BOARD OF WATER AND SOIL RESOURCES

Watershed-based Assessment

Root River Partnership

Local Government Unit Partnership Review

Final Report

September 25, 2023

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources

520 Lafayette Road North

St. Paul, MN 55155

651-296-0768

www.bwsr.state.mn.us

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

This report has been prepared for the **Root River Partnership** by the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 103B.102, Subd.3.

Prepared by Jennifer Mocol-Johnson (jennifer.mocol-johnson@state.mn.us; 507-344-2820).

BWSR is reducing printing and mailing costs by using the Internet to distribute reports and information to wider audiences. This report is available in alternative formats upon request.

Watershed Based Report Summary

Root River Partnership

What is a PRAP Performance Review?

The Board of Water and Soil Resources supports Minnesota's counties, watershed districts, and soil and water conservation districts that deliver water and related land resource management projects and programs. In 2007, the Board established a program (PRAP) to systematically review the performance of these local units of government to ensure their effective operation. Each year BWSR staff conduct routine reviews of several of these local conservation delivery entities. This document reports the results of one of those reviews.

Key Findings and Conclusions

The Root River Partnership is commended for their work in implementing actions identified within their Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan. Below is a summary of findings of the PRAP Performance Review.

Resource Outcomes

The Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan contains 210 planned actions or activities. Of those, 176 were identified as *In Progress/ Ongoing*, 9 were identified as *Not Started*, 4 were identified as *Completed*, and the remaining 21 had no information provided to make a determination.

Basic Requirements:

- Root River Partnership reports achievement of 6 of 7 basic requirements

Action Items (required to address within 18 months):

- Grantee must meet Website Reporting Requirements

Best Standard/Practice:

- Root River Partnership reports achievement of 16 of 22 best performance standards/practices

Commendations

- Root River Partnership is commended for meeting 8 of 11 high-performance standards

Partnership Recommendations

- **Recommendation 1: Improve Plan Progress Tracking**
- **Recommendation 2: Increase Communication Between Staff and Policy Committee Members**
- **Recommendation 3: Public Education with Watershed Focus**
- **Recommendation 4: Increase engagement with Advisory Committee (including stakeholders)**
- **Recommendation 5: Develop Formal Process to Rank Projects**
- **Recommendation 6: Annually Conduct Work Planning Exercise**

Introduction

This is an informational document prepared by the staff of the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) for the Root River Partnership. It reports the results of a routine performance review of watershed partnerships/organizations' implementation of their Comprehensive Watershed Management Plans, and overall effectiveness in delivery of conservation projects and programs.

The findings and recommendations are intended to give local government units (LGUs) constructive feedback they can use to enhance their joint and individual delivery of conservation services.

For this review, BWSR has analyzed the Root River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan, the Partnership's achievement of basic requirements, best standards/practices, and high-performance standards, and surveyed members of the Policy Committee, Planning Work Group, and Advisory Committee.

This routine performance review is neither a financial audit nor an investigation and it does not replace or supersede other types of governmental review of local government unit operations.

While the performance review reported herein has been conducted under the authority granted to BWSR by Minnesota Statutes Chapter 103B.102, this is a staff report and has not been reviewed or approved by the BWSR board members.

What is PRAP?

PRAP is an acronym for BWSR's Performance Review and Assistance Program. Authorized by the 2007 Minnesota legislature, the purpose of PRAP is to support local delivery of conservation and water management by periodically reviewing and assessing the performance of local units of government that deliver those services. These include soil and water conservation districts, watershed districts, watershed management organizations, and the local water management functions of counties.

The PRAP program includes an Annual Statewide Summary, and three types of assessments. Depending on the program mandates and needs of the local government unit, review types include both routine and specialized. The Annual Statewide Summary annually tabulates all local governmental units' compliance with basic planning and reporting requirements.

Organizational Assessments, conducted by BWSR once every ten years for each local government unit, evaluate operational effectiveness, partner relationships, and whether the LGU has achieved county water plan, watershed management plan, and/or SWCD comprehensive plan implementation goals. This assessment also evaluates compliance with performance standards, and the Wetland Conservation Act, where applicable.

