

Policy Committee Meeting Agenda

Clean Water Council

September 24, 2021

9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

WebEx Only

2021 Policy Committee: John Barten (Chair), Rich Biske, Kelly Gribauval-Hite, Raj Rajan, Victoria Reinhardt (Vice Chair), Peter Schwagerl, Phil Sterner, Jordan Vandal, and Marcie Weinandt

9:30 Regular Business

- Introductions
- Approve today's agenda
- ~~Approve minutes of previous meeting~~
- Chair and staff update

9:45 Debrief on Field Tour

10:00 Pharmaceutical Policy Statement Draft

10:45 BREAK

11:00 Draft List of Policy Topics to Rank for Future Consideration

12:00 Adjourn

.....

Possible Future Meeting Topics:

- LiDAR: Summary of its uses to date; future needs (From recently passed Legacy Finance bill)
- Council member interest in frac sand mining
- State soil health plan concept (idea from Minnesota House of Representatives) for **NOVEMBER**
- New Plan to Spend 3M Settlement for East Metro
- Neonicotinoids: clothianidin, and imidaclopid (idea from Minnesota House of Representatives)
- Tire chemical and salmon/smelt in Lake Superior (idea from Minnesota House of Representatives)
- Precision manure application/Manure storage grants for water quality



Approved by Policy Committee on 04/27/2018
Approved by Clean Water Council on 05/21/2018
DRAFT revision 09/24/2021

Clean Water Council

Pharmaceutical Policy

Policy Statement

The Clean Water Council recommends that the State establish the following to reduce the discharge of pharmaceuticals into the waters of Minnesota:

1. Require the words or symbols for “do not flush” be printed on all prescription pharmaceutical labels, and remove any existing instructions to flush unused portions.
2. Adopt a “Safe Medication Return Program” modeled after the legislation recently adopted by Washington State.
 - This legislation should provide flexibility by:
 - Utilizing the current collection infrastructure;
 - Requiring manufacturers support of public education and outreach activities; and to cover all administrative and support costs including, but not limited to: collection, compensation to authorized collectors, transportation, secure receptacles, and environmentally sound disposal of covered pharmaceuticals;
 - Allowing residents to take unused medications to drop-off locations or use a mailing envelope, both for free
 - Providing drop-off locations that are “equitable and reasonably convenient”
3. Fund research on the pathways of pharmaceuticals into surface water and ground water, identify priority pharmaceuticals that pose the greatest risk to human health and aquatic life, identify and support practicable solutions to reduce their entry into Minnesota waters, and recoup reasonable costs through the industry-funded safe medication return program.

Problem

Pharmaceuticals are used to treat, cure, diagnose, and prevent disease and ailments in humans, agricultural animals, and companion animals. The use of pharmaceuticals is expected to increase in response to increasing demand. These chemicals are designed to be biologically active and potent at low doses.

Pharmaceuticals enter the environment through many pathways including:

- Improper disposal of unused medications (both in home and at care facilities)
- Runoff from manure on agricultural fields or feedlots
- Effluent from health care facilities, medication manufacturing and other industrial sources
- Excretion from normal use in humans (e.g. not all of the drug is fully metabolized in the body)

Pharmaceuticals are commonly detected in Minnesota surface water, groundwater and sediment. The concentrations detected are low relative to other contaminants, but they can have negative impacts on the environment, especially aquatic species. It is extremely difficult and costly to remove these chemicals from wastewater and drinking water. Preventing entry to the environment, such as through improving prescription practices and minimizing input from waste streams is the best way to avoid potential impacts of pharmaceuticals.

In addition to the environmental impact of waste pharmaceuticals being discharged into the waters of Minnesota, there is also a public safety benefit to environmentally sound disposal. Prescription drugs left unused by the intended recipient, which are not disposed of properly, can be misused by others and have serious or fatal consequences. Seven out of ten people who start abusing prescription drugs get them from the medicine cabinets of friends and family. Among children, the most common cause of accidental poisoning is from ingesting drugs. In addition, periodic cleaning of the medicine cabinet reduces the likelihood that adults, especially the elderly, will take the wrong medication, wrong dose or use expired medications.

