Clean Water Council Meeting Agenda Monday, January 27, 2025 9:00 a.m. to 2 p.m.

IN PERSON at MPCA offices in St. Paul 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, Committee, and Council Staff update
 - Policy Committee Update
 - Budget and Outcomes Committee Update
 - Ad Hoc Outreach Group Update
 - o Committee Assignments
 - o Staff update
 - Legislative update
 - Process and timeline on hiring for new Administrator
 - Biennial report to the Legislature

9:30 (DISCUSSION ITEM) "Retreat" Concept

10:00 (INFORMATION ITEM) Background on the Interagency Coordination Team

- Dana Vanderbosch, ICT Chair & Assistant Commissioner, MPCA
- 10:30 BREAK

10:45 (INFORMATION ITEM) Nutrient Reduction Strategy

- Corrie Layfield & Dave Wall, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- 12:00 Lunch

12:30 (INFORMATION ITEM) WBIF Tracking

• BWSR and Local Government Reps

1:30 (ACTION OR INFORMATION ITEM?) Ad Hoc Outreach Group Report Out

- 1:45 Public Comment
- 2:00 Adjourn

Steering Committee Meets Directly After Adjournment

Clean Water Council

December 16, 2024, Meeting Summary

Members present: John Barten (Chair), Steve Besser, Rich Biske (Vice Chair), Dick Brainerd, Gail Cederberg, Steve Christenson, Tannie Eshenaur, Warren Formo, Brad Gausman, Kelly Gribauval-Hite, Justin Hanson, Holly Hatlewick, Rep. Josh Heintzeman, Annie Knight, Jason Moeckel, Ole Olmanson, Jeff Peterson, Peter Schwagerl, Glenn Skuta, Marcie Weinandt, and Jessica Wilson.

Members absent: Sen. Nicole Mitchell, Rep. Kristi Pursell, Peter Kjeseth, and Sen. Nathan Wesenberg. **Others present**: Tim Kelly (Coon Creek Watershed District), Ryan Merz (MMB), Nick Lardinois (MMB), Judy Svetek (Met Council), Margaret Wagner (MDA), Jim Stark (SWMP), Sophia Walsh (MDH), Annie Felix (BWSR), Paul Gardner (CWC), Brianna Frisch (CWC), Jen Kader (Met Council), Trevor Russell (Friends of the Mississippi River), Sheila Vanney (MASWCD), Angelica Anderson (Nature Conservancy), Molly Jansen (Red River Watershed Management Board), Tiffany Lesmeier-Knott, Kari Moore (White Bear Lake Chamber of Commerce)

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
 - Jeff Peterson (University of Minnesota) will step back from the Water Resource Center in September 2025. He will return to his role as a full-time teacher and a new representative will be appointed then.
- Motion to approve the December 16th meeting agenda by Dick Brainerd, seconded by Steve Christenson. Motion carries.
- Motion to approve the November 18th meeting minutes by Dick Brainerd, seconded by Steve Christenson. Motion carries.
- Chair, Committee, and Council Staff Update
 - Policy Committee Update
 - o Budget and Outcomes Committee Update
 - Ad Hoc Outreach Group Update:
 - The Interagency Coordination Team hosted a meeting between Paul Gardner and agency Tribal liaisons.
 - o Staff Update
 - Legislative Update: The House is tied. They will start January 14, 2025.
 - The Outdoor Heritage Council leadership meeting was helpful to understand their perspectives.
 - Story map is up and running: <u>Caring for Our Water</u>. Note, a static map will be added in with three selected projects supported by the Clean Water Funds (CWFs) including MDH source water protection grants, farms in the Minnesota Ag Water Quality Certification Program (MAWQCP), and Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) funding to protect or restore surface waters.
 - Process and timeline on hiring for new Administrator: The job posting should be by February 1st. It takes about ninety days for onboarding. Paul will be around for a few weeks to overlap.
 - The draft biennial report to the Legislature is not ready for final review today due to a contracting delay. It will be ready in time for the January 15th deadline.
 - We are still awaiting three Council appointments from the Governor's Office.

Presentation on November Budget Forecast by Ryan Merz, Executive Budget Officer, and Nick Lardinois, Director of Budget Policy and Analysis, Minnesota Management and Budget (MMB) (*Webex 00:38:30*)

- This is an update on the CWF balance in the November 2024 budget forecast. There is a copy of the general November forecast PowerPoint presentation and fund balance in the packet.
- The CWF will have \$310,752,000 available to appropriate for FY26-27, with a five percent reserve balance. This includes MMB estimates for carry forwards, sales tax receipts, investment income, and other revenue.
- There has been an decrease in sales tax revenue.

- The projected FY26-27 sales tax revenue forecast decreased in this update. These changes removed \$15.748 million dollars from available resources. This trend fits with the overall three percent decline in state sales taxes in the November 2024 forecast.
- There is a decreased reserve amount requirement.
 - Because the state sales tax revenue decreased in FY26-27, the five percent reserve amount required under Minn. § Stat. 114D.50 decreased. This released about \$800,000 in funds available for appropriation.
- There is also a consideration of investment earnings revenue and carry forward from this availability update.
 - The availability update in March 2024 was based exclusively on projected sales tax revenue and the statutory reserve requirement. The November 2024 update adds investment income and carry forward estimates. Forecasted investment income for FY26-27 contributed \$3.306 million dollars in funds available for appropriations. This update also considers projected FY26-27 unobligated carry forward. It assumes that FY26 reserve amounts will not be appropriated and will carry forward into FY27. Considering carry forward contributed approximately \$15 million to the amount available to appropriate.
- The Council may also be interested in understanding how canceled funds contributed to this availability update. There was \$1.814 million canceled in FY24 as of the close of the year.
- In summary, decreases in sales tax revenue and consideration of carry forward offset each other, while adding in projected investment income earnings contributed to the \$3.3 million dollar increase in the amount available to appropriate compared to the previous estimate. Note, revenue and expenditures numbers for FY24 and FY25 changed in the CWF with this forecast. They moved from projections to actuals. These changes are not directly represented but captured in the carry forward from prior year. Looking ahead to the February forecast, we will likely see changes up or down in both sales tax and interest earnings forecast due to the additional months of actual earnings.

Questions:

- Marcie Weinandt: How do canceled funds work? *Answer:* I do not have an example of a specific project with me. In general, if there was a project that was available to June 30, 2024, any funds that are not used get canceled and roll back into the Fund. If they are part of the biennium, then they carry forward as an available resource to that agency if they have a projected use or expenditure associated with them. If the authority of those funds expired at the end of the fiscal year, then those funds cancel and go to the Fund.
- Steve Christenson: What economic forces cause declines in revenues? Would inflation increase sales tax revenue? *Answer:* Our forecast page shows this well. We are seeing shifting consumption patterns. Consumers are shifting from goods to services post-pandemic. Most services are not taxed.
- Dick Brainerd: What will happen in February? *Answer:* We know interest earnings revenue and sales tax earnings revenue are coming into the Fund. It could move up or down and depends on different factors. We will have updates in FY25, FY26, and FY27 that will impact the funds balance. FY24 shouldn't change.
- Peter Schwagerl: How is the five percent reserve used? *Answer:* State statute requires a five percent reserve requirement in all Legacy funds. The sales tax receipt forecast line (\$151 million in FY26) has a reserve requirement is \$7,567,000.
- Paul Gardner: No one has ever spent the reserve, but could the Legislature take a percentage? What is the reserve for? *Answer:* Looking at the statute, in any fiscal year at least five percent must not be appropriated, so they could not appropriate those funds unless they would change the law.
- Tannie Eshenaur, MDH: When you say investment income to the CWF, is that the money that the five percent reserve is earning over time? Where does the investment income come from? *Answer:* Investment earnings are generated by the State Board of Investment. The cash in the bank is the principal (what is invested), and then there is interest earned. Interest rates are at about four percent monthly average, in FY22 they averaged 0.399%. It used to be minor, but now it is a chunk of revenue. The five percent reserve also includes it but is also much broader.

Budget & Outcomes Committee (BOC) Final Recommendations, by Steve Besser, BOC Chair (Webex 01:33:00)

- The BOC met to tackle the CWF final budget forecast. They were also able to ask Dana Vanderbosch about the Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) and the state agencies recommendations.
- Back in November, we recommended that the first dollars returned would go towards the first dollars taken out. The \$310,752 million is what the current CWFs are forecast. Therefore, the BOC voted to return the line

item 36, Watershed Based Implementation Funding (WBIF) so it is back up to the \$90 million request. They also returned some of the reduction to enhancing soil health (now at \$1,852,000).

- Motion by Steve Christenson for the Council to affirm the \$310,752 million funding recommendations outlined in the packet.
 - Steve Christensen: Three reasons you should feel good about supporting this set of budget recommendations: 1) We spent a lot of time reviewing these presentations with an eye to our strategic plan; 2) We increased WBIF by \$11 million to support best outcomes with local involvement; and 3) We invest in sustainable agriculture. There were tough choices and cuts so we could restore those later.
 - Motion seconded by Peter Schwagerl.
 - Discussion:
 - Rich Biske: I appreciate what the BOC has done. Looking at the cuts to easements after we have seen and heard about the importance of the clean water protection is hard. I think in recent years the protection of clean water has been overlooked. Unfortunately, it is a step back. It is easier to protect quality waters. I hope we have a chance to revisit this. It is an issue of permanence, especially considering the CWFs may sunset in 2034. I am disappointed to see a reduction in the watershed partners legacy program. That is a way to build a constituency. *Response from Steve Besser:* We talked through the process with BWSR as we were trying to prioritize things. We realized that a lot of the dollars that are dedicated to easements have a long stay time in the fund because someone needs to sign up for it. Someone has to get the title work done, so there is a buffer built in, and our hope is, and our thought process was, to restore the easements later. If in February we receive an increase, that is where we would recommend it to go.
 - John Barten: The Council now has about a year to be thinking before the next budget cycle begins. I think we should think long term. In the Strategic Plan we made a commitment to increase the WBIF, but part of that commitment was that other programs would be reduced. We have not done that yet, so we have to start looking at it long-term (if we are going to continue to increase the WBIF). We need to do some more work in this area. After listening to MMB this morning, the projections will probably not hold, and we need to consider how we move forward. I do think this is a great budget and the BOC did a great job. I support it. Yet, we need to start considering these concerns.
 - Annie Knight: At the BOC meeting, I recall having a conversation with BWSR. We asked them directly if we did recommend more funding to the easement program if they could use it. I recall they said no that they did not have the capacity to spend through more funds recommended in this cycle. Response from Justin Hanson, BWSR: When it comes to specific programs, like the protection programs in the Upper Mississippi, we are ramping that program up. There are local capacity challenges.
 - Gail Cederberg, Met Council: I appreciate all the work going into this process. One of the things we learned this morning, was that unspent funds return to the Fund. We should learn more about that, and which programs they were. It is not to punish, because we don't want to spend money just to spend money. Justin Hanson, BWSR: It is something that we talked about at the meeting. Often, it is small pots of money adding up to more significant funds.
- *Reminder: Motion for the Council to affirm the \$310,752 million funding recommendations outlined in the packet. Motion carries unanimously.*

