

Clean Water Council
Budget and Outcomes Committee (BOC) Meeting Agenda
Friday February 4, 2022 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
BY WEBEX ONLY

2020 BOC Members: Steve Besser (BOC Vice-Chair), Dick Brainerd, Gary Burdorf, Jen Kader, Holly Kovarik (BOC Chair), Warren Formo, Todd Renville

9:30 Regular Business

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

9:45 Specifics on New Federal Money for Drinking Water and Concerns on Private Well Protection Funding

- Tannie Eshenaur, Minnesota Department of Health

10:15 Review of 2022 Clean Water Fund Proposal Format

- Paul Gardner, Clean Water Council

10:30 New Topics Brought Up in Strategic Plan Survey and by Policy Committee

- Paul Gardner, Clean Water Council

10:45 BREAK

11:00 Drainage BMPs: What Would Help Landowners Go Beyond M.S. 103E Requirements?

- Committee

Next BOC Meeting Date: Friday, March 4th

Budget and Outcomes Committee Meeting Summary

Clean Water Council (Council)

January 7, 2022, 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members present: Steve Besser (Committee Vice Chair), Dick Brainerd, Gary Burdorf, Warren Formo, Jen Kader, Holly Kovarik (Committee Chair), and Todd Renville.

Members absent: Pat Shea.

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

- Introductions
 - Tannie Eshenaur, Minnesota Department of Health (MDH): The [Lead and Copper Rule Revision](#) has gone into effect, with the deadline for 2024. At this time, they have the inventory of the lead service lines, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has ramped up on the requirements. The new [Infrastructure Investments and Jobs Bill](#) will help in this area. Additionally, Frieda von Qualen is back with private wells and expanded policy roles. She previously had been reassigned to work on Covid-19.
- January 7 meeting agenda and the December 3 meeting summary, as one motion for approval by Dick Brainerd, seconded by Gary Burdorf, motion approved by roll call.
- Chair and staff update:
 - Council member Kevin Bigalke with the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) has moved to an outside position, and Marcy Westrick as well as Annie Felix-Gerth at BWSR will fill in.
 - Holly Kovarik: Along with Glenn Skuta and Kevin Bigalke, they presented at the Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (MASWCD) regarding the last budget cycle process of the Council, as well as the process for the upcoming budget cycle. Glenn Skuta included the inception of the Clean Water Funds (CWFs), the history of the funding, and looking at the top line items on the budget spreadsheet. Additionally, Kevin Bigalke talked about some of the programs that BWSR does and the shift from competitive to non-competitive funding. There were also time for questions and answers.

LiDAR Report to Legislature, by Paul Gardner, Clean Water Council (WebEx 00:15:00)

The Council is to give an assessment to the Legislature of how the state has used Light Detecting and Ranging (LiDAR) data, specifically from two appropriations of the CWFs in 2009 and 2011. The programs that use LiDAR are keen to make sure the Legislature knows how useful it has been in their line of work

- LiDAR technology creates a 3D representation of the surveyed environment. It really helps provide accurate elevations that reveal where water will flow and how fast it will flow.
- For this report, some highlights include:
 - The digital elevation data has saved countless hours of labor for water managers, enabling the targeted use of financial resources. This has allowed for more projects than they otherwise could have done.
 - Without this LiDAR appropriation, projects to achieve water quality goals would have been less effective or more costly during the last decade, or may not have happened at all.
 - LiDAR has also helped with Buffer Law compliance efforts.
- The areas covered in 2009 and 2011 was about 40,000 square miles in the Minnesota River Basin, Twin Cities metro area, Lake Superior basin, and the Mississippi River basin. The Red River Valley, southeastern Minnesota, and selected counties had their own data set.
- State agencies have created a lot of derived products from LiDAR.
 - Mapping digital dams and culverts with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR).
 - The stream power index (SPI) that shows where erosion is more likely to occur due to higher slopes and flow accumulation, and reveals where the water needs to be slowed down.
 - The daily erosion project (DEP) and the tillage and erosion project.
 - The buffer compliance and tracking (BuffCAT) tool for compliance with Minnesota's Riparian Protection Law and Buffer Law.
 - Identification for future water storage.

