

Clean Water Council
Budget and Outcomes Committee (BOC) Meeting Agenda
Friday October 7th, 2022 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
WEBEX ONLY

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

9:30 Regular Business

- Introductions
- Approve agenda & most recent minutes
- Chair and Staff update
 - Review of timeline for FY24-25 Clean Water Fund recommendations

9:45 Water Legacy Grant Program RFP Update

10:15 Review Key Topics from Public Input on CWF Recommendations

11:00 BREAK

11:15 Review Key Topics from Public Input on CWF Recommendations (continued)

11:45 Discussion & Next Steps

12:00 Adjourn

Next BOC Meeting Date: Friday, November 4th

Budget and Outcomes Committee Meeting Summary

Clean Water Council (Council)

July 8, 2022, 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members present: Steve Besser (Committee Vice Chair), Gary Burdorf, Warren Formo, Frank Jewell, Jen Kader, Holly Kavarik (Committee Chair), and Todd Renville.

Members absent: Dick Brainerd.

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
- January 7 meeting agenda and the December 3 meeting summary, as one motion for approval by Frank Jewell, seconded by Todd Renville, motion approved by roll call.
- Chair and Staff update
 - Small Grants Program: The Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) waited until the new fiscal year to move forward, so all appropriated funds were available. BWSR has a request for proposal (RFP) under development. BWSR plans have these complete by October. The grants management team did have a few comments and questions to work through.
 - Eligible entities discussed were local government units, tribal governments, and non-profits. There are many options for local government units to access clean water funds, so eligibility could be limited to tribal units and 501(c)(3) non-profits. This would help attract new, diverse ideas.
 - Grant amount minimum could be \$25,000 with \$200,000 to \$250,000 could be the maximum.
 - Expect challenges and questions in the first year of a new program, so manage expectations.
 - Tribal liaisons suggest a longer period to applying, so BWSR is now looking at 90 days.
 - BWSR will have a technical advisory panel to vet proposals to confirm eligibility and score them. The Council suggested a member or staff member could participate. However, staff or Council members may interact with those that apply and could create some bias concerns in the process. It may be best to not have a Council representative on the panel.
 - The Council should see advisory panel recommendations before they go to the BWSR board for final approval. An annual report or presentation should be provided after implementation, along with evaluation and any future adjustments. BWSR appreciates feedback from the Council.

Presentation and Discussion on Outcomes from SWCD Capacity Funding from Clean Water Fund by Sheila

Vanney, Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (MASWCD) (WebEx 00:39:00)

- The Council has not recommended that the CWF support capacity funding, but the Legislature appropriates it.
- The SWCDs look at capacity funding as a shared obligation with state and local (county) appropriations. Since fiscal year 2012, the SWCDs have received the same allocation of conservation delivery grants (general funds), at \$3,166,000 per year (for general services, nonpoint engineering, and implementation of easement program). There are 88 SWCDs, and for the general services, it is only about \$20,000 total for each. To provide greater perspective, statewide assessment needs in FY15 were underfunded by \$22 million and in FY20 by \$27.8 million.
- The SWCD board and staff develop an annual workplan for using funds to address priorities identified in state approved and locally adopted plans, and then submit them to BWSR who must approve them. There are four resource areas: soil erosion, riparian zone management, water storage and treatment, and excess nutrients. Within each of the four resource categories, they identify how they will tackle the issues. These costs can range from technology and capital expenditures, to cost share or incentives, to staff expenses. The SWCD identifies activity actions in each category. In addition, SWCDs receive project funding from the CWF and collaborate with MDA, MPCA, and BWSR as boots on the ground.
- This year the omnibus tax conference committee report included a general fund appropriation.

Questions:

- Steve Besser: How are the staff paid and who pays for the overhead costs of the buildings for the SWCDs? *Answer:* SWCDs are considered a subdivision of the state, but their budgets are a hodgepodge of things (county, state, sometimes federal) and require a lot of applications. Shifting funds from the general fund is hard too because it pulls from other areas (education, health, etc.). It is a constant struggle, which is why they change course to seek funding from the tax bill. This approach would be more likely to see increases over time. It is also where the local units of government receive funding. *Response from Holly Kovarik:* SWCDs are looked at a little differently because they are not a department of the county. It is not a guaranteed to have funding. So, appropriations can, and do, change drastically. In addition, the funding has specific and intended purposes, so it can get complicated.
- Rich Biske: Is BWSR underfunding the technical assistance piece, and if so, what is the direct impact? *Response by Justin Hanson (BWSR):* Technical assistance provides training and gets districts up to high skill level. The SWCDs have been very strategic. Sometimes they hire out for certain tasks.
- Rich Biske: What is the formula of distribution for the capacity funding with 88 SWCDs? *Answer:* It started out as \$100,000 per year to each SWCD in the first four years. The next four years, due to inflation, it was bumped to \$107,500 per SWCD. There have been varying degrees of county matching funds. A county's share of public waters shoreline and number of private acres impact remaining allocations.
- Paul Gardner: Before BWSR can send funding, there needs to be an approved workplan, which needs to fit with an approved plan, and it can be tied to specific outputs. Why are these called SWCD capacity funds instead of SWCD implementation funds? It sounds like most of the funding is for implementation. *Response:* On legislative spreadsheets it shows up as SWCD Administrative Grants. That is a better buzzword for it. The funding could be merged and name changed.
- Frank Jewell: How is the money flowing through SWCDs right now? Is the \$24 million broken up between all the SWCDs? *Answer:* The \$24 million (\$12 million a year), is divided among the 88 SWCDs, including Hennepin and Ramsey. The current allocation is \$107,500 per SWCD. Any remaining amount goes towards counties that have matching funds.

Walk-Through of “Change Items” in Agency/University Clean Water Fund Requests (WebEx 01:57:00)

- The Council has a little more time because the state agencies have more time to get items through the Governor's Office. Additionally, the Council has time until January 15, instead of December 1, as the deadline to provide recommendations to the Legislature.
- The Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) met yesterday but are not ready to share their spreadsheet yet. We should have it for the next Council meeting. Now is a good opportunity to advance through the current spreadsheet by line item, to review changes compared to last time. It provides relative information, without specific numbers. This will help provide feedback on if the Council is moving in the direction they intend.
- The activities are color coded on the spreadsheet. Items in the white rows are not state agency programs, but are included with the colors, as they fall under those activities. The white column is the enacted budget FY22-23. It is \$220 million, which was enacted by the Legislature. The next column is the FY24-25 increased budget ask, which is an estimate of what the state agencies may ask as increases (due to the larger projected budget). These are in small (steady effort acknowledging increase costs), medium (adding something, but not a lot), large (increasing potentially to double), and extra-large (more than doubling) categories. These are likely to need adjusted when the ICT presents their recommendations to the Council, but this provides a rough idea. In new programs it is blank. Another shows if programs are scalable, with a yes, no, or maybe. This is if it can be scaled up for two years using the additional funding appropriation. The final column connects to equity to make sure all Minnesotans have access to swimmable, drinkable, water.
- Items to note:
 - DNR: Fish Contamination Assessment program is likely an extra-large increase because they have added [Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances \(PFAS\)](#) fish tissue sampling into the statewide survey work.
 - Minnesota Department of Health (MDH): Drinking Water Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CEC) is expected to have a sizeable increase. This in reflection of an increase for PFAS work, and other contaminants of emerging concern.
 - MDH: Private Well Initiative was zeroed out last time, so it is new, but was previously allocated funds. This would also fund pilot programs. This would help expand their pilot programs as well.

- MPCA pass through funds to Red River Watch (Red River Watershed Board), has not had CWFs recommended, the Legislature includes it. It is included in this spreadsheet to see how it has fit in the past.
- MPCA Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (includes Total Maximum Daily Loads development) will also include the We Are Water program as part of the public engagement portion. Previously, it was pulled out as its own program, and was eliminated when it went to the Legislature.
- BWSR: Implementation Funding for Watersheds with Approved Comprehensive Watershed Plans (Watershed-based Implementation Funding), will increase significantly. More plans are being approved, and this would go to a lot of projects ready to go. There will be additional needs, so this can help to meet the demand.
- DNR: Mussel Restoration Pilot Program, Culvert Replacement Incentive Program, and Water Storage programs are new.
- MDA AgBMP Loan Program is expected to have a significant increase for funding equipment for water quality for producers to use for BMPs. Documented need continues to increase. It is a popular program. The administrative costs are small, so all the funds are available, and can be used to leverage additional funds. It is ideal for one time funding as well. It is an efficient program. As a loan, the funding will be available moving forward.
- MDA Conservation Equipment Assistance is a new program. One barrier to adopting new practices is specialized equipment. This program provides grants to individual growers, groups of growers, local government units, and fits well with the SWCDs equipment sharing programs.
- MPCA Chloride Reduction efforts are expected to have a significant increase.
- MPCA (pass through) National Park Water Quality Protection Program (Voyageurs National Park) has requested funds, increasing them due to flooding in the Rainy River area. The assessment has not been done yet, so the request amount may change. At the last Council meeting, it was suggested to have the state agencies reserve some funding that would be allocated to this program.
- DNR County Geologic Atlases Part B was added back in.
- MDA Forever Green Agriculture Initiative with the University of Minnesota (UMN) is expected to have an extra-large increase.
- MDA Agricultural Research/Evaluation would focus on manure research, manure crediting, and BMPs.
- MDH Recreational Water Quality Online Portal is new. This is for testing at Minnesota's beaches. It has previously been requested but was cut when the budget was smaller.