Watershed-based Assessments are routine reviews conducted with partnerships of local governments working together to implement Comprehensive Watershed Management Plans (CWMPs) developed through the One Watershed One Plan Program. This review evaluates progress on plan implementation and analyzes partners working relationships.

Special Assessments are conducted with LGUs experiencing significant obstacles or performance deficiencies and may include BWSR Board action to assign penalties as authorized by statute.

More details can be found on the BWSR PRAP webpage.

Executive Summary

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) staff met with the Root River Partnership to discuss an evaluation of the water management functions of the partnership that is actively implementing the Root River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan. The findings in this document represent the data collected over the course of 60 days of review and the recommendations are a result of the observations and conclusions made based on that data. There are four distinct parts of a Watershed Based Assessment conducted via the BWSR Performance Review and Assistance Program (PRAP) as authorized by M.S. 103B.102.

- Part 1: Evaluation of the progress made by water management entities toward goals stated in their approved and adopted local management or comprehensive plans.
- Part 2: Review of the entities' adherence to basic requirements, best standards and practices, and high-performance standards as directed by statutes, policies, and guidelines via a performance standards certification checklist.
- Part 3: Policy Committee, Planning Work Group, and Advisory Committee surveys to assess internal and external perceptions of performance, communication, partnerships, and delivery of conservation programs and customer service.
- Part 4: Review of the Assurance Measures, completed as part of the Watershed-based Implementation Funding (WBIF) policy.

After thorough review of the data, a list of actions and recommendations were developed to help guide the water management partnership in their continued growth of program delivery. This is done to ensure the partnership continues to work towards effective implementation of conservation practices. A list of commendations was also developed for the great work the partnership does in delivering conservation. Each of the above listed parts of the review are described in the findings section of this document, and the completed documents can be found in the notated appendices for further review. This report will be summarized in conjunction with other PRAP Assessments collected in 2023 to be used as the official BWSR PRAP report delivered to the legislature as part of our reporting requirement under M.S. 103B.102.

Key Findings and Conclusions

The Root River Partnership is commended for their work in implementing activities identified within their Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan. In general, Advisory Committee members feel the partnership is doing an effective job in implementing projects on the ground to meet plan priorities.

Increasing communication with both the Policy and Advisory Committees will help improve conservation delivery in the watershed. Additionally, considerations should be made in developing a formal project ranking process that includes evaluating cost effectiveness and tiers/adjusts rates based on priority levels. This will help focus and emphasize implementation on the desired locations. Focused implementation can also be increased through targeted marketing campaigns. 33.3% of Plan Work Group members stated that the partnership *rarely* or *sometimes* provided direct outreach to specific landowners.

The Partnership is commended for meeting 16 of 22 applicable best standards/practices, including reviewing the committee membership and updating annually, having current operational guidelines for fiscal procedures, and updating agency partners on accomplishments regularly.

The Partnership is also commended for meeting 8 of 11 high performance standards, a testament to the efforts made by the Root River Partnership.

Summary of Partnership Recommendations

Based on an analysis of the information and data collected during this review, BWSR staff developed several recommendations for the Partnership. BWSR relies heavily on our relationships with staff as well as the input of partners, staff, and board members to make sure recommendations provided are relevant, timely, and helpful for the partnership to implement and improve their operations. The full text of the recommendations can be found in the conclusions section.

- **Recommendation 1: Improve Plan Progress Tracking**
- **Recommendation 2: Increase Communication Between Staff and Policy Committee Members**
- **Recommendation 3: Public Education with Watershed Focus**
- **Recommendation 4: Increase Engagement with Advisory Committee (including stakeholders)**
- **Recommendation 5: Develop Formal Process to Rank Projects**
- **Recommendation 6: Annually Conduct Work Planning Exercise**

Findings

This section describes what BWSR learned about the performance of the Root River Partnership via the various collection methods as outlined below.

Findings Part 1: Planning

The findings in this section describe the Root River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan 2016-2026, the planned actions or activities within the plan and accomplishments made by the local water management entities.