- Stormwater management, surface water modeling, and flood modeling.
- County geologic atlases.
- The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) monitoring and assessment data, watershed program (i.e., modeling, Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) reports, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) development, SID, 3D imaging and rendering, etc.).
- The resolution of LiDAR is continuing to improve, but also the landscape of Minnesota is changing over time, so this really helps to update and retain the statewide data of this valuable information.

Questions/Comments:

- Dick Brainerd: What does this lead to? How is this data used? *Answer:* LiDAR helps to know where to place things, for the lowest cost.
 - *Comment from Holly Kovarik:* There are many different groups using LiDAR: NRCS partners, private industry, as well as the state agencies. It is good baseline information that is helping with natural resources on the land, and more efficient for staff time (instead of sending people out for surveys).
- Gary Burdorf: Erosion keeps getting worse. The LiDAR can really help knowing where to place water storage to avoid it.
- Dick Brainerd: Is this data sold, or available to anyone available? *Answer:* Yes, anyone can download the raw data off of the Minnesota Geospatial Information Office (MnGEO) website. There are proprietary applications as well. Dick Brainerd: Did we help create this with the appropriation? If there is upgrading, will this require more funds? *Answer:* I am not aware of this happening.
 - *Jason Moeckel, DNR:* The capacity needed to serve the new data will be substantially more, so there may be some higher costs. However, the number of derived products to use this data is growing, that may come up in budget requests
- Motion to approve the report by Dick Brainerd, seconded by Gary Burdorf, and motion approved unanimously.

Lakewide Action and Management Plan (LAMP) of Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) (Potential Proposal Item for 2022), by Theresa Haugen, Manager, North Section, Watershed Division, MPCA (*WebEx 00:48:00*)

Two years ago there was an opportunity to leverage federal funds with the CWFs for the GLRI, but it was delayed due to the pandemic. Now, with this budget cycle, this is being brought forward and will be proposed for CWFs.

- The Council has a guiding value to leverage other sources of funding for protection and restoration projects, including federal funds... This would use some CWFs to leverage a lot of GLRI funds.
- The GLRI is a growing non-regulatory federal program since 2010. The amount of funds available are increasing each year (providing \$475 million by 2026), and the Federal Infrastructure Bill will only add to it (\$1 billion over the next five years). There are 5-year Action Plans in place to direct priorities.
- In relation to LAMP, these will fund projects led by the St. Louis River Area of Concern (AOC) and LAMP coordinators. This is the primary funding source for the lake management actions. The LAMP is a binational action plan for restoring and protecting Lake Superior's ecosystem. The LAMP coordinators are with the MPCA and DNR. They have five focus areas within the Great Lakes Action Plan to implement LAMP objectives: toxic substances, invasive species, nonpoint source pollution impacts on nearshore health, and foundations for future restorations actions. The 2020-2024 LAMP is under final review, and will be published in early 2022. This includes the SWCDs priorities to support eligibility for GLRI funds.
- Since 2010, there have been about 28 GLRI funded projects in 5 watersheds (totaling \$9.05 million). These ranged \$30,000 to \$1.22 million, and 21 percent had no match. The projects with match ranged from state and local to federal (1:4.5 – 3.5:1).
- Currently, there is a Green Infrastructure stormwater project in the works (2022 -2023). This is in Agate Bay, Two Harbors and also Woodland Avenue, Duluth.
- Recently completed in 2021 are some aquatic passages at Two Island River, Baptism River, and Little Net River. These are for protection, looking at climate resiliency.
- The GLRI has had many opportunities for funding successes for the five area SWCDs, and could apply for more projects. However, capacity is a big issue in some way (i.e., no match available, reimbursement funding costs issue, staff capacity to manage the work, etc.). Therefore, this proposal to the Council for CWFs should help in this area. There could be more funding applications going in for funding, helping to put more implementation on the ground.

