



Report Card Legend

Action Status Scores	
	We are making good progress/meeting the target
	We anticipate difficulty; it is too early to assess; or there is too much variability across regions to assess
	Progress is slow/we are not meeting the target; or the activity or target is not commensurate with the scope of the problems

Outcome Status Scores	
	Water quality is high – we are on track to meet long-term water resource needs and citizen expectations
	Water quality needs improvement or it is too early to assess – it is unclear if we will meet long-term water resource needs and citizen expectations; and/or water quality varies greatly between regions
	Water quality is under intense pressure – long-term water resource needs and/or citizen expectations exceed current efforts to meet them

Trend	
	Improving trend
	No change
	Declining trend

This report card is a summary of the Clean Water Fund Performance Report. In 2008, Minnesotans demonstrated a renewed commitment to clean water. We voted to increase our sales tax and pass the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment providing 25 years of constitutionally-dedicated funding for clean water, habitat, parks and trails and the arts. This report focuses on the clean water portion of that funding. It clarifies the connections between Clean Water Funds invested, actions taken and outcomes achieved.

Each year until 2034, approximately \$85 million from the Clean Water Fund will be invested in various water management activities – from testing and assessing the state’s lakes, streams and groundwater, to installing conservation practices on the ground to protect and restore our water bodies. This work is being done by thousands of people from state policy makers to local landowners.

Learn more

To see the full report, visit the “Minnesota’s Legacy” website, the official site for all Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment Reporting:

www.legacy.leg.mn/funds/clean-water-fund

This publication can be made available in other formats, including Braille, large type, computer disk or audio tape, upon request.



Clean Water Fund
Performance Report Card

A summary of Clean Water Funds invested, actions taken
and outcomes achieved



2014



Clean Water Fund Report Card 2014

Measure		Status	Trend	Description
Investment measures				
INVESTMENTS	Total Clean Water Fund dollars appropriated by activity.	FY10-11: \$152.2 million FY12-13: \$179.4 million FY14-15: \$194.9M		Appropriation levels will vary by biennium and the strength of the economy. FY10-13 funds have been allocated, while FY14-15 allocations are in progress.
	Total Clean Water Fund dollars per watershed or statewide for 1) monitoring/assessment, 2) watershed restoration/protection strategies, 3) protection/restoration implementation activities, and 4) drinking water protection.	Most watersheds in the state are benefiting from local and statewide projects.		For FY10-13, nearly all 81 watersheds benefited from Clean Water Fund supported activities. Implementation activities comprise the largest portion of spending in watersheds statewide.
	Total Clean Water Fund dollars awarded in grants and contracts to non-state agency partners.	\$142.1 million was awarded in grants and contracts to non-state agency partners from FY10-13.		About 84 percent of grant and contract awards are for implementation activities; 43 percent of total FY10-13 appropriations were awarded to non-state agency partners.
	Total dollars leveraged by Clean Water Fund.	\$106 million was leveraged by Clean Water Funds in FY10-13, or \$1.16 for every implementation dollar invested.		Required Clean Water match funds were met and exceeded.
Surface water measures				
ACTION	Percent of major watersheds intensively monitored through the watershed approach.			We continue to make steady progress at the pace set in 2008.
	Local partner participation in monitoring efforts.			Since 2012, all programs have met local participation goals.
	Number of nonpoint source best management practices implemented with Clean Water funding and estimated pollutant load reductions.			Although funding has increased and there is a continued increase in practices and projects being implemented, the total request for FY10-13 projects was approximately three times greater than available funds.
	Number of municipal point source construction projects implemented with Clean Water Funding and estimated pollutant load reductions.			Pace of awards are linked to permit cycles and compliance schedules, however, demand also varies based on municipal budgets and other competing infrastructure demands.
	Rate of impairment/unimpairment of surface water statewide and by watershed.	Stream swimming Lake swimming Stream aquatic life	Not enough information for a trend determination at this time.	Water quality varies greatly by region. Watersheds yet to be assessed will influence the statewide impairment/unimpairment rate. It is unclear if long-term goals will be met.
OUTCOME	Changes over time in key water quality parameters for lakes, streams, and wetlands.	Lake clarity	Not enough information for trend determination at this time.	Lake clarity: There are improving trends in lake water clarity in more lakes than not.
		Stream fish		Stream fish: Fish community health varies greatly by region, but statewide percents of poor vs. good fish community health are similar.
		Wetland invertebrates		Wetland invertebrates: Statewide, most wetlands have good quality aquatic insect communities.
		Pesticides in streams		Pesticides in streams: Detections in streams vary greatly as a result of hydrologic and agronomic conditions; concentrations above water quality standards are rare.
		Pesticides in lakes		Pesticides in lakes: Detections in lakes vary by region; detections in lakes have been well below water quality standards.
	Number of previous impairments now meeting water quality standards due to corrective actions.			There is much variability in water quality across the state, but many projects are making progress in improving water quality. More water bodies are being listed as impaired relative to the slower rate of water bodies being delisted.
	Trends of mercury in fish in Minnesota.			Mercury in gamefish over the last 30 years shows an improving trend despite large shifts in the trend during shorter periods, demonstrating the need for long-term and consistent monitoring.