Other Existing Policy Statements for Platform (Webex 02:03:00)

- The Council recently approved policy statements for drinking water protection and drainage. However, we have several other existing policy statements that are still valid and would be included in our biennial recommendations. The Council also tries to coordinate with the Subcommittee on Minnesota Water Policy at the Legislature.
- There are five different policy statements that have been approved by the Council, and will be included in the Council's biennial report (see page 11 in meeting packet):
 - o Minnesota Underground Utilities Mapping Project
 - o Pharmaceutical Policy Statement (revised from a previous statement in FY18-19 recommendations)
 - o PFAS (Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances)
 - o Chloride Reduction: De-icer (revised from a previous statement in FY22-23 recommendation)
 - o Chloride Reduction: Water Softener (revised from a previous statement in FY22-23 recommendation)
- These will be included in the Council's report. Please support them with your constituents.

• Additionally, the report mentions cooperation with tribal governments. Note, the Council met with the ICT regarding a discussion on tribal government engagement. They gave advice, and said it was okay to reach out to tribal government environmental staff. It is useful and can help build rapport to bring up issues to talk about later. I asked if the Council to experience the state-tribal-relations training. There would be a cost, and it is usually located at a reservation or community, so some travel as well.

Questions/Comments:

- Dick Brainerd: I would like to hear an update on the PFAS Blueprint soon to know if we are making progress.
- Jim Stark, Subcommittee on Minnesota Water Policy at Legislature: The Minnesota Landscapers Association is driving for liability protection for Smart Salting certified snow removal companies. \
- Jeff Peterson (University of Minnesota): If you continue to work on the chloride reduction water softener policy, you should invite the folks from the stormwater research program because it has been a priority they have been working on. There is a tremendous amount that can be done from road design too (i.e., pavement facing the sun makes a huge difference, or the pile of plowed snow location).

White Bear Lake Area Comprehensive Plan Update by Jason Moeckel, DNR, and Judy Sventek, Metropolitan Council (*Webex 02:51:30*)

- Water levels in White Bear Lake fluctuate with the climate, as well as with the amount of groundwater that is being used largely from municipal water supply areas. This was figured out with groundwater models years ago. The aquifer is connected to the lake. It is a groundwater management issue complicated by PFAS.
- White Bear Lake Comprehensive Plan Legislation: The Legislature provided \$2 million for a Met Council work group to develop a comprehensive plan to ensure communities in the White Bear Lake area have access to sufficient drinking water and allow for municipal growth while ensuring the sustainability of surface and groundwater resources to supply the needs of future generations. The completed plan must be submitted to the Minnesota Legislature by June 30, 2027.
- The Metropolitan Council has established a work group consisting of:
 - Commissioners or designees from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), MDH, and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA).
 - Representatives from Metropolitan Area Water Supply Advisory Committee (MAWSAC) and St. Paul Regional Water Services.
 - The communities of Stillwater, Mahtomedi, Hugo, Lake Elmo, Lino Lakes, North St. Paul, Oakdale, Vadnais Heights, Shoreview, Woodbury, New Brighton, White Bear Lake, White Bear Township, and North Oaks. These communities combined have a water service population slightly over 300,000 people or approximately ten percent of the metro region's total population.
- There are five Legislative directives:

0

- 1. Evaluate methods to conserve and recharge groundwater include four main areas to address:
- Converting water supplies that are groundwater dependent to surface water.
- Reuse water, including water discharged from contaminated wells.
- Projects designed to increase groundwater recharge.
- Other methods for reducing groundwater use.
- 2. Determine which existing groundwater supply wells, if converted to surface water sources, would be the most effective and efficient in ensuring future water sustainability in the area.
- o 3. Identify a long-term plan for converting those groundwater supply wells to surface water sources.
- 4. Include any policy and funding recommendations for converting groundwater supply wells to surface water sources, treating and reusing wastewater, and any other recommendations for additional measures that reduce groundwater used, promote water reuse, and increase groundwater recharge.
- Work progress for 2024:
 - Finalize problem statement: Ensure equitable access to sufficient, safe, and affordable water for communities in the North and East Metro areas to meet current and future needs while safeguarding the sustainability of surface water and groundwater resources.
 - Evaluate methods to conserve and recharge groundwater include four main areas to address.
 - Converting water supplies that are groundwater dependent to total or partial supplies from surface water. Top three ranked solutions to evaluate: redirect stormwater to augment White Bear Lake, convey treated surface water from St. Paul Regional Water Services to north and east communities, or construct a regional surface water treatment plan near the chain of lakes in the north metro and

convey treated surface water to north and east communities. The MPCA is completing a feasibility study for Project 1007 to treat PFAS and reuse the water form twelve groundwater extraction wells for potable reuse. This may reveal more information and cost implications.

- Projects designed to increase groundwater recharge. Top three ranked solutions to evaluate: lake augmentation by pumping treated surface water from the Rice Creek chain of lakes into White Bear Lake, treat wastewater from local Metropolitan Council interceptors and inject treated wastewater into the aquifer to raise groundwater elevations, or stormwater collection and infiltration to raise groundwater elevations.
- Other methods for reducing groundwater use. Top three ranked solutions to evaluate: lawn water restrictions (day of week and time), implement/require/encourage non-potable water reuse for irrigation and process water, or tiered increasing block water utility rates.
- New issues and potential solutions: future PFAS impacts, treatment requirements, and long-term costs; raising outflow elevation of White Bear Lake to increase storage capacity; maintain existing groundwater wells as a backup supply source to potential surface water systems and study the feasibility of using them as peaking wells; and reductions from alternative low input turf grasses.
- They have been updating water demand projections. They are to provide agreed-up projections to the DNR for updating the groundwater model to estimate future long-term impacts to White Bear Lake if communities remained on groundwater supply public water systems. They are looking to provide consistent projections for each of the consultants for sizing future infrastructure needs and estimate water conservation potential for each of the potential solutions to be evaluated.
- Next Steps:
 - The next meeting date will be February 4, 2025 (1-3 pm). There will be a presentation on the DNR groundwater modeling update for future conditions in White Bear Lake Area, using the new water demand projection information. Additionally, the MPCA Project 1007 feasibility study will also be presented. The studies will help close in on the solution.

Questions:

- John Barten: If you were to redirect that stormwater augmentation, where would you redirect it? *Answer:* Taking it out of the immediate watershed, but also looking at other options.
- Marcie Weinandt: Looking at the map of the White Bear Lake Area (five-mile radius), many of the Council members live in these communities. *Response:* The map is dependent on certain things by the judge in the lawsuit. For example, Woodbury is not within five miles of White Bear Lake, but their wells impact the water levels of the lake.
- Rich Biske: How are you assigning costs and how are you assigning benefits? How is the decision-making process? *Answer:* There are hundreds of decisions in this decision-making process. There may not be 100 percent agreement but will come up with solution with most of the support.
- Marcie Weinandt: Can this be applied to other groundwater resource areas? Or is it unique because of White Bear Lake? *Answer:* There are similar situations in other parts of the state. We will learn from this project, which can help other areas of the state.

Topics for 2025 (Webex 03:54:00)

- This is for Council members to bring presentation ideas to the table. A list of 2025 presentation ideas is included in the meeting packet.
- Kelly Gribauval-Hite: I think public participation (define communication versus engagement versus outreach) would be a good idea.
- Marcie Weinandt: I was thinking about budget trade-offs (like when do grants move into the WBIF). Also, looking more at the permitting process from the view of local implementors.
- Steve Besser: I would like to see the pros and cons and feasibility of community water treatment.
- Jessica Wilson: I would like to hear more about low salt designs.
- John Barten: Neonicotinoids and shoreline (policy committee).
- Steve Besser: Collaboration with outdoor groups, lake associations, and lake stewards.
- Tannie Eshenaur, MDH: The Drinking Water Action Plan will be released in January 2025.
- Jason Moeckel, DNR: The State Water Policy will be released in September 2025.

- Holly Hatlewick: It would be good to talk more about tillage on the landscape.
- Dick Brainerd: Let's see and learn more about Voyageurs and the southwest part of Minnesota. We have new members on the Council, so it would be good to see the work being done.
- Rich Biske: The MDA Soil Action Plan from the Soil Health Framework. It would be good to see what the goals are and how they fit in the CWFs. Additionally, the Climate Action Framework work, like the working lands section and resilience.
- Glenn Skuta, MPCA: Sustainable Aviation Fuel.
- Peter Schwagerl: Green ammonia
- Tannie Eshenaur, MDH: Progress on the private wells in southeastern Minnesota.
- Tour ideas for September 2025. It would be good to decide on the location, so staff can start planning.
 - o Marcie Weinandt: The Saint Louis River, because there has been successful work done in that area.
 - Gail Cederberg: Including the tribal governments into our tour ideas. Perhaps on the tour, or on a retreat.
- Retreat has been mentioned, so staff need to have a better idea of what you have in mind. The public should also be able to be invited. It would be easiest to have it at MPCA as one of our regular scheduled meetings.
 - Steve Christenson: I am in favor of repurposing one of our existing meetings as this retreat. I want to go over how the processes work, especially with three new members coming on. Go over the mission, vision, and strategic plan.
 - Dick Brainerd: We will have new members, and it would be good to have a retreat. We can call it whatever we want. I thought we should have a facilitator to help put it together, to help lead a discussion. We tend to have good dialogue, but it gives us an opportunity to talk about these topics.
 - o Gail Cederberg: For scheduling, it should overlap with the new Council members.
 - John Barten: We can set aside a block of time to talk about major issues, where the Council wants to go, implementation process and outcomes. It is a firehose of information, especially for new members.
 - Holly Hatlewick: I thought we talked about review of the statutory language and requirements.
 - Rich Biske: I think we can also spend time on the areas where we do not align on issues as well.
 - Annie Knight: It was helpful to talk to the ICT members, to help understand the process. More questions came up after our BOC meeting. It would be good to have that with the full Council as well.
 - Brad Gausman: I want to echo Annie because the BOC is having great conversations. I would like to see it in front of the full Council as well. I would like to hear from the Council members not on the BOC, to hear their perspectives as well.
 - John Barten: From the input provided here today, the Council leadership can put together an outline of what this retreat would look like for moving forward.

