

Clean Water Council
Budget and Outcomes Committee (BOC) Meeting Agenda
Friday March 5, 2021 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
BY WEBEX ONLY

2020 BOC Members: John Barten, Gary Burdorf, Holly Kovarik (BOC Vice Chair), Warren Formo, Bob Hoefert, Frank Jewell, Todd Renville (BOC Chair), Pat Shea

9:30 Regular Business

- Introductions
- Approve agenda & most recent minutes
- Chair and Staff update

9:45 Impact of February forecast on CWF for FY22-23

10:00 Update on House CWF Bill (HF639) Presented on March 4th

- How much of Council's recommendations were included?
- What additional spending was included?

10:15 Discussion on Possible Supplemental CWF Recommendations

- Status of FY20-21 CWF "Holdbacks"; Requests for Extension on Expiration Dates
- Agency Requests to Restore Funding Reductions for Selected Programs
- Soil and Water Conservation Districts
- Governor's Supplemental Budget Process

12:30 Adjourn

Future BOC Meeting Dates: See attached

Approved Meeting Dates for Clean Water Council for 2021

(It is unlikely that state agencies will allow an in-person meeting until after June 2021)

Full Council (3rd Monday with Exceptions for Holidays)	Budget & Outcomes Committee (1st Friday) with Exceptions for Holidays	Policy Committee (4th Fridays) with Exceptions for Holidays
9 am to 12:30 pm (if by WebEx) 9 am to 2 pm (if in person)	9:30 am to 12:30 pm (if WebEx) 9:30 am to 2 pm (if in person)	9:30 am to 12:30 pm (if WebEx) 9:30 am to 2 pm (if in person)
January 25 th (MLK Day Jan 18)	January 8 (New Year's is Jan 1)	January 22
February 22 nd (Prez Day Feb 15)	February 5	February 26
March 15	March 5	March 26
April 19	April 2	April 23
May 17	May 7	May 21
June 21	June 4	June 25
July 19	July 2 (change due to Monday being the 4 th ?)	July 23
August 16	August 6	August 27
September 20	September 3 (change for Labor Day being the 6 th ?)	September 24
October 18	October 1	October 22
November 15	November 5	November 19 (Thxgvg is Nov 26)
December 20	December 3	December 17 (Xmas Eve Dec 24)

Budget and Outcomes Committee Meeting Summary
Clean Water Council (Council)
January 8, 2020, 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Committee Members present: John Barten, Gary Burdorf, Warren Formo, Frank Jewell, Holly Kovarik, Todd Renville, and Pat Shea

Members absent: Bob Hoefert

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

Regular Business

- January 8 meeting agenda and the December 4 meeting summary, as one motion for approval by Frank Jewell, seconded by Pat Shea, unanimous motion approved by roll call.
- Chair and Staff Update
 - Regarding new appointments to the Council, the Governor's Office anticipates April.
 - The legislators in charge of the Legacy funds are the same. Minnesota Management and Budget (MMB) has sent a memo to state employees saying not to go to the State Capitol, but to attend virtually instead. It is a message of safety to all employees, so everyone knows what is expected.
 - Pam Blixt, the Council's Vice Chair has been doing well, and her last step in her treatment is a bone marrow transplant, for which her brother is a match. She has not reapplied for the Council, but would stay a member until April when someone else is appointed. Therefore, the Vice Chair position will be open and on the agenda for the next full Council meeting. Council members interested should contact either Paul Gardner, Clean Water Council Administrator, or Frank Jewell, Chair of the Council.
 - The Covid-19 pandemic can have impacts on the upcoming field tour. There are options to have it virtual. An area the Council may want to tour is the southwestern part of the state. There are many things happening with nitrogen reduction strategies and drinking water protection. September looks like a good month for the tour, if students are able to safely attend schools once again.
 - One suggestion is the Pope County area of Minnesota, including a [Rosholt Research Farm](#).
 - Another option could be around the Twin Cities Metro Area.