As part of this review, County, SWCD, and Watershed District staff prepared a series of tables (see Appendix A) listing the accomplishments to-date for each action item identified for which they are responsible. BWSR incorporated a progress rating that indicates each action items' current status: whether the activity has been completed or target was met, whether progress has been made and work is continuing, or whether that activity was dropped, or work has not begun.

As part of this review process, staff provided the measurable goals from within the plan, and total progress made. BWSR staff then evaluated progress made on the goals. It must be noted that BWSR staff only provided progress made towards a goal when information was provided. If progress was not provided, it was noted as no progress made towards the goal. The Root utilized a consultant to assist in gathering BMP information. Additionally, their consultant determined % Progress toward 5-year Reporting Goal (as related to BMPs Implemented) for each of the priority HUC 10s identified within their plan. This can be found at the end of Appendix A and titled "Field Practices Table".

For planning and implementation purposes, the Root River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan includes all the Root River Watershed, in addition to areas that drain directly to the Mississippi River (Mississippi River – Reno watershed) and south into Iowa (Upper Iowa River watershed). The plan is divided by "A", "B", and "C" level resource concerns. By reaching "A" and "B" level concerns, it is believed that many of the "C" items will be addressed.

"A" level concerns include:

- Drinking Water Supplies
- Streams and Rivers
- Landowner and Producer Engagement in Water Management; and
- Livability

"B" level concerns include:

- Surficial-Subsurface Hydrologic Connections
- Flooding
- Wetlands
- Riparian Corridors
- Public Knowledge of and Behavior Relative to Water Issues
- Drainage Systems
- Water Retention Systems

A total of 210 action items were provided to BWSR. Of those, 176 were identified as *In Progress/Ongoing*, 9 were identified as *Not Started*, 4 were identified as *Completed*, and the remaining 21 had no information provided to make a determination.

A simple breakdown of the Table provided in Appendix A can be found below:

Resource Category: Groundwater- Water which is held underground within the pores of rocks and soil and which reaches the ground surface.
Resource Category Goal- Manage groundwater to maintain or improve the quality and quantity of drinking water supplies and the linkage between surface and subsurface hydrologic systems.

Resource of Concern	**Strategy**	In Progress/Ongoing	Not Started	Completed	No Information
A	**GW1- Nitrate-nitrogen (9 activities)**	8		1	
A	**GW2- Total coliform (7 activities)**	7			
A	**GW3- Pesticides (8 activities)**	8			
A	**GW4- Supply (5 activities)**	5			
C	**GW5- Supply (6 activities)**	5			1
B	**GW6- Land use / Runoff (2 activities)**	2			

Resource Category: Surface Water- Water resulting from excess precipitation leaving the landscape and collecting in streams, rivers, creeks, wetlands, lakes and ponds
Resource Category Goal- Manage surface waters to maintain or improve the quality and quantity of surface water supplies and obtain or maintain their beneficial uses.

Resource of Concern	**Strategy**	In Progress/Ongoing	Not Started	Completed	No Information
A	**SW1- Stream Stability (8 activities)**	6	2		
A	**SW2- Riparian Condition (6 activities)**	5	1		
A	**SW3- Sediment (8 activities)**	8			
A	**SW4- E. coli (10 activities)**	10			
A	**SW5- Nitrate- nitrogen (8 activities)**	8			
A	**SW6- Total phosphorus (10 activities)**	10			
A	**SW7- Dissolved Oxygen/Temperature (4 activities)**	4			
A	**SW8- Flooding (Landscape Impacts) (6 activities)**	4	1	1	
B	**SW9- Flooding (Infrastructure Impacts) (7 activities)**	5	2		
B	**SW10- Wetlands (3 activities)**	3			

Resource Category: Landscape Features- Visible natural features and characteristics of the landscape, often which are prominent or unique.
Resource Category Goal- Manage landscape features to maintain or improve the water resources of the Root River 1W1P boundary area.