- Lake County SWCD (Tara Solem):
 - It is a very unique, highly regarded, and pristine landscape. There is a need for protection and restoration. They have a collaboration between landowners, residents, stakeholders, and agencies.
 - Cost effective projects utilize SWCD staff time, technical service area (TSA) engineering staff, as well as conservation corps crew (CCMI) labor. The funding opportunities are exciting, but yet overwhelming due to the capacity and match.
 - They have six staff and on contractor, as well as a board of elected supervisors. Their core functions include: aquatic invasive species, forestry, water planning (1W1P and WRAPS), native plants and terrestrial invasive species, education and outreach, projects (design, management, and implementation), as well as many other duties dependent on collaboration and/or grant opportunities.
 - The SWCD work is important and complex. There is discrepancy between baseline funding and needs, and a great need for long term funding to keep positions (because their capacity comes from different funding areas), which impacts their capacity. Additionally, there are grant hurdles they deal with, such as a 25% to 100% match requirements, available state funding is competitive and limited, and any grant writing uses staff hours and does not guarantee funding. The SWCDs work with support from the board to work beyond landowner parcels. They have big projects, which mean large contractor payments. They often need community buy-in, and need to get them excited about the long-term investments.
 - For the SWCDs to do their core functioning and be effective, they need: increased baseline funding, to be a competitive employer (acquire and retain positions long term with solid funding), have SWCD work support (appreciation and collaboration goes both ways), grant hurdles (increase funds available for match, increase funding for staff time so they can write grants as well as project manage and implement).
- Carleton County SWCD (Brad Matlack):
 - In the last ten years, they have over \$1.2 million in projects in the Lake Superior Basin of Carleton County. This was implemented by one staff at about .40 full-time employee. They always leave some funding opportunities on the table, mostly due to staff capacity issues. They have about \$5 million in future identified projects.
 - They would like to see additional SWCD staff capacity to apply for, manage, and report on projects. They would like to be able to match with federal funding for projects. They also would like cash flow for reimbursements on the federal contracts. They find that flexibility is key to efficient and effective leveraging.
- Draft proposal:
 - There are 5 SWCDs with the Lake Superior Basin (about \$34 million of watershed work to develop and prioritize projects based on the 1W1P and WRAPS). About \$1.5 million would be dedicated match for each biennium, with \$150,000 per SWCD per year. This would support SWCDs efforts to take advantage of increased GLRI funds. The use of funds would be at the discretion of the SWCDs based on their needs.
 - This would help to demonstrate local cost-share preparedness to grant review committees to give the SWCDs a competitive edge (they are ready to commit to the project). It would provide critical flexibility to allow SWCDs to be nimble, and apply for funds when opportunities arise. It would also allow the leveraging of federal funds to implement plants for projects that would otherwise be funded by CWFs.
 - They are modeling this proposal from the highly successful St. Louis AOC, which was a result of the GLRI and CWFs. It includes 80 management actions (34 action complete, 42 actions in progress, and 4 action no longer necessary). It is a good success story.
 - State agencies would have a role in this proposal. The BWSR has the existing structure in place to convey funds to SWCDs, they do this work all ready. The DNR/MPCA LAMP coordinators will help facilitate communication with EPA and provide guidance on funding proposals.
 - This has been in the works for some time. A draft proposal was presented to the BOC back in January of 2020, but it was postponed due to uncertain budget impacts of Covid-19. Since then, they have discussed the proposal with EPA leadership receiving a positive response, they have had meetings with the Lake Superior Basin SWCDs to finalize a CWFs request, and they will be staying in contact with the Council for this FY24-25 budget cycle.

