Clean Water Council Budget and Outcomes Committee (BOC) Meeting Agenda Friday, November 3, 2023 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Webex Only

2023 BOC Members: Steve Besser (BOC Chair), Dick Brainerd (BOC Vice-Chair), Gary Burdorf, Steve Christensen, Warren Formo, Brad Gausman, Holly Hatlewick, Annie Knight

9:30 Regular Business

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

9:45 Altered Hydrology

- Jason Carlson, Regional Clean Water Hydrologist, Minnesota DNR
- 11:00 BREAK
- 11:15 Requesting feedback from members on CWF funding recommendations proposal format
- 11:45 Public Comment
- 12:00 Adjourn

December Meeting: Restoration Evaluation Report, Groundwater Protection Rule?

Budget and Outcomes Committee Meeting Summary Clean Water Council (Council) October 6, 2023, 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members present: Steve Besser (Committee Vice Chair), Dick Brainerd, Warren Formo, Brad Gausman, Holly Hatlewick, and Annie Knight.

Members absent: Gary Burdorf and Steve Christenson.

Other present: Glenn Skuta (MPCA); Jen Kader (Met Council); Justin Hanson (BWSR); Jason Moeckel (DNR)

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

Regular Business

- Introductions
- Approval of the October 6 agenda and September 8 meeting summary, moved by Dick Brainerd, seconded by Warren Formo. Motion carries.
- Chair and Staff Update
 - Communications Plan: Taglines, Legacy web page
 - The interagency communications sub-team wants a tagline to use with PowerPoint presentation and social media, as well as reports, print materials, etc. A tagline will help distinguish the Clean Water Funds (CWFs) from other Legacy funds when using the Legacy logo. There will be a link in the chat so people can rank the ten suggested taglines during the meeting.
 - They are working on a list of weblinks for major CWF programs, major water reports, data sources, etc. Currently, it is being setup in Microsoft Teams.
 - Field tour debrief/feedback:
 - Request is for coffee if not at a hotel (if in metro area).
 - Field tour received two thumbs up and five stars from Council members.
 - Next year, it may be good to have a site visit after a full Council meeting. There are many things to check out in the metro area, that did not make the cut on the field tour this year.
 - Mustinka River project: Paul Gardner was invited by Jaime Beyer to the Mustinka River Rehabilitation Project by the Bois de Sioux Watershed District. It is a multi-year project with multiple benefits. They dug a new channel, like the old channel, which has reestablished a flood plain, for five miles. The size of the project is astounding.

Strategic Planning/Indicators for Success (Webex 00:41:00)

- In the 2014 Road Map document, the agencies set goals for water use for 2034 that would be realistic. They
 estimated that 67 percent of waters could be fishable and 70 percent could be swimmable. People like
 absolutes, and this year the Legislature set a goal of 100 percent by 2050 for both. This may not be realistic,
 considering how the land in Minnesota is being used.
 - The upcoming 2024 Performance Report shows 68 percent of waters meeting goals for recreation activities ("swimmable"), so we could hit the 2034 goal early. However, "fishable" waters are at 61.4%.
- Delisting successes: Suggestions for what is meaningful to the public.
 - When the impaired waters map is released, there is a lot of red shown on the map. It can be impactful in a negative way to the public. It is important to remember some things. Minnesota has four times the impairments as Wisconsin, but Minnesota monitors in more places for more contaminants often with more protective standards than other states. More impairments do does not mean a state is worse off.
 - \circ $\;$ The impaired waters list is a diagnostic tool to figure out where to target efforts.
 - The impaired waters list is "binary" and not the best measure of progress/growth. The Performance Report has too many measures for the public to handle. Therefore, the strategic plan needs about a halfdozen measures that are "just right" so the public can better understand the context.
- Suggesting a set of success indicators for strategic planning