Resource of Concern	**Strategy**	In Progress/Ongoing	Not Started	Completed	No Information
B	**LF1- Riparian Vegetation (9 activities)**	7		2	
C	**LF2- Aquatic Habitat (1 activity)**	1			
C	**LF3- Trout Streams (5 activities)**	1			4
C	**LF4- Habitat (4 activities)**	2			2
C	**LF5- Plant Communities (4 activities)**	3			1
C	**LF6- Karst Formations (3 activities)**	3			

Resource Category: Social Capacity- The collective understanding of water related matters within the community and the ability to respond to and resolve water related issues.
Resource Category Goal- Broaden the collective understanding of water issues and build a robust and resilient system for maintaining and improving water resources.

Resource of Concern	Strategy	In Progress/Ongoing	Not Started	Completed	No Information
B	**SC1- Public Education/ Outreach (5 activities)**	5			
A	**SC2- Engaged Landowner and Producers (7 activities)**	7			
C	**SC3- Business Role (4 activities)**	2			2
C	**SC4- Staff Capacity/Admin (4 activities)**	3			1
C	**SC5- Emerging Issues (2 activities)**	2			

Resource Category: Sustainability of Communities- The endurance, resilience and interconnectedness of systems and processes which support a community, including the economy, culture, politics, and ecology.
Resource Category Goal- Improve or maintain communities' cultural, economic, natural and water resources.

Resource of Concern	Strategy	In Progress/Ongoing	Not Started	Completed	No Information
A	**Sust1- Livability of Community (5 activities)**	5			
C	**Sust2- Rural Sustainability (9 activities)**	9			
C	**Sust3- Urban Sustainability (9 activities)**	2			7
C	**Sust4- Managed Land Use (8 activities)**	6			2

Resource Category: Water Resources Infrastructure- The natural and man-made systems important for managing the rate, volume, and quality of water.
Resource Category Gola- Maintain or improve the natural and man-made systems used for managing the rate, volume, and quality of water in the Root River 1W1P Area.

Resource of Concern	Strategy	In Progress/Ongoing	Not Started	Completed	No Information
B	**WI1- Drainage Design (3 activities)**	3			
B	**WI2- Drainage BMPs (4 activities)**	3	1		
B	**WI3- Infrastructure Development (3 activities)**	3			
C	**WI4- SSTS Adequacy (1 activity)**	1			
C	**WI5- Wastewater Discharge (1 activity)**				1
B	**WI6- Water Retention (6 activities)**	6			
B	**WI7- Stormwater/Construction Erosion (3 activities)**	3			
B	**WI8- Low Impact Development (3 activities)**	1	2		

The Root River Partnership is commended for making significant progress on activities identified within the implementation section of the plan. A total of 488 BMPs were completed and evaluated during this process. The Field Practices Table, found in Appendix A identified significant progress towards 5-Year Reporting goal for the following HUC 10s: Crooked Creek (90%), South Branch Root River (95%), Middle Branch Root River (71%), Rush Creek (65%), and South Fork Root River (217%). HUC 10s that have less than 50% progress, or no progress, include: Headwaters Upper Iowa River (18%), Money Creek (37%), Trout Run-Root River (40%), Canoe Creek (0%) and Upper Iowa River (0%).

Within the Progress Towards Plan goals table provided to BWSR, activities within the 'C' Resource of Concern did not have information provided as these activities were not intended to be directly addressed by the partners within the 10-year life of the plan. In some cases, information was given if it was easily attainable, however the majority of activities did not have information. While the PRAP exercise allowed staff to evaluate and track plan progress, it would greatly benefit the partnership to establish a strong tracking mechanism and evaluate progress on a regular basis. The partnership can discuss in greater detail the 'Next Steps' and this effort could be done prior to completing annual work planning.

The BWSR rated version of the Plan Progress Evaluation Table submitted by the Root River Partnership is contained in Appendix A, pages 23-62.

Findings Part 2: Performance Standards

BWSR has developed a set of performance standards that describe basic requirements, best standards/practices and high-performance standards related to the overall operation and function of an organization. The standards are different depending on the type of organization or LGU. The watershed-based performance standards address five specific areas of operation and groupings: 1). General Administration; 2) Elected Official Committee/Board; 3) Staff, Agency, Other Advisors; 4) Staff Committee; and 5). Communication and Coordination.