- This is a voluntary report, which helps Minnesotans clarify connections between Clean Water Funds invested, actions taken and outcomes achieved. Measures in the report provide a snapshot of how Clean Water Fund dollars are being spent and what progress has been made. It is in draft form at this time, and they would appreciate any feedback.
- This is the sixth edition of the Clean Water Fund Performance Report. There are six state agencies (MPCA, DNR, Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA), MDH, BWSR, and the Board of Public Water Facilities) and the Metropolitan Council.
- These CWFs investments are an important part of water resource management in Minnesota, but they also rely on the dedication and partnership of the citizens, communities, and businesses to implement strategies which improve water quality.
- They are looking at 29 different measures, and each measure is given an action and outcome status, as well as a trend (improving, no change, declining). There is a brief report card included. Otherwise, there are three to four pages to go over the different measures in more details.
- Work initiated in 2019 was done to align the Performance Report measures with the Clean Water Council's Goals, Measures, and Objectives. They added tracking for pass through funds.
- The Covid-19 pandemic made it necessary to adjust programming, implementation, and outreach strategies. Many state employees were assigned new job responsibilities to support Minnesota's public health response to the Covid-19 pandemic, which took priority over regular projects and activities. In-person learning and networking opportunities moved from conference rooms to webinars. However, the CWFs supported the "We Are Water MN" traveling exhibit, and created both virtual and outdoor versions. It also offered online interactive speakers series and other events. This engaged over 6,500 visitors. These creative adaptations show that CWFs activities remained strong despite an unexpected transition to a largely digital world.
- Highlights:
 - Regarding partnership and collaboration, there were 3,631 grants awarded to protect and restore Minnesota's water resource, as well as 2,087 loans to prevent nonpoint source water pollution or solve an existing water quality problem.
 - Regarding protection, 778 easements were secured, which will permanently protect about 22,507 acres along riparian corridors within wellhead protection areas. Of those, 17,034 acres were protected using CWFs. Additionally, these funds have delineated drinking water supply management areas for all 525 vulnerable municipal water systems, to protect their drinking water sources.
 - They delisted 66 lake and streams from the Minnesota impaired waters list. They upgraded 48 municipal wastewater treatment facilities (reducing 145,000 pounds of phosphorus discharges a year). They also repaired 788 imminent health threats to subsurface sewage treatment systems.

Questions/Comments:

- Dick Brainerd: This report helps to get the information out there on the CWFs, and what they were used for during this time. It helps to know how Minnesota is doing, and with this moving target, it is very useful to have this information. In the end, a summary is needed to help know the impacts of the CWFs. *Response:* Yes, this is a good communication tool and also a tool to view in time the different actions and leveraged funds happening along with the CWFs. These can be teased apart in a way.
- Jen Kader: In thinking about how the Council can use this information, it can be shared with those groups the Council represents, but also talking about this report in general would be good. This can be a public facing document. Looking forward towards 2034, this helps communicate the work, and brings Minnesotans in to what is going on with the CWFs. There are other opportunities and ideas that can be put into place around this report as well.
- Paul Gardner: It would be interesting to have a strategic conversation with the Council on what measures for success are identified within the 2022 Performance Report. As the Council moves forward with their Strategic Plan, as well as conversations with the public and Legislature, it would be good to bring forward what is important, especially considering the many different groups the Council represents.
 - This review would take place at a full Council meeting.

Next BOC Meeting Date: Friday, February 4th

- Provide strategic direction and priorities to state agencies and the University of Minnesota

Adjournment (*WebEx 02:36:22*)

Tillage, Cover Crop and Erosion Evaluation

Program Contact Name: **Matt Drewitz**Phone **507-344-2821**

Contact E-mail Address:

matt.drewitz@state.mn.usPerson filling out form: **Marcey Westrick**Phone **651-284-4153**

Person filling out form e-mail address:

marcey.westrick@state.mn.us

Rationale/Background: Please describe how this program will protect, enhance, and restore water quality in lakes, rivers, and streams and to protect groundwater from degradation, or protect drinking water sources.

Program to systematically collect data and produce statically valid estimates of the rate of soil erosion state-wide and tracking the adoption of high residue cropping systems in the 67 counties with greater than 30% of land in agricultural row crop production

Applied use of this data are: 1)MPCA for creating residue mas for WRPAS and to inform HSPF modeling, 2) maps for One Watershed, One Plan development, 3) data on crop residue and cover crop for MN Nutrient Reduction Strategy, and 4) Daily Erosion Project which has potential for developing climate change scenarios.