- Surface waters: Should we show the impaired waters list trends? Should we share the Nutrient Reduction Strategy trends? Should we include progress against 2014 Road Map goals? Would it be good to reveal the percentage of improving versus percentage of declining quality?
- Drinking water: Should we include the percentage of households with safe(r) water in private wells at source and/or tap? Should we include the percentage of PWSs staying within federal drinking water standards?
- Groundwater: Should we reveal the upward trend in groundwater levels at observation wells? How about the downward trend in groundwater pollution detection?
- Social measures needs more development. Would it be a good idea to include a cross-section of changing norms over time (e.g., agricultural census? Polling?).
- Protection outcomes needs more development. Would the percentage of healthy waters not becoming impaired over time be good to include? How about "no change", "no degradation" or "no improvement"? *Discussion/Questions:*
- Annie Knight: Could you provide a background of the methodology of 2008 versus what it looks like now? For that comparison of the impaired waters map of 2008 versus now. Just to think about how we show the progress that has been made. Answer from Glenn Skuta, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA): One major change is the amount of data we have since then is so much more. There was not a lot of funding prior to the amendment back in 2008. There were fewer listings because we had done very little monitoring. It was about on par with what other states were doing at the time. Fifteen years later, we have done so much more monitoring of the state, we have found many more waters impaired. It is an artifact of the monitoring we have done. I will pass on the comments from this meeting to the folks working on the report, to message the impaired waters list. Now that we have gone through one whole cycle of the state's intensive water monitoring, the number of new impairments should be a lot lower than the first time through. Some of the methodology changes have changed. Some of the streams in the first ten-year cycle, were not assessed the first time through. If the methodology had existed back then, it would have been included. We have some sulfate with wild rice and PFAS changes that will drive the list as well. Note that fish mercury is included on the map, and should be included, but sometimes we show the impaired waters map without the fish mercury, so you can see how the waters are impaired for things other than mercury. The mercury in fish can be from global emissions, which we have very little control over, so compartmentalizing it can be helpful.
- Steve Besser: There are natural sources for mercury (volcanic activity), so do we know what is natural or resulting from human activity? *Answer from Glenn Skuta, MPCA:* I am not a mercury expert. There is a statewide TMDL for mercury that addresses many (not all) of the mercury impaired waters. That report does this quantification. It is what we look at for Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). Local emissions have gone down, and some impaired waters have been removed from the list from that change. There has been a lot of mercury reduction from wastewater treatment plants.
- Brad Gausman: Could we create a map of waters that have shown improvement since the work started? Maybe waters that have shown improvement in green, and degradation in red? Then, be able to toggle back and forth between them? Could we produce a map that uses the 2008 baseline? I think it would be an interesting comparison.
- Steve Besser: I agree, why not have an improved waters list?
- Paul Gardner: There is some information included in the recent Clean Water Fund Performance Report. The large river trends and lake water clarity. These indicators that I find are the most helpful.
- Paul Gardner: Is no change a good thing? Are we keeping water from getting worse? *Answer:* It can depend on measurements. Things not getting worse is a sign of success, even if it doesn't feel like it. We would love to see everything improving, but holding the line in the face of pressures is a success. Often, there is a long lag time for implementing actions before it shows up on the land, compared to the onslaught of pollution flowing into our rivers. It is a complicated system.
- Steve Besser: The population density is growing as well.

Minnesota Ag Water Quality Certification Program (MAWQCP) follow-up (Webex 01:28:30)

• The Council had received a letter from Lori Cox regarding the MAWQCP. She has followed up recently as well. She is unable to attend the meeting today. There are a few ideas to talk about. There may be some hesitancy

from Council members to dig too deep into measurement tactics on the certification program. Lori Cox was interested in measurements on both enforcement and evidence of what these farms have accomplished. *Discussion:*

