

Clean Water Council Meeting Agenda

Monday, October 20, 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—please declare any perceived or actual conflict of interest
- **(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

9:30 Public comment

Any member of the public wishing to address the Council regarding something not on the agenda is invited to do so as a part of this agenda item.

9:45 **(DISCUSSION ITEM)** Field Tour retrospective

10:15 Break

10:30 **(DISCUSSION ITEM)** Impact of Wake Boats

- Andy Riesgraf, staff researcher, lead researcher for this study, UMN St. Anthony Falls Laboratory
- Jeff Marr, co-author and Associate Director of Engineering and Facilities, UMN St. Anthony Falls Laboratory

Andy and Jeff will provide an overview of their recently released Phase 2 report that investigated the penetration depths and velocities of the hydrodynamic phenomena created by various recreational powerboat types, including wakeboats, and their impact on the water column and lakebed.

11:15 **(DISCUSSION ITEM)** WRAPS Roundup

- Heather Johnson, South Watershed Section Manager, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- Chad Anderson, North Watershed Section Manager, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

WRAPS provide the scientific foundation for effective watershed planning and implementation. The presentation will inform the Council on the status of WRAPS Updates, with a focus on key products being developed across the state.

12:00 Lunch

12:30 **(ACTION ITEM)** New budget proposal process, form, and rubric

The Budget and Outcomes Committee has finalized its proposal for a new scoring rubric, complete with adjustments to the program proposal form and process that has been used in previous cycles. Together, the intent is to increase transparency and accountability of the budget development process while providing a decision support tool for Council members. The BOC recommends approval for use in the coming budget development process.

1:45 Next steps

2:00 Adjourn

Steering Committee meets directly after adjournment

Clean Water Council
July 21, 2025, Meeting Summary

Members present: John Barten (Chair), Steve Besser, Rich Biske (Vice Chair), Dick Brainerd, Gail Cederberg, Tannie Eshenaur, Brad Gausman, Kelly Gribauval-Hite, Justin Hanson, Holly Hatlewick, Annie Knight, Chris Meyer, Fran Miron, Jason Moeckel, Ole Olmanson, Jeff Peterson, Peter Schwagerl, Glenn Skuta, and Marcie Weinandt.

Members absent: Steve Christenson, Warren Formo, Peter Kjeseth, Rep. Kristi Pursell, Jessica Wilson, and Sen. Nathan Wesenberg.

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

Regular Clean Water Council Business

- Introductions
- Motion to approve the July 21st meeting agenda by Steve Besser, seconded by Holly Hatlewick. Motion carries unanimously.
- Motion to approve the June 16th meeting summary by Marcie Weinandt, seconded by Brad Gausman. Motion carries unanimously.
- Chair, Committee, and Council Staff update
 - Budget and Outcomes Committee (BOC): The BOC was able to finalize the rubric, which is on the agenda for review today. The meeting also reviewed leveraged funds, to make sure the Council has more information on that area.
 - Policy Committee: They did not meet in July. They plan to set the order to address policy statements to continue working on this next year.
 - Staff:
 - The Clean Water Council will have a survey coming out soon. The questions are being refined, and looking at mid-August, open during the field tour, and then talk about outcomes in October. Please forward the survey out to your constituents, and any others.
 - Field Tour is on September 15th-16th. The purpose of the field tour will be the protection goal, and more info will come about it at the August meeting. We are lining up the logistics and speakers. Jen will send a calendar update as well. The meeting is open to the public and addresses will be provided if there is no room on the bus, and public members will need to bring their own food.
 - Nutrient Reduction Strategy is out for public comment until September 10th, 2025.
 - Jen Kader has attended these events, talking about the Clean Water Council (CWC): [Minnesota Watersheds Tour](#), [Minnesota Stormwater Research Council tour](#). Jen will be attending the [Lower Saint Croix Watershed Partners Workshop on the Water](#) (7/30/25), [Salt Symposium](#) (8/5/25). The Council has been invited to attend the Pokegama Lake Association meeting. They will have a presentation on nanobubbles as a way to address the nutrient load in their water.

Public Comment (*Webex 00:33:00*)

- Carly Griffith, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy (MCEA): Report of cumulative impacts of altered hydrology in the Minnesota River Basin. They did a webinar on it last week. The report is on the [website](#) and the recording as well.

Researching PFAS Contamination Risks to Private Well Users from the

Land Application of Biosolids, *Presenters: Matt Simcik (University of Minnesota), Carly Griffith, Water Program Director (MCEA), Jay Eidsness, staff attorney (MCEA), and Ginny Yingling, retired from the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) (Webex 00:34:00)*

With support from the MCEA, the University of Minnesota will provide an overview of a research proposal focused on private well contamination from PFAS from biosolids land application. This may be included as a proposal for the next biennium.