No Public Comment (Webex 04:19:12)

Adjournment (Webex 04:19:12)

Clean Wate	r Council Comm	ittee Roste	rs (Voting N	/lembers)
1/22/2225				

1/22/2025		BOC	Policy
John	Barten		1
Steve	Besser	1	
Rich	Biske		1
Dick	Brainerd	1	
Steve	Christenson	1	
Warren	Formo	1	
Brad	Gausman	1	
Kelly	Gribauval-Hite		1
Holly	Hatlewick	1	
Annie	Knight	1	
Ole	Olmanson		
Peter	Schwagerl		1
Marcie	Weinandt		1
Jessica	Wilson		
vacant	Township		
vacant	County-rural		
vacant	County-metro		
Gail	Cederberg		1
		7	6

Clean Water Council Ad Hoc Outreach Group Meeting Summary January 15, 2025 Meeting Online

A ending: Jessica Wilson, Marcie Weinandt, Ole Olmanson, Jen Kader (Met Council), Holly Hatlewick, Britt Gangeness (MPCA-We Are Water), Jana Larson (MPCA-We Are Water), and Paul Gardner (CWC)

The group re-iterated its desire at its August meeting that we should engage the public that doesn't follow the Council's activities, instead of just those whose job it is to follow the Council.

Jessica Wilson and Marcie Weinandt agreed to co-chair this group. After some discussion, the group supported the idea of fitting this group into the policy committee. It would be more efficient than having a separate meeting date and time since that would add more administrative work. Marcie is vice-chair of the policy committee and will ask that Jessica be added as a policy committee member.

At our next meeting, we should lay out principles, values, and measurable goals. A participation plan similar to what Jessica showed from the City of Edina will be reviewed as well. We should define our purpose, stick to it, and not be the place where the full Council refers things when it doesn't know what to do with something. This is not a communications committee. We need to build a common vocabulary on public outreach.

The group made a few comments about the draft response to public input on the FY26-27 Council recommendations. When complete, the response should be signed by Chair Barton and express gratitude for chiming in.

Britt and Jana presented about the public participation elements of We Are Water (WAW). MPCA applied for Clean Water Funds in the Water Partners Legacy grant program to support some of this work.

Britt gave an overview of WAW. They did a retrospective survey of past participants and found the program builds civic capacity in communities that last. It helped people understand values that led to outcomes. In Pipestone, the library and SWCD worked together for the first time and will do things together in the future.

Response to Public Input on

Clean Water Council FY26-27 Clean Water Fund Recommendations DRAFT 13 January 2025

The Clean Water Council is required to submit a biennial report to the Legislature and the Governor on January 15th of the odd-numbered year. The report includes recommendations on how to use the Clean Water Fund derived from dedicated sales tax authorized by the Clean Water, Land & Legacy Amendment.

The Council requested public input on its recommendations after hearing proposals from seven state agencies and the University of Minnesota in mid-2024. More than 100 entities submitted comments. The following is a set of responses to this input.

Major topics

Chloride

Comment: Support chloride application liability protection for snow removal businesses with Smart Salting certification.

Response: Advocates for reduced chloride use to protect water quality have helped introduce legislation for several years. The Council is on record supporting this policy.

Water Re-use

Comment: Support funding needed for water re-use, especially capital improvement funds, statewide policy and guidelines, and incentivizing better irrigation.

Response: The Council and the Clean Water Fund supported one-time funding for investigating re-use options through the Minnesota Department of Health, and a <u>report is available</u> that includes eight recommendations. Recommendations included development of policies and guidelines, but there has been no follow-up. The Clean Water Fund does support residential water efficiency including rebates for more effective irrigation controllers. Minn. Stat. §114D.50 permits the use of the Clean Water Fund for activities that prevent the degradation of groundwater, so re-use should be permissible for future funding, but some agency leadership is required. Capital improvement funds would need to come from the state's capital investment bill.

The Council would also be interested in specific policy suggestions.

Tile Drainage

Comment: Minimize/eliminate hydrologic changes in the Minnesota River watershed by regulating tile drainage in agriculture. Best management practices (BMPs) are not keeping up with growth in total suspended solids due to land use changes, more drainage, and more precipitation.

Response: The Policy Committee spent substantial time on drainage in 2023-2024. The result was a policy statement supporting more multi-purpose drainage management (MDM). The Clean Water Fund has supported MDM that includes water quality elements to ditch drainage projects that are allowed

under the state drainage law. The Policy Committee also considered additional policy on tile drainage but deferred it to the future due to the time required to look at the issue thoroughly.

Buffer Implementation

Comment: Suggest reducing Buffer Implementation support at the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) from \$4 million to \$2 million for FY26-27. Use \$2 million from General Fund Riparian Aid funding and fines from administrative penalty order (APO) authority.

Response: The Clean Water Fund provided considerable funding when the buffer law was enacted, including mapping and technical assistance, and the Legislature appropriated funds for soil and water conservation districts to help carry out the work. This work has been successful, but the CWF still supports \$4 million every two years to help SWCDs and BWSR maintain a high level of compliance. The CWF is not used for enforcement but to help landowners make sure they stay compliant. There are more than 500,000 parcels subject to the buffer law, so usually through honest mistakes some landowners may dig up the buffer. Working with the landowner usually is cheaper than going through an unpredictable administrative penalty order (APO) process. Enforcement authority is usually reserved for rare cases for the most recalcitrant landowners. The Council would like to ask BWSR how many parcels are addressed by both CWFs and the enforcement funding.

Irrigation Water Quality Protection

Comment: Increase fees, where feasible, on irrigators rather than relying on the CWF for activities that previously relied on other funding sources.

Response: The DNR charges <u>groundwater fees</u> according to rates in statute for use of groundwater, but the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA) runs the Irrigation Water Quality Protection Program. An additional fee would have to be authorized—perhaps in statute—to support this activity instead of the CWF. The CWF supports a University of Minnesota Extension staffer who leads training for agricultural irrigators. This effort allowed the state to land a major federal grant that helps pay for precision irrigation controllers that reduce the waste of groundwater. The MDA will report on this progress soon.

Conservation Equipment Assistance

Comment: Are farmers getting equipment for free and then renting out for profit and should this be permitted?

Response: The Council's Budget and Outcomes Committee (BOC) has discussed this issue without a firm conclusion. The argument in favor is that we should want a producer to use the equipment on as many acres as possible no matter who owns it for maximum water quality benefits.

MDA reports that grants are reimbursements for up to 50% of the purchase cost of equipment to expand soil health management. While not funded by the Clean Water Fund, the Soil Health Financial Assistance Pilot Program (SHFAP) funded by the Legislature resulted in one-time investment averaging \$18/acre for one-year of use. MDA notes that average USDA payment for planting cover crops for a year is \$50/acre for three years.

Drinking Water Supply Management Areas (DWSMAs)

Comment: The state should support a higher price to secure easements for land within high risk DWSMAs to support drinking water supplies.

Response: The Council agrees that the state should offer a market rate for land in the highest-risk DWSMAs. An obstacle is that few landowners have not been that willing to part with this highly productive land at any price for an easement.

Agricultural Best Management Practices Loan Program (AgBMP)

Comment: Support re-allocation of loan funds to counties that have a big waiting list from counties with extra funds.

Response: The AgBMP Loan program indicates the following: "The AgBMP Loan Program does have an annual review panel that makes a proposal to our commissioner when there is funding available to reallocate at that time from counties showing they do not plan on using their proposed budgets for the year.

"MDA staff also reaches out to counties several times a year to see if any county is unable to use their funds due to projects falling through during the year. If funds are found available throughout the year, then those funds in the past have been reallocated by the MDA commissioner to counties with identified projects that are on a funding waiting list as the top priority." MDA reports the current backlog at roughly \$70 million.

Flood Control Funding

Comment: Make CWFs available for flood control since they impact water quality. Drainage management can reduce total suspended solids and phosphorus at a lower cost than cover crops.

Response: Projects that support flood control as well as wastewater treatment, climate resilience, carbon sequestration, and habitat have water quality benefits. However, the primary reason for funding needs to be water quality to be constitutional under the Legacy Amendment.

MN Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program

Comment: Support policy change: 1) Certified farms inside DWSMA are not exempted from Level 3 & 4 Groundwater Protection Rule (GPR) mitigation requirements; 2) reduce certification period for farms inside DWSMAs with elevated nitrate levels from 10 years to 5 years.

Response: MAWQCP requires nitrogen application to be at or below what is required by the GPR, whether the farm is in a DWSMA or not. Certified farms must meet many other standards besides those on nitrogen so certification is harder to get than being compliant with the GPR.

Comment: Support investment in more monitoring for outcomes on this program.

Response: Council members have also expressed interest in supporting additional edge-of-field monitoring for the program. As with many water quality programs, the state uses modeling to estimate likely pollutant reductions from best management practices. Finding a balance between cost and efficacy is a task the Council would like to explore more.

Monitoring for Pesticides in Surface Water and Groundwater

Comment: Increase fees, where feasible, rather than relying on CWF for activities that previously relied on other funding sources. In this case it would be an increase in pesticide fees.

Response: The Council is generally in favor of user fees to help address water quality issues caused by the user. An increase in pesticide fees would require legislation.

Nitrate in Groundwater

Comment: Increase fees, where feasible, rather than relying on CWF for activities that previously relied on other funding sources. In this case it would be an increase in fertilizer fees.

Response: In its most recent recommendations, the Council is in favor of user fees to help address groundwater quality issues caused by the user. An increase in pesticide fees would require legislation. A modest fertilizer fee increase was proposed (initially \$0.99 per ton and then \$0.40 per ton) in the Legislature in 2024 but failed. It would have funded a limited amount of mitigation like water treatment and new wells in southeastern Minnesota.

Culvert Replacement Cost Share

Comment: Please recognize conflict between connectivity and flood control.