Statutory citation that guides program activities, if applicable:

Funding Request

FY10-11	FY12-13	FY14-15	FY16-17	FY18-19	FY20-21	TOTAL FY10-21	FY22	FY23	FY22-23
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$850,000	\$850,000	\$2,700,000			\$723,000

Describe the likely measureable outcomes of this proposal. (If this program has been funded previously by the Clean Water Fund, please describe the measurable outcomes, outputs, or results achieved to date and how close the program is to a goal, when applicable.)

Track tillage trends, cover crop adoption, and land cover in the 67 county area with greater than 30% of land dedicated to row crop production, with future expansion to forested zone

Long-term funding vision: If this proposal is funded, should the Clean Water Council expect future requests to increase, decrease, stay about the same, or not be needed? (Do not factor inflation into your answer.)

Stay about the same

Other Funds: Will this program receive or request other funding from non-CWF sources, or eventually leverage non-CWF sources? If so, please describe. If not, leave blank.

Supplement vs. supplant: Minnesota Statutes 114D.50 Subd. 3 requires that “any state agency or organization requesting a direct appropriation from the clean water fund must inform the Clean Water Council and the house of representatives and senate committees having jurisdiction over the clean water fund, at the time the request for funding is made, whether the request is supplanting or is a substitution for any previous funding that was not from a legacy fund and was used for the same purpose.” **Indicate if this proposal will supplement or supplant previous funding.**

Supplement

Pass-Through: Will part or all of this funding from the CWF be passed through to non-state entities such as SWCDs, universities or other local units of government? If yes, please be specific about how much will go to non-state entities and what type.

Yes

If this funding will be disbursed through competitive grants, loans, or contracts, or if recipients are not yet known, please list what entities have received this funding in previous fiscal years and how much. Feel free to e-mail separate documents to the Clean Water Council at paul.gardner@state.mn.us

83%

State FTEs: Indicate the number the full-time state employees supported by the CWF in this proposal

FY10-11	FY12-13	FY14-15	FY16-17	FY18-19	FY20-21	FY22-23
0.5	00.00	00.00	00.50	00.50	00.50	

Legacy Amendment Attribution: Minnesota Statutes 114D.50 Subd. 4(f) requires that “when practicable, a direct recipient of an appropriation from the clean water fund shall prominently display on the recipient's website home page the legacy logo...accompanied by the phrase "Click here for more information." In addition, the Clean Water Council has issued guidance on the use of the logo and attribution for any appropriation to the legacy amendment and the Legislature. **Will you ensure that the legacy logo is displayed and attribution given to the legacy amendment in publicly available materials, when practicable?** Yes



MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

Clean Water Council Strategic Plan Review 2022

As the Council prepares to hear proposals for the Clean Water Fund, it's a good time to review the Council's Strategic Plan to see if you would like to make any changes or additions. Please take a few minutes to review these strategies below and respond with your reaction.

Goal 1: Drinking water is safe for everyone, everywhere in Minnesota

Q1 Strategies to Achieve Goal 1: Please indicate which category each of the strategies listed below falls.