- PFAS Overview: Broadly defined as any compound with at least “one fully fluorinated carbon atom”. 3M was the first to mass produce PFAS in the 1950s. PFAS has become ubiquitous due to the unique chemistry prized by the industry. Health risks started to become understood and PFAS regulations followed shortly, beginning in the early 2000s. Today, PFAS regulations are some of the strictest, and multiple “legacy” PFAS are considered carcinogenic and linked to a variety of adverse health effects. Minnesota and other jurisdictions regulate PFAS through an array of measures.
- UMN’s Involvement and Expertise
 - Environmental occurrence (kept finding it everywhere they looked)
 - Fate and transport
 - Toxicity (various studies)
 - Remediation design was developed:
 - Either drill a well or use existing well.
 - Inject PAC/coagulant into the well to create absorbative zone (make low organic carbon soil into a higher organic carbon soil, that can then be used in the well)
 - Withdraw water from treated zone
- Note, they are not at this meeting to ask for funding from Clean Water Funds (CWFs) but rather connecting with a group that has brought experts together, to address these complicated problems.
- MCEA’s Involvement and Expertise: East Metro Settlement, Legislative Successes, Amara’s Law Rulemaking, 3M Clean Water Act Permit, Biosolids Strategy, Biosolids Advocacy Report
- The wastewater treatment process and residual biosolids issue: PFAS are produced industrially, and landfills and wastewater treatment tend to become sources of PFAS (due to the industrial and residential waste going there). There are two waste streams from a wastewater treatment plant: direct discharge of treated wastewater that goes typically to surface waters, along with the biosolids or sludges that are nutrient rich (waste applied to agricultural fields due to the nutrients), and this PFAS may degrade down to the basic elements of the PFAS which can have greater health risks. In the past we have applied our waste to fields, but it wasn’t until PFAS entered that biosolids from wastewater treatment plants impacted, in the 1970s under the Clean Water Act, as a way to reduce inputs to surface waters.
- What Minnesota is Doing on Biosolids: Biosolids are nutrient-rich organic material that farmers can apply to their fields. Nearly twenty percent of the state’s biosolids are land-applied. Legislature directed the MPCA to develop a strategy to reduce the risk associated with biosolid land application, after it was found PFAS could be reabsorbed in plants and accumulated in livestock.
- MPCA strategy: This is a tiered, risk-management approach like Michigan (four tiers, and if high levels of PFAS the biosolids cannot be applied – they need to figure out a way to dispose rather than land apply). It focuses on forward looking risks from land-application. Information and Education are also involved (like reduction of PFAS at the source is critical). Maine has been working on this since 2021.
- Gaps in Minnesota’s Regulation – Our Proposal Seeks to Close the Gap: The strategy does not address legacy sources of PFAS contamination. Joint proposal (University of Minnesota, partnering with MDH and MPCA). This is a coordinated effort standpoint. If PFAS is found with private well owners, they want to provide ways to address the issue for those private well owners. Begin targeted investigations of high-risk sites for legacy PFAS contamination of drinking water sources from biosolids. Sampling of private wells near biosolids application sites (Safe Drinking Water Act PFAS monitoring only includes community water supply wells). Investigation drive by risk factors: Cumulative application load, whether biosolids were likely to be industrially impacted due to the source, distance to drinking water sources, and sensitive hydrogeology.
- MDH focus: Initially on the east metro related to waste disposal from 3M. There was over 150 square miles of contaminated groundwater in that county due to those disposal sites. Surveyed over 2,000 wells in that area. Also sampled in Bemidji and Duluth where there was fire suppressant foam and used in fire training activities. There is a good basis of sampling these wells for these PFAS. Higher levels have been found, possibly from land application sites (did not find out for sure). Ambient sampling from the MPCA and MDH, to reveal PFAS in groundwater. There is a robust data set. This is a needed approach.
- Draft Workplan:
 - Over the next two biennia (2028-2032), they hope to sample 400 well locations. These would be across the state, but concentrated in areas where biosolids are known to have been applied. Both in

impacted and expectedly unimpacted sites. Collecting the well water, and potentially the soil (permission dependent).

- Searching for a suite of twenty-five plus PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, Gen-X, short-chain)
- Non-target PFAS analysis: Identify, but can't quantify unknown fluorinated compounds
- Compare levels to EPA standards
- Compare levels among biosolids application intensity
- Compare water levels to soil levels
- Draft Budget: Total cost for four years (400 wells): \$1,819,492
- Potential Solution: Inject powdered activated carbon (PAC)/coagulant into well to create absorptive zone (in-situ treatment). The MDH and MPCA have coordinated with using activated carbon to collect the PFAS, which can be at a whole-house level. There are several treatment options available to treat PFAS.
- Three reasons it is worthy of conversation: It is designed to protect public health, it compliments the MPCA biosolid strategy, and they want to close the knowledge gap.

Questions/Comments:

- What happens to the activated carbon that absorbs the PFAS? *Answer:* If properly managed the carbon filter is taken to a facility where it is thermally desorbed at temperatures that will destroy the PFAS. The carbon can be reused, but not in a drinking water option. If using ionic exchange resin, you do a rinse aide of the resin to pull off the PFAS, and provides a more concentrated form of the PFAS, which is destroyed via thermal destruction as well. There are a lot of ways to be exposed to PFAS, but if you are drinking it daily, the levels in your blood are much higher for those folks than the general population (bioaccumulation). Focusing first on drinking water provides a bigger bang for our buck approach.
- Fran Miron: I thought biosolid land application sites in Minnesota was regulated by permits? Who holds those records? *Answer:* Yes, you do need to hold a permit, and it is held by the MPCA. This goes to the wastewater treatment plant, and they contact the local haulers. They must have certification to land apply the biosolids. They work with individual landowners to each site. The wastewater folks need to have reports, documenting this process. It has been regulated by the state for some time.
- Fran Miron: Does PFAS show up in soil samples, or does it leave the soil too quickly for that? *Answer:* We do see it in soil samples, and it is soluble and moves (fate and transport) into plant matter and filters down into the groundwater. The short answer is yes.
- Brad Gausman: Are these human produced biosolids? *Answer:* Yes domestic and industrial wastewater.
- Brad Gausman: So, one out of every five biosolid creation events in MN end up on a field somewhere?
 - *Answer:* Yes, that is the twenty percent. It is unique to Minnesota. Other states deal with their biosolids differently. Other states have responded to this issue differently. Right now, Minnesota incinerates and landfills most of the biosolids.
 - *Glenn Skuta, MPCA:* Everything solid that goes down the drain (includes food scrapes, toilet paper, etc.), it is screened out. Then, remaining settles creating a sludge. There is also a microbial activity that happens at the treatment facility, creating its own sludge too at the microbial waste level, and that needs to go somewhere as well. It has nutrient value, so it can be used as fertilizer on fields. However, now there are these PFAS issues.

We Are Water program overview, retrospective evaluation, by Jana Larson (program coordinator) and Rachel Busse-Aswar (program manager) (*Webex 01:55:00*)

We Are Water is an innovative program that invites Minnesotans to both engage more deeply with water stewardship and strengthen their community connections. Program coordinators from MPCA and the Minnesota Humanities Center share highlights, insights, and lessons learned after nearly a decade of the exhibit being hosted in 40 communities across Minnesota.

- Folks attending the meeting are asked “*How does water show up in your life outside of work?*” Opening these conversations about how impacting water is in daily life.
- This program is different because it is designed to build local capacity in communities to take action to protect and improve water resources. We meet people where they are and listen to their stories. By relating to others in their community who might be different from them, it helps to understand that water is important for health, safety, wellbeing, and joy. The end goal is to build relationships between people and organizations that allow them to work together to make tough decisions for greater good.