The basic requirements are items that are either statutorily required or required via policy. In these instances, if items are not completed, action items will be developed for the partnership to gain compliance. The Partnership has one action item to address. The action item, identified in the Watershed Based Implementation Funding grant agreement, requires the grantee to prominently display on its website the Clean Water Legacy Logo and a link to the Legislative Coordinating Commission website. While the logo appears on the partnership's page, a link needs to be provided.

The best standards/practices describe items that are fundamental to the functionality of the partnership. Items within this area are consider a basic practice that is appropriate for the organization to function.

The high-performance standards describe practices that reflect a level of performance or a practice that exceeds what is required. While organizations should meet basic standards/practices, proactive LGUs will meet high-performance standards. These standards can be considered stretch goals, or goals to reach or work to attain.

The performance standards checklists submitted and reviewed for the Root River Partnership is contained in Appendix B, pages 63-64.

For this Watershed-based Assessment, the partnership reports achievement of 16 of 22 best standards/practices, 6 of 7 basic requirements, and 8 of the 11 high performance standards for the partnership.

A few notable high achievements include:

- Shared service opportunities leveraged amongst partners
- Training efforts provided to policy committee to inform on watershed related topics
- The policy committee is involved in project funding discussions or decision making
- Coordination with County Board, SWCD Board, City/Township Officials

Findings Part 3: Internal and External Surveys

Part 3 of this performance assessment is based on responses to an online survey of individuals within the partnership as well as external partners. The survey consists of questions related to Communication, Initiative, Timeliness, Cooperation, Working Relationships, and Plan utilization during decision making.

The survey was given to three groups: the Policy Committee, Planning Work Group, and the Advisory Committee.

- The Policy Committee consists of one board member from each local water planning authority (ex. County, SWCD, and watershed district).
- The Planning Work Group consists primarily of local government staff (ex. Water Planners, SWCD Managers or District Technicians)
- The Advisory Committee consists of (but is not limited to) state agency partners, local nonprofits, municipalities, citizen based environmental groups, sporting organizations, drainage authorities, and agricultural/farm groups.

Because each group serves a different role, each of the three groups were asked different questions. Survey questions are designed to elicit information about successes and difficulties in implementing plan goals and objectives and assessing the extent and quality of the partnership during implementation.

Internal Surveys: Summary of Self-Assessments by Policy Committee Members

A total of twenty-five policy committee members (past and present) were invited to take the online survey, and twelve individuals participated.

Please note: Information in this section has been analyzed and paraphrased to keep responses anonymous.

Policy Committee members were asked how frequently the committee meets, and 9% responded *monthly*, while 73% stated *once every three months* and 18% stated *once every four months*. Of the meetings being held, 100% of the Committee stated that the number of meetings held was *About right*.

The policy committee members were asked to assess performance in five areas. Initiative, Completing Plan Priorities, and Timelines/Follow-through were each given that highest ranking with a combined score of over 83% *agree* and *strongly agree*.

Performance Area	Policy Committee Ratings (percent)					
	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree Nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**	**Don't Know**
Communication: keep us informed and seek input	**0.0%**	**25.0%**	**0.0%**	**33.3%**	**33.3%**	**8.3%**
Completing Plan Priorities: projects consistent with plan goals and objectives	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**8.3%**	**50.0%**	**33.3%**	**8.3%**
Initiative: willing to do what's needed to get work done, including initiate change	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**50.0%**	**41.7%**	**8.3%**
Timeliness and Follow-through: reliable and meet deadlines	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**8.3%**	**66.7%**	**16.7%**	**8.3%**
Cooperation: easy to work with and seek opportunities to address priorities	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**16.7%**	**41.7%**	**33.3%**	**8.3%**

During the project selection process, 45.5% of Policy Committee respondents felt the partners focused on priority areas for implementation *All of the time* while 36.4% stated *Some of the time*. This response was reiterated during both the Plan Work group and Advisory committee responses.