- Steve Besser: I don't believe it is the Council's or the subcommittees business to be advising these various projects on what they should do at a tactical level. Regarding measures of success, they are the scientists, the experts. Our goal is to decide if it is worth funding, and what level of funding would assist them in achieving our mission. I am hesitant to insert the committee and Council in between a board member/citizen and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA). I think we want to make sure the program continues to exist and provides measurable results. I don't think we need these small details.
- Warren Formo: I agree with you Steve. Given her role as a member of the actual advisory committee that advises the MDA directly on the program, in that capacity, she should be weighing in with that group. I would prefer she present her ideas and concerns about the program to that advisory committee. If that advisory committee comes about a resolution to this concern, like a change to the program, then we can think about incorporating it with the budget considerations.
- Dick Brainerd: I also agree.
- Holly Hatlewick: I would also reiterate what has been said. I think this is getting into the weeds, and not really staying in our lane with those recommendations. I also think it is a capacity matter, as far as measuring and collecting that data. I think this program is seeing traction, they are bringing back data from farmers, they have sideboards on the data, so it is consistent information. I don't know about palatability if other measurements are the desire of the program. As an oversight committee we should default to Brad at MDA.
- Paul Gardner: There was a lot of detail in the letter. I appreciate that people care so much about water in Minnesota. There are some entities in Minnesota that have a different understanding of what the program is about. There is a lingering idea over the last decade that the certification program is a means to get out of regulation. I see it as something as a lure into a conversation about improving water quality, then use modeling to reveal what the reported environmental benefits would be. My concern is if there would be something wrong with the modeling, then we have a bigger problem with modeling. We use modeling for determining environmental outcomes across the board. I have a lot of faith in that. Does the Council want to affirm what you think the program is about? That may help future discussions.
- Jen Kader with the Metropolitan Council: Lori Cox did try to go through the board that she is on but did not receive a satisfactory response. She did her due diligence. The reason it is coming back here is about our earlier discussion of knowing if the CWFs are making a difference.
- Warren Formo: This is a great discussion. This program provides a way to work with the state agencies, to
 make sure the farmers are aware of, and are complaint with regulations at the most basic level. Beyond that
 look for BMPs to do on the farm. Certified farmers are using the best available science specific and applicable
 to their farm. It is about all we can expect from them at this point. There are other states doing similar things
 (i.e., Michigan and Florida), but they are not as comprehensive as Minnesota. I have been critical of this
 program, but we have developed something that has a lot of potential and it has helped a lot of farmers
 implement more conservation. Personally, I think we need to keep it going without this sort of interference.
 The MDA has its own advisory committee and can sort this out. The full Council could benefit from Brad
 Redlin talking about the program and delve into an example of how it plays out. Perhaps a Soil and Water
 Conservation District (SWCD) staff and a farmer could also talk about their experiences with the program.
- Brad Redlin, MDA: The MDA commissioner and I met with Lori and other signatories after the last policy committee meeting with your group. The other participants are not here today, so I want to be careful in how I share this, but I think the meeting was constructive. We identified some things that were within the scope of the program, as well as other areas to work on. I would be happy to discuss the certification process, it is often misunderstood. The new online platform is being updated as well. This will help us integrate all the different services we provide the growers, as a one-stop platform. We are happy to answer any questions the Council has at any time. We are always looking at evolving the program and want to do better.

Public Comment (Webex 02:08:00)

• No comments provided at this meeting.

Adjournment (Webex 02:09:56)



Minnesota Evaluation of Hydrologic Change (EHC)

Jason Carlson | Regional Hydrologist

jason.Carlson@state.mn.us





Presentation Outline

- •EHC Approach
- •What We've Learned
- Technical Summary Reports
- Moving Forward/Conclusions



EWR Staff

Hydrology Technical Team

- Ryan Bjerke
- Kim Boland
- Suzanne Jiwani
- Ben Kiefer
- Stephanie Klamm
- Andrew Lindlof
- Dan O'Shea
- Dan Reinartz
- Katie Wigen

Project Management Team

- Jason Moeckel
- Barbara Weisman
- Steve Kloiber
- Ian Chisholm
- Greg Kruse (former)



EHC Approach

- Prepare long term hydrologic data sets
- •Assess timing of hydrologic change
- Compare periods before and after change
- •Characterize and quantify change