- The design of the program is from Dr. Mae Davenport's work at the University of Minnesota (UMN) on her [community capacity for sustainable watershed management model](#) developed in 2013 (Davenport & Seekamp, 2013). It began in 2016 with grant and state funds. It is funded through the WRAPS program, through the CWFs. WRAPS reports and 1W1P, are important in the planning phase of each host site for the exhibits, and they look at these when considering the sites. They help identify long term goals, partnerships they want to pursue, and engagement strategies.
- They often work with watershed conservation management districts. They try to help them meet their communities' members where they are at and understand how the community members value water. This helps make connections to the priorities and living connections of their community members before trying to pursue their own policy and priorities. They are looking to increase this work with water professionals across the state, to provide them models, and really listen to the stories that are shared. These stories can reveal information that may not be immediately water related, but in these communities, it may help make community changes in this area. Then, try to find genuine connections, that follows the theory to make sustainable, and ethical long-term changes.
- Recorded Story Annie Humphry played for meeting. Then, people were put into pairs, to talk about how her story connects to their reasons for serving on the Clean Water Council. Answers were shared.
- We Are Water is a traveling exhibit (5 selected each year), partnership network (community events), and holds public events. This is to increase Minnesotans' responsibilities to and relationships with water.
- State partners: promote program, lead host site selection, oversee evaluation, connect networks to project, and provide support for educational demonstrations. They are: MPCA, Minnesota Humanities Center, MDH, DNR, MDA, BWSR, Minnesota Historical Society, and UMN.
- Evaluation and ongoing assessment is an important part of the We Are Water Minnesota program. Each host site at the end of their hosting has a closing webinar to reflect on the successes, what worked well, growth opportunities. Additionally, they have an evaluation firm called Creation and Common that meets with each host site, collecting qualitative and quantitative data, and compile into a report at the end of the year. These reports provide evidence that We Are Water Minnesota is a consistently successful initiative that builds strong, local, and statewide networks to promote positive social norms and enable the development of a community-wide vision for water stewardship. In 2024, saw that combined with the humanities centers (narrative approach), revealed a robust network of partnerships (324 partnerships activated in 2024 in the five communities). They pulled in and recorded stories that might otherwise be excluded. In 2024, there were 22,714 exhibit attendees, and 2,257 event attendees.
- At the end of 2023, Creation and Common did a retrospective evaluation, for those that hosted from 2016-2023, to participate in a survey. There were thirty host sites (five exhibit tours), about 90,000 visitors, about 20,000 event participants, 615 partnerships (212 were new), and 3,107 water stories. Then, 45 people from those host sites were asked to do a more in-depth interview process (15 of the 30 host sites participated in it).
- They use two models in their work: Absent narratives approach and the community capacity building model (Davenport & Seekamp, 2013). These were used in the evaluations.
 - Increasing engagement using absent narratives approach: this is to learn from and with multiple voices, amplify community solutions for water, build and strengthen relationships, and recognize the power of a story and the danger of absence. This is connecting people across differences by including perspectives and stories that might not typically be heard. This builds trust and helps people to have hard conversations about water.
 - Community capacity building model:
 - Programmatic capacity: clear goals and objectives, cross-jurisdictional coordination, outcomes tracking and adaptation
 - Organizational capacity: organizational development, leadership development, stakeholder engagement and partnerships
 - Relational capacity: interpersonal relationships and social networks for knowledge exchange, norm development and organization action
 - Individual capacity: member benefits, concern, sense of responsibility, and civic/water action
 - Justice capacity: trust, legitimacy, and fairness
- Some collaborations and partnerships endure for years. Creates space for difficult conversations.

Questions/Comments:

- Rich Biske: We Are Water is now under WRAPS. In the early days of WRAPS there was a civic engagement process, and the community would gather to develop goals into a water plan that would move forward. How are those goals collected, documented in the plan, and followed through?
 - *Answer:* The short answer is that it happens when we are working specifically with watershed conservation districts as the host. We do not work exclusively with folks in charge of those 1W1P projects. Some of the hosts are other nonprofits and we record all of the community goals identified and partners working with our official contracts and host sites. Not all of them are watershed districts shaping those plans. The 1W1P is brought to the table, but sometimes we are working with historical societies or art organizations. So, we have a larger vision happening around water, and planting seeds to make more things happen, due to the partnerships developing.
 - *Response from Rich Biske:* Perhaps as a Council, as we move forward, this being one of the only dedicated civic/community engagement program funded by CWFs. How do we use it as a foundational piece to move forward in our recommendations piece.
 - *Comment from Glenn Skuta, MPCA:* One challenge area is that we have funds to do five sites per year, but more 1W1Ps.

UPDATE: Protecting Private Well Users in Southeast Minnesota, presented by Kim Kaiser (MDA) and Sophia Walsh (MDH) (*Webex 03:00:00*)

Leaders from the Council asked MDH to provide an update on Phase II of the response to the nitrate petition for eight counties in southeast Minnesota. This phase focuses on the public health response to ensure safe drinking in the near-term. Activities include outreach and education, well inventories, free well water testing for five contaminants, mitigation for nitrate, and access to data on water quality and agency activities.

- Testing reveals nitrate private wells (in the eight-county southeast Minnesota area):
 - Community water systems: Safe Drinking Water Act protects consumers
 - Private wells have little protection (pre-code wells are especially vulnerable). They believe there are about 3,600 private wells that they estimate in that area, serving 9,400 people. Often, they are built to be the least expensive, and often not as protective.
 - Health concern is methemoglobinemia. Babies can also get blue baby syndrome.
- The EPA directed the state agencies to develop a coordinated and comprehensive work plan to reduce nitrate contamination of drinking water aquifers in eight southeaster Minnesota counties.
- They are in the Phase II: Public Health Intervention – MDH and MDA (July 2024 and moving forward). They are looking to: Identify impacted residences, conduct education and outreach, test private well drinking water, provide mitigation, and provide public record of work.
- The CWFs help fund public health intervention:
 - CWFs \$2.79 million (FY25): well inventory; testing; education, outreach, community engagement; staff capacity (local and state).
 - General Fund \$2.8 million to MDA (FY25): home water treatment, option to transfer to MDH for a mitigation program
 - Together these fund one year of a ten-year public health intervention
 - Going forward, SEMN work (not mitigation) if folded into the general CWF Private Well Initiative
- The MDH felt if they only tested for nitrates, they may be misleading private well users about the safety of their drinking water. So, they test the well for the five main contaminants: coliform bacteria, nitrate, arsenic, lead, and manganese. These are voluntary.
- This aligns well with the Council's Strategic Plan. Vision: Drinking water is safe for everyone, everywhere in Minnesota. It hits goal two: ensure that private well users have safe, sufficient, and equitable access to drinking water (testing, mitigation, policy).
- In addition to the state partners, they rely heavily on local partners. They focus a lot on communications (email, meetings, etc.). They ask for feedback a lot, and update approaches when necessary. Southeast Minnesota Water Analysis Laboratory (SEMWAL) is doing all of the water testing (all free water testing), and connecting well users to mitigation, and helping them understand what can be done from the results revealed. The counties and SWCDs are working on the well inventory. Everyone is working on outreach and education, and it has supported the work they are doing.

