

Policy Committee Meeting Agenda

Clean Water Council

June 24, 2022

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 update
- Staff update
 - Legislative update
 - Drainage, MOSH forum update

Review of Priority Topics for Future or Revised Policy Statements

9:45 Microplastics Update

- David Duffey, Environmental Analysis & Groundwater Services, MPCA

10:15 Shoreland Management

- Paul Radomski, DNR lake ecologist
- Greg Berg, Stearns County SWCD, Riparian Resources Specialist
- Anne Sawyer, University of MN - Extension, Extension Educator in Water Resources
- Joe Shneider, MN Coalition of Lake Associations, President

11:15 Break

11:30 Carp Follow-Up

- Meg Duhr & Przemyslaw Bajer, MAIRSC (invited)

11:45 Refining Spreadsheet of Policy Statement Options

12:00 Adjourn

Next Meeting: July 22nd

- **Living Cover:** Review of existing policy recommendation
 - [CWC Leg Report 2016 Living Cover Recommendation.pdf](#)
 - [Working Lands Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study and Program Plan: Final Report](#)
- **Neonicotinoids:** Review of MDA's [Surface Water Pesticides of Concern](#)
 - Dan Stoddard, MDA

Policy Committee Meeting Summary
Clean Water Council (Council)
April 22, 2022, 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

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

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
- Approve today's agenda and minutes from previous meeting, motioned by Victoria Reinhardt and seconded by John Barten with the correction of the committee membership Chair designation to be Rich Biske and not John Barten.
- Chair and staff update
 - Paul Gardner, John Barten, and Marcie Weinandt attended the MN Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program (MAWQCP) Advisory Committee meeting farm tour on April 14.
 - Last week council members attended the Minnesota Office for Soil and Health (MOSH) Summit session at the University of MN.
 - Will be meeting in-person for the next Full Council Meeting April 25, 2022, at the MPCA with WebEx capabilities.
 - Legislative update: Supplemental finance bills for ag, environment and natural resources, and LCCMR are pending.

1. BWSR Water Storage, by Rita Weaver, Chief Engineer (*WebEx 00:21:14*)

- One Watershed One Plan (1W1P) requires a watershed storage goal with 10-year goals. The BWSR water quality and storage program received \$2 million for two years to put in water storage projects that improve water quality, reduce flooding, or mitigate for climate change impacts. BWSR received seven applications.
- \$1 million will go towards the Water Quality and Storage Program next year. They are addressing a gap between 1W1P and feasibility studies, working with PTMAApp to enhance functionality for watershed modeling and project targeting.
- The RCPP AFA Application for climate resilience is \$8 million from USDA matched by \$8 million in state funds. The project will focus on smaller HUC12 size areas within three 1W1Ps. It will pilot the expansion and enhancement of water storage, creating a model for allocating water storage and water quality goals and engaging farmers/landowners.

- [Water Storage: A Planning and Decision Framework \(state.mn.us\)](#)

Questions/Comments

- *Rich Biske* – Each 1W1P has a storage goal, and in terms of the gap, is the issue that there isn't the technology to do that within the scope of 1W1P, or funds aren't sufficient to do the level of planning that some watersheds do. Could you describe that a little more? *Answer:* A big part of that is the funding, the way that it has been done in the past is expensive. What is missing is the strategic approach, and it's very important when it comes to storage and that is the additional level of planning that's needed. Our hope is to come up with a more cost-effective way to do that without having to create the watershed wide models, or possibly use the models that are already out there.
- *Marcie Weinandt* – The USDA RCPP grant is through farm service agency, is the \$8 million match from the Clean Water Funds? *Answer:* No, the \$8 million match would be from the bonding money. The federal money is from USDA NRCS.