Impact of December 1 Budget Forecast on Clean Water Funds (CWFs) for FY22-23 (WebEx 00:19:00)

- This is to check in where the CWFs recommendations are at for FY22-23, and the additional funding that was revealed in the November forecast (another \$28 million available). There is no longer a need to provide further budget cut recommendations, but this does bring up the use of these additional funds for the Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs). Back in December, the BOC wanted to wait on any additional recommendations. The Governor may have a supplemental funding request, so the Council may wish to chime in.
 - The Council supports the work of the SWCDs. However, they do not want to see CWFs used for the SWCDs. There was an effort for alternative funding options, and hope for that effort to continue moving forward.
 - The two legislators who have the most power regarding the Legacy funds at the legislature, have done a good job of warding off other ideas for those additional funds.
 - A supplemental recommendation would help direct the remaining additional funds, but this could be conveyed in a different way. If there is a supplemental recommendation, there should be a review of all the items that did not make it into the final budget recommendations.
 - Regarding the communication strategy with the legislators, Paul Gardner has a dual role. He represents the Council, but is also a state agency member. His role has some autonomy to communicate with folks at the state capitol, but this may need to be highlighted more, to help make sure Paul is able to communicate.
 - The Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) has provided the list of SWCD alternative options developed by the Council to the Governor's Office and is waiting to hear back.

- *Comment from Jen Kader:* Rep. Fischer is working towards an option, that my help fund SWCDs as well. One option mentioned was groundwater appropriation fees to help support that funding, dedicated specifically to the SWCDs.
- *Comment from Paul Gardner:* If pressed by legislators, would the BOC be comfortable with reporting that the BOC vetted some of the programs? *Answer:* They did not rise to the level of funding for the budget considerations at the time, but the BOC has had robust discussions on this topic.

Refining the Small Grants Program Concept (*WebEx 01:07:00*)

- There was a robust discussion at the last meeting. Some of the options mentioned have been composed in a poll. This poll would help provide more information and focus on how the funding should be used for the small grants program concept. The poll information is submitted anonymously. Two areas that came forward from the last discussion was new and innovative areas which could provide a proof of concept in this kind of program, as well as items that work but for entities that could not receive Clean Water Funds (CWFs) on their own (i.e., groups or associations). This poll was open to Council members on the meeting, including state agency members, as well as anyone on the WebEx who wanted to participate.
- Small Grants Program poll questions, with results:
 1. What would be optimal use(s) of a small grants program? (Select all that apply)
 - a. Fund new and “outside the box” ideas that could accelerate progress on clean water but are in need of proof of concept. 7/23 (30%)
 - b. Fund proven approaches for entities that can’t usually access the Clean Water Fund. 9/23 (39%)
 - c. Other (enter idea for question 1 in chat window) (no answers provided) 0/23 (0%)
 - d. No answer 11/23 (48%)
 2. Who should be the eligible applicants? (Select all that apply)
 - a. Individuals 4/23 (17%)
 - b. Nonprofits and associations 11/23 (48%)
 - c. Local government 12/23 (52%)
 - d. State government 1/23 (4%)
 - e. Other (enter idea for question 2 in chat window) 0/23 (0%)
 - f. No answer 11/23 (48%)
 3. Should the small grants be limited in scope in the first year?
 - a. They should align with a limited set of strategies in the Strategic Plan 7/23 (30%)
 - b. The Council should solicit a broad set of proposals that fit the Strategic Plan to “see what we get.” 5/23 (22%)
 - c. Other (enter idea for question 3 in chat window) 0/23 (0%)
 - d. No answer 11/23 (48%)
 4. What should be the acceptable size for a grant? (Click all that apply. Current budget is \$250,000.)
 - a. \$50,000 7/23 (30%)
 - b. \$25,000 7/23 (30%)
 - c. \$10,000 7/23 (30%)
 - d. \$5,000 0/23 (0%)
 - e. \$1,000 0/23 (0%)
 - f. No answer 11/23 (48%)

Questions/Comments:

- *Comment from Jason Moeckel (DNR):* I think the dollar amounts available will make substantive new and outside the box ideas a challenge. Innovation often has more costs to begin a project.
- *Comment from Todd Renville:* This reinforces some of the ideas that were talked about at the last meeting. At the funding level, there would also be an in kind match proposed by the applicant as well.
 - *Response from Kevin Bigalke (BWSR):* That is a good point. Many of the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) grants are dependent upon the source (10% to 25% funding match, or in-kind match).
 - *Response from Jen Kader:* Speaking with environmental groups before this meeting, the 10% match or in-kind match, would be a good amount for this program. If it is too high it can eliminate some of those

groups from being able to apply. Another item to mention, would be a technical review committee process, or some kind of review of the applications.

- *Response from Paul:* The last meeting confirmed the desire for a technical review process, so there was no question posed for this item.
- *Kevin Bigalke (BWSR):* A few things to consider to help in these decisions. The size of the grants can be a determinate factor in terms of the approach. They could limit the scope (i.e., purpose or intent), with the geography or funding amount. The BWSR program “Lawns to Legumes” focused on habitat for the Rusty Bumble Bee, so that created a resource specific and geographical location focus. It used two approaches, one broader neighborhood scale approach (associations and local governments), as well as funding to Metro Blooms, which the scale was trimmed down to individuals creating pollinator habitat. There are options to focus on that could be put to use.
- *John Barten:* My thoughts have been that the CWF provides millions for watershed management activities, and rightly so. However, I have found it more difficult to get funds for in-lake activities, or in-stream work. I suggest that this could be the focus of the initial grant since the dollars are fairly small. That would limit the type and number of grant BWSR would receive.
- *Ali Elhassan (Metropolitan Council):* Could this program could be used to advance/experiment with equity in the water sector? They have a few programs as well to share, that could be helpful in designing some of the criteria, including the level of reporting. *Comment from Judy Sventek (Metropolitan Council):* In thinking about the minimum level, you need to think of the administrative costs. If there is too much needed for administration and reporting, that may limit who applies unless the dollar amount is high enough. They have not been able to use grants for anything smaller than \$25,000 because the administrative costs would then be too high.
- *Glenn Skuta (Minnesota Pollution Control Agency):* It's also possible that proposers may use this in combination with other funding/resources.
- *Jen Kader:* Partnering with a local government could help with those reporting requirements as well.
 - *Comment from Kevin Bigalke (BWSR):* For the “Lawns to Legumes” program, this was used to help in that area, but then there was a lot of learning happening. Often these association groups would have the reporting responsibility with a council member, who had to follow the requirements for this tracking and reporting for the grants. It has its own challenges, especially with transparency and accountability. Looking at specific partnering groups would be a better area, and there are opportunities there.
 - How is the grant awarded? Is it a legal contract? *Answer:* For BWSR grants, there are grant agreements where the local unit of government would submit a grant proposal. This would be reviewed by the BWSR board. Once selected, their board conservationist would work with the local government to put together a work plan. The grant agreement is a legally binding agreement, and lays out the funding amount, process, duration of agreement, and both parties sign it. There is a level of reimbursement that happens along the way. Sometimes having to support a project based on reimbursement, the groups would need to have the cash on hand ahead of time, submitting receipts for reimbursement.
- *Holly Kovarik:* Can the Council say how this is structured? If it is through reimbursement, some of these entities would not be able to have a cash flow for that kind of project. *Answer:* The BWSR has a grants manual, and all the different options and criteria of these grants. It would be good to make sure the criteria is defined, and the reporting aspects are included. The key is to figure out what is necessary to make the program successful. If the Council identifies the focus areas, that can help narrow down a draft of this process.
- *Paul Gardner:* The Council does not have to have a complete design for this program at this time, because the funding has not been appropriated yet. This process is more to answer to the legislature if they had any inquires, to help bring forward the ideas that have been presented for this item, to help make sure it remained on the recommendations. Discussing the topics may be something to talk about at this meeting. Suggesting innovation and access to funds would be the direction at this time.
 - *Comment from Jen Kader:* Selecting a specific criteria and/or a specific geographical location is something important to consider; to make an impact in one small area, which can make an impact for future work.
 - *Comment from Todd Renville:* I would also mention looking at protection as another option as well. The grant having a component of protection embedded in it. Not having a specific target in mind, this cannot be defined any more.