- Traditional communication: They have work with communicating through social media, TV, radio, newspapers, MDH websites, and the Private Well Education Program (UMN). The test kit requests increased the weeks following a press release from local partners. They are tracking how folks heard about the free well test kits, so they know what is working better than other methods. Well users are a diverse population, so they want to use different communication strategies to try to capture everyone. Television, SWCDs, and word of mouth played a bigger role in the second quarter for how people learned about the free well test kits, compared to previous quarters.
- Other targeted outreach: Private Well Peer Leader Network, UMN Extension, Groundwater Awareness Week, Drinking Water Week, Realtor CEUs, Buying and Selling a Home brochures, Well mitigation navigator with county laboratory
- They are working with the UMN to learn more about the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of private well users. They are working on two approaches: focus groups (policy changes, strategic programming, and coordination across governance) and surveys (water source, home water treatment, testing frequency, perceived barriers, and prompts to test). There is a statewide attitude and behaviors study. The results will be statewide but will also help in the southeast area. They have received a 28 percent response rate (still getting surveys in). They hope to have a full report at the end of 2025.
- They are also working with a marketing firm for outreach and education (How can they get their message out to private well users), working with MP+G. They finished up local partners interviews in early April. Two focus groups of private well users were hosted in early May. Evaluations and recommendations should be in by the end of July. They will launch an outreach campaign in later summer 2025.
- Well inventory: Identify all private wells supplying drinking water for a home. Provide information to update the County Well Index (which updates Minnesota Well Index). They met with each of the counties last fall, and the MDH made sure to stay flexible. Two counties have executed contracts and are working on it already (Dodge and Fillmore). Goodhue, Wabasha, and Houston counties have contracts developed and will be signed off soon. Mower, Olmstead, and Winona counties are in que to work on it and will start in the next two years to start the process. There has been collaboration with the Minnesota Geologic Survey (training and data quality control).
- Well Test Kits and Results Process:
 - Private well household requests a free test kit online. SEMWAL mails test kit to requestor
 - Requestor collects sample and sends to lab (for free). SEMWAL analyses the sample and share the results with requestor.
 - Mitigation navigator contacts household if any elevated concentrations or to answer questions
 - If there is nitrate (>10 mg/L) the household is connected with mitigation options.
 - Progress: By 6/30/2025, 1,733 private well households requested a well test kit. They estimate there are about 36,000 private well households in southeast Minnesota. Their goal was to get 10 percent (3,600) tested by the end of the first year of efforts (6/30/2025). Winona is the only county that had ten percent of its anticipated private well households request well test kits.
- Private Well Testing Results (n=1,013)
 - 9% of samples had nitrate concentrations >10 mg/L. (*right around expected results for MDH*)
 - Lead detection (>0.5 µg/L) revealed forty percent (*surprise results for MDH*)
 - Arsenic detection (>0.5 µg/L) revealed eighteen percent
 - Bacteria present in ten percent
 - Manganese >100 µg/L in eight percent
- Mitigation:
 - Appropriation became available July 2024 (Joint Powers Association signed with Olmstead County).
 - Reached out directly to MDA private well testing participants (over 1,200): Township Testing, Private Well Pesticide Sampling Program, and Southeast Volunteer Monitoring Network.
 - October 2024 the first reverse osmosis system was installed. They do prioritize low income and vulnerable populations.
 - June 2025 the Interagency agreement with MDH to establish and administer a mitigation program.
 - Nitrate Follow-up Sampling: All households with installed reverse osmosis systems receive a follow-up sample to test the effectiveness of the system. The results reveal the median reduction of nitrates is at 88%.

- They are also working on some cost-benefit analyses: for cost data and evaluation of mitigation options as well as public health cost-benefits (with UMN).
- The things they are learning now, will be used to carry forward to the rest of the state: locally led, be adaptable, prioritize vulnerable populations, rely on social science, multi-pronged outreach, test for the top five, multiple mitigation strategies, and make it simple for well users.

Questions/Comments:

- Holly Hatlewick: Moving forward adopting this pilot statewide, when will that be? *Answer:* When there is funding to do so. Right now, concentrated in southeast Minnesota. They are setting up work in other areas. They are looking for energy and engagement at the local level. Those places will be first.
- Fran Miron: Nitrates bring up Blue Baby Syndrome, and looking at Washington County, they do a good job of outreach to families of newborns. That outreach could expand as a targeted approach for families with newborns to offer testing in this way. It could be expanded, and it makes a lot of sense to do it that way. It would be a low-cost approach, managed by the counties, with a little collaboration between social services and public health department. That would expand the MDH's database as well.
Response: The counties do work closely with their own health departments.
- Brad Gausman: We have mail in kits for Chronic Wasting Disease (can be provided before the hunting season) and sent in. These are from the early adopters, who can share their experience (hopefully positive), and share information with others. So, that may be a good way to start responses for the rest of the state in private well water testing. Additionally, at my family's cabin, we share a well with our neighbor. I got everything ready to get that well tested, called the testing lab in Duluth. I hit a stopping point when it was \$294. It was more than I was ready to do in the moment. I am taking it seriously, but it will be next year. The cost was a roadblock for me. *Response:* This is an issue for us in the future. There are only about thirty labs in the state that will except a sample from a private well user. They are not equally distributed either. I am not sure how we will address it. We don't want our MDH lab competing against private business. If there is an increased demand, will the market respond? We do not know. We want them to be accredited labs (which is expensive for the lab). We feel your pain.

