



**Minnesota Pollution
Control Agency**

520 Lafayette Road North
St. Paul, MN 55155-4194

Final Report Format

Section 319 and Clean Water Partnership Projects or Final Progress Report for TMDL/WRAPS Development and TMDL/WRAPS Implementation Projects

Doc Type: Reporting/Final Report

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) provides grants to organizations to help fulfill the agency's mission. Each grant project is required to complete a final report. Information from this grant report will be used to illustrate progress toward meeting the MPCA's goals and missions and will be shared with interested parties, targeted audiences, and legislators.

More information about preparing a final project report for a Section 319 grant can be found in the [Section 319 Final Project Reports Workshop](#) on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Polluted Runoff: Nonpoint Source Pollution website at <http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps>. This notebook describes the purpose of Section 319 final reports, the information that should be included in the report, examples of especially effective elements from 319 reports, and ways to expand the final report to be used for outreach and education, building partnerships, and many other uses.

Instructions: This grant report must be submitted **no later than 30 days after the end of the grant contract**. It must include results, in the form of data and information, that best demonstrate achievement of project goals and objectives.

Please follow the attached report format, referring back to the work plan and budget and any subsequent amendments to your grant agreement, contract, or work order. When completed, send an electronic copy of the completed report to your MPCA project manager for review.

Executive summary

Problem

- Specify the location of the water body, and, if relevant, geographic connection with other streams/rivers.
- If applicable, what year was the water body put on the 303(d) list? (b) What beneficial use was not met? (c) Which parameter was the cause of the listing, if known? (d) If not identified in the listing, what pollutant(s) is believed to have been responsible for the impairment?
- What was the water quality problem?
- Describe the source(s) of the problem and specify category and subcategory (e.g., agriculture, cattle with access to streams).
- Was a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) or Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) completed? If so, please provide information (e.g., the water body was listed for [insert parameter here], and the TMDL/WRAPS said it was necessary to meet a target of [insert concentration or loading] to achieve water quality standards).

Waterbody improved

- What was done to address the problem?
- Did the water body improve or was it removed from the state's 303(d) list?

Project highlights

- What major Best Management Practices (BMPs)/activities addressed causes of pollution and demonstrated in-stream improvements?
- Who were major partners in the effort?
- During what timeframe did the activities occur?
- Was there a larger context of a watershed/comprehensive plan?
- Are there ongoing plans to continue improvement

Results

- What water quality goals were achieved?
- What were the specific load reductions in pollutants that indicate progress?
- Was the water body delisted? If so, which year was it delisted, or when does the state expect to delist the water body?
- Were any new ordinances or laws put into place as a result of the actions?

Body of main report

Section I – Work plan review

- Briefly outline any approved changes from the original work plan, staff, or participating organizations.

NONE

- Please list and give a brief report on each activity/task identified in your work plan (Attachment A of the 319 Grant Agreement, contract, or work order) or most recently approved work plan amendment. For each task, briefly summarize the activities completed and describe any problems, delays, or difficulties that have occurred in completing the project work. Explain how problems were resolved or list any activities that were not completed.

Objective 1: Project Administration, Coordination and Fiscal Management

Task A: Quarterly Invoice Submittals and Semi-Annual Reporting. COMPLETED

Task B: Project Coordination and Communication. COMPLETED. INCLUDED REGULAR PARTNER MEETINGS AND COORDINATION, COORDINATING ACTIONS OF THE PROJECT CONSULTANT, REPORT REVIEWS AND COLLABORATION, ETC.

Objective 1 Deliverables:

- Invoices submitted at least quarterly and semiannual and final reports delivered on time (semiannual reports due February 1 and August 1 each year and final report due within 30 days of the contracted end date in MPCA specified formats). COMPLETED
- Project is managed according to the contract. COMPLETED
- All project partners are provided with communication throughout the project. COMPLETED

Objective 2: Civic Engagement

Task A: WRAPS and TMDL Civic Engagement.

Subtask 1. Public Gatherings. ACCOMPLISHMENTS INCLUDED PUBLIC MEETINGS AT PAGE AND BORGHOLM TOWN HALLS, TELEVISION INTERVIEW WITH QCTV, AND STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS.