Questions:

- Paul Gardner: Regarding the Private Well Initiative, is this request leading us to give every private well owner the opportunity to test for five major contaminants within the next ten years? *Answer: Yes.*
- Frank Jewell: The Council pushed hard for groups like the Red River Watch to provide a request to the Council, have they done this? *Answer from Paul Gardner:* They have not submitted a request but were asked to present at the full Council meeting and they did so. *Response from Frank Jewell:* I would ask that they do what all the other groups do and put in an application to use the same process.
- Rich Biske: Regarding the Implementation Funding for Watersheds, can you explain how the funds are dispersed? *Answer:* It is formula-based. This includes shoreline miles and acres of private land. In addition, the plan includes targets over the next ten years, so these numbers are being worked with as well.
- Warren Formo: For the AgBMP Loan Program, are those funds that are repaid, do they go back to the general fund? *Answer:* No, they go back into the account, to be available to future loans and specifically for this use. Interest is three percent or less.
- Jen Kader: Did the Metropolitan Council pull the Mapping Infrastructure Climate Risk and Resilience Opportunities? *Answer:* They did pull it. They are looking at other funding sources.
- Jen Kader: There are a lot of groups interested in water reuse. Is funding an issue? *Answer:* Nothing really happened on it during COVID-19. A white paper was written on the topic. There is a project charter that has been approved by the ICT. State agency representatives will meet in a few weeks on this item. They do not know where it will lead, so they do not know what the funding would look like at this time. It is a contentious process. There would need to be long-term funding. Previous appropriations are still being used.

Discussion & Next Steps (WebEx 03:29:00)

- Next week Paul will receive the numbers from the state agencies. There is also a Word document that pairs with the spreadsheet, currently being reviewed. The initial agency total request was at \$370 million, and there is \$337 available currently. The Council members do still have the request to have the state agencies leave funding for Voyageurs National Park and the UMN programs.
- Having a memo to present to the stakeholders would be ideal as well. To share what is different this budget cycle, as well as what has been done previously. The Council is addressing key issues like PFAS, CECs, water storage, perennial living cover, etc. It could be an executive summary to the recommendations report.
- Once the Council receives the draft numbers, they can start drafting a contingency scenario in case the November forecast. The conversations with the state agencies ahead of time could help to know where to cut funding, or where to add additional funding if the forecast is higher than expected.

Adjournment (WebEx 03:45:00)

FY22-23 Clean Water Legacy Partners Grant Program PILOT

Policy

From the Board of Water and Soil Resources, State of Minnesota

Effective Date: 9/28/2022

Approval: Board Decision #22-XX

Duration: Availability and use of funds appropriated by Laws of Minnesota 2021, 1st Special Session, Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 6 (n).

Policy Statement

This policy provides expectations for activities conducted via the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) Clean Water Fund (CWF) Clean Water Legacy Partners Grant program as defined by the Clean Water Fund appropriation under Laws of Minnesota 2021, 1st Special Session, Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 6 (n). Activities must align with the purpose of Minnesota's CWF and expand partnerships for clean water in Minnesota.

The CWF was established to implement part of Article XI, Section 15, of the Minnesota Constitution, and Minnesota Statute §114D with the purpose of protecting, enhancing, and restoring water quality in lakes, rivers, and streams and to protect groundwater and drinking water sources from degradation.

Reason for the policy

A total of \$1,000,000 was allocated to this program for the FY22/23 biennium. BWSR will use grant agreements for assurance of deliverables and compliance with appropriate statutes, rules and established policies. Willful or negligent disregard of relevant statutes, rules and policies may lead to imposition of financial penalties or future sanctions on the grant recipient. The associated FY 22/23 Request for Proposal (RFP) for these funds identifies additional requirements.