Scoring Rubric, Annie Knight and BOC members (Webex 03:45:00)

Over the past several months, the BOC has developed a draft scoring rubric to formalize how proposals are evaluated and to clearly reflect Council priorities. This tool will strengthen Council and public engagement, while providing clear guidance to and increased feedback for applicants. We'll review the draft rubric, user guide, and proposed process at this meeting and seek preliminary endorsement of the rubric for "beta testing" this summer.

- Scoring Rubric Overview
 - Purpose of the Rubric
 - Consistent evaluation process. This provides a framework, but it is also flexible. Regardless of score, the Council can prioritize one program over another
 - Structure for funding decisions. It can tap into the expertise we have on the Council versus going with the loudest voices.
 - Aligns with Council goals
 - Supports future Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) engagement. If there are tough decisions (over or under anticipated funds), it can make the process easier.
 - Key Criteria
 - The rubric is a total of fifty points. The categories provide the point values.
 - The back side includes a scoring rubric guide hitting five areas: review each proposal thoroughly, score each section independently, be consistent, provide comments and questions, and maintain flexibility. There are also two key considerations: water quantity and other environmental concerns.
 - Strategic Plan Alignment
 - Groundwater, surface water, drinking water, and water legacy are the four pillars of the Council's Strategic Plan. The rubric categories fall into these four pillar areas:
 - Water Quality Impact is the first criteria in the rubric (weighted higher), falls into the groundwater, surface water, and drinking water pillars.

- The Strategic Alignment covers all four
- The Measurable progress covers all four
- Financial Leverage and Sustainability goes to the role as the Council in making responsible funding recommendations
- Community Value and the Outreach and Communication areas would fall under the water legacy pillar.
- Proposed Implementation (open to adjustments)
 - All proposals submitted at the same time
 - Council members score and submit questions in advance
 - Scores and questions posted two weeks before presentations
 - Agencies present (up to fifteen to twenty minutes each)
 - Additional questions submitted post-presentation
 - Agencies respond in writing
 - The BOC reviews score and follow-ups to shape recommendations

Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- John Barten: Thank you to the BOC for this work. Note, this is a tool for the Council to use for the recommendations process. In particular, it could be helpful for new members. Each of the members represent different stakeholder groups, so the scores will likely be different, but helpful to bring that representation forward during the process. This will help us focus on the priorities as well.
- Jen Kader: There will be a box-and-whisker plot, to reveal the spread of the scores. It can help members focus on the programs that need more attention versus the ones that most people agree on. It would be incumbent on Council members to take good notes, to provide feedback during deliberation for why programs were scored; the thought process behind it.
- Holly Hatlewick: I like having the proposals all in at the same time. That will really help with the consistency piece. Great job on this Annie.
- Steve Besser: The Council would have these scores to look back on, if we submit them at the meetings that the presentations are occurring. *Response from Annie Knight:* You would recommend sticking two and three, and score in real time during the agency presentations. *Steve Besser:* Yes.
- Jason Moeckel: I would like to know more about the proposals submitted at the same time. The Council has done it different in the past, so I would like clarification. The agencies are not able to place the dollar amount in the proposals if it is at the start of the year, we get them closer to June. The Council has past history of the funding and can hear from the state agencies predictions of steady, increase, or decrease funding during the presentation.
- Jen Kader: We could move forward with beta-testing, to know if how this tool can be useful. We need to know if this is sufficient. In response to the testing, we can evaluate it at that time, knowing how best to use it (i.e., timing, etc.).
- Gail Cederberg, Met Council: If we get rid of two and three, if we score right away, those won't be sent to the agencies right away. I think we want to be able to re-score. There are always more questions and internal discussions, which we need to have. Somehow there needs to be a process to follow up and submit. Thank you to everyone who worked hard on this rubric. I am happy to sit down and score programs, and submit questions privately too, versus during the meetings. Once we score them, how do we potentially re-score giving additional information. The rubric will help speakers with their presentations as well.
- Rich Biske: I think there is value in ranking items before the presentations, so we go into the next phase, so we see where the Council sits. It is a way for Council members to communicate equally. It is helpful for the Council to consider.
- Jen Kader: The discussion is not over the rubric itself, so I would suggest the Council focus on it, in order for it to be advanced for the BOC to beta-test it. Through a fist-to-fives hand vote showing, the Council would like to move forward for the BOC to test this rubric out. Then, the Council members can solidify the process moving forward.

Adjournment (Webex 04:15:45)

Clean Water Council Scoring Rubric (10/3/2025 draft)

Purpose and Prioritization: The Clean Water Council’s scoring rubric is a tool to help the Council formally and consistently evaluate proposals using clear, shared criteria. While the rubric provides a structured evaluation framework, the Clean Water Council may prioritize proposals for funding based on its collective judgment, regardless of score, so long as it is consistent with [Minnesota Statutes 114D.50 Subd. 3](#).

Criteria	Criteria Description	Points Available
Water Quality Impact	Water quality is the top priority , with a focus on measurable improvements to surface water, groundwater, or drinking water . Prioritizes implementation of proven or innovative practices, with monitoring, assessment, research, strategy development, or planning included if it directly supports implementation. May also provide co-benefits that address other environmental concerns, including water quantity.*	0-15 _____
Strategic Alignment	Aligns with Clean Water Council Strategic Plan and state-approved water plans ; coordinates effectively across local, state, and federal initiatives.	0-10 _____
Measurable Progress & Feasibility	Defines clear, outcome-based goals and measurable indicators ; shows historical progress or a feasible path to long-term systems change . May include research, monitoring, or planning activities that support measurable outcomes.	0-10 _____
Financial Leverage & Sustainability	Supplements vs supplants; potential for leveraging local or partner support; if partially funded, project is scalable	0-5 _____
Community Value	Engages landowners, local communities, and underserved groups ; addresses environmental justice and equity considerations; direct community support is evident.	0-5 _____
Outreach & Communications	Clear plan on communicating outcomes ; includes outreach strategies; has a plan or has demonstrated how to raise awareness of CWF through this program (e.g., Logo displayed, CWF mentioned)	0-5 _____

Total Points Received: _____ /50

Scoring Rubric Guide for Council Members

The scoring rubric provides a clear, consistent framework for evaluating proposals in alignment with the Clean Water Council's strategic priorities. Here are a few guiding steps to help with the scoring process:

1. **Review Each Proposal Thoroughly**

Read each proposal carefully and assess how it addresses each rubric criterion.