Current Efforts by State Agencies with Clean Water Fund (CWF)

With funding from CWF, the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) conduct research, public education, monitoring and collecting waste pharmaceuticals throughout the State, and environmental surveillance. Both agencies work closely with other State agencies, local entities such as local law enforcement, county & city public health departments, and local pharmacies to keep unwanted pharmaceuticals from reaching our waters.

Minnesota Department of Health:

Pharmaceutical Rapid Assessments: Using a novel method, MDH has established conservative screening values (above which the risk of negative human health affects increases) for 119 pharmaceuticals commonly prescribed in the U.S., and monitored for in the environment.

Outreach & education grants: Grants go to local governments, non-profits, watersheds districts, and academic institutions to raise awareness of pharmaceuticals and other contaminants of emerging concern (CEC), expand outreach on pharmaceutical take-back opportunities, and reduce the presence of CECs in the environment through behavior change.

Educational resources: The Department creates resources for local entities that facilitate outreach to communities and provide a consistent message throughout the State on the health and environmental risks of pharmaceuticals and other CECs.

One Health Antibiotic Collaborative: The MDH leads a team of experts from Minnesota Department of Agriculture, MPCA, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Board of Animal Health, Board of Veterinary Medicine, University of Minnesota, pharmacy and dentistry groups, physicians, agricultural representatives, and other experts to ensure that Minnesotans use antibiotics in a manner to reduce antibiotic resistance and protect the environment. <http://www.health.state.mn.us/onehealthabx/>

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Monitoring of pharmaceuticals and other contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) in surface and groundwater: The MPCA monitors pharmaceuticals and other CECs in surface water and groundwater to determine their presence and prevalence in the environment. Currently, the MPCA monitors about 140 chemicals comprised of pharmaceuticals, hormones, anti-corrosives, and other industrial or commercial chemicals in surface and groundwater. Among those, most frequently detected pharmaceuticals in surface water are: antidepressants (amitriptyline, fluoxetine, and sertraline), and iopamidol (an x-ray contrast agent). The January 2021 study, "[Pharmaceuticals and Chemicals of Concern in Minnesota Lakes](#)", shares the results of sampling in 50 randomly selected lakes. The study shows that contaminants of emerging concern are widespread in the state.

Investigation of sources of pharmaceuticals and other CECs to the environment and evaluate their potential effects on aquatic life: MPCA conducts focused investigations to determine sources of pharmaceuticals to the environment and understand potential actions to reduce them: pollution prevention, best management practices, rules. Often MPCA collaborates with university and federal researchers in these studies to use genomics and other new techniques to assess potential effects on fish and other aquatic life. MPCA has also developed a semi-automated approach for summarizing known information about the behavior and potential impacts of specific pharmaceuticals and CECs on aquatic life, resulting in an Aquatic Toxicity Profile (ATP). The ATPs provide a basis for comparing one chemical versus another.

Outreach & education materials: The agency provides support to local governments, pharmacies, law enforcement and other agencies to raise awareness on the impacts of pharmaceuticals in the home and in the environment, and to support proper disposal of unneeded pharmaceuticals.

Registration and tracking of waste pharmaceutical collection locations in the state: The MPCA works with local law enforcement, pharmacies, Native American Tribes and other state and federal agencies to encourage the installment of secure bins to dispose of unwanted pharmaceuticals. The MPCA oversees over 350 collection sites and collects data from them annually. Since 2010, these programs have voluntarily collected over 550,000 pounds of waste pharmaceuticals. The MPCA is working with the Department of Human Services on a federal grant to place approximately 25 collection boxes in underserved areas of the state in 2018.