- *Marcie Weinandt* – An RCPP grant supports the MAWQCP. CWFs bring \$6 million per biennium, which leverages \$9 million.
- *Rich Biske* – Would feasibility be used for HUC-8 (used in 1W1P) or HUC-12? *Answer:* Yes, sometimes you may not be at a big 8-digit HUC scale, and you may want to fine tune it. Those are decisions that have further refined through the 1W1P. For us the driver is the MPCA WRAPS (Water Restoration and Protection System). If the WRAPS stressor ID states hydrology is an issue, that would drive it. These are some of the decisions that would have to be made locally and the 1W1P doesn't fully fund the concerted effort.
- *Rich Biske* – Are you working with DNR to study aquatic fish communities to identify the best minor watersheds to serve? Aquatic eco-systems are among the “multiple benefits” in DNR stream studies. *Answer:* That is called out in the water quality and storage program. We work behind the scenes some with the DNR and the drainage management. Projects seeking funding will score higher if they talk to the area hydrologist.
- *John Barten* – How much of this \$16 million will incentivize landowners to do this in and is leasing that land one of the costs. How does that mechanism work? *Answer:* We expect that half of it will go to easements, we are looking at all different options: purchasing, long-term easements, perpetual easements, 25-year easements, and flowage easements. It really depends on the project that is going in that area and what makes the most sense. We expect half of it to be required for some sort of land use.
- *Tannie Eshenaur* – How proximity to groundwater recharge and drinking water sources considered in the planning framework? *Answer:* In the planning framework one of the considerations that we have is that you should be looking at proximity to the groundwater recharge or other areas that are more susceptible to contamination. A project would be ineligible if it causes issues with groundwater or if it is in one of those areas that might cause contamination.
- *Rich Biske* –Is there a connection with the Army Corps of Engineers? I know they have done some large comprehensive studies on the MN River and even in the Headwaters. Does the Corps have a role here technically or even financial support? *Answer:* I have not approached them yet. We do look at the reports that they do put out to see if it would help us make decisions. We haven't taken as an active approach toward them as we have the NRCS or other agencies.

2. **BWSR Water Storage**, by Rita Weaver, Chief Engineer (*WebEx 39:00*)

- How do we measure the water quality benefits long-term of storage and storage BMPs. Do we have enough staff for landowner marketing, technical capacity for local partnership? How can we best demonstrate the outcomes? The priority area for the water quality and storage program is the MN River Basin and the lower Mississippi River Basin. We're probably going to be able to fund four or five projects with \$2 million of funding. Can we tie irrigation with these storage areas so there is less need for groundwater use using the 103E drainage law?

Questions/Comments

- *Marcie Weinandt* – I was in a rural watershed and now currently in a metro watershed district. Some metro watershed districts, including Rice Creek, are doing water storage and irrigation, and that gets complex. Let's discuss water retention ponds that are often way past due to get cleaned out. This question may not be relevant to this project, but it's certainly relevant to our policy statement on water storage and what is the outcome 30 to 40 years later. *Answer:* Those are excellent points and that is something that we have talked about. The DNR did a study on Maple Creek watershed with lots of pop-up ponds to find out how much reduction in flowrate would they get if they just cleaned them out, and it was impressive. We do acknowledge that would make a difference if we went that far and should be considered as we move forward.
- https://www.bwsr.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/2022-02/WaterStorage%20Feb2022FinalDraft_1.pdf

3. **Carp & Water Quality**, by Meg Duhr of Minnesota Aquatic Invasive Species Research Center (MAISRC)

(WebEx 51:42) Przemek Bajer, MAISRC & Carp Solutions

- *Impacts to water quality due to carp and recent research advances in management solutions and cost benefit analysis of carp management versus other water quality improvement tools.* Carp can root six to eight inches into the sediment, have high feeding requirements, are large, and have a long lifespan. They breed as early as two years old and female carp can produce up to two million eggs. Drawdowns are ineffective for carp as they can tolerate very low oxygen, extreme temperatures, and other highly polluted environments. Lakes transition from a clearwater state to a turbid state due to carp and cause low water quality, high nutrient loading, lack of aquatic macrophytes, and extremely low habitat quality and functioning. Studies has shown a decline of 90% of plant life along with habitat degradation so there is a loss of ecosystems services. There are enhanced conditions for algae growth and increase in the frequency and severity of algae blooms. The University of MN Carp Solutions has done years of research on carp and are finding new ways to remove carp and MAISRC work directly with them.
- *Prezemek Bajer, MAISRC & Carp Solution (WebEx 01:07:08)*