	Strategy is still a priority and is Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Timebound (SMART)	Strategy is still a priority but needs some work to be SMART	Strategy has been completed, is no longer needed, or is no longer a priority	I'm not sure
Support widespread and routine testing of private well water and help private well owners achieve safe limits at the tap, beginning with a pilot project in FY2020-2021.	6 (42.9%)	7 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.1%)
Prioritize implementation funding that supports the Ground Water Protection Rule, so no additional municipal water supply wells exceed the drinking water standard for nitrate.	8 (53.3%)	6 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)
Implement the Nitrogen Fertilizer Management Plan (NFMP) to promote vegetative cover and advanced nitrogen fertilizer management tools to protect private wells in vulnerable areas.	9 (60.0%)	6 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Protect the approximately 400,000 acres of vulnerable land surrounding drinking water wellhead areas statewide by 2034.	13 (86.7%)	2 (13.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Conduct ongoing source water protection planning and implementation for the state's 500 vulnerable community public water systems	9 (60.0%)	6 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Complete first generation source water protection plans for the remaining 420 community public water systems by 2025	12 (80.0%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (13.3%)
Complete revised source water assessments for all 23 surface water systems by 2025	10 (66.7%)	2 (13.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (20.0%)
Complete source water intake protection planning by 2027	8 (53.3%)	3 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (26.7%)
Complete pilot source water protection planning for 10 non-community public water systems with at-risk populations by 2027.	10 (66.7%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (6.7%)	2 (13.3%)
Provide financial assistance for source water implementation activities through grants to satisfy 50% of demand through 2034.	8 (57.1%)	5 (35.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.1%)
Increase public water supply efficiency in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area by reducing groundwater use by 150 million gallons per day to accommodate future population growth. Sustain the quantity and quality of the resources through water reuse, alternative supplies, efficiency, technology, intergovernmental collaboration, and technical assistance.	10 (66.7%)	4 (26.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)

Q2 Please use the space below to explain any of your responses if you wish.

4 (100.0%)

Goal 2: Groundwater is clean and available to all in Minnesota

Q3 Strategies to Achieve Goal 2

	Strategy is still a priority and is Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Timebound (SMART)	Strategy is still a priority but needs some work to be SMART	Strategy has been completed, is no longer needed, or is no longer a priority	I'm not sure
Complete Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies (GRAPS) for all major watersheds engaged in comprehensive watershed planning by 2025.	12 (80.0%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (13.3%)
Complete groundwater atlases for all Minnesota counties by 2029.	14 (93.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Achieve a goal of 1,600 state-owned and managed long-term groundwater monitoring wells statewide by 2034.	13 (86.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (13.3%)
Prioritize the sealing of unused groundwater wells that present a risk to drinking water aquifers by 2034.	12 (80.0%)	2 (13.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)
Maintain a compliance rate for subsurface septic treatment (SSTS) systems at a minimum of 80 percent, and to attain a goal of 90 percent annually.	10 (66.7%)	4 (26.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)
Adopt BMPs for water efficiency, water use reduction, and irrigation water management, and prioritize them in areas of high water use intensity by agricultural irrigators, highly sensitive areas, Groundwater Management Areas (GWMAs), and highly vulnerable Drinking Water Source Management Areas (DWSMAs).	5 (33.3%)	8 (53.3%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (6.7%)
Identify significantly contributing groundwater recharge areas to the aquifers in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area by 2025, and develop protection and management strategies for these aquifers by 2034 to ensure continuous orderly and economic development.	9 (60.0%)	5 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)

Q4 Please use the space below to explain any of your responses if you wish.

3 (100.0%)

Goal 3: Surface waters are swimmable and fishable throughout the state

Q5 Strategies to Achieve Goal 3:

	Strategy is still a priority and is Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Timebound (SMART)	Strategy is still a priority but needs some work to be SMART	Strategy has been completed, is no longer needed, or is no longer a priority	I'm not sure
Fund the completion of Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) for all 80 major watersheds by 2023.	10 (71.4%)	1 (7.1%)	3 (21.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Fund the completion of comprehensive watershed management plans for all 80 major watersheds, including those under One Watershed One Plan, by 2025.	13 (86.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (13.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Protect 100,000 priority acres and restore 100,000 priority acres in the Upper Mississippi River headwaters basin with a combination of public and private funding to ensure high quality water by 2034.	11 (73.3%)	3 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)
Invest in activities and research that can accelerate improvement in water quality through new approaches (e.g., perennial crops and other “landscape drivers”, chloride management or alternatives, etc.).	4 (26.7%)	10 (66.7%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Include climate impacts as one of multiple benefits of protection and restoration, and incorporate climate resilience into comprehensive watershed management plans.	6 (40.0%)	8 (53.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)
Support effective science-based responses to emerging threats or contaminants of emerging concern.	8 (53.3%)	7 (46.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Support cities to upgrade wastewater treatment facilities to address specific water quality goals by reducing the discharge of nutrients and other pollutants based on total maximum daily loads (TMDL) and regulatory requirements.	8 (53.3%)	5 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (13.3%)

