the metropolitan
- 19.11 area. These projects provide communities
- 19.12 with:
- 19.13 (1) potential solutions to leverage regional
- 19.14 water use by using surface water, stormwater,
- 19.15 wastewater, and groundwater;
- 19.16 (2) an analysis of infrastructure requirements
- 19.17 for different alternatives;
- 19.18 (3) development of planning-level cost
- 19.19 estimates, including capital costs and operating
- 19.20 <u>costs;</u>
- 19.21 (4) identification of funding mechanisms and
- 19.22 an equitable cost-sharing structure for
- 19.23 regionally beneficial water supply
- 19.24 development projects; and
- 19.25 (5) development of subregional groundwater
- 19.26 models and strategies.
- 19.27 (b) \$750,000 the first year and \$750,000 the
- 19.28 second year are for the water demand
- 19.29 reduction grants to assist municipalities in the
- 19.30 metropolitan area with implementing water
- 19.31 demand reduction measures to ensure the
- 19.32 reliability and protection of drinking water
- 19.33 supplies.
- 19.34
 Sec. 9. UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
 \$
 2,000,000
 \$
 1,000,000

	02/09/23	REVISOR	CKM/RC	23-02976
20.1	(a) \$500,000 the first year and \$500,000 t	the		
20.2	second year are for developing Part A of			
20.3	county geologic atlases. This appropriation	on is		
20.4	available until June 30, 2030.			
20.5	(b) \$1,000,000 the first year and \$1,000 (000		
20.5	(0) \$1,000,000 me mst year and \$1,000,000,000 me mst year and \$1,000,000 me mst year and \$1,000,000	uate		
20.0	nerformance and technology transfer for			
20.7	stormwater best management practices to			
20.8	evaluate best management performance a	nd		
20.9	evaluate best management performance a	ind		
20.10	maximum daily loads to dayslon standar	da		
20.11	maximum dany loads, to develop standar	<u>us</u>		
20.12	and incorporate state-or-the-art guidance us	sing J-1		
20.13	minimal impact design standards as the mo	del,		
20.14	and to implement a system to transfer			
20.15	knowledge and technology across local			
20.16	government, industry, and regulatory sect	ors.		
20.17	This appropriation is available until June	<u>30,</u>		
20.18	<u>2030.</u>			
20.19	Sec. 10. LEGISLATURE	<u>\$</u>	<u>6,000</u> <u>\$</u>	<u>-0-</u>
20.20	\$6,000 the first year is for the Legislative			
20.21	Coordinating Commission for the website	<u>e</u>		
20.22	required under Minnesota Statutes, sectio	n		
20.23	3.303, subdivision 10.			
20.24	Sec. 11. PUBLIC FACILITIES AUTHOR	<u>ORITY</u> <u>\$</u>	<u>8,350,000</u> <u>\$</u>	<u>8,350,000</u>
20.25	(a) \$8,250,000 the first year and \$8,250,0	000		
20.26	the second year are for the point source			
20.27	implementation grants program under			
20.28	Minnesota Statutes, section 446A.073. Th	nis		
20.29	appropriation is available until June 30, 20	<u>)30.</u>		
20.30	(b) \$100,000 the first year and \$100,000	the		
20.31	second year are for small community			
20.32	wastewater treatment grants and loans un	der		
20.33	Minnesota Statutes, section 446A.075. Th	nis		

- 21.1 (c) If there is any uncommitted money at the
- 21.2 end of each fiscal year under paragraph (a) or
- 21.3 (b), the Public Facilities Authority may
- 21.4 transfer the remaining funds to eligible
- 21.5 projects under any of the programs listed in
- 21.6 this section according to a project's priority
- 21.7 rank on the Pollution Control Agency's project
- 21.8 priority list.

21.0	ADTIC	163		
21.9				
21.10	PARKS AND TH	RAILS F	UND	
21.11	Section 1. PARKS AND TRAILS FUND AP	PROPR	IATIONS.	
21.12	The sums shown in the columns marked "Ap	propriatio	ons" are appropriated	to the agencies
21.13	and for the purposes specified in this article. T	he approp	priations are from th	ne parks and
21.14	trails fund and are available for the fiscal years indicated for each purpose. The figures			
21.15	"2024" and "2025" used in this article mean th	at the app	propriations listed u	nder the figure
21.16	are available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2024, or June 30, 2025, respectively. "The			
21.17	first year" is fiscal year 2024. "The second year" is fiscal year 2025. "The biennium" is			
21.18	fiscal years 2024 and 2025. These are onetime	appropri	ations.	
21.19			APPROPRIAT	IONS
21.20			Available for th	e Year
21.21			Ending June	<u>e 30</u>
21.22			<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>
21.23	Sec. 2. PARKS AND TRAILS			
21.24	Subdivision 1. Total Appropriation	<u>\$</u>	<u>66,631,000</u> <u>\$</u>	<u>63,779,000</u>
21.25	The amounts that may be spent for each			
21.26	purpose are specified in the following sections.			
21.27	Subd. 2. Availability of Appropriation			
21.28	Money appropriated in this article may not be			
21.29	spent on activities unless they are directly			
21.30	related to and necessary for a specific			
21.31	appropriation. Money appropriated in this			
21.32	article must be spent in accordance with			
21.33	Minnesota Management and Budget MMB			