List of Potential Policy Ideas for the Clean Water Council to Discuss in 2017-2018
REV 6/20/17

| Topic | Current Status/Origin of Idea | Concept | Stakeholder Comments and Ranking (12/12/16) - please see full set of comments | Stakeholder Ranking (Jan. 2017). Highest Priority = 1 and Lowest Priority = 21. Topics that are blank were new | 2017 Status/Next Steps |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Reduce runoff from feedlots | Proposed in 2017; many presentations about new large feedlot rule 2019-2020 | Support new large feedlot rule in its entirety; consider expanding to feedlots < 100 animal units and support enforcement | Middle priority (11th of 21 topics). Effective oversight and enforcement of existing laws is important. Should not be a Council priority - agencies already enforce the law. Current feedlot situation is terrible - deserves significant attention. Highly concerned about upstream feedlot impacts to Prairie Island Indian Community. | 11 | Discussed in January 2017. Committee asked MPCA Feedlot Program staff to return to a future meeting with policy ideas but MPCA declined. Recommend forming a Committee subteam to meet with MPCA staff separately to discuss potential ideas. |
| Support improved rangeland/grazing management for water quality | Proposed in 2017 | (1) Promote practices to reduce animal (cattle) access to streams. (2) Regulations to reduce animal (cattle) access to streams. (3) Develop and implement a 'working lands' permanent conservation easement program for livestock grazing and pasture. Eligibility should be limited to highly sensitive land and should require livestock management plans. | Higher priority (6th of 21 topics). Original idea closely related to #11 under Water Governance - could combine and have an overarching feedlot policy. Could be good if converting row crop to vegetation but not paying to keep pasture. Concern about targeting sensitive lands for grazing. High concern - animals with direct access to streams and impacts. Create incentives for working land easements. | 6 | MDA provided pros/cons of stakeholder ideas to the Committee in June. Committee may revisit this topic with stakeholders in late fall 2016. |
| Develop a state perennial cellulosic biofuels standard | Proposed in 2017. | Develop a state perennial cellulosic biofuels standard (e.g. 10% by 2030 of our total fuel mix from perennial cellulosic biofuels). | | | Added this policy idea on 1/27/17 from stakeholder comments. |
| Reduce chloride from de-icers | Council has two existing policy statements as of 2020 on de-icer and on water softening | (1) Reduce liability for private applicators who attend training/are certified with smart salt application techniques for winter snow and ice management. (2) TBD - Example (promote alternative practices to reduce the amount of chloride used for de-icing impervious surfaces). (3) Incentives and education on sanding roads and stormwater capture as well as the chloride trainings. | Middle priority (12th of 21 topics). Need to figure out if this policy would have water quality benefits. Chloride is a permanent pollutant and needs decisive action. Liability makes sense but there are higher-priority options to attend to. High priority in urban areas - need to provide alternatives and work on liability issues. This is one of the greatest challenges for future water resources in Minnesota. Too detailed for policy development. | 12 | Committee decided not to pursue in 2016 as they already had too many topics to discuss. Added #3 on 1/27/17 from stakeholder comments. Committee decided on 5/26/17 that this would be a high priority topic to discuss in 2017-2018. |
| Support a safe medication return program funded by industry to reduce pharmaceuticals in water | Policy statement adopted in 2018 is under revision after a committee presentation | Support the creation of a Safe Medication Return program based on a recent law from Washington State. | Lower priority (19th of 21 topics). It's wise for health care, pharmacy, law enforcement, and environmental sectors to partner with the State/LGUs to create a statewide drug take-back program. Supporting a study process seems to make sense. Other topics are higher priorities though. Doesn't go far enough since it doesn't address the fact that the chemicals we excrete from our body enter wastewater or septic systems. Also doesn't address the widespread and unregulated use and disposal of animal pharmaceuticals. Need better information on CECs. Important but we need more research on CECs first. Duplicative of other efforts. | 19 | Discussed in January and April 2016. Committee decided not to pursue this topic because agencies did not have any specific policy recommendations ready at that time. Topic named changed from Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) to Pharmaceuticals in May 2017. Committee decided on 5/26/17 that this would be a high priority topic to discuss in 2017-2018. |
| Incorporate water storage/retention and multi-purpose drainage management into comprehensive watershed management plans | Proposed in 2017. | (1) Develop drainage performance standards and require Best Management Practice treatment where appropriate. (2) Improve watershed resilience through watershed management, including agricultural drainage systems. (3) Leverage local agricultural accountability by creating agricultural management areas and drainage authority accountability at the subwatershed level. (4) Incentives for reduced runoff volume, peak flows and sediment delivery. (5) Water storage to reduce peak flows (detention storage) and to reduce volume of runoff and carrying capacity (longer term storage that provides more infiltration and/or evapotranspiration). (6) Enhanced integration of multipurpose drainage management in local water plans, including 1W1P. | Higher priority (2nd of 21 topics). Item #1 is most important - this is vital and would be more effective than incentives. Very high priority - incentives won't change practices on scale needed. Consider requiring permits for new drain tile installation with performance standards for flow and nutrients. Item #3 is an important concept. Item #2 can help reduce nutrients and maintenance costs. Huge issue and we are going in the wrong direction - need to know how many more lands could be tiled. | 2 | Discussed in April, June, and October 2016. Sent a letter to the Drainage Work Group (DWG) from the Policy Committee on 11/18/16 to ask them to review a water storage policy and provide recommendations on how to better align drainage law and watershed planning objectives. Policy Chair and Vice Chair plan to attend a future DWG meeting to discuss this in more detail (future DWG mtgs are June 8, 2017 and July 13, 2017). |