Subtask 2. Focused Discussions: ACCOMPLISHMENTS INCLUDED ANOKA AND ISANTI CO MEETINGS WITH MS4 PERMIT HOLDERS, PRESENTATION ABOUT THE PROJECT TO ANOKA CO COMMISSIONERS, PRESENTATION TO ANOKA SANDPLAIN PARTNERSHIP, PLANNING COLLABORATION WITH UPPER RUM RIVER WMO, ONGOING USE OF PREVIOUSLY COMPLETED WEB VIDEOS AND WEBSITES TO DISSEMINATE PROJECT INFORMATION, PROVIDE PLANNING MATERIALS TO ISANTI CO, AND PUBLICIZING DRAFT WRAP AND TMDL REPORTS. ADDITIONALLY THERE WAS REGULAR COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE PROJECT TEAM OF 10 SWCDS, NON-PROFITS, CITIES, COUNTIES, STATE AGENCIES AND OTHERS.

Objective 2 Deliverables:

- Conversations with targeted audiences to share information on the TMDL and WRAP as well as gain feedback from citizens and other interest groups. Notes from these conversations will be saved and incorporated into the final WRAPS and TMDL documents. COMPLETED.

Objective 3: Complete TMDL and WRAPS for the watershed

Task A: TMDL Development and Review.

Subtask 1. Develop Agency Review Draft TMDL report. OUR CONSULTANT, RESPEC, PRODUCED A DRAFT TMDL REPORT WHICH WAS REVIEWED BY THE LOCAL PARTNER TEAM.

Subtask 2. Prepare Preliminary Draft TMDL Report for review by US EPA. RESPEC PRODUCED A DRAFT TMDL DRAFT TMDL REPORT THAT INCORPORATED COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE AGENCY REVIEW DRAFT. MPCA COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED AND ADDRESSED.

Subtask 3. Prepare Public Notice Draft TMDL report. RESPEC WILL PRODUCED THE PUBLIC NOTICE DRAFT TMDL REPORT BY INCORPORATING COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT TMDL REPORT AS DIRECTED BY MPCA. PUBLIC NOTICE OCCURRED IN MAY 2017.

Subtask 4. Prepare Final Draft TMDL Report. RESPEC PRODUCED THE FINAL DRAFT TMDL REPORT BY INCORPORATING COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE PUBLIC NOTICE DRAFT TMDL REPORT. MPCA SUBMITTED THE FINAL DRAFT TMDL REPORT TO MPCA AND EPA FOR FINAL APPROVALS.

Task B: WRAPS Development and Review. MPCA PRODUCED A RUM RIVER WRAPS REPORT, PLUS SUMMARY DOCUMENTS. THE LOCAL PARTNER TEAM REVIEWED THE WRAPS AND PROVIDED LOCAL INFORMATION AND

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH WERE INCORPORATED.

Objective 3 Deliverables:

- (a) TMDL report prepared and reviewed by local partners, the public, MPCA and EPA. COMPLETED.
- (b) Final WRAPS approved by MPCA. COMPLETED.

Section II – Grant results

For TMDL/WRAPS Development Projects describe the work products of the contract, such as a written TMDL/WRAPS or technical report, data files, maps, and any other attachments that were produced by the project.