Response: The Council believes this is concern that increasing flows through culverts during high water would conflict with flood control objectives. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) promotes geomorphic design on culverts but is focused on a limited number of streams where erosion control, floodplain connectivity, and habitat are the top priority. Streams and rivers that have impoundment strategies would not be a focus.

Comment: Please increase funding for this program.

Response: Budget constraints in FY26-27 required the Council to avoid increases to most programs.

Mussel Restoration

Comment: Please increase funding for this program.

Response: Budget constraints in FY26-27 required the Council to avoid increases to most programs.

Nonpoint Source Implementation & Technical Assistance

Comment: Red River projects supported by the Clean Water Fund are experiencing permit delays from the DNR. Encourage state agencies to standardize and streamline their process.

Response: Seeking DNR response.

Private Well Initiative

Comment: Please report progress on this effort.

Response: MDH is producing a dashboard to show project status in southeastern Minnesota. Showing progress toward protecting roughly 400,000 acres in Drinking Water Supply Management Areas (DWSMAs) is a high priority.

National Park Water Quality Protection Program

Comment: Support request at \$4 million.

Response: Budget constraints in FY26-27 required the Council to avoid increases to most programs.

Comment: The Clean Water Fund is not the right source for this program. The Council should also not earmark this project.

Response: Many Council members have expressed concerns about the program either not being the right funding source or that it will encourage more private development in a fragile area. The Council will continue to discuss in 2025 as a high priority.

River and Lake Monitoring and Assessment

Comment: Monitor all lakes and streams, and fine polluters.

Response: The CWF allows for comprehensive monitoring with an intensive watershed monitoring (IWM) effort occurring every ten years for each HUC-8 watershed. Since 85 percent of Minnesota's impairments are from nonpoint sources (the main focus of the Council), it is difficult to assess responsibility for many impairments. Agriculture is also mostly exempt from the Clean Water Act.

Forever Green Initiative

Comment: Support at \$6 million in FY26-27.

Response: The Council increased its recommendation to \$6 million for FY26-27. This program and its interaction with Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) is a high priority.

Water Storage (could also include any water storage like wetland easements)

Comment: The Red River Basin is not getting CWFs for water storage and funding is going to less organized parts of Minnesota.

Response: The Red River Basin is ahead of the Minnesota River basin on planning, use of geospatial data, and basin-wide collaboration due to the response to flooding in the 1990s. However, the DNR water storage line item in FY24-25 was only for two projects on state owned land in southwestern Minnesota. DNR is not asking for funding in FY26-27. Water storage funding on a larger scale is being done via other funding sources than the Clean Water Fund.

Measurement of Success

Comment: There is a lack of transparent tracking and communication of progress towards water quality goals with the broader public. It is unclear the influence the Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) may have over Clean Water Fund recommendations each biennium.

Response: The Council acknowledges that the outcome data for water quality is often too complicated. There is a biennial Performance Report assembled by agencies to look at key indicators, but generalizations are hard for the average person to glean from the data. As a response, the Council just assembled a <u>story map</u> to show the overall strategy for the Clean Water Fund. Fact sheets on surface waters, drinking water, and groundwater will be ready soon. The Council and Council staff have regularly communicated with agencies on their outreach to make sure their content showing projects outcomes show a clear connection to the Clean Water Fund when applicable. The state also has data stored in different places in different ways that needs some storytelling. In 2025, the Council will be discussing the best ways for describing outcomes in an accessible way.

The Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) is a group of seven agencies that use the Clean Water Fund. They meet to sift through agency requests before submitting a final set of proposals for Council review. The Council spends roughly six months hearing from agencies and asking pointed questions in public on project details and outcomes. During the most recent proposal cycle, Council member asked for a significant amount of data that was shared publicly and received more than 100 public comments. Recommendations made by the Council often vary from what some agencies want.

The Council is currently engaged in debate on its deliberation process and its relationship to the ICT. These discussions will be public at Council meetings in 2025.

Contaminants of Emerging Concern

Comment: What are you doing on microplastics in water?

Response: The FY19-20 CWF appropriation (at legislative direction) included support for a study of microplastics and their presence in MN surface water, groundwater, and drinking water. Results are expected in 2025.

Technical Assistance

Comment: Crop retailers suggest a new targeted financial incentive program that would incentivize crop advisors to promote conservation instead of promoting more fertilizer.

Response: Budget constraints in FY26-27 kept the Council from supporting new programs.

Watershed Based Implementation Funding

Comment: Many users of WBIF commented about the need to support and prioritize the program to maintain progress on work at the watershed level.

Response: The Council recommended an \$11 million increase in WBIF to \$90 million in FY26-27. This would provide steady funding to watersheds with an approved watershed plan while accommodating the increased number of watersheds with a plan. The Council had extensive debate on the rate of growth for this program since it will continue to increase in response to more approved plans through the end of the Legacy Amendment.

Comment: "Simply ramping up voluntary cost-share BMP adoption funding is not likely to produce the needed results."

Response: Watershed Based Implementation Funding (WBIF) encompasses many different activities that often don't involve direct assistance to landowners. These activities can range from stream restoration to carp management to stormwater management on public property. Activities funded by WBIF also generally conform to priorities in a watershed's comprehensive plan, which are based on the expected pollutant reductions calculated in the MPCA's Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy (WRAPS). Some watersheds require more assistance to landowners than others. The Council will continue to engage BWSR on expectations for WBIF through 2034.

One Watershed One Plan (1W1P)

Comment: Don't spend funding on 1W1P funding in the metro. It is redundant and wasteful since metro watersheds have a separate plan requirement that is older than 1W1P.

Response: The comment came from a metro county that includes a HUC-8 watershed that is participating in 1W1P as well as areas under the jurisdiction of watershed districts. Therefore, the Council can understand the overlapping planning efforts. We urge commenter to work with BWSR on incorporating existing plans into 1W1P without requiring too much redundant work.

Clean Water Fund Programs that Received Letters of Support

The Council thanks the commenters for their input on the following programs and their support is noted. In most cases, the commenters requested continued support.

- Aquifer Monitoring for Water Supply Planning
- Conservation Drainage and Management
- Conservation Equipment Assistance
- Critical Shoreland Protection Easements
- Enhanced County Inspections/ SSTS Corrective Actions
- Expand Weather Station Network
- Future of Drinking Water Initiative
- Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies
- Metropolitan Area Water Supply Sustainability Support
- Nonpoint source implementation
- Pesticide Testing in Private Wells
- Point Source Implementation Grant Program
- Private Well Initiative
- Projects and Practices
- RIM Easements
- Source Water Protection
- Stormwater Research and Technology Transfer Program
- Technical Assistance
- Wastewater/Stormwater TMDL Implementation
- Watershed Legacy Partners Program
- Working Lands Floodplain Easements

Suggested Outcomes for a Clean Water Council "Retreat"

Shared understanding of:

- 1. the intent of the Legacy Amendment, the subsequent state statutes on the use of the fund, and the reason for creating the Clean Water Fund (e.g., G16 recommendations)
- 2. the unique role of the CWF compared to other funds
- 3. the creation of the ICT and its role
- 4. what programs must continue after 2034 to maintain progress
- 5. what is in our strategic plan

Initial conversation about:

- 1. determining the highest and best use of CWF dollars (recognizing that different Council members will come to different conclusions)
- 2. the best ways to show outcomes of the CWF and who is supposed to do it
- 3. the changing proportion of the CWF spent on 1W1P and its impact on other outcomes
- 4. how to enhance the CWF application and evaluation process
- 5. the best way for Council members to use their expertise to make a difference
- 6. a possible process that would allow voting members to have an independent conversation within the boundaries of the Open Meetings Law
- 7. looking at any changes to strategic plan (Upper Mississippi protection target, for example)
- 8. Minn. Stat. 114D.30 Subd. 6(c): The council must recommend methods of ensuring that awards of grants, loans, or other funds from the clean water fund specify the outcomes to be achieved as a result of the funding and specify standards to hold the recipient accountable for achieving the desired outcomes.



Overview of the Clean Water Fund Interagency Coordination Team (ICT)

Dana Vanderbosch, MPCA

CWF Interagency Coordinating Team Lead

January 27, 2025



State and federal water law Oversight of water law is a shared responsibility: MPCA (Clean Water Act) DNR MDH (Safe Drinking Water Act) MDA BWSR

Met Council

Administration with Tribal and local governmental units is critical

Drinking Water Protection: State Agency Collaboration

 Water Quantity Ecosystem Interactions 	 Private Land Owners Soil Health Water Quality 	PesticidesFertilizers	 Water Monitoring Standards Permits Clean-up 	 Groundwater Guidance Public Drinking Water Wells
DNR	BWSR	MDA	MPCA	MDH

Clean Water Legacy Act

- Most, if not all, water programs were underfunded before 2008
- State, stakeholders, legislators worked to create the Clean Water Land and Legacy Amendment, passed by voters in 2008
- Clean Water Fund was established afterwards to help implement the state Clean Water Legacy Act



A holistic water management system

- Needed to develop a comprehensive water management framework
- Connect, modify, adapt existing state programs to it
- Coordinate state and local water actions



ICT was formed

- Develop a more coordinated water management system with partners
- Efficiently and effectively implement the CWLLA
- Provide legislative support to CWFrelated actions
- Develop budget recommendations with CWC





Interagency Coordinating Team Metropolitan Council **Board of Water and Soil Resources** Minnesota Department of Agriculture Minnesota Department of Health Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Minnesota Public Facilities Authority U of MN and EQB join us at times

Subteams of the ICT

• Surface Water Monitoring and Assessment

• Employ an integrated monitoring approach to understand the status and trends of Minnesota's waters.

• Groundwater and Drinking Water

- Coordinate statewide drinking water protection and groundwater sustainability efforts for drinking water, aquatic ecosystems, and other uses.
- Watershed Management and Implementation
 - Coordinate state Clean Water Fund programming so that state-generated data and information are used in decisions about planning and on-theground implementation.

Subteams, continued

Measures and Outcomes

 Create and track measures to report statewide outcomes of Minnesota's progress implementing the Clean Water Legacy Act. Authors the Clean Water Fund Performance Report, which is published in January of even-numbered years.

Interagency Research

• Facilitate interagency discussion and information sharing to coordinate applied research efforts.

Communications

 Works with the ICT to plan communication efforts and provide guidance on interagency initiatives and coordinated messaging related to Clean Water Funded work.