Seventy percent of carp impact is in southern Minnesota and 23% in central Minnesota. There is great improvement in lake quality within a short period of time from carp removal. Old technologies that have been used is water drawdowns, rotenone treatment, and commercial netting. The downside is they can't be used in large numbers of lakes and can be costly. The new tools include electric fences through the stream that directs large group of carp into a trap. This removal is done with conveyers and minimal labor costs. Another tool is summer removal baiting (corn) technique that remotely trigger nets and can be done several times of the year. Microchip tags are used to indicate when carp feed and the best time to trigger the nets. This method can remove 30% to 50% of the biomass in one season. The goal is to use a year-round scheme that targets carp management. To have a sustainable lake, 60% to 70% of carp biomass needs to be removed annually with an annual cost of \$225,000 per lake. With potential cost reduction and compost/fertilizer use the annual cost could be reduced.
- Other resources available at: <https://maisrc.umn.edu/common-carp> and <http://carpsolutionsmn.com/Questions/Comments>
 - Peter Schwagerl: With the steady stream of product coming out of these lakes and in speaking about the phosphorus and composting, has there been any discussion with the rendering industry in MN? Is that a way to get some sustainable funding and business models in place in MN? *Answer Prezemek Bajer:* Yes, I think so, there are fish fertilizer producers on a small scale in the Twin Cities and there are also fish fertilizer brokers in southern MN that get the fish fertilizer from the Great Lakes. If you had locally sourced invasive fish that could be turned into compost fertilizer and applied to fields in the same local area it would be cheaper. Fertilizer production does require some investments in machinery and buildings, but compost just needs space and time. The smell in composting fish has been figured out and just needs certain sources of carbon, like woodchips, and is being used on the west coast. *Answer Meg Duhr:* One of the barriers for doing this is the DNR statutes prohibit carp solutions, watershed districts, or any non-commercial entity to raise money for the carp, even if only to defray management costs. We need to find ways that the carp can be reused and get some money for management costs.
 - *John Barten:* Moving ahead you stated we need to have further discussion like the definition of carp in the state statute, as opposed to an invasive species, it's considered to be a rough fish which in turn throws it into a different set of rules for catching and disposing of them as opposed to calling it invasive species which makes it a little bit broader. There are other impediments to some of the work that you are doing and potentially we could address with a policy recommendation. Can you provide a little more detail on that? *Answer:* I'm glad you touched on the classification that common carp are not considered an invasive species under the statutes. They are managed as a commercial rough fish. There are constraints about what can happen with carp once they're removed and it is almost setup to try to maintain carp populations for commercial fishing industry for human consumption, which isn't a thing anymore. Also, commercial carp fisherman can only remove carp during winter months of the year. They are not allowed to use the summertime tools

that are in place due to the restrictions on harvesting times. These cost effective and efficient changes seem achievable and would be a win-win for commercial fisheries and managers.

- *Victoria Reinhardt*: This seems to be a potential policy statement to review for changing obsolete statutes to get better outcomes.
- *Jason Moeckel*: Have you been in touch with the DNR about the statute change? Yes, we have been in close communication with Sean Sisler who supervised the commercial fishery program and Shannon Fisher. Some of the initial ideas came from dialogues with Jack Lauer and his staff in the central region. I was just having meetings with them to kind of understand DNRs perspective and their challenges with carp. This discussion led to these things that were not possible because of the statutes. It will be important to engage with DNR, so we don't have any unintended consequences, and I feel that they are open to this.
- *Jason Moeckel*: Do you know if there are rule changes that need to go with this, or is it all just statute? Answer: I don't know.
- mduhr@umn.edu if you have any follow up questions.