Long Term Data Sets



- Watershed Averaged Annual Precipitation (State Climatology Office)
- Annual Average Runoff (USGS gage data)



• Annual Peak Discharge (USGS gage data)



Identifying Hydrologic Change

- 17 Change Point Tests
- 4 Data Categories
- Preponderance of Evidence
- Best Professional Judgement



Data Category	Breakpoint Test	Break Point Year
Dracinitation	Hurst Precipitation	1978
Precipitation	DNR Hydrologic Assess. Tool (ED)	1978
Dunoff	Hurst Runoff	1973
Kulloli	DNR Hydrologic Assess. Tool (ED)	1978
Precipitation/Runoff Relationship	Double Mass Curve	1998
	Cramer-Von-Mises (CPM)	none
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov (CPM	none
	LePage (CPM)	none
	Energy Divisive Method	1968
	Lombard Wilcoxon	none
Annual Poak Discharge	Pettitt	none
Annual Feak Discharge	Mann-Whitney (CPM)	none
	Bayesian	none
	Lombard Mood	none
	Mood (CPM)	none
	Smooth Lombard Wilcoxon	none
	Smooth Lombard Mood	none

Measuring Change

- Magnitude: % change before/after a change point
- Frequency: How often something happens
- Variability: How consistently something happens





Range of Variability (RVA)





Comparing Periods





Hydrologic Group	Hydrologic Group Metric		Magnitude Impact	RVA Change %	RVA Impact
	Annual Precipitation	20	Major	-54	Extreme
Annual Values	Annual Discharge	93	Extreme	-29	Major
Annual values	Annual Peak Discharge	61	Extreme	-1	Neutral
	Annual Runoff Ratios	64	Extreme	-27	Major
	7-Day Minimum	95	Extreme	-33	Major
Low Flows	August Median Base Flow	175	Extreme	-53	Extreme
	90% Flow Duration	124	Extreme	-60	Extreme
	May Median Flow	156	Extreme	-13	Moderate
Madarata Flavra	50% Flow Duration	191	Extreme	n/a	n/a
woderate Flows	1.5 Year Return Interval Flows	81	Extreme	n/a	n/a
	Annual Baseflow	94	Extreme	-42	Major
	10% Flow Duration	92	Extreme	124	Extreme
	5 Year Return Interval Flows	51	Extreme	n/a	n/a
righ riows	10 Year Return Interval Flows	41	Major	n/a	n/a
	3-Day Maximum	76	Extreme	7	Neutral
		-			
	Julian Day Max Flow	23	Major	-27	Major
Flow Timing	Julian Day Min Flow	14	Moderate	-20	Moderate
	High Pulse Count	38	Major	-20	Moderate
Flachinger	Low Pulse Count	-63	Extreme	-27	Major
Flashiness	Number of Reversals	31	Major	-67	Extreme
	Rise Rate	-3	Neutral	-20	Moderate





Hydrologic Group	Metric	Magnitude Change %	Magnitude Impact	RVA Change %	RVA Impact
	Annual Precipitation	20	Major	-54	Extreme
Appual Values	Annual Discharge	93	Extreme	-29	Major
Annual values	Annual Peak Discharge	61	Extreme	-1	Neutral
	Annual Runoff Ratios	64	Extreme	-27	Major
	7-Day Minimum	95	Extreme	-33	Major
Low Flows	August Median Base Flow	175	Extreme	-53	Extreme
	90% Flow Duration	124	Extreme	-60	Extreme
		-			
	May Median Flow	156	Extreme	-13	Moderate
Moderate Flows	50% Flow Duration	191	Extreme	n/a	n/a
	1.5 Year Return Interval Flows	81	Extreme	n/a	n/a
	Annual Baseflow	94	Extreme	-42	Major
	10% Flow Duration	92	Extreme	124	Extreme
	5 Year Return Interval Flows	51	Extreme	n/a	n/a
nigri riows	10 Year Return Interval Flows	41	Major	n/a	n/a
	3-Day Maximum	76	Extreme	7	Neutral
	Julian Day Max Flow	23	Major	-27	Major
Flow Timing	Julian Day Min Flow	14	Moderate	-20	Moderate
	High Pulse Count	38	Major	-20	Moderate
Flockinger	Low Pulse Count	-63	Extreme	-27	Major
Flashiness	Number of Reversals	31	Major	-67	Extreme
	Rise Rate	-3	Neutral	-20	Moderate