- *Comment from Jen Kader:* In addition, leaving this more open would provide an opportunity to see what proposals come in; possible innovation.
- How would you set up technical review? How would BWSR want to proceed with this? *Answer:* As an example, here is how the “Projects and Practices” grant program proceeds. They start with an announcement of the timeframe for people to submit proposals. They go through an internal review with their staff (a board) to make sure the applicants meet the eligibility criteria. Then, they have an interagency review, with representatives from the different state agencies, to see the scoring and ranking criteria (about 6 items) of these programs. The scores are tabulated to bring forward the highest projects and programs. It is a technical aspect to review these programs, looking at the science that is being used, and the connections to the goals they are working towards accomplishing. The staff expertise requested would be dependent on the type of project or program.
 - Are these all government folks, and is there a per diem? *Answer:* For the BWSR programs, they are all state agency employees that participate. There is no per diem. It is a contribution of the state agencies to make sure we have the highest review of the projects and programs.
 - What would be the Council’s role? Would they be able to participate? *Answer:* That would be up to the Council.
 - The environmental organizations would like to see either a Council staff member, or a voting Council member selected to serve as part of that review team. Not only to be a part of that conversation, but also to relay the information to the Council.
 - *Comment from Jeff Berg (Minnesota Department of Agriculture):* At a staff level, as a BWSR committee member who has participated in this process, but also from a SWCD employee perspective who has administered these programs, this review process is not as easy as it seems. There needs to be someone who is accountable to make sure CWFs are spent according to the law. It is not easy because you need both technical and financial expertise.
- Paul Gardner will put a memorandum together to bring forward at the next full Council meeting.

New Business (*WebEx 02:01:00*)

- One Council member on this subcommittee will not be reapplying for membership, so there will be at least one opening to fill in the future. There will be at least three openings on the Policy Committee as well.
- Next BOC meeting in February will be canceled. The March BOC meeting will review the Strategic Plan.

Adjournment (*WebEx 02:04:09*)

\$ in Thousands

Clean Water Fund

Reductions Needed	\$17,606
-------------------	----------

Reductions Proposed by the Clean Water Interagency Coordination Team

Agency	Appropriation	Fiscal Year of Appropriation	Reduction
Public Facilities Authority	Point Source Implementation Grants	FY21	\$ 1,224
Public Facilities Authority	Small Community Wastewater Treatment	FY21	\$ 17
Agriculture	Nitrate in Groundwater	FY19	\$ 198
Agriculture	Clean Water Research	FY17	\$ 82
Agriculture	Clean Water Research	FY19	\$ 206
Agriculture	Technical Assistance	FY16	\$ 19
Agriculture	Technical Assistance	FY19	\$ 25
Agriculture	Technical Assistance	FY20	\$ 256
Agriculture	Research Database	FY20	\$ 43
Agriculture	Forever Green	FY21	\$ 290
Agriculture	Vegetative Cover and Soil Health	FY19	\$ 58
Agriculture	Private Well Pesticide Testing	FY19	\$ 30
Agriculture	Private Well Pesticide Testing	FY21	\$ 270
Water and Soil Resources Board	Watershed-based Implementation Funding	FY21	\$ 2,831
Water and Soil Resources Board	Projects and Practices	FY21	\$ 3,360
Water and Soil Resources Board	One Watershed One Plan	FY21	\$ 280
Water and Soil Resources Board	Conservation Drainage Management	FY21	\$ 178
Water and Soil Resources Board	Shoreland Buffer Compliance	FY21	\$ 350
Water and Soil Resources Board	Riparian Buffers	FY21	\$ 665
Water and Soil Resources Board	Targeted Wellhead Protection	FY21	\$ 280
Water and Soil Resources Board	Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program	FY21	\$ 1,207
Water and Soil Resources Board	Critical Shoreline Protection	FY21	\$ 210
Water and Soil Resources Board	Tillage and Erosion Transects	FY21	\$ 59
Pollution Control	Chloride Reduction Efforts	FY20	\$ 226
Pollution Control	Drinking Water Protection	FY19	\$ 36
Pollution Control	Drinking Water Protection	FY21	\$ 211
Pollution Control	Subsurface Sewage Treatment System Programs	FY19	\$ 28