10:45 BREAK

4. **Private Wells:** Revisiting existing policy statement on Advanced Drinking Water Protection, by Tannie Eshenaur MDH/Frieda Von Qualen MDH (*WebEx 01:42:16*)

- The MDH has a shared goal with the CWC strategic plan, that drinking water is safe for everyone everywhere in the state of Minnesota. We've had setbacks in the last couple of years with lack of clean water fund appropriation for private wells for 2022-2023 and the covid needs from MDH staff.
- There are not any specific policy recommendations today but we're hoping to set the table for that process. The policy recommendation on drinking water protection that was from 2016 was very broad and had a significant change in the drinking water world. The development on comprehensive, systematic approach for periodic testing of the water quality of private wells including the notification of testing results and education on possible actions is what we need to work on.

Frieda Von Qualen, MDH (WebEx 01:46:37)

- 1.2 million people or one in five Minnesotans use private wells. Currently, there is funding for regular testing for public waters systems, treatments to address contaminants, protecting source water, and funding for treatment, repair, and sealing. For private well users, treatment and protecting source water is all up to the private well users. There are some disparate grant and loan opportunities, but they are limited. A 2016 survey found that less than 20% of the private well owners had tested their well water at the frequency recommended. Those that had responded had arsenic concentrations above the safe drinking water act standard, and yet 1 in 3 of them had not taken any action to reduce their exposure. Looking at the location of wells, socioeconomic vulnerability, and mapping out the concentration levels of arsenic above 10 parts per billion can determine the policy interventions, and partners needed.

Tannie Eshenaur, MDH (WebEx: 01:55:17)

- The challenge is that there are large gaps when it comes to law and policies on private wells. There is a gap in the water management framework. There isn't sufficient data, regulatory testing, and proper testing of contaminants that creates monitoring gaps and insufficient evidence as there isn't any baseline data to measure progress. Current actions don't reflect what the public health burden of disease and disability is. Arsenic is a widespread contaminant with a large public health burden and affects people's health across all ages. We know that about 12% of wells when drilled have arsenic above the 10 microgram per liter.
- In terms of solutions, we are not looking for more regulatory authority as it is strictly a voluntary approach and there are two reasons why we've come to this conclusion. There is much independence of private well owners and the volume of the work that needs to be done. There are two bills in the Legislature on the topic. One is HF 3006 to send money through MDH to the water resource center and

non-government organizations to do well testing and clinics that was priced out at \$1 million for that project. The second bill was HF 1806 that was to test and treat every private well in MN and MDH was to price out what that would cost, and MDH came up with a \$40 million dollars a year.