In general, about half of the Policy Committee members felt that more communication would be beneficial. When asked how well-informed individuals are in partnership efforts, 50.0% stated *great* while 41.7% stated *good*, that they receive communication, but it could be more. The remaining percentage was *unsure*. Overall survey respondents felt the partnership was *strong, with individuals working well together most of the time* (45.5%), while 54.5% stated the working relationship is *good, with some clear and minor issues that the partnership occasionally has to work through* that may at times cause issues.

Respondents were asked if they had any additional thoughts on how the partnership could improve at this stage of plan implementation:

- *SWCD supervisors are provided information ahead of time because they make motions on projects and accept dollars at their respective board meetings. County Commissioners are not provided communication and feel a bit in the dark.*

Internal Surveys: Summary of Self-Assessments by Planning Work Group Members

A total of 14 local government staff were invited to take the Planning Work Group survey and ten individuals participated.

Survey respondents were asked if the partnership had a formal working agreement for implementation, 100% stated *Yes*.

Below is a summary of the respondents' assessment of the successes and challenges of their current organizational structure:

Most Successful Aspects of the Current Structure

- Additional funding for SWCDs
- The joint powers agreement is informal enough that the policy committee is supportive of the partnership, while giving staff flexibility and leveraging to work together to spend money and put projects on the ground
- The collaboration makes implementation more flexible
- We all share the common goal of promoting conservation and working hard to get effective practices and projects on the ground. The SWCD staff work together very well and if more funding is needed those have not used their funds will provide it to whomever needs it
- Everyone is very comfortable to speak and bring up concerns and everyone is engaged
- Funds are leveraged (ex $ + EQIP$= 90% cost share)
- Receiving funds allows staff to get work done
- Funding is well distributed among the SWCDs. Only one level of cost-share (90%) rather than different rates for different practices

Biggest Limitation or Challenge of the Current Structure

- One Watershed One Plan is time consuming with meetings for SWCD staff. Too much coordination for the fiscal agent and day to day contact

- A lot has been learned since the Root went through the pilot program. There are tools used in other watershed areas that could aid the Root in implementation, prioritizing projects, and sharing data between LGUs for reporting. It can be difficult working with advisory committees instead of joint powers board because they are limited on authority or may not understand their authority. It is also difficult to have a rotating committee and new membership.
- Change-over in staff and not all partners track progress the same way
- Not having a tracking spreadsheet has been difficult. The Root River Partnership is starting to work with Houston Engineering on the 5-year Assessment and a form of project tracking has been put together which will continue to be built upon. It can also be difficult to conduct a meaningful policy committee meeting.
- Very few of the people that start this endeavor in 2014 are still around (staff turnover). Also, there appears to be confusion over the function of the policy committee. While members do not want to be a joint powers board, actions appear to contradict that.
- The plan has lots of objectives, and the document is not user friendly.
- Tracking was not set up from the beginning making it difficult now (x2)
- More communication needed with policy committee members that do not know the work of the partners.

When asked what kind of changes you would like to see made to make things work more smoothly and easily:

- More consistence between plans with one tracking tool for practices supported by BWSR and compatible with eLINK
- More streamlined approach to ranking projects, sharing data with partners, invoicing, etc.
- Consistent tracking of progress (x2)
- It would be nice if the Policy Committee were a Joint Powers Board entity so the partners would not have to take the risk of holding a large WBIF grant
- Less reporting, or report only on what the SWCDs do.

Planning Work Group members were also asked to assess seven performance areas. Both Sharing Resources and Willingness to Accept and Incorporate new Data received the highest marks with 33.3% ranked as *excellent*. When ranking Equal efforts made by partners, 33.3% ranked either *poor* or *fair* which some explained was due to the variable percentages of the watershed within individual counties.