2. **Score Each Section Independently**

Assign a score within the specified range for each section, based on how strongly the proposal meets that criteria.

3. **Be Consistent**

Use a consistent scoring approach across all proposals you review. For example, if you tend to score conservatively, apply that same approach for each project.

4. **Provide Comments and Questions**

Where possible, include comments or questions for each section. These notes are valuable for agencies and the Interagency Coordination Team to address during or after presentations. This is especially helpful when reviewing multiple proposals over time, as it provides context for Council discussion and follow-up.

5. **Maintain Flexibility**

The rubric is a decision-making tool, not an automatic approval or denial mechanism. Final funding recommendations reflect both rubric scores and the Council's collective judgment.

* Key Considerations for Water Quality Impact:

- **Water Quantity:** While water quality is the top priority, proposals may provide co-benefits for water quantity, such as improving water availability, storage, or flow conditions within a watershed.
- **Other Environmental Concerns:** Additional environmental co-benefits may include habitat restoration, biodiversity, climate resiliency, or protection of natural resources that directly support water quality and quantity goals.

FY26-27 CLEAN WATER FUND PROPOSAL

Program Title:	
Program Number (if applicable):	
Agency/Organization Name:	
Program website:	

Program Contact	
Name	
Email	
Phone	

Person Filling Out Form	
Name	
Email	
Phone	

Eligibility Requirements

Proposers must confirm that their proposal meets basic statutory eligibility. Please check each box that applies to certify the following:

☐ **Eligible Use of Funds:** Requested funds will be used in accordance with Minnesota law and Clean Water Fund requirements, outlined in full in [Minnesota Statutes 114D.50 Subd. 3](#). This includes confirmation that this funding request supplements rather than supplants previous non-legacy state funding.

☐ **Accounting and Reporting Capacity:** The proposing organization has experience with or ability to meet accounting and reporting requirements in order ensure appropriate use of funds, as stipulated in [Minnesota Statutes 114.50 Subd. 4](#).

☐ **Mandate Alignment (if applicable):** This proposal supports or fulfills state or federal mandates (i.e. TMDL, Nonpoint Source Pollution, Nutrient Reduction Strategy, Wild Rice protection, etc.).

If yes, please cite applicable statute or rule: _____

Abstract

Provide a summary (up to 100 words) that clearly states the purpose of the program, its intended water quality impact, and who it serves. The content here will largely be used as a brief summary when looking across programs, so some degree of redundancy is anticipated with other content in the form.

Water Quality Impact

Which step of the Water Management Framework does this program most fit under:

Overall, how will this program protect, enhance, and restore water quality in lakes, rivers, and streams, protect groundwater from degradation, or protect drinking water sources. Please limit your response to 200 words.

Measurable Outcomes

Responses under each bullet (e.g. 1a, 1b, etc.) should be limited to 50-100 words.

1. Expected Outcomes for FY28–29 Request:
 - a. Describe measurable and outcome-based goals for the current funding request.
 - b. Describe how outcomes will be tracked, evaluated, and reported.
 - c. (If applicable) For past recipients, describe any planned changes to this program from previous funding cycles, if any.
2. Outcomes from Prior Clean Water Fund Appropriations (if applicable):
 - a. How would you characterize progress made to date? As much as is possible, include outcomes achieved as they relate to the program purpose.
 - b. How close is the program to reaching its long-term goals?

Alignment with Clean Water Council Strategic Plan

For each relevant goal or strategy in the Clean Water Council's Strategic Plan, list the applicable item and briefly explain (50-100 words) how this proposal helps fulfill that objective.

Additionally, please list any other statewide or federal plan this effort supports.

Interconnection

Please list other Clean Water Fund-supported programs it informs and/or is informed by. Please briefly describe for each (up to 50 words) how Clean Water Funds add to existing efforts.

Connected CWF-supported programs:

Connected non-CWF-supported programs:

Long-term funding vision

- If this proposal is funded, should the Clean Water Council expect future (beyond FY28-29) requests to increase, decrease, or stay about the same? (Do not factor inflation into your answer.)
 - ___ Increase
 - ___ Decrease
 - ___ Stay the same
- Do you have an anticipated end date for funding need? If so, when? _____
- Do you intend to continue this program past 2034 in some capacity? ___ Yes ___ No ___ Unsure

Non-CWF Funding

Will this program receive or request other funding from non-CWF sources, or eventually leverage non-CWF sources?

If so, please describe what funds are being leveraged, the anticipated amount, and your degree of certainty that the funding is secure. Feel free to add rows if needed.

Funding Source	Anticipated Amount	Degree of Security (%)
<i>Ex. Private landowner contributions</i>	<i>\$100,000</i>	<i>100%</i>

If additional description or elaboration is needed, please include here. (50 words max)

Funding Recipients

Please state as a percentage the amount of funding from this request that is anticipated to be pass-through to a non-state agency entity.

_____ %

Engagement and Community Value

- How have program beneficiaries been engaged in the development or evolution of this program? Who are the program partners, if any? (150 words)
- Please describe how this program advances environmental justice and promotes equity. (150 words)
- If this has been funded through Clean Water Funds in the past, please share 1-3 recent examples of outreach conducted by this program. Links or attachments are allowable.

CWF Communication Plan

For both new and returning applicants, please describe (under 100 words) or attach the plan for communicating with the public and pass-through recipients about the Clean Water Fund.

PRIOR APPROPRIATIONS	
FY10-11	
FY12-13	
FY14-15	
FY16-17	
FY18-19	
FY20-21	
FY22-23	
FY24-25	
FY26-27	
TOTAL APPROPRIATED TO DATE	

FY28 Request	FY29 Request	FY28-29 TOTAL REQUEST

[For agency applicants: don't fill out the FY28-29 until you receive agency approval. We will update the form at that time. Until then, please include "New", "Hold steady", "Increase", or "Decrease".]