Questions/Comments

- *Jordan Vandal:* We do have a point of sale on the private wells, or is that something that you'd like to see implemented? Is this ongoing testing of wells and where would the funding source come from?
Answer Tannie Eshenaur: The testing of property transfer was a policy recommendation from the CWC in the previous biennium and that didn't go anywhere in that legislative session. Washington County has an ordinance for that but I'm not aware of it in any other county. We know that there needs to be ongoing testing at the local level. We're hoping that in the next round of CWF appropriations will include the private well initiative to do another round of these pilot grants.
- *Jordan Vandal:* If we know somebody with a high arsenic or nitrate levels in their private well, is the thought to treat it at the point of use or the point of entry? And long-term who's going to maintain that filter and replace it the second time? *Answer:* Those are big challenges as the kind of system that would be installed would depend on the contaminant to make sure that the water treatment system is appropriate. For arsenic and nitrate that could be one treatment at the kitchen sink. There are other contaminants that would need to treat all the water coming into the house because of inhalation exposures. There are liability issues going into individual's homes and overtime the homeowner will be responsible for the operation and maintenance. Currently, a lot of private well owners can't even get the treatment device to start with.
- *Raj Rajan:* Do any of the arsenic monitoring studies investigate whether it is purely chemistry related, or if it is due to work construction methods? Shared link by Raj Rajan <https://www.wrc.umn.edu/arsenicwells> evaluated the effects of geochemical changes that occur after well installation and operation on arsenic concentrations by aquifer type. *Answer:* With CWF dollars in an earlier appropriation we contracted with the U.S. Geological Survey to look at arsenic in MN with Dr. Mindy Erickson and one of the things that was looked at was construction methods, particularly how close the screen in the well was to a confining layer (clay layer) and she found that by adjusting that, less arsenic was mobilized out of the surrounding bedrock into the water. That doesn't help with wells that have already been constructed.
- *John Barten:* Regarding surrounding wells and spatial limitations of wells, if you find arsenic in one well can you draw conclusions about a well 100 meters, half mile, or one mile away? *Answer:* I would have to defer this question to colleagues at the health department. With human caused contaminants like PFAS, I have found that one well had no contaminant and the neighboring well had significant issues.
- *Marcey Weinandt:* In a property transfer the septic system must be tested but not the well water? *Answer:* That is correct. I don't believe that requirement is true for every county in the state of MN, but it is for most.
- *Rich Biske:* During the GRAPS (Groundwater Restoration and Protection Strategies) if there's intensive monitoring isn't there an opportunity there to have more wells tested? *Answer Tannie Eshenaur:* No monitoring is done as a part of the GRAPS process. It relies strictly on existing data that the agencies have from four different networks. There is no new data that is gathered as a part of the GRAPS process. *Answer Dan Stoddard:* Dept of Ag did an extensive private well sampling program over a period of seven years where we offered every single private well owner in areas that were vulnerable to groundwater contamination from the ground surface a free nitrate test and did a follow-up inspection. For those that had nitrate we also ran pesticide testing. The goal was to inform homeowners of the health risk from their wells, but the other was to characterize areas where there's significant nitrate contamination so that we could prioritize our work and address it. We coordinate well with the other agencies, especially with Health. Regarding gaps, there really isn't any sampling for arsenic and manganese and other contaminants of concern in specific areas.

- *Leann Buck*: Surface water has been a priority and a driver. Dakota County has a groundwater plan and maybe we could have some future takeaways from that. It is a case-by-case basis and it's probably not as much of a systematic approach as we would like to see in the future.
- *Tannie Eshenaur*: When 1W1P goes into their five-year midpoint evaluation that is the window of opportunity to add groundwater into that package.

The following are deferred until next meeting June 25, 2022:

- **Review of Priority Topics for Future or Revised Policy Statements (continued)**
 - **Soil Health**: Update on April 11th MN Office of Soil Health Forum
Paul Gardner/John Barten/Rich Biske
 - **Drainage**: Brief Review of Past Discussions with Drainage Work Group in 2016-2017 + 2022 bill
Paul Gardner, possibly John Barten

Adjournment (*WebEx 02:27:02*)

- Next Meeting: June 24, 2022

Clean Water Council Policy Implementation Progress

Policy	Adopted In	Key Policy Recommendations	Progress	Future Actions Needed
Riparian Buffers	FY 13-14	Require buffers along Public waters and ditches and private ditches that drains into Public waterways	Minnesota Buffer Law was signed into law in June 2015 and requires 50 foot buffer along Public waters and 16.5 foot buffer along Public drainage systems	All the policy goals are achieved. The State Agencies and Local governmental units are responsible for ensuring the buffers are maintained.
		Fund local implementation & enforcement	CWF provides funding for technical support for local units of government	
		One State Agency oversee Local activities	Board of Soil & Water Resources (BWSR) has overall implementation responsibility with technical support from other Agencies.	
Water Retention, Storage and Infiltration	FY 13-14	Require all major (HUC 8) watersheds outside 7-county metro area develop comprehensive watershed management plans.	All non-metro water planning and implementaiton is based on major watersheds. Water retention/storage goals have been incorporated in 1W1P requirements via statute (103B.801) and agency plan content requirements.	BWSR currently working on white paper looking at the technical issues, policy considerations, and potential costs necessary to scale up adoption of water storage and treatment. [This is from FY18-19]
Living Cover for Drinking Water Protection	FY16-17	Require the establishment of living cover in vulnerable areas such as wellhead & upstream of surface water intakes	These areas are targeted, but voluntary, the progress is limited.	
		Property Transfers: Notify the buyers the potential existence of lead-pipes between the water main and taps, and provide informational material to mitigate risks.		Legislation may be necessary to ensure the seller discloses the existence of lead piping. [New Lead & Copper Rule requires water utility notify property owner about possibility of lead pipes]