Pollution Control	Subsurface Sewage Treatment System Programs	FY19	\$ 24
Pollution Control	Subsurface Sewage Treatment System Programs	FY21	\$ 287
Pollution Control	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems	FY19	\$ 10
Pollution Control	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems	FY21	\$ 97
Pollution Control	St. Louis Harbor Restoration	FY19	\$ 12
Pollution Control	St. Louis Harbor Restoration	FY20	\$ 93
Pollution Control	Total Maximum Daily Load Development	FY19	\$ 15
Pollution Control	Total Maximum Daily Load Development	FY21	\$ 1,060
Pollution Control	Voyagers National Park	FY20	\$ 70
Pollution Control	Water Quality Assessment	FY19	\$ 39
Pollution Control	Water Quality Assessment	FY21	\$ 949
Health	Contaminants of Concern	FY21	\$ 800
Health	Source Water Protection	FY19	\$ 74
Health	Virus Study	FY19	\$ 4
Health	Drinking Water and Lead Study	FY19	\$ 4
Health	Contaminants of Concern	FY19	\$ 2
Metropolitan Council	Metropolitan Area Water Supply Sustainability Support	FY21	\$ 87
Metropolitan Council	Water Demand Reduction Efficiency Grants	FY21	\$ 100
Natural Resources	Aquifer Monitoring for Water Supply Planning	FY21	\$ 378
Natural Resources	Buffer Map Maintenance	FY20	\$ 56
Natural Resources	Buffer Map Maintenance	FY21	\$ 75
Natural Resources	Lake Index of Biological Integrity Assessments	FY21	\$ 150
Natural Resources	Stream Flow Monitoring	FY21	\$ 100
Natural Resources	Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies	FY19	\$ 47
Natural Resources	Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies	FY21	\$ 150
Natural Resources	Applied Research and Tools	FY21	\$ 74
Natural Resources	County Geologic Atlases	FY21	\$ 75
Natural Resources	Fish Contamination Assessment	FY20	\$ 135
Natural Resources	County Geologic Atlases	FY20	\$ 27
Total Clean Water Fund Reductions			17,633
Reductions as a Percentage of FY21 Budget			14%

Parks and Trails Fund

Reductions Needed	\$6,558
-------------------	---------

Reductions Proposed by DNR, the Met Council, and the Greater Minnesota Parks and Trails Commission

Agency	Appropriation	Fiscal Year of Appropriation	Reduction
Natural Resources	Parks and Trails Programs and Grants	FY18, FY19, FY20, FY21	\$ 2,623
Metropolitan Council	Parks and Trails Grants	FY21	\$ 2,623
Greater MN Parks and Trails	Parks and Trails Grants	FY21	\$ 1,312
Total Parks and Trails Fund Reductions			6,558
Reductions as a Percentage of FY21 Budget			13%

Arts and Cultural Heritage Fund

Reductions Needed	\$9,985
-------------------	---------

Reductions Proposed by MMB

Agency	Appropriation	Fiscal Year of Appropriation	Reduction
Arts Board	Arts and Arts Access Initiatives	FY21	\$ 3,729
Arts Board	Arts Education Collaborations	FY21	\$ 694
Arts Board	Arts and Cultural Heritage	FY21	\$ 224
Historical Society	Statewide Historic and Cultural Grants	FY21	\$ 982
Historical Society	Statewide History Programs	FY21	\$ 982
Historical Society	History Partnerships	FY21	\$ 350
Historical Society	Statewide Survey of Historical and Arch Sites	FY21	\$ 70
Historical Society	Minnesota Digital Library	FY21	\$ 53
Education	Regional Public Libraries Grants	FY21	\$ 357
Education	Water Safety Grant Program	FY21	\$ 7
Administration	Minnesota Public Radio	FY21	\$ 249
Administration	Association of MN Public Education Radio	FY21	\$ 238
Administration	Minnesota Public TV	FY21	\$ 564
Administration	Wilderness Inquiry	FY21	\$ 53