Discussion



Clean Water Fund Interagency Coordinating Team (ICT) Charter

Charge and Scope

The agencies have established the ICT to coordinate Clean Water Funded and associated activities to ensure resources are used efficiently and effectively to achieve the purposes of the Legacy Amendment. While the primary focus of the ICT is on Clean Water Fund activities, the ICT also serves as a forum for coordination of water-related programs and policies funded through other sources. Specific responsibilities of the ICT include:

- Collectively develop draft agency proposals for Clean Water Fund biennial budget recommendations based on direction from the Governor and Commissioners/Agency Heads, and that take into consideration Clean Water Council priorities.
- Provide support to Commissioners/Agency Heads and Legislative Directors for CWF-related legislative actions.
- Modify, adapt, or replace existing CWF or other water programs to assure water management activities are working to achieve constitutionally and statutorily described outcomes.
- Conduct special projects or assignments as directed by Commissioners/Agency Heads such as supporting the development and implementation of the State Water Plan.
- Serve as a forum for leadership-level program coordination, information sharing and planning.
- Oversee ICT subgroups, which were established to develop Clean Water Funded work and to resolve policy, coordination, and programmatic questions in several key areas.
- Report to Commissioners/Agency Heads, Boards, and agency staff on the planned, underway, and completed work of the ICT.
- Coordinate state agency clean water and related activities through oversight and decisionmaking support for the Interagency Coordination Subteams.

Membership

Metropolitan Council: Sam Paske, Judy Sventek

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil: Andrea Fish, Justin Hanson

Minnesota Department of Agriculture: Margaret Wagner, Raj Mann

Minnesota Department of Health: Myra Kunas, Tannie Eshenaur

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: Jess Richards, Jason Moeckel

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency: Dana Vanderbosch (Chair), Glenn Skuta

Minnesota Public Facilities Authority: Jeff Freeman (retiring Feb 2025), Karin Berkholtz



Team Coordinator: Katie Jensen, MPCA

Membership Roles

ICT members shall be empowered to make decisions on behalf of Commissioners and Agency Heads. ICT members shall understand the connections between programs to comanage the State clean water enterprise to "protect, enhance, and restore water quality in lakes, rivers, and streams, to protect groundwater from degradation, and to protect drinking water sources (M.S. 114D.50, Subd. 3)".

To benefit the whole enterprise, members shall represent their agency's work and understand the intersection with others' work and act as a conduit for information and change management via agency Commissioners/Agency Heads and managers.

Outcomes

- Efficient use of public funds targeted towards highest priority restoration and protection needs.
- Cleaner surface waters and ground water resources.
- Broad support for Minnesota's water management system, for the Clean Water Fund, and the future renewal of the Fund.

Please refer to the ICT Subteams Charter for more information on the Subteams.

ICT Subteams

- **Communications**: The Communications Subteam works with the ICT to plan communications efforts and provide guidance on interagency initiatives and coordinated messaging related to Clean Water Fund work.
- **Surface Water Monitoring and Assessment:** Employ an integrated monitoring approach to understand the status and trends of Minnesota's waters.
- **Groundwater and Drinking Water:** Coordinate statewide drinking water protection and groundwater sustainability efforts for drinking water, other uses, and aquatic ecosystems.
- Watershed Management and Implementation: Coordinate state Clean Water Fund programming so that state-generated data and information are used in decisions about planning and on-the-ground implementation.
- Measures and Outcomes: Create and track measures to report statewide outcomes of Minnesota's progress implementing the Clean Water Legacy Act.
- Interagency Research: Facilitate interagency discussions and information sharing to coordinate efforts related to applied research.

Last updated: January 2025



Clean Water Fund Interagency Coordinating Team (ICT) Subteams Charters

Communications Subteam

Charge and Scope

The Communications Subteam works with the ICT to plan communications efforts and provide guidance on interagency initiatives and coordinated messaging related to Clean Water Fund work. The Communications Subteam is generally not considered a content-creation team. Individual agencies maintain primary responsibility for developing and promoting communication materials for their own programs and projects. A key work product of the Communications Subteam is the biennial CWF Performance Report.

The Communications Subteam serves as a resource for other subteams of the ICT and for agencies engaged in Clean Water Fund work.

Membership

ICT liaison: Dana Vanderbosch, MPCA Subteam Chair: Alycia Overbo, MDH

- Beverly Godfrey, MPCA
- Jason Moeckel/ Greg Husak, DNR
- Mary Juhl, BWSR
- Jen Schaust, MDA
- Alycia Overbo, MDH
- Deb McKinley, Met Council
- Paul Gardner, Clean Water Council [for communication that needs to align with CWC]

Target Audiences

- Clean Water Council
- Legislature
- Media
- Water-related entities/organizations (local government, water suppliers, watershed districts, non-government organizations, advocacy groups, etc.)
- State agencies
- Residents
- Landowners
- Business



Main Tasks

- Develop communications planning for interagency Clean Water Fund work. Planning will include identifying target audiences, developing key messages, and updating communications tools.
- Coordinate implementation of strategies and development of products identified in the communications planning process.
- Serve as a communications resource for the ICT, ICT subteams, and state agencies engage in Clean Water Fund work.

Outcomes

- Target audiences receive Clean Water Fund messaging that is consistent in tone, content, and formatting.
- Stakeholders, such as the Clean Water Council, the legislature, and other partners will receive timely and accurate fact sheets, reports, and presentations about Clean Water Fund activities and outcomes. This work is closely coordinated with the CWC Executive Director.
- Target audiences have increased awareness of Clean Water Fund activities in Minnesota and are aware of the impact of those activities (They are able to answer the question "What difference do these funds and activities make in Minnesota?").
- The Clean Water Performance Report is delivered on time to the legislature.

Last updated: January 2025



Surface Water Monitoring and Assessment Subteam

Charge and Scope

Coordinate surface water monitoring and assessment among state agencies to ensure efforts maximize efficiency, integrate the work of federal and local partners (including volunteers), support agency roles and programs, and provide for effective Clean Water Fund (CWF) implementation. The subteam will promote an integrated monitoring and assessment approach to understand the status and trends of Minnesota's surface water quantity, quality, physical attributes, and biology. These data will be used to inform watershed restoration and protection strategies (WRAPS) development and local water plan implementation, identify research, inform resource management decisions, and assess progress toward surface water quality related goals at the local, state, and federal levels.

Membership

ICT liaison: Dana Vanderbosch, MPCA Subteam Chair: David Tollefson, MDA

- Kim Laing, Ben Lundeen, and Jordan Donatell, MPCA
- Joy Loughry, DNR
- David Tollefson and Bill VanRyswyk, MDA
- Dereck Richter, MDH
- Dan Henely and Steve Kloiber, Met Council
- Udai Singh, BWSR

Tasks

- Continuously evaluate agency surface water monitoring activities to identify gaps in data needed to meet state needs and develop strategies to address information gaps.
- Share assessment tools and techniques between agencies.
- Document coordination efforts and identify opportunities to further enhance monitoring coordination, including (as applicable) partnerships for monitoring and data management efforts, co-locating monitoring sites, adjusting schedules to provide data to meet multiple goals, employing the watershed approach to organize and align monitoring efforts, etc.
- Review local and federal monitoring/assessment efforts and capabilities (including volunteer efforts) and identify opportunities to further engage those efforts/capabilities to help meet the state's monitoring and assessment needs.
- Work with the Groundwater/Drinking Water Subteam to ensure coordinated collection and sharing of surface water and groundwater information needed by both groups.
- Identify gaps and recommend coordinated legislative funding proposals to the ICT to continue CWF monitoring efforts already underway and address any identified gaps.



Outcomes

- Surface water monitoring activities in Minnesota are conducted in an efficient and coordinated manner.
- The integrated monitoring approach informs decision-making efforts for WRAPS development, implementation, research needs, resource management along with one watershed one plans (1W1Ps), drinking water source water assessments (SWAs), and a variety of other coordinated surface water work.
- The state remains on schedule to assess its surface waters on a ten-year rotating watershed cycle, and perpetually operating monitoring systems are maintained.
- State agency monitoring and assessment efforts effectively employ the capacities of federal agencies, LGUs, local groups, and volunteers to help meet monitoring needs.
- Monitoring and assessment data is easily accessible to all users.

Connection to Coordination Team (ICT) and other Subteams

- Meet with ICT chair quarterly to discuss work products and any needs from the ICT.
- Currently there is no member on the surface water Subteam who also serves on the Drinking Water Subteam, and this Subteam needs to consider if this is needed. Recommend that the ICT review the Surface Water charter annually.

Chair Roles and Responsibilities

- Coordinate with ICT liaison on a quarterly basis. If Chair isn't from MPCA, MPCA member will make sure to help facilitate the connection between the Chair and the ICT Liaison.
- Coordinate with other Subteams where possible.
- Solicit agenda ideas from members and create agenda.
- Schedule meetings.
- Facilitate discussion, keep momentum up on work projects.

Rotating chair

- MDA to chair August 2024
- DNR to chair mid-2025 (begins Aug 1)
- MPCA to chair mid-2026

Note taking

• Starting in August 2021, notes for any meetings will be on a rotating basis. Note taker will provide notes to the Chair. The Chair will send notes out to the group and place on the SharePoint.

Last updated: January 2025



Groundwater and Drinking Water Subteam

Charge and Scope

Coordinate statewide groundwater and drinking water protection and management efforts. The team will identify priority groundwater and drinking water protection and management issues that may affect Minnesota's public health, welfare, and environment, and develop strategies for addressing them. The team will focus on activities that affect groundwater and drinking water sustainability (quality and quantity) including issues related to the interaction between groundwater and surface water, and ecosystem protection.

The team will also provide a forum for presentation and discussion of activities, research, and reports on Minnesota groundwater and drinking water. The team coordinates all groundwater and drinking water related activities, including relevant Clean Water Fund activities.

Team members will provide a level of support that reflects their resource capabilities. All work shall be conducted cooperatively with the team members responsible collectively for the work and success of the team. Specific strategies may be implemented by the appropriate program within agencies as fits their mission and scientific expertise. The team may form subgroups to carry out its tasks. All decisions and products shall be developed by consensus of the agencies.