Support technical assistance and construction financing to help small communities replace failing septic systems with community subsurface systems.	7 (46.7%)	6 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (13.3%)
Achieve a goal of five million acres of row crop agriculture that use cover crops or continuous living cover by 2034.	13 (92.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.1%)
Enroll 6,500,000 acres and 5,100 Minnesota farms in the Minnesota Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program (MAWQCP) by 2030.	12 (80.0%)	1 (6.7%)	2 (13.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Fund technical assistance and local demonstration sites to assure that application of crop fertilizer uses the best available science.	4 (28.6%)	9 (64.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.1%)
Support in-lake treatment and restoration activities that only address water quality impairments and are supported by comprehensive plans, including One Watershed One Plan.	5 (33.3%)	9 (60.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)
Support state-federal cooperative programs, actions, and priorities outlined in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiatives Action Plan.	5 (33.3%)	7 (46.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (20.0%)

Q6 Please use the space below to explain any of your responses if you wish.

3 (100.0%)

Goal 4: All Minnesotans value water and take actions to sustain and protect it

Q7 Strategies to Achieve Goal 4

	Strategy is still a priority and is Specific, Measure able, Attainable, Relevant, and Timebound (SMART)	Strategy is still a priority but needs some work to be SMART	Strategy has been completed, is no longer needed, or is no longer a priority	I'm not sure
Develop cultural competency on the Council to incorporate the strengths of diverse communities in Minnesota. Develop an inclusion plan by 2021 in consultation with the state's four ethnic councils (Councils for Minnesotans of African Heritage, Minnesota Council on Latino Affairs, Minnesota Indian Affairs Council, and Minnesota Council on Asian Pacific Minnesotans), Women Caring for the Land/Women Food & Ag Network, Hmong American Farmers Association, Center for Health Equity at the Minnesota Department of Health, and others.	5 (33.3%)	7 (46.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (20.0%)
Support agency efforts to inform, educate, and encourage the participation of citizens, stakeholders, and others in the protection and restoration of Minnesota's waters. Efforts should include the biennial Clean Water Fund Performance Report, traveling exhibits, more integrated presentation of projects and outcomes supported by the Clean Water Fund on state web sites, etc.	6 (40.0%)	8 (53.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.7%)
Develop a set of questions by 2021 that can be used in occasional statewide surveys to determine the public's understanding of water resources and quality in Minnesota. The Council will work with agencies and/or the University of Minnesota on a cost-effective method of surveying Minnesotans regularly on the same questions through 2034.	10 (66.7%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (6.7%)	3 (20.0%)

Plan for program resilience after expiration of Legacy Amendment in 2034 and discourage Clean Water Fund applicants from relying on 100% CWF funding.	10 (66.7%)	3 (20.0%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (6.7%)
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	-----------	----------	----------

Q8 Please use the space below to explain any of your responses if you wish.

6 (100.0%)

New Topics?

The Council and its committees have heard from various experts during the last two years on a variety of topics.

Q9 Do any of these topics warrant a SMART strategy in the Council's Strategic Plan? (In some cases, there are activities going on but they are not spelled out in the Plan.)

12 (85.7%) Chloride (e.g., X participants in Smart Salting training by a certain year)

9 (64.3%) Soil health (such as acreage goals)

10 (71.4%) Manure management (such as acreage managed with precision application equipment)

12 (85.7%) Pharmaceuticals (such as prioritizing certain drugs for source reduction)

5 (35.7%) Fulfilling MDH's manganese response plan for drinking water

7 (50.0%) Outreach to difficult-to-reach audiences, such as non-operating landowners

4 (28.6%) Monitoring and assessment strategy

Other topics?

4 (100.0%)

Q10 What three things do you feel should be considered the top priority for how Clean Water Funds should be distributed, and why?

13 (100.0%)

Q11 Please use the space below for anything else you want to share with the Council:

4 (100.0%)

Thank you for your input on the important work of the Clean Water Council!