Measure		Status	Trend	Description
Surface water measures				
OUTCOME	Trends of mercury emissions in Minnesota.			Significant progress has been made reducing mercury emissions in Minnesota. World-wide scale emissions are increasing.
	Changes over time in municipal wastewater phosphorus discharges.			Significant phosphorus load reductions have been achieved through regulatory policy, infrastructure investments and improved technology. Future reductions will continue to be challenging and expensive as small systems receive limits and tighter discharge permits resulting in extremely low phosphorus concentrations.
Drinking and groundwater measures				
ACTION	Number of community water supplies assisted with developing source water protection plans.			Met target for FY12-13. On track to meet long-term target of every vulnerable community public water system engaged in source water protection by 2020.
	Number of grants awarded for source water protection.			Increased grant funds have accelerated the implementation of proven strategies for source water protection.
	Number of local government partners participating in Clean Water Fund supported groundwater nitrate-nitrogen monitoring and reduction activities.			Minnesota Department of Agriculture continues to establish new local partnerships for nitrate-nitrogen monitoring and reduction activities.
	Number of new health-based guidance values for contaminants of emerging concern.			Met target for FY12-13. On track to meet goal of 10 guidance values developed each biennium.
	Number of counties completing a county geologic atlas for groundwater sustainability.			Significant progress has been made completing county geologic atlases and the rate of completion has increased. Counties continue to step up to participate but substantial work remains before all counties in Minnesota are done.
	Number of long-term groundwater monitoring network wells in Minnesota.			Many areas of the state still lack important groundwater information. Long-term ramp up in monitoring accelerated by Clean Water Fund investments is filling gaps.
OUTCOME	Changes over time in pesticides, nitrate-nitrogen and other key water quality parameters in groundwater.	Pesticides 		Decreasing trends for three and no trend for two common pesticides. Low levels are still frequently detected in vulnerable groundwater.
		Nitrate-Nitrogen statewide 		In many areas, local drinking water aquifers are not vulnerable to surficial contamination and wells generally have low levels of nitrate-nitrogen. However, in certain localized areas it can be a significant concern.
		Nitrate-Nitrogen Central Sands 	Not enough information for a trend determination at this time.	Nitrate levels vary greatly within this region; in certain areas of the Central Sands, water quality needs improvement. It is unclear if we will meet long-term water resource needs.
		Nitrate-Nitrogen southeast region 		The Karst region in southeast Minnesota is one area vulnerable to nitrate contamination. In some townships water quality is under intense pressure. It is unclear if we will meet long-term water resource needs in this region.
	Changes over time in source water quality used for community water supplies.		Not enough information for a trend determination at this time.	Water sample collection and laboratory analysis was completed in 2013. Analysis of the results will be conducted in 2014.
	Nitrate concentrations in newly constructed wells.			Although nitrate levels in less than two percent of new wells exceed the drinking water standard for nitrate, there is a slight increase in recent years.
	Changes over time in groundwater levels.			Most indicator wells show no significant trend, but many areas of the state lack important groundwater information and in addition are experiencing groundwater declines.