Clean Water Council Policy Implementation Progress

Advancing Drinking Water Protection	FY 16-17	Renters: Notify the renters the potential existence of lead-pipes between the water main and taps and provide informational material to mitigate risks.		Legislation may be necessary to ensure the landlord discloses the existence of lead piping. [Note above for Lead & Copper Rule revision in 2021]
		Establish a panel of subject matter expert from around the country to advise MN lawmakers and Agencies ways to protect and improve drinking water quality.	MDH has a contract with U of MN's Water Resources Center and Humphrey School of Public Affairs to convene an expert panel and their report is now in the review phase.	Policy Committee review the report and recommend policy actions [done 2020]; CWF recommended in FY22-23 to support implementation of report.
		State mandate source water protection plans (SWPP) for surface water systems.	Minneapolis, St. Paul, and St. Cloud has them, but 21 others are yet to draft SWPPs. [This is from FY18-19]	CWC strategic plan: Complete revised source water assessments for all 23 surface water systems by 2025 & complete source water intake protection planning by 2027 .
De-icing Chloride Reduction	FY 18-19 [revised FY22-23]	Fully fund the Smart Salting applicator training and certification program, and MPCA chloride reduction program aimed at reducing salt use.	The MPCA's Strategic Plan includes chloride reduction efforts. The MPCA has requested and CWC has recommended CWF monies to provide the training program statewide.	The CWC has recommended funding for the Chloride Reduction Program for FY22-23.
		Request that the Legislature give MPCA the authority to charge a fee for chloride training.		New recommendation FY22-23
		Provide liability protection for the Smart Salting program certified private winter de-icing applicators to reduce salt use.	During 2018 and 2020 legislative sessions, bills were introduced in the both houses, but were not included in the Omnibus bills.	Re-introduce, pass and sign into law the liability protection Bill.
		Provide research funds to develop new technology, alternatives and best management practices		New recommendation FY22-23
		Encourage and support the adoption of the MPCA's Chloride Reduction Model Ordinance language by local government entities.		

Clean Water Council Policy Implementation Progress

		Have the MPCA convene and lead a stakeholder process to develop recommendations for new labelling requirements on bags of de-icing chemicals sold in Minnesota.		New recommendation FY22-23
Pharmaceutical Pollution Prevention	FY18-19 [revised for FY24-25]	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 an industry-funded safe medication return program.		
		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.		
		Adopt a “Safe Medication Return Program” funded by the pharmaceutical producers.	Washington State and several other states have passed similar legislation and are going through rulemaking or are just starting their programs.	
		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.		
Increasing Continuous Productive Vegetative	FY18-19	Establish a Minnesota Agricultural Diversification Steering Council	The Council recommended funding to establish the Minnesota Agricultural Diversification Steering Council at the University of Minnesota.	Legislature to approve the CWC's recommendation.