Hydrologic Group	Metric	Magnitude Change %	Magnitude Impact	RVA Change %	RVA Impact
	Annual Precipitation	20	Major	-54	Extreme
Annual Values	Annual Discharge	93	Extreme	-29	Major
	Annual Peak Discharge	61	Extreme	-1	Neutral
	Annual Runoff Ratios	64	Extreme	-27	Major
	7-Day Minimum	95	Extreme	-33	Major
Low Flows	August Median Base Flow	175	Extreme	-53	Extreme
	90% Flow Duration	124	Extreme	-60	Extreme
	May Median Flow	156	Extreme	-13	Moderate
Moderate Flows	50% Flow Duration	191	Extreme	n/a	n/a
woderate Flows	1.5 Year Return Interval Flows	81	Extreme	n/a	n/a
	Annual Baseflow	94	Extreme	-42	Major
	10% Flow Duration	92	Extreme	124	Extreme
High Flows	5 Year Return Interval Flows	51	Extreme	n/a	n/a
High Flows	10 Year Return Interval Flows	41	Major	n/a	n/a
	3-Day Maximum	76	Extreme	7	Neutral
Flow Timing	Julian Day Max Flow	23	Major	-27	Major
	Julian Day Min Flow	14	Moderate	-20	Moderate
	High Pulse Count	38	Major	-20	Moderate
Elashinass	Low Pulse Count	-63	Extreme	-27	Major
ridsfillitess	Number of Reversals	31	Major	-67	Extreme
	Rise Rate	-3	Neutral	-20	Moderate





Hydrologic Group	Metric	Magnitude Change %	Magnitude Impact	RVA Change %	RVA Impact
	Annual Precipitation	20	Major	-54	Extreme
Annual Values	Annual Discharge	93	Extreme	-29	Major
	Annual Peak Discharge	61	Extreme	-1	Neutral
	Annual Runoff Ratios	64	Extreme	-27	Major
	7-Day Minimum		Extreme	-33	Major
Low Flows	August Median Base Flow	175	Extreme	-53	Extreme
	90% Flow Duration	124	Extreme	-60	Extreme
	May Median Flow	156	Extreme	-13	Moderate
Modorato Flows	50% Flow Duration	191	Extreme	n/a	n/a
woderate Flows	1.5 Year Return Interval Flows	81	Extreme	n/a	n/a
	Annual Baseflow	94	Extreme	-42	Major
	10% Flow Duration	92	Extreme	124	Extreme
High Flows	5 Year Return Interval Flows	51	Extreme	n/a	n/a
Tigh Flows	10 Year Return Interval Flows	41	Major	n/a	n/a
	3-Day Maximum	76	Extreme	7	Neutral
Elow Timing	Julian Day Max Flow	23	Major	-27	Major
	Julian Day Min Flow	14	Moderate	-20	Moderate
	High Pulse Count	38	Major	-20	Moderate
Elashinoss	Low Pulse Count	-63	Extreme	-27	Major
FIGSHIILESS	Number of Reversals	31	Major	-67	Extreme
	Rise Rate	-3	Neutral	-20	Moderate