Membership

ICT liaison: Margaret Wagner Subteam Chair: Tannie Eshenaur (MDH)

- Annie Felix, Ed Lenz, Justin Hanson, Marcey Westrick, BWSR
- Jason Moeckel, Jay Frischman, DNR
- Larry Gunderson, Margaret Wagner, MDA
- Sandeep Burman, Tannie Eshenaur, Dave Liverseed, Steve Robertson, Teresa Purrington, MDH
- Judy Sventek, Jen Kostrzewski, Lanya Ross, Met Council
- Heather Johnson, Paul Pestano, Erik Smith, MPCA

Tasks

- 1. Coordinate technical and programmatic activities related to groundwater and drinking water
 - a. Support, prioritize, and develop cross-agency programs, such as GRAPS and WRAPS reports and advance integration of groundwater and drinking water issues into local comprehensive water planning.
 - b. Share information around agency-specific initiatives.
 - c. Promote enhanced data sharing and coordination.
 - d. Support coordination and development of statewide capacity for using groundwater models integrated with other quantitative data assessment tools.
 - e. Coordinate the interagency review of plans and reports on groundwater and drinking water.



- 2. Identify, discuss, and develop shared strategies and plans to effectively address key groundwater and drinking water challenges.
- 3. Assess the potential impact of new and emerging challenges especially climate change and PFAS on groundwater and drinking water sustainability.
- 4. Serve as a resource for providing technical and programmatic expertise on groundwater and drinking water activities.
 - a. Prepare informational materials, fact sheets, presentations, etc. as needed for internal and external audiences.
 - b. Coordinate technical support for communications so that agencies speak with one voice.

Outcomes

- Statewide drinking water protection and groundwater sustainability efforts are coordinated and effective.
- Effective strategies are implemented to address priority drinking water protection issues that affect the health and welfare of Minnesotans.
- Effective strategies are implemented to address priority groundwater protection issues that affect ecosystem services, sustainability, and surface water quality/quantity.
- Barriers to effective implementation of groundwater and drinking water protection strategies are identified and addressed.

Measures

Team continues to monitor groundwater and drinking water measures included in the Clean Water Performance Report, and develops new measures as needed. The team's work plan contains desired results and outcomes for individual work items.

Last updated: January 2025



Measures and Outcomes Subteam

Charge and Scope

Create measures to report statewide outcomes of Minnesota's progress implementing the Clean Water Legacy Act and the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment and take a leadership role producing the biennial Clean Water Fund Performance Report.

This work is meant to show the "big picture" of how Clean Water Funds are being used to protect and restore waters. The Measures and Outcomes Subteam will also determine a strategy for coordinating data and work with the Communications Subteam for delivering the key messages to interested audiences.

Membership

ICT liaison: Dana Vanderbosch, MPCA Subteam chair: Kim Laing, MPCA

- Jen Schaust, Reid Christianson, MDA
- Vacant, DNR
- Annie Felix-Gerth, Udai Singh, BWSR
- Lanya Ross, Met Council
- Alycia Overbo, Azra Thakur, MDH
- Kim Laing, David Miller, and Bill Dunn, MPCA

Tasks

- Create measures and associated metadata for reporting statewide outcomes of MN Clean Water Legacy Act and the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment investments
- Publish 2026 Performance Report and associated metadata
- Communicate results of the 2026 report
- Work with the Clean Water Council Budget and Outcomes Committee and ICT Communications Subteam to come up with alternate communication/publication ideas for 2028 report.

Outcomes

- Performance measures are developed to report statewide outcomes of the Clean Water Legacy Act and the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment.
- Clean Water Performance Report is published every two years with updated data, information, and graphics.


- Clean Water Performance Report is distributed to interested stakeholders and outcomes of CWF investments are reported to key audiences by easily understandable communication materials (report card and presentations).
- Progress is made towards improved communications and products related to the accomplishments of the Clean Water Fund.

Last updated: January 2025



Watershed Management and Implementation Subteam

Charge and Scope

Coordinate state Clean Water Fund programming* so that state-generated data and information are used in decisions about planning and on-the-ground implementation.

- Make recommendations on interagency processes and products that can lead to a reduction in the overlap of state agency service requests to local partners.
- Help support and accelerate science-based prioritized and targeted implementation at the local level.

*including: WRAPS; One Watershed, One Plan; Watershed Based Implementation Funding; GRAPS (for coordination purposes – not replacing the GRAPS team); DNR standard deliverables; Groundwater protection rule implementation.

Membership

ICT liaison: Glenn Skuta, MPCA Chair: Reid Christianson MDA, Carrie Raber and Jenilynn Marchand MDH

- Jenilynn Marchand, Carrie Raber, MDH
- Jeff Risberg, Heather Johnson, Justin Watkins, MPCA
- Maureen Hoffman, Steve Christopher, Met Council
- Jeff Berg, Reid Christianson, MDA
- Barbara Weisman, Megan Moore, Jason Moeckel, DNR
- Annie Felix, Marcey Westrick, Julie Westerlund, BWSR

Tasks

- Facilitate critical linkages among programs, explore opportunities to create efficiencies, and maximize value to local implementers (such as Protection Framework Recommendations, "home" of Watershed Management Framework).
- Review the process for developing WRAPS, GRAPS and state involvement in the One Watershed, One Plan program and recommend adjustments to state agency operations to improve the process and products. (such as the review of MPCA WRAPS Cycle II continuous improvement project and review of the One Watershed, One Plan Guidebook)
- Explore options to more holistically integrate surface and groundwater into watershed management (such as the One Watershed, One Plan Program)
- Explore options on how to expand civic engagement and community capacity building to all aspects of the MN Water Management Framework.
- Develop a stronger connection with the Interagency Watershed Approach Team in efforts to provide leadership for state coordination at the local level via Interagency



Watershed Core Teams (Example of teamwork in the Root River Watershed – Field to Steam Partnership).

- Assist ICT and agency leadership in clarifying expectations for "enterprise" approach: the state as a "consulting firm" that can provide data, information, and planning and implementation assistance. Includes strategic deployment of staff and money to best serve local needs.
- Review/recommend methods for tracking and evaluating success of Clean Water Funds this could include:
 - methods for evaluating implementation of comprehensive watershed management plans (level of effort, effectiveness of partnerships, progress toward goals)
 - b. other evaluations of state programs
 - c. discussions that relate to other measurement efforts, including:
 - 1. the CWF Performance report (the ICT Measures and Outcomes team)
 - 2. the Clean Water Council's Strategic Plan
 - 3. agency performance measures (e.g., MPCA)
- Identify critical linkages with other Clean Water Fund ICT subteams and work with other subteams to maintain communication to foster overall program success
 - a. Groundwater / Drinking Water
 - b. Research (targeting tools)
 - c. Measures and Outcomes
 - d. Communications

Outcomes

- Implementation activities are coordinated statewide for surface water, groundwater and drinking water so that each agency's work enhances the work of others.
- State agencies support local implementation in a unified way, guided by the agreed upon approach and priorities.
- Implementation funding is coordinated, streamlined, and timely. Executive branch funding for local projects distributed outside of the coordinated system is by exception.
- Critical linkages with other Clean Water subteams are identified and effectively managed to support continuous improvement of the state's Clean Water Fund delivery
- Outcome reporting methods are identified, tracked, and successfully communicate to key audiences

Last updated: January 2025



Interagency Research Subteam

Charge and Scope

The Interagency Research Subteam facilitates discussions and shares information related to applied research, with a focus on nonpoint source knowledge gaps. This subteam provides needed opportunities for networking between state agency scientists and an avenue to disseminate research results.

The primary goal of the Interagency Research Subteam is to encourage the transfer of science and knowledge across state agencies and coordinate efforts related to Clean Water Fund research, including both groundwater and surface water issues. Subteam members will liaise between the agencies and the Interagency Research Subteam. The Interagency Research Subteam identifies ways to most effectively bring research results to agency staff so that they can approach problem solving with the latest science in mind.

Membership

ICT liaison: Margaret Wagner (MDA) Subteam Chair: Aicam Laacouri, MDA

- Jeppe Kjaersgaard and Aicam Laacouri, MDA
- Rita Weaver, BWSR
- Ryan Anderson and David Wall, MPCA
- Heidi Rantala and Peter Jacobson, DNR
- Carrie Raber, MDH
- Hong Wang and Steve Kloiber, Met Council
- Sean Vaughn, MNIT

Tasks

- Share research projects, proposals, and results between state agencies to increase learning, avoid duplicative research efforts, and identify new research opportunities.
- Facilitate partnerships and increase communication between state agency research efforts and when appropriate, leverage resources from local, state, federal, and academic sectors.
- Sponsor new and innovative ways to transfer science to staff from all agencies (i.e. webinars/seminars, 5-minute lightning talks) to internal and external partners.
- Identify major knowledge or research gaps regarding impaired waters causes, effects, and remediation efforts that could be addressed via best management practices, conservation practices, and associated research.
- Identify ways to better use technology (e.g. LIDAR) to identify sensitive areas and provide guidance on use of computer simulator (modeling) tools used in the Impaired Waters Process. Encourage local conservation professionals to use that technology.



• Coordinate, inform, and report to other subteams, agency personnel, and stakeholders regarding CWF supported research efforts. Specifically, coordinate with the Interagency Communications Subteam to share results.

Outcomes

- Clean Water Funded research results are available and used by state agency staff and other key stakeholders to inform future work and support adaptive management.
- Coordinate and liaison with water research proposals and projects supported by other funding mechanisms such as LCCMR, RCPP and similar.
- Strong partnerships and communication between state agency research efforts and between state agencies and the University of Minnesota.
- Relevant research being conducted at a regional and national level is incorporated into strategies being developed and supported by CWF and other in-state programs.
- Research efforts/findings are submitted to the Minnesota Water Research Digital Library (MNWRL).