List of Potential Policy Ideas for the Clean Water Council to Discuss in 2017-2018
REV 6/20/17

| Topic | Current Status/Origin of Idea | Concept | Stakeholder Comments and Ranking (12/12/16) - please see full set of comments | Stakeholder Ranking (Jan. 2017). Highest Priority = 1 and Lowest Priority = 21. Topics that are blank were new | 2017 Status/Next Steps |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Reform Local Water Governance and Planning | Proposed in 2017 | (1) Reform watershed governance (e.g. combine some WDs/WMOs with SWCDs). (2) Consider policy options for watershed governance to deliver water quality goals for the agricultural sector. (3) Require watershed governance structures statewide that have full-fledged autonomy to act (e.g. raise funds, regulate, and execute priorities). (4) Enhance and streamline local watershed planning and align it with One Watershed, One Plan and Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS). (5) Manage water using One Watershed One Plan. (6) Promote infiltration and water retention in local watershed management plans. (7) Provide tax levy authority in greater Minnesota to allow the same capacity for local water planning, management and implementation that exists in the Seven-County Metropolitan Area. (8) Regulate water quantity through watershed districts. (9) Require local comprehensive watershed management plans that set water retention, storage and infiltration (volume control standards) that will hold the first X inches of rainfall for at least 24 hours by the year 2020. (10) Require local water management authorities to implement water plans. (11) Require that local comprehensive watershed management plans address altered hydrology through water retention, storage, infiltration goals. (12) Create a timeline and process for creating of Watershed Districts to correspond with One Watershed One Plan comprehensive watershed plans. | Higher priority (1st of 21 topics). Council should pursue topics items #3, #7, #8, #9, #3, and #7 because LGUs need better base funding. Items #8 and #9 - high priority ideas - need volume control in all areas to get to clean water. Good ideas for watersheds to be able to raise funds and implement water retention projects. Creating local watershed authorities will be most effective at changing behavior. Item #9 is important for parking lots. Item #3 is important now because watershed planning efforts are underway. Item #3 is important because we need these groups to implement 1W1P activities. | 1 | Committee decided not to pursue in 2016 as they already had too many topics to discuss. Added policy idea #12 on 1/27/17 from stakeholder comments. |
| Support Policy to Reach Goals in State's Nutrient Reduction Strategy | Proposed in 2017; five year status report on Nutrient Reduction Strategy was issued in 2020 | (1) Consider a polluter pays principle for nutrient management. (2) Recommend a nutrient accountability program (e.g. fall fertilizer application prohibitions). (3) Recommend adding the word "sustainable" to maximum return to nitrogen guidelines provided by the University of Minnesota. (4) Institute a fertilizer surcharge to provide compensation for drinking water treatment where contamination has occurred. (5) Direct the MPCA to create nitrate standards for surface waters by July 1st, 2018. (6) Fix the MDA's Nitrogen Fertilizer Management Plan. (7) UMN create Maximum Sustainable Return to Nitrogen guidelines that prescribe the level of fertilizer application at which surface and ground waters will not be compromised. (8) Expand the use of point to non-point trading for net benefit to water quality. (9) Create a timeline and process for creating of Watershed Districts to correspond with One Watershed One Plan. (10) Develop policy and funding recommendations to reduce nitrogen loads leaving Minnesota by 20% by 2025 and 45% by 2045. | Higher priority (7th of 21 topics). Item #3 - clarification needed - can't just add a word - need to create fertilizer recs based on water resources. Items #1-4 are all high priority ideas. See social costs of nitrogen article. May be politically difficult. | 7 | MDA provided pros/cons of stakeholder ideas to the Committee in June. Committee may revisit this topic with stakeholders that developed policy ideas in early 2017. Added policy ideas #5-#10 on 1/27/17 from stakeholder comments. Committee decided on 5/26/17 that this would be a high priority topic to discuss in 2017-2018. |
| Support an increase in Clean Water Fund support for infrastructure | Proposed in 2017 | (1) Consider changing caps and match requirements for CWF infrastructure grants. (2) Address WWTF infrastructure needs so funding can be more sustainable. | Lower priority (16th of 21 topics). LGUs need funding for water infrastructure projects. Funding already available through PFA. Communities need funding for planning stages of projects. Nitrogen remediation very expensive for rural towns. Need to add scoring criteria that values "green or natural infrastructure" and non-point trading. | 16 | Committee decided not to pursue in 2016 as they already had too many topics to discuss. |
| Require stringent BMPs on priority acres subjected to certain land use conversion | Proposed in 2017 | Protect targeted lands from the worst impacts from land use conversion (e.g. require Best Management Practices if x number of acres is converted from forestland to potatoes). | Higher priority (3rd of 21 topics). Need some sort of "no net increase" in pollutants to waters policy. Need more information to evaluate this. Recommend creating "Freshwater Protection Areas" to protect high quality aquatic habitats. Landuse conversion is primary driver of altered hydrology and water quality - focus should be to evaluate strategies to maintain forests. Protecting vulnerable lands supporting healthy waters is far more cost-effective than restoring degraded waters. | 3 | Discussed in April and May 2016. Decided to wait until the Pineland Sands research area studies are completed. |
| Protect healthy waters with policy, funding, land use designation, and incentives | Stakeholder feedback January 2017. | (1) develop policy and funding recommendations to protect healthy waters. (2) create property tax incentives for perennial cover in drinking water supply management areas and critical water supply source areas. (3) Expand the Scientific and Natural Area program to include lakes and rivers of biological significance. (4) Use existing authorities to strengthen protection of healthy surface water and groundwater through designation. | | | Added this policy idea on 1/27/17 from stakeholder comments. |

List of Potential Policy Ideas for the Clean Water Council to Discuss in 2017-2018
REV 6/20/17