- **Measurements:** Please describe your evaluation plan and its results.
 - What tools did you use, what methods did you use to gather information?
WATER QUALITY MONITORING WAS USED TO GATHER RESOURCE CONDITION INFORMATION. HSPF MODELING WAS A TOOL USED TO INTERPRET DATA AND STRATEGIZE MANAGEMENT. A VARIETY OF METHODS DESCRIBED ELSEWHERE IN THIS REPORT WERE USED TO GAIN STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AND INPUT.
 - If you did a survey, what was the sample size and what was the response rate, how did you analyze the results, evaluate the monitoring data, etc.?
A PUBLIC ONLINE SURVEY WAS COMPLETED DURING PHASE I OF THIS PROJECT, NOT DURING THE PHASE II BEING REPORTED HERE. THE SURVEY PROVIDED GENERAL INPUT FROM LESS THAN 200 PARTICIPANTS REGARDING THEIR USE OF WATERBODIES AND PERCEPTIONS OF NEEDED MANAGEMENT. IT PROVIDED GENERAL GUIDANCE ONLY TO THIS PROJECT GIVEN THAT NOT ALL STAKEHOLDERS WERE REPRESENTED THROUGH OUT METHODS.
 - If you have measurable environmental results, such as pounds of chemicals reduced, best management practices installed, pollutants prevented, waste eliminated, changes in water quality, resources conserved, etc., also include those here or under the appropriate project objective.
NA
- **Products:** Please list, and attach copies of any documents or products that have been produced during the reporting period, including monitoring data (if applicable, including the electronic summary of all data for the EQUIS data base), brochures, articles, special reports, tapes, CDs, etc. Provide relevant project photographs.
THE TMDL, WRAPS AND RELATED REPORTS PRODUCED DURING THIS PROJECT ARE ON THE MPCA WEBSITE. MONITORING DATA WAS NOT COLLECTED DURING PHASE II OF THE PROJECT WHICH IS REPORTED HERE.
- **Public outreach and education:** If part of your work plan, please evaluate the effectiveness of public participation and education plans for the project. Also include the total numbers from project outreach and education activities, such as number of people reached, educational materials distributed, workshop participants, etc.
PUBLIC OUTREACH AND EDUCATION INCLUDED PRESS RELEASES TO LOCAL NEWSPAPERS, A WEB STORY MAP, WEBSITE, PUBLIC MEETINGS, AND TARGETED STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS. SOME QUANTIFIABLE RESULTS INCLUDE: 3 COUNTIES (ISANTI, MILLE LACS AND ANOKA) WITH NEWSPAPER ARTICLES, ONE ONLINE SURVEY, ONE TELEVISION INTERVIEW FOR QCTV, 10+ LOCAL PARTNERS AS PART OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT, ONE WEB VIDEO AND ONE STORY MAP.
- **Long-term results:**
 - Do the results of this project build capacity that can increase the likelihood of long-term outcomes, such as:
 - environmental problems identified or understood
 - land use changes in the watershed
 - recommendations created
 - consensus for action created
 - increased ability to solve similar problems in the future, etc.?
 - if so, how?
CAPACITY HAS GROWTH THROUGH THIS PROJECT THROUGH COLLABORATION ON MUTUALLY AGREED UPON PRIORITIES. A NUMBER OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES WHICH HAVE CROSS-COUNTY IMPACTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AND ARE BEING INCORPORATED INTO LOCAL WATER PLANS. THE ANOKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT HAS DESIGNATED SOME OF ITS OWN FUNDING TO CONTINUE LEADERSHIP OF WATERSHED-WIDE MANAGEMENT.
 - Did you form new partnerships or alliances as a result of the project? If so,
 - What longer-term impact will this have on the project?
 - What future efforts are anticipated as a result of the partnership(s)?
 - Describe any activities you are aware of by others that benefited from the results of your project and/or resulted in implementation of similar projects in other locations.
SEE ANSWER TO NEXT QUESTION.
 - Is there a plan to continue the project beyond the end date of the grant agreement or contract? If so, explain.
YES. THE LOCAL PARTNER TEAM HAS ALREADY MET AFTER THIS WRAP PROJECT TO COORDINATE BMP

INSTALLATIONS AND LOCAL WATER PLANNING. PURSUIT OF A ONE WATERSHED, ONE PLAN IS UNDER CONSIDERATION.

- Describe how you shared the results of your project. List any information or technology transfer and dissemination (newsletters, web sites, training, reports, disseminated project activities, accomplishments, and lessons to the general public). Where and to what audiences have you made presentations?

PROJECT INFORMATION SHARING AND INPUT COLLECTION HAS OCCURRED THROUGH PUBLIC MEETINGS, MEETINGS WITH INDIVIDUAL STAKEHOLDER GROUPS, WEBSITE, WEB STORY MAP, WEB VIDEO, PRESS RELEASES, COMPLETED REPORTS AND TELEVISION INTERVIEW. IN-PERSON PRESENTATIONS HAVE INCLUDED LAKE ASSOCIATIONS, COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, TOWN BOARDS, MAYORS AND CITY COUNCILS, WATERSHED ORGANIZATION BOARDS, AND OTHERS.