Last updated: January 2025

MINNESOTA

Minnesota Nutrient Reduction Strategy Update

Clean Water Council January 27, 2025

Corrie Layfield, NRS Coordinator Dave Wall, NRS Lead Scientist



- NRS since 2014 background and progress
- 2025 NRS update approach and accomplishments
 - All results shown are preliminary and subject to change
- What to expect in 2025
- Questions

In-state and downstream impacts

Minnesota Waters



Protect water from excess nitrogen and phosphorus

Downstream south



Reduce the hypoxia/dead zone at the Gulf of Mexico

Downstream north



Reduce algae blooms in Lake Winnipeg

2014 Minnesota Nutrient Reduction Strategy (NRS)



- Nutrient conditions in Minnesota waters
- Causes and sources
- Goals in-state & downstream
- Science-based solutions/practices
- Magnitude of changes needed on land
- Specific strategies to increase effectiveness
- Ways to track progress toward goals

11 Organizations



Much progress since 2014 – more needed before 2040





• NRS since 2014 – background and progress

2025 NRS update – approach and accomplishments

• All results shown are preliminary and subject to change

- What to expect in 2025
- Questions

2025 Update: Working together 50 people, 10 organizations

Six working groups



Scientific Analysis

Assess implementation

Tracking metrics, measures, displays

Updating and strengthening 24 building blocks

Six working groups

Water loads, goals & priorities	Urban nutrients	Agricultural BMP science	Agricultural BMP adoption	Watershed support/tools	Progress tracking
River loads & trends analysis	Wastewater data analysis	BMP efficiency science	Approaches to scale-up BMPs	Learning from WRAPS, 1W1Ps	Water changes dashboard
Priority areas for in-state needs	Wastewater technologies	BMP combination scenarios	BMP socio- economics	Watershed tools survey	BMP adoption tracking
Nutrient sources verification	Stormwater science/data	Research needs identification	Maximum practical BMP increases	Local staff needs assessment	Priority metrics and measures
Goals update	Wastewater N strategies	Nutrient balance on land analysis	Existing programs analysis	Watershed load reduction needs	Permit program dashboard

Water quality

Six working groups						
Water loads, goals & priorities	Urban nutrients	Agricultural BMP science	Agricultural BMP adoption	Watershed support/tools	Progress tracking	
River loads & trends analysis						
Priority areas for in-state needs						
Nutrient sources verification						
Progress toward goals						

In-state reduction needs – Priority watersheds



In-state phosphorus trends



In-state nitrate trends



Downstream reduction needs - priority watersheds



Downstream nitrogen reduction needs

Mississippi River Basin



Downstream phosphorus reduction needs

Mississippi River Basin



Wastewater & stormwater

Six working groups						
Water loads, goals & priorities	Urban nutrients	Agricultural BMP science	Agricultural BMP adoption	Watershed support/tools	Progress tracking	
	Wastewater data analysis					
	Wastewater technologies					
	Stormwater science/programs					
	Wastewater N strategies					

Urban wastewater discharges

Total phosphorus reduced 76%

Total nitrogen – No change 2010-2023





MPCA Wastewater Nitrogen Reduction Strategy

Mississippi River

Total nitrogen wastewater loads at state line million pounds per year

12000

10000 10,163 8000 7,798 NRS Goal 6000 4,795 4000 4,069 2000 0 **Current** WW total nitrogen with Load with WW nitrogen **WQBELs** reduction strategy

How?

- Phased implementation
- Design considerations to treat TN at new, expanded & upgraded WWTFs (2024)
- Nitrogen management plans & water quality trading (2024)
- Effluent limits derived from nitrate WQBELs (future rulemaking)
- 10 mg/L total nitrogen effluent limits (future rulemaking)

Cold climate wastewater denitrification

Studied successes

- How much reduced?
 - ✓ 71% reduced to <10 mg/l
- How did they do it?
 - ✓ Biological removal
- What did it cost?
 - ✓ \$3-21 per lb. TN (\$9/lb. median)
- Careful Management needed
 - ✓ Optimization of N & P
 - ✓ Hydraulic capacity



Science of agricultural solutions

Six working groups							
Water loads, goals & priorities	Urban nutrients	Agricultural BMP science	Agricultural BMP adoption	Watershed support/tools	Progress tracking		
		Cropland BMP efficiencies					
		BMP combination scenarios					
		Research needs identification					
		Nutrient balance on land analysis					

Solutions - nitrogen reduction potential at edge of field

Nutrient Management	Corn-soybean rotation – 10% rate reduction Corn-soybean rotation – 25% rate reduction Continuous corn – 10% rate reduction Continuous corn – 25% rate reduction 100% fall to 100% spring pre-plant 100% spring preplant to a spring split Timing modification toward spring and sidedress plus a rate reduction Nitrification inhibitor	In-field fertilizer management reduce 5-20%
Cover crops	Cover cropping in general Cereal rye in a corn-soybean rotation Cereal rye in continuous corn Oat cover crop in a corn-soybean rotation Cover crops following short season crops in a cold climate (not undersown)	Cover crops reduce 18-35%
Land use change	Extended rotation (including perennial) In rotation: Alfalfa In rotation: Small grain (oat) Kura clover Winter oilseed relay crops Intermediate wheatgrass Conversion to prairie Prairie strips Conversion to pasture Conversion to bioenergy crops	More perennials reduce 40-90%
Drainage engineer	Controlled drainage Saturated buffers Denitrifying bioreactors Shallow drainage Gravel / blind inlets Drainage water recycling constructed wetlands	Drainage water treatment reduce 30-50%



Reduction scenarios – what will it take?

	TN Mississippi Basin at state line			Nitrogen				
250	million p	ounds per year	r			Practice	Acres added	Lbs/year reduced at state line
200						Tile water – edge of field	2 M	9 M
			ſ	Nitrogen	ו	Fertilizer & manure mgmt.	3 M	4.5 M
150				reduction needed		More living cover into crop rotations	4.3 M	13.6 M
				72 M lbs		Convert to perennial crops	1.3 M	10.7 M
100						Runoff controls cropland & pasture	2 M	1.8 M
						Urban Wastewater	NA	13 M
50						In-channel & floodplains	TBD	TBD
						Septic, stormwater, other		<1 M
0	Baseline	Recent		Goal			About 54	M lbs/yr

Reduction scenarios – what will it take?

TP Mississippi Basin - MN watersheds at state line			Phosphorus			
12,000,000		•••		Practice	Acres added	Lbs./year reduced at state line
10,000,000				Tile water – field edge	2 M	0.1 M
8,000,000			Phosphorus reduction needed	Fert & manure mgmt. in-field	3 M	0.1 M
6,000,000			1.2 M lbs.	More living cover into crop rotations	4.3 M	0.4 M
				Use perennial crops	1.3 M	0.3 M
4,000,000				Runoff controls cropland & pasture	2 M	0.3 M
2,000,000				Urban wastewater & stormwater	TBD	0.1 M
-	Baseline	Recent	Goal	In-channel & floodplains	TBD	TBD
					Abou	It 1.3 M lb./yr

Agricultural practices/success-acres-adoption

Six working groups						
Water loads, goals & priorities	Urban nutrients	Agricultural BMP science	Agricultural BMP adoption	Watershed support/tools	Progress tracking	
			Approaches to scale-up BMPs			
			BMP socio- economics			
			Maximum practical BMP increases			
			Existing & new programs analysis			

Obstacles to switch or add practices

Social science research shows many real and perceived barriers

- 1. Risk to land-owner
- 2. Beliefs about effectiveness/benefits
- 3. Trust (or lack of)
- 4. Cost/economics
- 5. Red tape hassles
- 6. Land ownership
- 7. Knowledge to change
- 8. Labor (time)
- 9. Weather uncertainties





Multiple programs overcoming obstacles

Characteristics of successful agricultural programs

- Trust built over time
- Simplicity for land-owners
- Flexibility
- Community engagement
- Locally motivated & prioritized
- Messaging clear, simple, persistent
- Funding persistent

Reviewing programs aimed at accelerating adoption

- 46 unique existing programs
 - 28 are Minnesota grown
- New program ideas considered
- Identify programs to develop



Effort Name	Where Initiated 🗾 🗾
Root River Field to Stream Partnership	Root River Watershed in Minnesota
Olmstead County Soil Health	Olmstead County, Minnesota
Central Iowa Blitz Project (batch and build)	Iowa - Polk and Dallas Counties
Minnesota Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program	Minnesota
Cover Crop Business Accelerator	Iowa
Fall Cover for Spring Savings	Illinois
Cooperatives for Climate	Minnesota
Conservation Agronomist	Multiple
Climate Smart Farms Project	Minnesota
Soil and Water Outcomes Fund	Multi-state
IRA funds – large dollars with some challenges	National
Soil Health Financial Assistance Program Grants	Minnesota
Wilkin County Soil Health Demonstration	Minnesota
MN Corn Innovation Grants	Minnesota
Implementation Grants	Minnesota
One Watershed, One Plan	Minnesota
Irrigation RCPP	Minnesota
Cedar River Source Water Partnership RCPP	Iowa
The Conservation Infrastructure Initiative	Iowa
Sustainability Cover Crop Initiative	Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Missouri
Sustainable Soy Cover Crop Program	Iowa (and surrounding states)
N Rate Risk Protection Program	Iowa and surrounding states
Stearns County Cover Crop Program	Stearns County, MN
Saving Tomorrow's Agricultural Resources (STAR) Program	National
SWCD	Minnesota
Farmers Protecting Rice Creek	Rice County, MN
Minnesota Extension	Minnesota
Oatly	Minnesota, Iowa
We Are Water MN	Minnesota
Nitrogen Fertilizer Management Plan	Minnesota
Groundwater Protection Rule	Minnesota
Buffer Law	Minnesota

Local support for nutrient reduction

Six working groups						
Water loads, goals & priorities	Urban nutrients	Agricultural BMP science	Agricultural BMP adoption	Watershed support/tools	Progress tracking	
				Learn from WRAPS & 1W1Ps		
				Watershed support tools & resources		
				Local staff needs identified		
				Watershed load reduction needs		

Supporting local action to achieve nutrient goals



Major river basins & watershed scales work together

NRS basins



BMP effects science Tracking systems & tools Promoting downstream needs Programs to support local action

Watersheds



Subwatersheds



Experienced local staff Watershed nutrient science Local action plans Practice delivery

NRS helps watersheds to plan for downstream needs

Watershed nutrient loads

2024

Watershed nutrient loads to accomplish Minnesota's Nutrient Reduction Strategy Goals

Interim Guidance for Watershed Strategies and Planning



MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY



TN Load reduction planning targets

TP Load reduction planning targets


See progress in our water and lands

Six working groups					
Water loads, goals & priorities	Urban nutrients	Agricultural BMP science	Agricultural BMP adoption	Watershed support/tools	Progress tracking
					Water quality track & display
					BMP adoption track & display
					Programs and people progress
					Point sources track & display

NRS Website — Today's progress tracking links

MINNESC	MINNESOTA POLLUTION	Air, Water,	Trending	Business	Get	About
	CONTROL AGENCY	Land, Climate	Topics	With Us	Engaged	MPCA

Air, Water, Land, Climate / Water / Water quality initiatives

Reducing nutrients in waters

Nitrate, phosphorus, and total nitrogen

WATER QUALITY

m

Addressing nitrate in southeastern Minnesota

Reducing nutrient

Protecting wild ric Cleaning up the St

River Minnesota's PFAS

Understanding em

contaminants Getting lead out of tackle

Contact

David Wall 651-757-2806 david.wall@state.mn Excessive nutrients, particularly phosphorus and nitrogen, pose a significant problem for Minnesota's lakes and rivers as well as downstream waters including the Great Lakes, Lake Winnipeg, and the Gulf of Mexico. Nutrients enter our lakes and rivers from agricultural and urban lands and in discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. When nutrient levels exceed natural conditions, they can cause excessive algae growth, low levels of oxygen, toxicity to aquatic life, and unhealthy drinking water.