| Topic | Current Status/Origin of Idea | Concept | Stakeholder Comments and Ranking (12/12/16) - please see full set of comments | Stakeholder Ranking (Jan. 2017). Highest Priority = 1 and Lowest Priority = 21. Topics that are blank were new | 2017 Status/Next Steps |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Enhance compliance for septic systems | Proposed in 2016; SSTS compliance now above 80% due in part to CWF; 90% possible according to MPCA | Enforce existing septic system laws. | Middle priority (9th of 21 topics). Effective oversight and enforcement is important, Agencies/LGUs should already be enforcing this law - not a topic for the Clean Water Council. Need Clean Water Fund dollars to enhance/match low/no interest loan programs. One of the most important issues. | 9 | Committee decided not to pursue in 2016 as they already had too many topics to discuss. |
| Enhance shoreland protection | Proposed in 2017 | (1) Give local governments the backing and support to make variance decisions that protect lakes and rivers. (2) Recognize higher standards in shoreland ordinances are an effective way to address water quality stressors and risk and make it a priority to provided funding to local governments to adopt them. (3) Provide a strong statement on the importance of vegetative riparian buffers in urban areas. (4) Recommend that the State act to strengthen how shoreland protections for public water resources are implemented at the local level. (5) Add a special set of criteria for variances in shoreland areas. | Lower priority (17th of 21 topics). Unclear purpose and intent. Not sure variances and urban buffers will have water quality impacts. Items #1 and #2 - supporting LGUs with buffers important particularly for Public Water Wetlands. Item #3 - urban areas contribute less nutrients to the Mississippi River so may be valuable in some cases but not priority at the statewide scale. | 17 | Presentation on Shoreland Rules at April full Clean Water Council meeting. Discussed in May and June. Recommended that DNR and implementers of shoreland rules discuss aspects of shoreland rules that could be updated. Committee still needs to discuss variance criteria too. |
| Reduce erosion on Highly Erodable Lands through conservation plans and/or ordinances | Proposed in 2017 | Assist in advancing reforms that will require on Highly Erodible Land (HEL) a conservation plan or system which will prevent water and wind erosion from exceeding tolerable soil loss limits as identified in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Field Office Technical Guide. | Middle priority (14th of 21 topics). Applying concept to non-HEL lands could be high impact. If HELs already require a conservation plan than not needed, if they don't this is a sound strategy if enforced. Support BWSR soil-loss ordinance work - tolerable (T) is a vague concept for LGUs to enforce. Good idea but will be almost impossible to quantify when this is exceeded so success unlikely. | 14 | Discussed in March and June 2016. Tabled further discussion on this topic for that year because Minnesota passed new soil erosion loss language last year and we need to know the results of that effort first. Enforcing existing laws should not be a Council item. #3 - especially supportive of this idea. Variance Board often grant variances - it is the rule rather than the exception. Need incentives for landowners to protect shoreland beyond minimum standards - could sign a long-term covenant (50 year) - this could get Clean Water Fund dollars out to people on the ground and change behavior and build grassroots support. Incentives need to be revenue neutral for local governments. |