Addressing Deficits in the Legacy Funds

Administration	Como Park Zoo	FY21	\$	189
Administration	Science Museum of MN	FY21	\$	91
Administration	Midwest Outdoors Unlimited	FY21	\$	4
Administration	Lake Superior Center and Great Lakes Aquarium	FY21	\$	11
Administration	Lake Superior Zoo	FY21	\$	11
MN Zoo	Programmatic Development	FY21	\$	245
Humanities Center	Program Development	FY21	\$	154
Humanities Center	MN Children's Museum	FY21	\$	74
Humanities Center	Rochester STEM	FY21	\$	7
Humanities Center	Children's Museum Start-Up and Expansion Grants	FY21	\$	88
Humanities Center	Community Identity and Heritage Grants	FY21	\$	119
Humanities Center	Civic Education Competitive Grants	FY21	\$	14
Indian Affairs Council	Language Preservation and Education Grants	FY21	\$	93
Indian Affairs Council	Dakota and Ojibwe Language Imersion Educational Institutions	FY21	\$	62
Indian Affairs Council	Dakota and Ojibwe Imersion Education Efforts	FY21	\$	93
Indian Affairs Council	Dakota and Ojibwe Indian Working Group	FY21	\$	7
Indian Affairs Council	Graves Protection	FY21	\$	10
Agriculture	County Fair Grants	FY21	\$	56
University of MN	Bell Museum of Natural History	FY21	\$	7
Total Arts and Cultural Heritage Fund Reductions			\$	9,885 *
Reductions as a Percentage of FY21 Budget				14%