Hydrologic Group	Metric	Magnitude Change %	Magnitude Impact	RVA Change %	RVA Impact
	Annual Precipitation	20	Major	-54	Extreme
Appual Values	Annual Discharge	93	Extreme	-29	Major
Annual Values	Annual Peak Discharge	61	Extreme	-1	Neutral
	Annual Runoff Ratios	64	Extreme	-27	Major
	7-Day Minimum	95	Extreme	-33	Major
Low Flows	August Median Base Flow	175	Extreme	-53	Extreme
	90% Flow Duration	124	Extreme	-60	Extreme
	May Median Flow	156	Extreme	-13	Moderate
Modorato Flows	50% Flow Duration	191	Extreme	n/a	n/a
woderate Flows	1.5 Year Return Interval Flows	81	Extreme	n/a	n/a
	Annual Baseflow	94	Extreme	-42	Major
	10% Flow Duration	92	Extreme	124	Extreme
High Flows	5 Year Return Interval Flows	51	Extreme	n/a	n/a
Tigh Flows	10 Year Return Interval Flows	41	Major	n/a	n/a
	3-Day Maximum	76	Extreme	7	Neutral
		-			
Elow Timing	Julian Day Max Flow	23	Major	-27	Major
	Julian Day Min Flow	14	Moderate	-20	Moderate
	High Pulse Count	38	Major	-20	Moderate
Elachinaca	Low Pulse Count	-63	Extreme	-27	Major
ridstilliess	Number of Reversals	31	Major	-67	Extreme
	Rise Rate	-3	Neutral	-20	Moderate





What We've Learned: **Statewide EHC Results**





Statewide EHC Results Flood Flows

Annual Peak Discharge Percent Change





1.5 Year Return Interval Percent Change







August Median Baseflow Percent Change









Flow Duration Curve Analysis



Relation of Watershed Row Crop Acreage to Runoff



Statewide EHC Results

Random Forest Data Model





Change in Precipitation (inches)





Change in Annual Discharge (inches)





Change in Annual ET (inches)





Change in Runoff Ratio (%)



What We've Learned

- •Strong regional similarities
- Aspects of hydrologic change differ across regions and across the state
- Context is key hydrology is both a driver and is driven by watershed health



EHC Technical Summary Reports

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Evaluation of Hydrologic Change (EHC) Technical Summary

Le Sueur River Watershed

Hydrologic Unit Code: 05320500 DNR Major Watershed ID: 32

July 2023



Annual Precipitation

- Annual Runoff
- Annual Peak Discharge
- Flow Duration
- Runoff Ratios
- Baseflows
- Water Balance
- Data Leaning Model (Variable impact

Analysis)

Report Sections

Summary Information

- Hydrologic Change Point Determination
- Observed Hydrologic Changes
- Change in Hydrologic Dynamics
- Hydrologic Drivers



Report Sections

Summary Information

- Hydrologic Change Point Determination
- Observed Hydrologic Changes
- Change in Hydrologic Dynamics
- Hydrologic Drivers



Summary Information



Figure 1. Le Sueur River Watershed map showing stream order (Horton 1945), streamflow gage location, and contributing watershed area



Key Hydrologic Change Statements

Categories:

- Change point determination
- Precipitation & Discharge changes
- Flood Flow changes
- Channel Forming Flow changes
- Watershed Storage Capacity
- Impacts from Dam operations



Report Sections

Summary Information

- Hydrologic Change Point Determination
- Observed Hydrologic Changes
- Change in Hydrologic Dynamics
- Hydrologic Drivers



Hydrologic Change Point Determination

Data Category	Change Point Test	Change Point Year
Precinitation	Hurst Precipitation	1991
	DNR Hydrologic Assess. Tool (ED)	1990
Discharge	Hurst Discharge	1993
	DNR Hydrologic Assess. Tool (ED)	1991
Precipitation/Runoff Relationship	Double Mass Curve	1990, 2009
	Cramer-Von-Mises (CPM)	none
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov (CPM	none
	LePage (CPM)	none
	Energy Divisive Method (ED)	1979
	Lombard Wilcoxon	none
Appual Poak Discharge	Pettitt	none
Annual Feak Discharge	Mann-Whitney (CPM)	none
	Bayesian	none
	Lombard Mood	1969
	Mood (CPM)	none
	Smooth Lombard Wilcoxon	none
	Smooth Lombard Mood	none



Figure 10. EHC hydrologic change points for 47 Minnesota watersheds (this watershed circled)