State Employees

If applicable, indicate the number the full-time state employees supported by the CWF for this program.

FY10-11	
FY12-13	
FY14-15	
FY16-17	
FY18-19	
FY20-21	
FY22-23	
FY24-25	
FY26-27	

Draft Budget Process

FY28-29 Budget Cycle

- **Proposal submission phase (November 2025-January 2026)**
 - Post the proposal form, process, and rubric to the website late fall 2025.
 - All proposals submitted by the same time in mid-January.
 - Jen reviews proposals to ensure eligibility.
 - Links to eligible proposals posted online.
- **Review and scoring phase (January-June 2026):**
 - *Review and scoring of proposals will happen over a series of four full Council meetings. Council members will have access to ALL proposals from the very beginning should they want to look at them all together, but expectations are only that they need look at the ones relevant to the next meeting.*
 - A subset of the proposals shared with Council members four weeks in advance, with reminders to review them ahead of time.
 - Links to the proposals
 - Links to their personal rubric
 - Scores and questions submitted to Jen two weeks before Full Council meeting. Jen sends scores and questions to presenters, and includes a summary of questions by program in the meeting packet, sent one week in advance.
 - Council members able adjust their scores in real time in the meeting, asking additional questions as they go.
 - Scores and final questions/comments submitted by the EOD Wednesday the week of the presentations.
 - Jen sends copies of people's scores and questions/comments back to them
 - Jen consolidates the information to share with proposers
 - Questions and comments
 - Box and whisker plot for overall scores, as well as averages by rubric category
 - Proposers take until the following Friday (7 business days) to respond to questions in writing.
 - Scores, questions, and responses from proposers sent to the BOC the Tuesday preceding their meeting.
 - At the BOC meeting:
 - BOC asks additional questions of proposers as needed.

- BOC deliberates and sets preliminary suggestions for which of the applications to add, increase, hold steady, decrease, or drop.
 - At the next full council meeting:
 - Questions and answers sent to BOC included in the meeting packet, along with preliminary BOC suggestions.
 - BOC presents the preliminary suggestions for initial response by the full council.
- **Draft budget development phase (June-September 2026)**
 - Once ALL proposals have been reviewed, the final scores and initial funding suggestions come together for the initial full-budget deliberations. Full Council will give first reaction to complete package, hear public input, and provide guidance for the BOC's first comprehensive discussion.
 - Now that we've seen all of the presentations, are there considerations for what to adjust on funding suggestions?
 - Is there any other direction to the proposing organizations that we would like to make at this time?
 - BOC deliberates to determine the following for each proposed program:
 - Level of priority to the Council (High, Medium, Low)
 - Direction of funding (up, down, steady, new, drop)
 - *Any combination is possible. For instance, it is possible to have "High Priority, Decrease" as well as "Low Priority, Increase," etc.*
 - Full Council reviews draft suggestions to adjust or affirm
 - Proposers provide estimated numbers in response to draft budget suggestions
 - BOC sets draft budget using numbers from proposers
 - Full Council reviews
 - Additional back and forth as needed
 - Preliminary budget adopted by the Full Council
- **Final budget development phase (September-December 2026)**
 - Full Council provides input to BOC regarding priorities for funding more if more funding is available, and what to cut if less is available
 - BOC drafts scenarios
 - Full Council affirms
 - Following November budget forecast, BOC finalizes budget numbers
 - Full Council finalizes budget recommendations for the legislative report

November 2025

Proposal form and process posted to the Clean Water Council website

December 2025

Budget targets discussed

January 2026

1/16: All proposals submitted.

1/19: Jen reviews for eligibility and gets them posted to the website.

1/20: Eligible proposals posted to the website. Packet sent to Council members.

1/26: Full Council—Overview of proposals shared with the Clean Water Council. Schedule for presentations set. Instructions given to both Council members and proposing organizations for next steps.

1/29: Proposals for **first meeting** sent to Council members.

February 2026

2/9: Draft scores and comments submitted for **first presentation** meeting, Jen sends to proposers.

2:16: Packet for **first presentation** meeting sent out, including relevant proposals and summary of submitted questions

2/23: Full Council—**First presentation** meeting

2/25: Final scores and comments from **first presentation** meeting due.

2/26:

- Scores and comments for **first meeting** sent to proposers for response
- Proposals for **second meeting** sent

Budget Forecast released end of the month.

March 2026

3/9:

- Written responses from **first meeting** for BOC consideration are due
- Draft scores and comments for **second presentation set** are due from Council Members

3/10: BOC packet containing responses from **first round** of questions sent

3/13: BOC: **First deliberation** and suggestion, budget target based on February forecast discussed

3/17: Packet for second presentation meeting sent out, including:

- Questions and responses from **first meeting**, along with preliminary BOC suggestions
- Proposals for the **second presentation** meeting and summary of questions submitted

3/23: Full Council meeting

- Outcomes from BOC preliminary review shared for **first meeting** proposals
- **Second presentation** meeting, budget target discussed

3/25: Scores and questions for **second presentation** set due from Council members

3/26:

- Scores and comments for **second meeting** sent to proposers for response
- Proposals for **third meeting** sent

April 2026

4/6:

- Written responses from **second meeting** for BOC consideration are due
- Draft scores and comments for **third presentation** set are due from Council Members

4/7: BOC packet containing responses from **second round** of questions sent

4/10: BOC **Second deliberation** and suggestion

4/14: Packet for **third presentation** meeting sent out, including:

- Questions and responses from **second presentation** set, along with preliminary BOC suggestions
- Proposals for the **third presentation** meeting and summary of questions submitted

4/20: Full Council meeting

- Outcomes from BOC preliminary review shared for **second meeting** proposals
- **Third presentation** meeting

4/22: Scores and questions for **third presentation** set due from Council members

4/23:

- Scores and comments for **third meeting** sent to proposers for response
- Proposals for **fourth meeting** sent

May 2026

5/4:

- Written responses from **third presentation** for BOC consideration are due
- Draft scores and comments for **fourth presentation** set are due from Council Members

5/5: BOC packet containing responses from **third presentation** questions sent

5/8: BOC: **Third deliberation** and suggestion

5/12: Packet for **fourth presentation** meeting sent out, including:

- Questions and responses from **third presentation** set, along with preliminary BOC suggestions
- Proposals for the **Fourth presentation** meeting and summary of questions submitted

5/18: Full Council meeting:

- Outcomes from BOC preliminary review shared for **third presentation** set
- Proposals for the **fourth presentation** meeting and summary of questions submitted

5/20: Scores and questions for **fourth presentation** set due from Council members

5/21: Scores and comments for **fourth presentation** set send to proposers

June 2026

6/1: Written responses from **fourth presentation** proposers for BOC consideration are due

6/5: BOC: **Fourth deliberation** and suggestion

6/9: Packet sent for full Council meeting, including:

- Questions and responses from **fourth presentation** set, along with preliminary BOC suggestions
- Recap of all preliminary BOC suggestions, adjusted per Full Council feedback as applicable

6/15 Full Council:

- First third: Review BOC suggestions from **Fourth presentation** round and all in aggregate.
- Second third: public input.
- Final third: Deliberation and direction to BOC based on input.

July 2026

7/10 BOC: Provide draft funding direction suggestions for all proposals, including high priority, medium priority, and low priority.

7/20 Full Council: Review and advance draft funding direction suggestions for proposers for their response.

All proposers have 3 weeks to submit draft dollar amounts by the week prior to August BOC meeting.

August 2026

8/10: Memo from ICT and budget requests from other proposers due

8/11: BOC packet sent

8/14 BOC: Review draft dollar amounts submitted by proposers and develop first draft of preliminary budget recommendations.

8/18: Packet sent

8/24 Full Council: Review draft budget recommendations and provide direction to BOC.

September 2026

9/11 BOC: Amend recommendations per Full Council input.

9/15: Packet sent

9/21 Full Council: Preliminary recommendations set by the Council.

October 2026

10/2 BOC: First discussions on increases or decreases depending on the budget forecast

10/19 Full Council: Include discussion of adjustments based on the budget forecast. Direction to BOC.

November 2026

11/6 BOC: Final discussions on increases or decreases depending on the budget forecast.

11/16 Full Council: ratify plan for what to do based on the budget forecast.

Budget Forecast released end of the month.

December 2026

12/4 BOC: Review forecast, develop final proposal for recommendations based on established plan.

12/8: Packet sent

12/14 Full Council: Final recommendations made by the Council.

January 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16 Applications submitted	17
18	19 Jen reviews for eligibility	20 All applications posted to web, packet sent	21	22	23	24
25	26 Full Council: process overview, scheduled confirmation	27	28	29 Applications for first meeting sent	30	31

Notes

December '25

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

February '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

February 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9 Draft scores and comments for 1st meeting due, JK sends to appl.	10	11	12	13	14
15	16 Packet sent with relevant applications, summary of Qs	17	18	19	20	21
22	23 Full Council: 1st presentation meeting	24	25 Scores for 1st round of applications due	26 JK sends scores & Qs to applicants. JK sends 2nd mtg apps.	27	28

Notes

MMB Budget Forecast will be released end of the month.

January '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

March '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

March 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9 Appl response to Qs for BOC due. Draft scores & Qs for 2nd mtg due.	10 BOC packet sent	11	12	13 BOC deliberation of 1st round of applications	14
15	16	17 Packet for 2nd meeting sent, inc. 1st mtg Q&A and BOC suggestions	18	19	20	21
22	23 Full Council: review BOC prelims, 2nd round of presentations	24	25 Scores for 2nd round of applications due	26 JK sends scores & Qs to applicants. JK sends 3rd mtg apps.	27	28
29	30	31				

Notes

February '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

April '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

April 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			1	2	3	4
5	6 Appl response to Qs for BOC due. Draft scores & Qs for 3rd mtg due.	7 BOC packet sent	8	9	10 BOC deliberation of 2nd round of applications	11
12	13	14 Packet for 3rd meeting sent, inc. 2nd mtg Q&A and BOC suggestions	15	16	17	18
19	20 Full Council: review BOC prelims, 3rd round of presentations	21	22 Scores for 3rd round of applications due	23 JK sends scores & Qs to applicants. JK sends 4th mtg apps.	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

Notes

March '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

May '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1 2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

May 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
					1	2
3	4 Appl response to Qs for BOC due. Draft scores & Qs for 4th mtg due.	5 BOC packet sent	6	7	8 BOC deliberation of 3rd round of applications	9
10	11	12 Packet for 4th meeting sent, inc. 3rd mtg Q&A and BOC suggestions	13	14	15	16
17	18 Full Council: review BOC prelims, 4th round of presentations	19	20 Scores for 4th round of applications due	21 JK sends scores & Qs to applicants.	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

Notes

April '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

June '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

June 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	1 Appl response to Qs for BOC due.	2 BOC packet sent	3	4	5 BOC deliberation of 4th round of applications	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15 Full Council: Review prelim for 4th round, and all. Public input. Initial direction.	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

Notes

May '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

July '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

July 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10 BOC: Using ALL input, draft priority level and funding direction	11
12	13	14 Packet sent	15	16	17	18
19	20 Full Council: Deliberation and direction to applicants	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

Notes

June '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

August '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

August 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10 \$\$ amounts from applicants due	11	12	13	14 BOC: Draft first budget	15
16	17	18 Packet sent	19	20	21	22
23	24 Full Council: Review draft budget, provide feedback	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

Notes

July '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

September '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

September 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11 BOC: Amend per Full Council input	12
13	14	15 Packet sent	16	17	18	19
20	21 Full Council: Preliminary budget set, 1st scenarios convo	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

Notes

August '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

October '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1 2 3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

October 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
				1	2 BOC: Contingency planning for more or less \$\$	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19 Full Council: Discuss contingency scenarios, provide feedback	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Notes

September '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
			5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

November '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

November 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	2	3	4	5	6 BOC: Amend contingency scenarios	7
8	9	10 Packet sent	11	12	13	14
15	16 Full Council: Ratify contingency scenarios	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

Notes

MMB Budget Forecast will be released end of the month.

October '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

December '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

December 2026

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1	2	3	4 BOC: Review forecast, develop final proposal for budget	5
6	7	8 Packet sent	9	10	11	12
13	14 Full Council: Final recommendations	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

Notes

November '26

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

January '27

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1 2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						