* Reduction totals do not add due to rounding

Agency	Program Name	Purpose	Trimmed by Council	Governor's Budget as of 1/26/2021	Final CWC Recs 11/16/2020	BOC recommendation 9/21/2020:	FY22-23 ICT Request	FY20-21 CWC Recs	FY20-21 Appropriated
MDA	Forever Green Agricultural Initiative (U of MN)	Competitive R&D grants for crops providing continuous living cover.	128,000	3,872,000	3,872,000	\$ 3,872,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 4,300,000
UMN	Stormwater Research and Technology Transfer Program	Competitive grants to research & evaluate stormwater BMPs.	150,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000
UMN	County Geologic Atlas Part A	Develops Part A county-level geologic atlases.	100,000	900,000	900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000
UMN	Chronic Wasting Disease and Water	Would research waterborne transmission of CWD.	1,126,000		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
MPCA	River and Lake Monitoring and Assessment	Intensive monitoring in ~8 watersheds/yr & annual pollutant monitoring @ 197 sites annually	268,000	14,432,000	14,432,000	\$ 14,432,000	\$ 14,700,000	\$ 16,000,000	\$ 16,300,000
MPCA	Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (includes TMDL development)	Develops data-driven strategies to meet water quality goals in each of 80 watersheds. ~8-10/yr. Required by law.	642,000	13,208,000	13,208,000	\$ 13,208,000	\$ 13,850,000	\$ 16,100,000	\$ 15,100,000
MDA	Pesticide Testing in Private Wells	Free pesticide testing for 90,000 wells in 300 priority townships.	192,000	678,000	678,000	\$ 678,000	\$ 870,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000
MDH	Source Water Protection	Completes DWSMAs, public water supplier grants; planning; surveillance	202,000	6,158,000	6,158,000	\$ 6,158,000	\$ 6,360,000	\$ 5,494,000	\$ 5,494,000
MPCA	National Park Water Quality Protection Program	Replaces failing septic systems polluting Voyageurs National Park.	150,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,550,000	\$ 1,550,000
MPCA	Enhanced County inspections/SSTS corrective actions	County grants for more SSTS inspections & income-based assistance.	176,000	5,324,000	5,324,000	\$ 5,324,000	\$ 5,500,000	\$ 7,876,000	\$ 6,750,000
PFA	Point Source Implementation Grant (PSIG) Program	Municipal water treatment facility upgrades to comply with TMDLs.	596,000	16,136,000	15,935,000	\$ 16,198,000	\$ 16,732,000	\$ 18,000,000	\$ 18,000,000
PFA	Small Community Wastewater Treatment Program	Grants & loans to replace failing SSTS with community SSTS.	200,000		200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
MDA	Nitrate in Groundwater	Support new N rule: 700-900 well tests/yr; 2 UMN extension staff for BMP education & adoption; local advisory teams; 7 BMP demo sites.	164,000	5,006,000	5,006,000	\$ 5,006,000	\$ 5,170,000	\$ 5,170,000	\$ 5,170,000
MDA	Technical Assistance	25 edge-of-field WQ monitoring sites; 100 farm demonstration plots/yr; 150 events for 3,000 partners	96,000	2,904,000	2,904,000	\$ 2,904,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 3,000,000
BWSR	Watershed Management Transition (One Watershed, One Plan)	Complete ~7 comprehensive watershed management plans/year. Have all plans started by 2025.	192,000	5,808,000	5,808,000	\$ 5,808,000	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 4,540,000	\$ 4,000,000
BWSR	Critical Shoreland Protection-Permanent Conservation Easements	Protect threatened shoreline with easements to protect good WQ.	82,000	2,468,000	2,468,000	\$ 2,468,000	\$ 2,550,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,000,000
BWSR	Working Lands Floodplain Easements [formerly Riparian Buffer-Permanent Conservation Easements]	Purchase & restore permanent easements on riparian buffers.	128,000	3,872,000	3,872,000	\$ 3,872,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 9,750,000	\$ 9,500,000
BWSR	Wetland Restoration Easement	Permanent easements for de-nitrification, rate & volume control.	160,000	4,840,000	4,840,000	\$ 4,840,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ -
BWSR	Buffer Law Implementation	Oversight & grants to SWCDs for implementation of the buffer law.	128,000	3,872,000	3,872,000	\$ 3,872,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000
BWSR	Accelerated Implementation	LGU grants; technical assistance; analytical tools to speed up projects.	318,000	9,682,000	9,682,000	\$ 9,682,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 12,100,000	\$ 8,000,000
BWSR	Surface and Drinking Water Protection/Restoration Grants: (Projects and Practices)	Competitive grants for high priority conservation & urban BMPs in local mgmt plans; 20% to DW.	734,000	22,266,000	22,266,000	\$ 22,266,000	\$ 23,000,000	\$ 32,601,000	\$ 32,000,000
BWSR	Grants to Watersheds with Approved Comprehensive Watershed Plans (Watershed-based Implementation Funding)	Non-competitive grants to fulfill projects in approved 1W1Ps.	1,436,000	43,564,000	43,564,000	\$ 43,564,000	\$ 45,000,000	\$ 29,422,000	\$ 26,966,000

BWSR	Drinking Water Protection Program	Subsidy to de-risk use of continuous living cover crops in DWSMAs. Proposed by Friends of the Mississippi River.	4,000,000		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
BWSR	Enhancing Soil Health and Landowner Adoption of Cover Crops for Drinking Water & Groundwater Protection	Supports Ofc of Soil Health, grants to SWCDs for cover crop & conservation tillage demo projects. Supports Governor's climate initiative.	134,000	4,066,000	4,066,000	\$ 4,066,000	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 500,000	\$ -	
BWSR	Measures, Results and Accountability	Grants management, reporting, and oversight.	90,000	2,710,000	2,710,000	\$ 2,710,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	
TOTAL			\$ 11,591,000		\$220,247,000	\$219,984,000	\$ 226,312,000	\$ 262,703,000	\$ 261,261,000	
SWCD request			\$ 24,000,000							