- What other audiences (media, businesses, other agencies, etc.) would be most interested in the results of this project?
THE GREATEST ONGOING INTEREST IS FROM LAKE GROUPS, WATERSHED ORGANIZATIONS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNTY AND CITY, ESPECIALLY MS4).
- Please describe any lessons learned during this project that would be valuable for future projects, even if the project didn't succeed as expected. What other recommendations or advice would you make for future activities related to this priority project area?

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH IS A CHALLENGE. IT IS UNREALISTIC TO EXPECT BROAD PUBLIC INPUT. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT SHOULD BE SPLIT INTO (A) BROAD PUBLIC AWARENESS AT A GENERAL LEVEL AND (B) IN DEPTH STAKEHOLDER INPUT. IT SEEMS THAT PRESENTLY TOO MUCH EFFORT IS SPENT TRYING TO GET DETAILED INPUT FROM THE PUBIC AT LARGE WHO GENERALLY DON'T CARE THAT MUCH. FOCUS ON THOSE WHO CARE MOST AND WILL BE PARTNERS ON FUTURE MANAGEMENT (EXAMPLE: LAKE ASSOCIATIONS).

- Please provide any feedback or suggestions that you would like to share with the MPCA to improve their grant programs.

NONE

Section III – Final Expenditures

Projects should use the format they used in their work plan for the budget to report on the final expenditures. This should list the tasks or activities outlined in their original (or amended) work plan.

PROVIDED ON SEPARATE PAGE(S)

Final Report

Grant project summary

Project title: Rum River Watershed Restoration and Protection Project Phase II
Organization (Grantee): Anoka Conservation District
Project start date: 6/30/2016 Project end date: 6/30/2017 Report submittal date: July 20, 2017
Grantee contact name: Jamie Schurbon Title: Watershed Projects Manager
Address: 1318 McKay Drive NE suite 300
City: Ham Lake State: MN Zip: 55304
Phone number: 763-434-2030 Fax: 763-434-2094 Email: jamie.schurbon@hotmail.com
Basin (Red, Minnesota, St. Croix, etc.) /Watershed & 8 digit HUC:: Rum River, 07010207 County: Mille Lacs, Isanti, Anoka et al.

Project type (check one):

- Clean Water Partnership
- Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)/Watershed Restoration or Protection Strategy (WRAPS) Development
- 319 Implementation
- 319 Demonstration, Education, Research
- TMDL/WRAPS Implementation

Grant funding

Final grant amount: \$75,000 Final total project costs: \$66,540.52
Matching funds: Final cash: NA Final in-kind: NA Final Loan: NA
MPCA project manager: Bonnie Finnerty

For TMDL/WRAPS development or TMDL/WRAPS implementation projects only

Impaired reach name(s): See table below
AUID or DNR Lake ID(s): See table below
Listed pollutant(s): See table below

303(d) List scheduled start date: See 303(d) list Scheduled completion date: See 303(d) list

AUID = Assessment Unit ID

DNR = Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Table 2-7: Summary of impaired AUIDs. Waterbodies in **bold** are addressed in the Rum River Watershed TMDL Report.

HUC-10 Subwatershed	Stream/Reach (AUID) or Lake (ID)	Pollutant
Mille Lacs Lake	Borden Creek -554	Dissolved Oxygen
	Cedar Creek -546	Dissolved Oxygen
	Malone Creek -547	Dissolved Oxygen
Upper Rum River	Bogus Brook -523	Escherichia coli
	Vondell Brook -567	Fish
	Vondell Brook -687	Fish
	Washburn Brook -641	Fish
	Tibbets Brook -676	Fish
	Twelve Lake. 49-0006	Excess Nutrients
West Branch Rum River	W. Branch Rum -525	Macroinvertebrates, Escherichia coli
	Unnamed -667	Macroinvertebrates
	Estes Brook -679	Macroinvertebrates, Escherichia coli
Stanchfield Creek	Stanchfield Creek -520	Fish
	S. Stanchfield Lake 30-0138	Excess Nutrients
	N. Stanchfield Lake 30-0143	Excess Nutrients
Middle Rum River	Tennyson Lake 30-0113	Excess Nutrients
	Baxter Lake 30-0114	Excess Nutrients
	Green Lake 30-0136	Excess Nutrients
	L. Stanchfield Lake 30-0044	Excess Nutrients
Cedar Creek	Cedar Creek -521	Escherichia coli
	Crooked Brook -575	Dissolved Oxygen
	Mahoney Brook -682	Fish
Lower Rum River	Seelye Brook -528	Escherichia coli
	Isanti Brook -592	Fish, Macroinvertebrates
	Skogman 30-0022	Excess Nutrients
	Fannie Lake 30-0043	Excess Nutrients
	Long Lake 30-0072	Excess Nutrients
	Francis Lake 30-0080	Excess Nutrients
	Trott Brook -680	Fish, Macroinvertebrates, Dissolved Oxygen
	W. Hunter Lake 71-0022	Excess Nutrients
E. Hunter Lake 71-0023	Excess Nutrients	