| Develop a soil health plan and/or soil health goals | Proposed in 2017; Rep. Lippert is also interested in setting a state soil health goal and developing a soil health plan | Adopt a soil health policy statement similar to other state policies related to water. Needs to address both urban and rural areas. | Lower priority (18th of 21 topics). Too vague - need more information. Surprised this is not already a policy. A policy statement would draw attention to this critically important resource and help pave the way for future efforts - soils are the foundation for many ecosystem services including clean water. | 18 | Discussed in March, September, and October 2016. John Barten is willing to draft a policy on reducing soil compaction from construction activities in urban areas. |
| Create Standard of Care and Best Management Practices in Agriculture | Proposed in 2017 | (1) Develop performance-based standards for nonpoint pollution sectors (e.g. consider doing this by watershed). (2) Consider policy options that require a basic "standard of care" for crop agriculture. (3) Promote landscape Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. buffers, BMPs on new tile systems, cover crops, no-till, etc.) for nutrient management. (4) TBD - Address challenges for landowners to implement Best Management Practices. (5) Develop and implement research and demonstration sites to provide information and education, and actively engage farmers in water quality BMPs. (6) Explore a tax incentive program to promote conservation implementation. (7) Support and promote the opportunity to capture market value for water quality protecting and enhancing agricultural products and services. | Higher priority (4th of 21 topics). Item #2 is needed to require a standard of care. Item #5 - don't need more research. Item #6 is promising but politically hard because LGUs lose tax base. | 4 | MDA provided pros/cons of stakeholder ideas to the Committee in June. Committee may revisit this topic with stakeholders that developed policy ideas in early 2017. |
| Reduce groundwater use through greater efficiency | Proposed in 2017 | (1) Improve industrial water efficiency. (2) Motivate consumers to conserve water. (3) Promote regional water supply and sustainability. (4) Use agricultural irrigation water more efficiently. (5) For Budget Committee - could take Met Council water efficiency grants and industrial water use programs statewide. (6) For Budget Committee - for ag. irrigation efficiency - need more training for producers though UMN Extension. | Middle priority (10th of 21 topics). Item #2 is helpful but not a priority outside of a few targeted areas. Item #3 is important - some regions are facing dwindling water supplies. What you really need is a stronger approach to align permit issuance with available sustainable ground water supplies. Need to target largest users and provide data to communities. Important - how about protecting water supplies with better wellhead BMPs. Item #4 is important - depends who the consumer is - daily residential use little impact compared to water use in industry and agriculture. | 10 | Committee decided not to pursue in 2016 as they already had too many topics to discuss. Committee would like agencies to provide more detailed policy recommendations on this topic. Could have a few water utilities present. Didn't discuss industrial water efficiency much so that could be a future meeting topic. |