Clean Water Council Policy Implementation Progress

Cover		Create a Minnesota Agricultural Diversification Network		
Chloride Reduction: Water Softening	FY22-23	Provide financial support and technical assistance to municipalities to reduce chloride discharges and allow flexibility for how municipalities achieve these reductions.		The CWC has recommended funding for the Chloride Reduction Program for FY22-23.
		Update the state plumbing code to effectively prohibit the installation of new water softeners in Minnesota that use timers rather than on-demand regeneration systems.		New recommendation for FY22-23
		Fund a program for activities, training, and grants that reduce chloride pollution. Grants should support upgrading, optimizing, or replacing water softener units.		The CWC has recommended funding for the Chloride Reduction Program for FY22-23.
Disclosure of Well Water Quality at Time of Sale	FY22-23	Require all sellers of real property to test drinking water from wells for bacteria, nitrate, arsenic, manganese, and lead		MDH suggests changing this to recommending a model county ordinance
		Inform buyers and renters of the test results		
		Direct buyers to mitigation guidance from the Minnesota Department of Health		
PFAS	FY24-25	The Clean Water Council recommends that the State of Minnesota implement the comprehensive PFAS Blueprint, which uses the following priorities to prevent, manage, and clean up PFAS pollution in Minnesota.	Approved by the Policy Committee but not yet by the full Council.	Any interest in calling out specific tasks from the Blueprint that require legislative approval?

Clean Water Council Policy Implementation Progress

Underground Utilities	FY24-25	To create an accurate inventory of Minnesota's underground utility infrastructure, the Clean Water Council (CWC) recommends that the State of Minnesota develop an accurate map of all underground utilities installed in the state and require Minnesota's public and private sectors to support sharing of necessary data in a secure and confidential manner.	Approved by the Policy Committee and the full Council.	
Soil Health	FY24-25	MN Office of Soil Health has a stakeholder process going. MDA got 2022 funding to develop a Healthy Soils Plan. Does the Council want to express support for these efforts, and specifically ask for certain topics to be included? For certain stakeholders to be consulted? For there to be targets like number of acres?		Still needed? Legislation just passed to create a state Healthy Soils Plan.
Carp	FY24-25	Possible options: 1) modify statutes/rules to make commercial carp fishing more viable; 2) modify statutes/rules to make carp invasive species, not "rough fish"; 3) support carp removal with CWF by targeting nearly/barely impaired waters where removal would lead to de-listing	Based on presentation and discussion. Getting some more detailed feedback from MAISRC and related stakeholders.	
Private wells	FY24-25	Possible options: 1) Use CWF to expand pilot private well testing/mitigation program to more counties using MPCA SSTS low-income assistance model; 2) promote county ordinances to require well testing at time of sale rather than using state statute; 3) add groundwater to intensive watershed monitoring approach on 10-year cycle	Based on MDH presentation	CWF appropriation for expansion of pilot is being proposed by MDH. Should policy promote a 10-year plan for offering private well testing statewide?

Clean Water Council Policy Implementation Progress

Water Storage & Drainage	FY24-25	Options: 1) Ensure compatability between required water storage feasibility studies and One Watershed One Plan; 2) develop model applications for drainage projects to show benefits of water storage; 3) support local staff capacity to carry out modeling, design, and construction; 4) provide incentives for storage when drainage is improved under 103E; 4) develop stronger partnerships with drainage authorities to identify potential storage opportunities	Based in part on BWSR presentations and background information	
Manure	FY24-25	Options: 1) View manure not as a waste but as a resource; 2) Increase capacity at University of Minnesota to research and promote more precision manure application; 3) Promote more trial manure application plots and precision application field days; 4) Develop more precise N crediting method; 5) Provide more education to small producers who are not subject to large feedlot permit	based on discussions with MPCA feedlot staff	CWF appropriation by MDA is being proposed for #4 on N crediting method.
Micro- and nano-plastics	FY24-25		2019 CWF appropriations used in 2022 for groundwater sampling by MPCA/UMD and in 2023 for surface waters by MPCA/USGS	We are likely to find microplastics wherever we look; what can Minnesota contribute to the global discussion that no one else is doing? Refine info on pathways into our water? Better identify resins to narrow down sources? Develop health-based guidance for drinking water? Develop aquatic toxicity values for fish?
Shoreland Management	FY24-25		Awaiting DNR presentation in June 2022	
Neonicitinoids	FY24-25		MDA has identified several neonics as Surface Water Pesticide of Concern	

Lead report
drainage in 1W1P
Buffers