Executive summary of project (300 words or less)

This summary will help us prepare the Watershed Achievements Report to the Environmental Protection Agency. (Include any specific project history, purpose, and timeline.)

Problem (one paragraph)

The purpose of this project was to create a Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) for the Rum River watershed and TMDL report for impaired waters. These work products, and the collaborative approach used to develop them provide guidance for protecting good conditions where they exist and addressing water quality impairments.

Waterbody improved (one paragraph)

The entire Rum River watershed was addressed in this project. The project aimed to provide strategies for protecting and restoring waters. Implementation is occurring through local action that follows this project.

Project highlights (one paragraph)

This project was a collaboration between 10 county soil and water conservation districts and county water planners. Numerous other stakeholders including lake associations and The Nature Conservancy were also involved. Each will be using the WRAPS and TMDL to guide their upcoming water management.

We expect the WRAPS to be the foundation of continued cross-jurisdictional collaboration. Project partners have already met once since the end of the grant project to collaborate on WRAP implementation. The group plans to apply for 2018 MN Clean Water Funds for this purpose, and is exploring a One Watershed, One Plan. Four of the project partners are currently updating their local water plans and are incorporating WRAPS concepts. Anticipated BMP installations in the near future include agricultural BMPs, land protection in riparian corridors, streambank stabilization and urban stormwater retrofits.

Results (one paragraph)

The Rum River WRAPS and TMDL are complete. The WRAPS has been approved by MPCA. The TMDL is complete except for anticipated EPA approval.

Additional work products from this project include building intangible but highly valued inter-agency collaboration, greater public awareness of watershed management strategies and stakeholder outreach materials to be used on an ongoing basis.

An HSPF model was created as part of this project. It is available for future managers, including through the simplified HSPF SAM interface.

Partnerships (Name all partners and indicate relationship to project)

Technical advisory team

Jamie Schurbon	Anoka Conservation District
Susan Shaw	Mille Lacs Soil & Water Conservation District
Holly Nelson	Isanti County
Derrick Wotachek	Isanti County
Tiffany Determan	Isanti Soil & Water Conservation District
Janet Smude	Aitkin Soil & Water Conservation District
Dan Cibulka	Sherburne Soil & Water Conservation District
Adam Beilke	Benton Soil & Water Conservation District
Sheila Boldt	Crow Wing Soil & Water Conservation District
Helen Mclenan	Morrison Soil & Water Conservation District
Craig Mell	Chisago Soil & Water Conservation District
Deanna Pomiji	Kanabec Soil & Water Conservation District
Todd Haas	Lower Rum River Watershed Management Organization & City of Andover
Chuck Schwartz	MSA, Consultant for the Upper Rum River Watershed Management Organization
Len Linton	City of Ramsey
Brandon Wisner	City of Elk River
Perry Bunting	Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe
Chad Weiss	Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe
Andrea Brandon	The Nature Conservancy
David Johnson	Board of Water & Soil Resources
Bonnie Finnerty	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Mark Evenson	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Chuck Johnson	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Chandra Carter	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
Craig Wills	Department of Natural Resources
Rick Bruesewitz	Department of Natural Resources
Leslie George	Department of Natural Resources
Nick Proulx	Department of Natural Resources

Consultant - RESPEC

Pictures

LOCAL, STATE AND NON-PROFIT PARTNERS AT RUM RIVER