Program Requirements

1. Eligible Applicants

Non-governmental organizations and tribal governments are eligible for this funding.

- Non-governmental organization are defined as an organization that is a nonprofit, also known as a charitable organization, that is formed for the purpose of fulfilling a mission to improve the common good of society rather than to acquire and distribute profits. The organization meets the definition

in Minn. Stat. §309.50 Subd. 4 and meets the definitions defined in the Internal Revenue Service code, with the most common type being a 501 (c) (3), (Policy 08-06 Minnesota Office of Grants Management).

- Minnesota Tribal Governments refers to the federally recognized sovereign tribal nations that share geography with Minnesota (MINN STAT. 10.65).

2. Match Requirements

A non-state match equal to at least 10% of the amount of the grant received is required. Match can be provided by landowners, land occupiers, private organizations, local governments, or other non-state sources and can be in the form of cash or in-kind for services or materials contributed to the accomplishment of grant objectives. Funds used for match for this program cannot be used as match for any other state grant program.

3. Requirements for Eligible Activities

Eligible activities can consist of structural practices and projects; non-structural practices and programs; program and project support (e.g. education, outreach, marketing), including staffing; technical and engineering assistance necessary to implement these activities; and grant management and reporting.

The FY22/23 Clean Water Legacy Partners Grant Request for Proposal contains information on activities that are considered ineligible for use of these grant dollars.

4. Technical Expertise

The grantee has the responsibility to ensure the appropriate technical expertise, skills and training for the project. BWSR may review the qualifications of all persons providing technical assistance and review the technical project design, particularly if a recognized standard is not available.

5. Grant Agreement

BWSR staff may review grant applicant's financial records to establish capacity to successfully manage state grant funds, develop grant agreements, including requirements and processes for work plans, project outcomes reporting, closeouts, and fiscal reconciliations.

The grant agreement provides information about expectations and terms. Grant work plans are developed as part of the grant agreement. Regular reporting of grant expenditures, technical assistance and accomplishments are required.

History

This policy may be reviewed annually and updated as needed.

Description	Date
This policy was originally created in 2022.	09/28/2022

Ranking Criteria	Maximum Points Possible
<u>Abstract:</u> A brief description of anticipated achievements and outcomes as well as the project area.	5
<u>Water resource(s) identified:</u> Lake, stream/river, or groundwater resource is described and reasons are given for why the resource(s) were chosen.	10
<u>Water Resource Outcome(s) and Longevity:</u> Activities will protect or restore an identified water resource or support future implementation efforts. Activities identified in a natural resource and/or watershed plan are preferred. Activities should provide long-term benefits to the water resource.	30
<u>Readiness and Partnerships:</u> The application has a set of specific activities that can be implemented soon after grant award. Proposed activities being part of a larger effort or partnership working toward clean water, or attempting to build a new partnership, are preferred.	20
<u>Public Benefit:</u> Proposed activities will benefit the public from a local, regional and/or state perspective. Diversity, equity and inclusion is also incorporated.	20
<u>Applicant Performance:</u> Applicant's history with receiving grants and/or other funding sources and successfully completing planned activities will be assessed.	15
Total Points Available	100



Summary of Public Comment to Clean Water Council Proposals for the Clean Water Fund FY24-25

As of 19 Sep 2022

Entity	Agency	Program Name	Comments
City of Randall	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Brooten	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Ellendale	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Mahnomen	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Baudette	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Glenwood	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Moorhead	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Fairmont	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Mankato	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Halstad	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
Empire Township, Dakota County	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Upsala	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
Marshall & Polk Rural Water System	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Dassel	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Princeton	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Rochester	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
Curtis Flats (non-public water supply in Champlin)	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Walker	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Roscoe	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Bovey	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
Rock Co Rural Water	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Edgerton	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
St. Paul Regional Water Services	MDH	Source Water Protection	Support
City of Bloomington	UMN	Stormwater BMP Performance Evaluation & Technology Transfer	Support
Mississippi Water Management Organization	UMN	Stormwater BMP Performance Evaluation & Technology Transfer	Support
Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District	UMN	Stormwater BMP Performance Evaluation & Technology Transfer	Support
Lois Brink, Oakdale resident	MPCA	Does not believe that PFAS is getting enough attention	Concern