Tracking progress

Adopting nutrient reduction practices in urban and rural areas is important for reducing nutrient pollution. Many state and federal government programs have set a priority goal of reducing nutrients in waters. Now you can look at the combined progress of these agencies in three different ways: rural best management practice adoption, urban wastewater nutrient discharges, and river nutrient level monitoring.

Using special software, you can see where these programs are in use. The software allows you to sort and illustrate by year how much of each program and where in Minnesota the improvements have been made and in which rivers we are finding water quality improvements. By exploring these data, we can better visualize and understand the potential to reduce nutrients.

Tracking changes on the land

Annual added BMP acreages through government programs



Living cover (701,390 acres total)

Practices that reduce nutrient and soil loss by keeping plants growing continuously, including the Fall and Spring months. Common practices include cover crops and conservation cover.

Cropland erosion control (822,153 acres total)

Designed to reduce runoff and soil losses. This group consists primarily of farming practices that leave crop residue on the surface or structural practices that reduce or capture runoff and eroded soil.

Drainage water retention and treatment (28,674 acres total)

Practices designed to slow down waters leaving tile-drained landscapes or otherwise treat tile-waters for nutrient removal prior to entering streams. Wetland restoration and controlled drainage management are the most common practices, but other emerging practices include saturated buffers and bioreactors.

Nutrient management (1,611,997 acres total)

Managing the amount, form, placement, and timing of nutrient and soil amendments such that nutrients are used most efficiently by the crops, at the same time minimizing leaching and runoff to surface and ground water.

Tracking effects — BMP Effects Estimator Tool (BEET)



Watershed scale

Water quality – River and stream trends







- NRS since 2014 background and progress
- 2025 NRS update approach and accomplishments

What to expect in 2025

• Questions

Revision process in 2025

Ongoing	 Continue to engage stakeholders 		
Winter	 Incorporate 24 NRS building blocks 		
Spring	 Prepare 7 chapters for Steering Team 		
	 Including ~15 support documents 		
Summer	 NRS public review 		
Fall	 Edit based on public review process 		
End of 2025	 Finalize strategy documents 		



- NRS since 2014 background and progress
- 2025 NRS update approach and accomplishments
 - All results shown are preliminary and subject to change
- What to expect in 2025

• Questions

MINNESOTA

Minnesota Nutrient Reduction Strategy Update

January 27, 2025 Preliminary Update

Clean Water Council



WATERSHED BASED IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING: TRACKING AND LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION

Kyle Richter, Renville SWCD



Water Management Transformation



Watershed Planning

Resource Focused, Data Driven Prioritized Issues, Targeted Implementation, Measurable Goals Kyle Richter kyler@renvilleswcd.org



ONE WATERSHED, ONE PLAN







BACKGROUND

Tracking Workgroup

- 2022 MASWCD Convention
 - Informative Session that laid out the importance of tracking and public transparency
- 2023 Winter
 - Workgroup to discuss how the state should proceed
 - Options and autonomy
 - What works best for districts?







HOW TO MANAGE THIS?

MS4 Front

- Software developed by Houston Engineering
- Contract Management
- Ranking Projects
- Reporting Projects
- Public Transparency





Project Input

Contract Number		Project Name 🕐		Project Description 🕐	
CRMWP-026		Jane Doe		WASCOB	
Primary Practice 🕜		Lead Implementation Partner *	0	If Lead Partner is Other, de	scribe: 🕐
638 - Water and Sediment Control	$X \mid v$	Renville SWCD	x ~]		
		Required			
Partner Organizations 🕜		If Partner Organization is Other, o	lescribe: 🕐	Technical Assistance Provi	der
Select				SWCD	\times \sim
Planning Area Zones		HUC10		County	
Agricultural	$\times \mid \checkmark$	0702000411	x ~]	Renville	$\times \mid \checkmark$
Township/City Name		Township		Range	
Troy Township	$\times \mid \checkmark$	115	x ~	35	$\times \mid \checkmark$
Section		1/4 Section		Parcel ID 🕜	
17	XIV	Select			
Landowner Information					~

Land Occupier Name		Land Occupier Address	Land Occupier City
Jane Doe		1234 River Run	Deer Run
Land Occupier State		Land Occupier Zip	Land Occupier Phone
MN	$\times \mid \checkmark$	55555	+1 (234) 567-8911
Land Occupier Email		Is the Land Occupier the Owner?	Landowner Name
		💽 Yes 🔘 No	



Project Ranking

Land Occupier Name	Planning Region	Primary Practice	
Jane Doe	Agricultural	638 - Water and Sediment Control Basin	\sim
Total Points 🕜	Scored By: 🕐	Scoring Date	
	Kyle Richter X V	01/21/2025	
Scoring Notes:			
50-59pts 50%, 60-84pts 75%, 85-100pts 90%, if nonstructural, select practice and move to financial			
Worksheet			^
Darral is Duffer Low Compliant		Desisting Desists	
	Practice 😵		
	Select		
What Tier Concern does this Project Address? 🕜	What Tier Concern does this Project Address Points	Is Project Located within a Priority Watershed? (?)	
Select	0	Select	\sim
Project Located within a Priority Watershed Points	Does the practice address more than one Tier 1 concern?	Does the practice address more than one Tier 1 concern Points	
0	Select V	0	
Other sources of funding available? 🕜	Other sources of funding available Points	Is Project located along Impaired Reach According to WRAPS?	
Select	0	Select	\sim
Project located along Impaired Reach According to WRAPS Points	Watershed/Area of Impact Size 🕜	Area of Impact Size Points	
0	Select V	0	
Does Project Include Water Storage? 🕜	Project Include Water Storage Points	Does the project improve biological diversity? (?)	
Select	0	Select	\sim
Does the project improve biological diversity points	Distance from surface water body (feet)	Distance from surface water body Points	
0	Select v	0	
Lake of Significance 👔	Lake of Significance Points	Project within located within a WHPA or DWSMA 🛛 🕐	
Select	0	Select	$ $ \sim]
Project within located within a WHPA or DWSMA Points	Landowner Motivation	Landowner Motivation Points	
0	Select	0	



Project Einensiels	Contract and Costs (LGU Data Entry)				
Project Financials	Planned Install by Date:	Contract Type	Total Cost Estimate		
	Landowner Cost-Share Amount	Joint Board Cost-Share Amount	Joint Board Funding Source		
	Total Other Cost-Share Amount	Other Cost-Share Source	Flat Rate Contract Term		
	If Flat Rate, what type?	If Flat Rate, Acres	If Flat Rate, Per Acre Rate		
	Cost Comments	Joint Board Costshare Multiplier	Landowner cost share multiplier		
		0	0		
	Contract and Costs (JPB Data Entry)		^		
	Contract Number CRMWP-026	Date Contract Approved	Total Contract Amount Authorized		
	Total Project Actual Cost				



R Î **Practice Details Project Reporting** ~ Actual Install Date: Practice ID eLink Activity Category * WBIF-SFC-BMP-2025-005 Select ... \checkmark Required Required Metric Value 🕜 * eLINK Practice * Number of Unique Practices 0 Select... count \sim Required Required Outcome Narrative 🕜 Practice Lifespan Metric Value Units 🕜 Select... Select ... \sim \sim Practice Indicators ^ Waterbody 🕜 Nitrogen Reduction Value eLINK Calc Tool HSPF SAM - 12 Digit HUC XV 0 lbs/yr Water Storage / Volume Reduced 🕜 Phosphorus (Est. Reduction) Value Sediment (Tss) Value Acre-Feet/Yr lbs/yr 0 tons/yr 0 Soil (Estimated Savings) Tons/Year



COLLATED DATA

Central MN River Watershed Management Plan Tracker



10 Year Plan Metrics Outreach and Education Activities

This dashboard allows users to visually track and evaluate progress of implementation actions toward measurable goals within the plan. The "10-Year Plan Metrics" tab allows users to view a summary of plan measurable goals, and progress implementation activities have made toward ten-year goals in real time. The "Outreach and Education Activities" tab summarizes the engagement work planning partners have done to assist voluntary conservation efforts in the watershed. For more information about the Central MN River CWMP and implementation efforts, please click here





11





WBIF PROVEN SUCCESS

Stakeholder Education

- Most important part of implementation
- Teaches stakeholders about regional resource concerns and how to address them
- Provides place for people implementing practices to share ideas
- Without education there are no projects





WBIF PROVEN SUCCESS CONT.

Project Development

- Conservation Planning
- Understanding producers/stakeholders goals
- Documenting what and how resource concerns will be addressed
- Making sure project addresses plan

goals









Pollution Reductions:

- Nitrogen (N) reduced by 89.15 lbs/yr
- Phosphorus (P) reduced by 11.35 lbs/yr
- Sediment (S) reduced by 1.224 T/yr



Typical Cross Section

Water and Sediment Control Basin after 2" Rain









3 Species Cover Crop

- Oats, Turnips, and Radish interseeded into standing corn in early June
- Pollution Reductions for 62 acres
 - N reduced by 146.9 lbs/yr
 - P reduced by 5.062 lbs/yr
 - S reduced by 1.585 tons/yr







No Till Crop

- New corn crop emerging in last years corn stubble
- Reductions for 136 acres
 - N reduced by 168.7 lbs/yr
 - P reduced by 26.34 lbs/yr
 - S reduced by 3.758 tons/yr







Drainage Water Management

- Utilizes water gates to store water in soil profile during low flows, and allows water to flow during high flows
- Pollution Reductions for 107 ac management zone
 - N reduced by 534.4 lbs/yr
 - P reduced by 3.347 lbs/yr
 - S reduced by 0 lbs/yr



THANK YOU

Kyle Richter (320) 523-1559 kyler@renvilleswcd.org www.renvilleswcd.org