List of Potential Policy Ideas for the Clean Water Council to Discuss in 2017-2018
REV 6/20/17

| Topic | Current Status/Origin of Idea | Concept | Stakeholder Comments and Ranking (12/12/16) - please see full set of comments | Stakeholder Ranking (Jan. 2017). Highest Priority = 1 and Lowest Priority = 21. Topics that are blank were new | 2017 Status/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Support Tax Incentives for Water Storage | Proposed in 2017 | Increase storage/retention by providing property tax relief for sustaining wetlands, flowage easements and flood retention structures that also reduce nutrients. | Lower priority (20th of 21 topics). Need more specificity. There isn't money to provide these incentives. Tax incentives can be effective. Potential to work with forestry stakeholders on this topic. Important way to broaden adoption of practices. Should include the idea of water storage here too. | 20 | Committee decided not to pursue this topic in 2016 as it is more of an action than a policy topic. However, the Committee may want to hear more about this topic in 2017 to better understand it. Added policy idea on 1/27/17 from stakeholder comments. |
| Reduce Runoff from Urban Stormwater | Proposed in 2017 | (1) Control and filter runoff with green infrastructure. (2) Institute Minimal Impact Design Standards. (3) Provide funding to deploy smart technology. (4) Require stormwater capture at construction sites. | Middle priority (13th of 21 topics). Items #1, #3, and #4 are already required for urban projects. Item #2 - MIDS need further promotion - valuable tool. MIDS designed as voluntary tool so if required there would be political pushback. Item #4 is important - have seen tremendous amounts of erosion from construction sites. Would like to see incentives for construction stormwater training. A lot of effort has and will be done already on this topic. Need to utilize green infrastructure and consider trading. | 13 | Committee decided not to pursue in 2016 as they already had too many topics to discuss. |
| Promote water reuse | Proposed in 2017, deferred to await interagency white paper | | | | Water reuse is waiting for interagency team to develop a white paper in 2017. Committee decided on 5/26/17 that this would be a high priority topic to discuss in 2017-2018. |
| Promote water storage | Council has 2014 policy statement; WRAPS and One Watershed One Plan includes water storage now | (1) Revisit Council 2014 policy recommendation. (2) Public land issues related to water storage. (3) Wildlife versus storage. (4) Wetland design. (5) Fairness for funding water storage projects. (6) Expand the current Council policy on water storage and retention to add guidance to agencies and/or local governments. (7) consider developing a set of recommendations/principles designed to integrate all of the pieces such as soil health, living cover, conservation cropping systems, and water storage. (8) A statewide soil health watershed policy. (9) BOC discussed this idea in March 2016 - where appropriate, require comprehensive watershed management plans that use the One Watershed, One Plan framework to include water volume reduction (or storage) goals. (10) There is so much overlap on these topics – should consider developing a more overarching policy. For example, a policy recommendation that watershed plans have water quantity (storage) and water quality goals/requirements. (11) See tax incentive idea above. | Middle priority (8th of 21 topics). Topic seems to be covered elsewhere. Need an integrated approach. Critical important due to climate change. Item #7 seems the best way to integrate all these ideas. Items #9 and #10 are the best ideas - to incorporate water storage into watershed plans. A lot of opportunity/support for this topic (from farm groups). | 8 | Discussed in January and June 2016. Drafted proposal to revise 2014 Council policy recommendations related to water storage. <i>"Proposed 2016 Policy Statement: The Clean Water Council recommends that comprehensive watershed management plans (i.e. One Watershed, One Plans), developed under Minn. Stat. § 103B.801, must develop, where appropriate, goals and strategies for flow reduction, sediment reduction and nutrient reduction. The goals and strategies should be expressed in quantifiable and measurable terms such as acre-feet of water storage, peak flow reduction, tons of sediment, and pounds of phosphorus in relation to the reductions necessary to meet water quality standards."</i> See also Nov. 2016 letter to the Drainage Work Group. |
| Promote secure data sharing for underground utilities to reduce risk to water quality from accidents | Proposed in 2021, policy statement approved by Policy Committee, awaiting full Council approval | | | | |