Summary of Public Comment to Clean Water Council Proposals for the Clean Water Fund FY24-25

League of Mn Cities	MPCA	MPCA staff increase for facilitating water quality trading (CWF supports this with NPDES wastewater/stormwater TMDL implementation program)	Support
City of Rochester	MPCA	Chloride Reduction Program	Support
City of Rochester	MPCA	NPDES wastewater/stormwater TMDL implementation	Support
City of Rochester	MPCA	Point Source Implementation Grant (PSIG) program	Support
University of MN Water Resources Center	UMN	Stormwater research program (four-page annual report highlights in packet)	Support
NorthHarvest Bean Growers Association	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
MN Sunflower Council	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
Irrigators Association of Minnesota	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
MN Wheat Research & Promotion Council	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
MN Association of Wheat Growers	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
Schlichting Farms	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
American Crystal Sugar Company	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
MN Corn Growers	BWSR	Working Lands Floodplain Easements	Does not support permanent easements
MN Corn Growers	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
MN Corn Growers	MDA	Conservation Equipment Assistance	Support
MN Corn Growers	MDA	Technical Assistance	Support
MN Corn Growers	BWSR	Conservation Drainage Management Grants	Support
MN Corn Growers	MDA	AgBMP Loan Program	Support
MN Corn Growers	BWSR	Enhancing Soil Health and Landowner Adoption of Cover Crops for Drinking Water & Groundwater Protection	Support
MN Corn Growers	BWSR	Buffer Law Implementation	Funds at this level are now unnecessary
MN Crop Production Retailers	MDA	Technical Assistance	Support
MN Crop Production Retailers	MDA	Expand Ag Weather Station Network	Support
MN Crop Production Retailers	MDA	Conservation Equipment Assistance	Support
MN Crop Production Retailers	MDA	AgBMP Loan Program	Support
Kabetogama Township	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support

Summary of Public Comment to Clean Water Council Proposals for the Clean Water Fund FY24-25

St. Louis County Plng	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support
St. Louis County Board	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support
Koochiching EDA	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support
Michael & Wendy Pedginski	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support
Koochiching County Board	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support
National Park Service	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support
Arne & Gina Wuorinen, cabin owners	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support
Koochiching County Environmental Services	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Support
City of North St. Paul	MC	Metropolitan area water supply sustainability support program & water demand reduction (efficiency) grant program	Support
White Bear Township	MC	Metropolitan area water supply sustainability support program & water demand reduction (efficiency) grant program	Support
City of New Brighton	MC	Metropolitan area water supply sustainability support program & water demand reduction (efficiency) grant program	Support
City of Prior Lake	MC	Metropolitan area water supply sustainability support program & water demand reduction (efficiency) grant program	Support
City of Eden Prairie	MC	Metropolitan area water supply sustainability support program & water demand reduction (efficiency) grant program	Support
City of Cottage Grove	MC	Metropolitan area water supply sustainability support program & water demand reduction (efficiency) grant program	Support
City of Cottage Grove	MC	Metropolitan area water supply sustainability support program & water demand reduction (efficiency) grant program	Support
City of White Bear Lake	MC	Metropolitan area water supply sustainability support program & water demand reduction (efficiency) grant program	Support
Conservation Minnesota	MDH	Future of Drinking Water	Support lead service line inventorying
Conservation Minnesota	BWSR	Soil and Water Conservation District Capacity Funding	CWC should propose alternative funding
Coalition of Greater MN Cities	MPCA	Chloride Reduction Program	Support; water softener focus
Coalition of Greater MN Cities	PFA	Point Source Implementation Grant (PSIG) Program	Support
Coalition of Greater MN Cities	MPCA	Wastewater/Stormwater TMDL Implementation	Support

Summary of Public Comment to Clean Water Council Proposals for the Clean Water Fund FY24-25