Performance Area	Planning Work Group Ratings (percent)				
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Accomplishing stated plan goals	0.0%	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%
Addressing plan priorities	11.1%	0.0%	66.7%	11.1%	11.1%
Communication and Coordination	0.0%	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%
Equal Efforts made by partners	0.0%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	0.0%
Timelines and Follow-through	0.0%	22.2%	44.4%	22.2%	11.1%
Sharing Resources	0.0%	11.1%	55.6%	0.0%	33.3%
Willingness to Accept and Incorporate new Data	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%

Additional Comments regarding Performance Areas:

- *There should not be equal efforts by all partners. Dodge has very little of the watershed while 100% of Fillmore County is in the watershed.*
- *Participation of staff in One Watershed One Plan meetings for SWCDs is not always cost effective if you don't have flexible funds or support from the County allocation.*

Regarding the Day-to-Day utilization of the Root River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan in processes, 44.4% of responses indicated the CWMP was consulted or reviewed *as needed*, while 22.2% indicated *biannually*, and the remaining 11.1% was shared equally with *weekly, monthly*, and annually.

Day to Day Work in Implementing Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan	Planning Work Group Ratings (percent)				
	Weekly	Monthly	Biannually	Annually	As Needed
How often you consult the CWMP	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	11.1%	44.4%
How often are priority projects discussed	0.0%	33.3%	22.2%	11.1%	33.3%
How often do non-priority projects get implemented	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	77.8%
How often is the policy committee consulted on project funding decisions	0.0%	0.0%	44.4%	0.0%	55.6%
How often are policy documents and bylaws reviewed and updated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%
How often are plan goals or outcomes reviewed	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%
How often are new data and trends discussed	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%

Planning Work Group members indicated that plan goals or outcomes are reviewed *annually* (22.2%), *biannually* (11.1%), or *as needed*, (66.7%). Similar responses were provided when Planning Work Group members discussed new data and trends, with 66.7% stating that happened *as needed*, and 33.3% stated they discussed *annually*.

Planning Work Group members appear to provide a consistent response regarding how often priority projects were discussed with 33.3% stating *monthly, 33.3% stating as needed*, 22.2% stating *biannually*, and the remaining stating *annually*.

Responses from Planning Work Group members and policy members indicated an increased utilization of grant funds including BWSRs Watershed Based Implementation Funding (WBIF). The survey included questions about projects funded using WBIF. Most respondents indicated projects were located within the highest priority areas, with 11.1% stating *always*, and 22.2% stating *often* and 66.7% stating *sometimes*. Of those projects, 33.3% stated that cost effectiveness was considered *often*, while 33.3% stated *sometimes*. If cost effectiveness is not considered with each project, this is an area of potential improvement (see table below).

Projects Funding by WBIF Only	Plan Work group Ratings (percent)				
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Are projects located within the highest priority areas	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%
Is cost-effectiveness considered before implementing a specific project	0.0%	22.2%	33.3%	33.3%	11.1%
Do you provide outreach to specific landowners	0.0%	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%	0.0%
Do you adjust cost-share rates based on priority levels	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	11.1%
Do you have any shared services with other partnerships	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%

Survey responses of particular interest included the question related to outreach, with 33.3% stated outreach was *rarely* or *sometimes* provided to specific landowners. This is an area of potential improvement for the partnership. According to the survey as well, the partnership *rarely* (11.1%) or *never* (44.4%) adjusts cost-share rates based on priority levels. This is something the partnership may want to evaluate and/or ask adjacent watersheds for examples.

One item of accolades in survey responses would be utilization of shared services within the partnership, with almost seventy percent stating that the partnership utilizes shared services to accomplish mutual goals.

External Surveys: Advisory Committee Members (Agency Partners and Local Stakeholders)

A total of 50 partners were invited to take the survey and twelve participated. When asked the frequency of interaction with the planning partnership, 33.3% stated *not at all*, 50.0% stated *several times a year* 8.3% stated *monthly and* 8.3% stated *weekly*. Of those interactions, 18.2% stated the amount of Advisory Committee meetings held was *Not enough, and we could meet more often*, while 63.6% stated the number of meetings were *About right*. The remaining percentage was not specified. Regarding consultation, 33.3% felt the Advisory Committee was *not consulted enough, and could provide more expertise*. The remaining 66.7% felt the amount was *about right*.