List of Potential Policy Ideas for the Clean Water Council to Discuss in 2017-2018
REV 6/20/17

| Topic | Current Status/Origin of Idea | Concept | Stakeholder Comments and Ranking (12/12/16) - please see full set of comments | Stakeholder Ranking (Jan. 2017). Highest Priority = 1 and Lowest Priority = 21. Topics that are blank were new | 2017 Status/Next Steps |
|--|-------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Create additional incentives for Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program | Proposed in 2017 but deferred | (1) Enhance Minnesota's certification system for responsibly produced agricultural product. (2) Clean Water Certified Products - promote products that have been produced with water-friendly methods using a system based on attributes/standards. Could use the MN Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program (MAWQCP) as a standard for certification. | Lower priority (15th of 21 topics). MAWQCP fails to protect waters from subsurface nitrate delivery so needs to be revised before it is used as a standard for certified products. MAWQCP scoring thresholds need to be fixed before this should be used. Not a priority for the Council unless there is evidence this can be scaled up. Needs to be constructed carefully so a "Clean Water" certification actually means it is less environmentally destructive. Using market forces could work. Should increase participation as nonpoint ag. continues to be a large contributor to water quality impairments. Need to establish benchmarks and annual improvement of water quality goals at the watershed level and MAWQCP can help support private sector efforts. Minnesota Farmer's Union sees interest growing with farmers in this program. | 15 | Discussed in March. Committee decided not to pursue this topic as it doesn't seem ready and is a very large issue to take on. |
| Address Aquatic Invasive Species | Proposed in 2017 | (1) View AIS as biological pollutants. (2) Change the way people have access to public waters to limit the spread of AIS. | Lower priority (21st of 21 topics). Need more information - would this be a change to agency jurisdiction? Limiting access to water is very unpopular. Both good steps - new invasive can severely impact water quality. Costs savings with prevention efforts. For river systems, enforcement does little to prevent the spread of AIS. Most AIS impacts are ecological - important issue to address but other entities better suited to address this issue. | 21 | Discussed in March. Committee decided not to pursue this topic as there is a statewide AIS Advisory Council discussing these issues. |
| Encourage cover crops through federal crop insurance policy | Proposed in 2017 | Assist in advancing the adoption of cover crops by requesting the Federal Risk Management Agency (FRMA) to allow insurability of a crop that has been properly interseeded and to request the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to rewrite their Cover Crop Standard to encompass this practice. | Higher priority (5th of 21 topics). Removing barriers to cover crop adoption important. High priority for ability to make landscape scale change. Could significantly improve water quality. See Dunn County, WI for example of civic governance that increased cover crops to thousands of acres. Likely for federal program to make the change? Lots of interest with farmers - RMA an issue that needs to be addressed. | 5 | Discussed in March and May 2016. Federal government is already working to remedy this issue so no action needed. |

List of Potential Policy Ideas for the Clean Water Council to Discuss in 2017-2018
REV 6/20/17

| Topic | Current Status/Origin of Idea | Concept | Stakeholder Comments and Ranking (12/12/16) - please see full set of comments | Stakeholder Ranking (Jan. 2017). Highest Priority = 1 and Lowest Priority = 21. Topics that are blank were not ranked. | 2017 Status/Next Steps |
|---|---|---------|---|--|------------------------|
| Fund de-risking payments to incentivize cover crops | Proposed by FMR in 2020 as CWF recommendation | | | | |