Figure 11. Frequency of EHC change point occurrences in 47 assessed watersheds in Minnesota

Report Sections

Summary Information

- Hydrologic Change Point Determination
- Observed Hydrologic Changes
- Change in Hydrologic Dynamics
- Hydrologic Drivers



Observed Hydrologic Change - Standardized Analysis Reporting

Graphical Representation





Standardized Analysis Reporting

Statewide Map Results





Standardized Analysis Reporting

Regional and Statewide Box Plots





Report Sections

Summary Information

- Hydrologic Change Point Determination
- Observed Hydrologic Changes
- Change in Hydrologic Dynamics
- Hydrologic Drivers



Hydrologic Drivers



Figure 35. Le Sueur River Watershed area-weighted USDA county-reported harvest data

United States Department of Agriculture: Annually Reported County Harvested Crop Acreage





Random Forest Regression

- 7 variables assessed in relation to discharge
- Each variable's impact is assessed relative to the others by the % change in the mean square error (higher values have greater impact)
- The top 3 variables are then assessed (while holding the others constant) to see their impact on average annual discharge



Permanent Housing for EHC Summaries



💲 BUSINESS DEV, LOANS, GRANTS 🔮 ENVIRONMENT, SUSTAINABILITY 🛛 🖧 PESTICIDE, FERTILIZER 🍟 FOOD, FEED 🔍 PLANTS, INSECTS 💶 LICENSING & INSPECTIONS

MINNESOTA WATER RESEARCH DIGITAL LIBRARY (MNWRL)

www.wrl.mnpals.net



Moving Forward

- Informing WRAPS and 1W1P Efforts
- •Assessment of Statewide Results
- Developing methods to characterized subwatersheds where recent hydrology data is available.
- Extending Analyses on existing EHC gages





Cooperative Stream Gaging Records



EHC Gages



EHC Strengths

- Consistent and repeatable
- Wide array of metrics based on empirical data
- Comparable across regions
- Identifies additional analysis needs
- Identifies time frames and supports goal setting



EHC Challenges

- •Limited by length of records available
- May not represent sub-watershed conditions
- Not available everywhere
- Complex results require interpretation





THANK YOU!

Jason Carlson | Regional Hydrologist

jason.Carlson@state.mn.us



Permanent Housing for EHC Summaries



💲 BUSINESS DEV, LOANS, GRANTS 🔮 ENVIRONMENT, SUSTAINABILITY 🛛 🖧 PESTICIDE, FERTILIZER 🍟 FOOD, FEED 🔍 PLANTS, INSECTS 💶 LICENSING & INSPECTIONS

MINNESOTA WATER RESEARCH DIGITAL LIBRARY (MNWRL)

www.wrl.mnpals.net



Program Name Grants to Watersheds with Approved Comprehensive Watershed Plans (Watershed-based Implementation Funding)

Program Contact Name Annie Felix-Gerth Phone 651-238-0677

Contact E-mail Address: annie.felix-gerth@state.mn.us

Person filling out form: Marcey Westrick Phone 651-284-4153

Person filling out form e-mail address marcey.westrick@state.mn.us

Which activities of the Water Management Framework does the proposal address?

Nonpoint Source Implementation

Statutory citation that guides program activities, if applicable:

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.

A non-competitive, performance based grants program for local government units to implement projects on a watershed scale that protect, enhance, and restore surface water quality in lakes, rivers, and streams, protect groundwater from degradation, and protect drinking water sources. Projects must be identified in a water or comprehensive watershed plan developed by local governments and approved by the Board of Water and Soil Resources. This may include those under the One Watershed, One Plan or under the Metropolitan Surface Water Management frameworks and county groundwater plans.