MN Environmental Science and Economic Review Board	MPCA	Chloride Reduction Program	Support; water softener focus
MN Environmental Science and Economic Review Board	PFA	Point Source Implementation Grant (PSIG) Program	Support
MN Environmental Science and Economic Review Board	MPCA	Wastewater/Stormwater TMDL Implementation	Support
Assn of MN Counties	BWSR	Watershed-Based Implementation Funding	Support
Assn of MN Counties	BWSR	One Watershed One Plan	Support
Assn of MN Counties	MPCA	Enhanced SSTS Compliance	Support
Assn of MN Counties	PFA	Small Community Wastewater Treatment Program	Support
Assn of MN Counties	BWSR	Conservation Drainage Management and Assistance	Support
Assn of MN Counties	UMN	County Geologic Atlas Part A	Support
Assn of MN Counties	DNR	County Geologic Atlas Part B	Support
Assn of MN Counties	MDA	Ag BMP Loan Program	Support
Freshwater		General: Avoid using CWF when other state funding sources would suffice (bonding, general fund surplus)	
Freshwater		General: Avoid over-reliance on CWF for basic programs (and SWCD funding) as we approach 2034 expiration	
Freshwater		General: Nonpoint Source Protection Plan may need to include climate, equity, local capacity, research, monitoring, analysis	
Freshwater		Water storage	Support more water storage
Freshwater		CWC should update program and eligibility criteria to make sure that projects result in clean water outcomes	
Nature Conservancy	BWSR	Wetland Restoration Easements	Support
Nature Conservancy	BWSR	Working Land and Floodplain Easements	Support
Nature Conservancy	BWSR	Critical Shoreland Easements	Support; increase to \$6 million
Nature Conservancy		Wild Rice Reinvest in MN (RIM) Easements (for future consideration)	Support
Nature Conservancy	DNR	Mussel Restoration Pilot Program	Support
Nature Conservancy	DNR	Culvert Replacement Incentive Program	Support
Nature Conservancy	DNR	Water Storage	Support

Summary of Public Comment to Clean Water Council Proposals for the Clean Water Fund FY24-25

Nature Conservancy	MDA	Conservation Equipment Assistance	Support
Nature Conservancy	MDA	AgBMP Loan Program	Support
Nature Conservancy	MDA	Technical Assistance	Support
Nature Conservancy	MDH	Private Well Initiative	Support
Nature Conservancy	MDH	Future of Drinking Water	Support; increase to \$4 million to support lead service line inventory
Nature Conservancy	BWSR	Soil and Water Conservation District Capacity Funding	CWC should recommend alternative funding
Nature Conservancy		Council should require reports on measurable outcomes and accomplishments	
MN Environmental Partnership	MDA	Forever Green Initiative	Increase to \$8M
MN Environmental Partnership	MDH	Community Lead Service Line Inventory Grants	New, support at \$6M
MN Environmental Partnership	MDH	Private Well Initiative	Support at \$3M
MN Environmental Partnership	MPCA	Chloride Reduction Program	Strongly support
MN Environmental Partnership	BWSR	Targeted Wellhead/Drinking Water Protection	Strongly support
MN Environmental Partnership	MPCA	Enhanced SSTS Compliance	Strongly support
MN Environmental Partnership	DNR	Fish Contamination Assessment	Strongly support addition of PFAS
MN Environmental Partnership	BWSR	Watershed Partners Legacy Grants	Strongly support
MN Environmental Partnership	DNR	Aquifer Monitoring for Water Supply Planning	Strongly support
MN Environmental Partnership	DNR	Nonpoint Source Restoration and Protection	Strongly support
MN Environmental Partnership	MPCA	Lake Superior Basin SWCDs Leveraging Federal Funding	Strongly support
MN Environmental Partnership	BWSR	Buffer Law Implementation	Concern about continued need; use APO authority
MN Environmental Partnership	MPCA	National Park WQ Protection Program/Voyageurs National Park	Concern about earmark approach
MN Environmental Partnership	MDA	MN Ag Water Quality Certification Program (MAWQCP)	New funding should go to Targeted Wellhead/ DW Protection until N

Summary of Public Comment to Clean Water Council Proposals for the Clean Water Fund FY24-25

			recs are more protective in DWSMAs
MN Environmental Partnership	BWSR	Watershed-Based Implementation Funding & Projects & Practices	Concern about fewer results from ag BMPs vs. new/innovative uses of CWF
MN Environmental Partnership	BWSR	Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)	Appreciate having no CWF funding
MN Environmental Partnership	BWSR	Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Capacity Funding	Appreciate having no CWF funding
Minnesota Environmental Partnership comments submitted on behalf of Clean Water Action Minnesota, Friends of Minnesota Scientific and Natural Areas, Friends of the Mississippi River, Land Stewardship Project, League of Women Voters Minnesota, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, Northern Waters Land Trust, Save Lake Superior Association, Save Our Sky Blue Waters, St. Paul Audubon Society, and Wilderness in the City			