Provides non-competitive funding to local government partnerships to implement prioritized and targeted activities identified in the plan that will yield the highest return on investment for cleaner water

FY10-11	FY12-13	FY14-15	FY16-17	FY18-19	FY20-21	FY22-23	TOTAL
						APPROPRIA	FY10-23
						TED	
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,750,000	\$26,966,000	43564000	80280000

FY24 Request	FY25 Request	FY24-25 TOTAL REQUEST

How much of this	\$0	How much of this	\$0
request will be spent		request will protect	
EXCLUSIVELY to		drinking water sources	
protect drinking water		INDIRECTLY?	
sources?			

Does th Plan?	is request address any of the following goals in the Clean Water Council's Strategic	
Goal 1	"Drinking water is safe for everyone, everywhere in Minnesota"	Yes
Goal 2	"Groundwater is clean and available to all in Minnesota"	Yes
Goal 3	"Surface waters are swimmable and fishable throughout the state"	Yes
Goal 4	"All Minnesotans value water and take actions to sustain and protect it"	Yes

Please indicate which strategy in the Clean Water Council's Strategic Plan applies to this proposal. (Please request a copy of the Plan from the Clean Water Council if necessary.)

Goal 1, Strategy 4; Goal 2, Strategy 6, Goal 3, Strategy 1, Strategy 10, 12, 13, Goal 4, Strategy 4

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.)

Implementation of high priority action items identified in Comprehensive Watershed Management Plans .

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.)

Increase

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.

0.89230769230769225

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

91%

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	FY24-25
0	0	0	0	4.400000	5.400000		
				0000000	0000000		
				004	004		

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

Program Number: 18

Program Name Accelerated Implementation

Program Contact Name Marcey Westrick Phone 651-284-4153

Contact E-mail Address: marcey.westrick@state.mn.us

Person filling out form: Marcey Westrick Phone 651-284-4153

Person filling out form e-mail address marcey.westrick@state.mn.us

Which activities of the Water Management Framework does the proposal address?

Nonpoint Source Implementation

Statutory citation that guides program activities, if applicable:

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.

Enhance the capacity of local governments to accelerate implementation of projects and activities that supplement or exceed current state standards for protection, enhancement, and restoration of water quality in lakes, rivers, streams, and groundwater. Activities include: 1) increase technical assistance through regional technical service areas (TSAs), 2) technical training and certification, 3) leveraging federal program dollars, and 4) developing and using analytical targeting tools that fill an identified gap.

1) Increases technical assistance through regional technical service areas (TSAs), 2) provides technical training and certification to soil and water conservation district, 3) inventories of potential restoration or protection sites, and 4) developing and using analytical targeting tools like PTMApp that fill an identified gap.

FY10-11	FY12-13	FY14-15	FY16-17	FY18-19	FY20-21	FY22-23	TOTAL
						APPROPRIA	FY10-23
						TED	
\$0	\$6,600,000	\$8,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$7,600,000	\$8,000,000	9682000	51882000

FY24 Request	FY25 Request	FY24-25 TOTAL REQUEST		

How much of this	\$0	How much of this	\$0
request will be spent		request will protect	
EXCLUSIVELY to		drinking water sources	
protect drinking water		INDIRECTLY?	
sources?			

Does th	is request address any of the following goals in the Clean Water Council's Strategic	
Plan?		
Goal 1	"Drinking water is safe for everyone, everywhere in Minnesota"	Yes
Goal 2	"Groundwater is clean and available to all in Minnesota"	No
Goal 3	"Surface waters are swimmable and fishable throughout the state"	Yes
Goal 4	"All Minnesotans value water and take actions to sustain and protect it"	No

Please indicate which strategy in the Clean Water Council's Strategic Plan applies to this proposal. (Please request a copy of the Plan from the Clean Water Council if necessary.)

Goal 1, Strategy 4; Goal 2, Strategy 6, Goal 3, Strategy 1, Strategy 10, 12, 13, Goal 4, Strategy 4

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.)

Increased capacity of local governments

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.)

Increase

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.

0.68421052631578949

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 <u>paul.gardner@state.mn.us</u>

80%

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	FY24-25
0	0.900000	2.5	4.599999	7.400000	3		
	0000000		9999999	0000000			
	0002		996	004			

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