Advisory Committee members provided ranking in six performance areas. Regarding Communication, 58.4% stated they both *agree* and *strongly agree* that they were kept informed, and the members seek input from them. Very similar percentages were also seen with Completing Plan Priorities, consistent with the plan goals and objectives, with a combined 58.3% *agree* and *strongly agree*, and Cooperation, with a combined score of 58.4% *agree* and *strongly agree* that the partnership seek opportunities to address priorities and is easy to work with. The highest area of agreement is found with Timelines and Follow-Through, with a combined score of 66.6% *agree* and *strongly agree* indicating the partnership is reliable and accomplishes tasks on time.

Performance Area	Advisory Committee Ratings (percent)					
	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree Nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**	**Don't Know**
Communication: keep us informed and seek input	**0.0%**	**16.7%**	**8.3%**	**41.7%**	**16.7%**	**16.7%**
Completing Plan Priorities: projects consistent with plan goals and objectives	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**25.0%**	**33.3%**	**25.0%**	**16.7%**
Equal Efforts made by Partners: Everyone's willing to pull their weight	**0.0%**	**8.3%**	**33.3%**	**16.7%**	**16.7%**	**25.0%**
Initiative: willing to do what's needed to get work done, including initiate change	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**25.0%**	**41.7%**	**16.7%**	**16.7%**
Timeliness and Follow-through: reliable and meet deadlines	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**16.7%**	**58.3%**	**8.3%**	**16.7%**
Cooperation: easy to work with and seek opportunities to address priorities	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**25.0%**	**16.7%**	**41.7%**	**16.7%**

Regarding rating the working relationship of the partners, 87.5% of Advisory Committee members felt the working relationship was *strong*, while the remaining 12.5% felt their working relationship was *good*.

Comments regarding Partnership Working Relationship:

- The Root River Partnership reflects an excellent example of a local partnership. Excellent collaboration, and it's apparent all involved care for the watershed resources.
- There could be easier access to information about project accomplishments.
- Despite staff turnover, there is a strong partnership in place.

Additional thoughts on how well the CWMP process has worked for the watershed at this stage of implementation:

- The partnership is doing an effective job in implementing projects on the ground to meet plan priorities. There is little effort given to finding ways to leverage funding and engage partners to accomplish more.
- Given this was the original pilot, the process has worked well, primarily due to the strong partnership.

- Being a pilot, they have navigated the Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan process very well. They do a great job changing course when needed and sharing what they've learned to others.
- There have been gaps due to staff transition, COVID, and lack of meetings. The partnership could do better.
- Future plan amendments could benefit the partners to establish clear priority areas in the watershed to focus on. Getting the Advisory Committee back to meeting on a regular basis would help with communication and provide opportunity for partnership.

Full partner survey responses are in Appendix C, pages 65-70.

Findings Part 4: Assurance Measures/Watershed-based Implementation Funding

Watershed Based Implementation Funding (WBIF) is an alternative to BWSRs traditional competitive funding progress. Once the entities within a partnership have a BWSR Board Approved and Locally Adopted Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan meeting the requirements of the One Watershed One Plan Program, they are eligible for WBIF to fund eligible activities identified within their plan. In the Twin Cities metro, approved plans may include the Metropolitan Surface or Groundwater Management Plan.

The Watershed Based Implementation Funding Policy includes four assurance measures that BWSR uses to supplement the existing grants accountability system. Assurance measures are designed to define expectations for how these large, non-competitive grants are used and to demonstrate to key audiences that WBIF dollars are being spent effectively to address the highest priority clean water needs in the watershed. The four Assurance Measures are:

1. Prioritized, targeted, and measurable work is making progress toward achieving clean water goals
2. Programs, projects, and practices are being implemented in priority areas
3. Grant work is on-schedule and on-budget
4. Leverage of non-state funds

BWSR staff reviewed these Assurance Measures for the FY18/19 WBIF Grant. Documentation of the Assurance Measure review is found in Appendix D, pages 71-74 of this report.

As a result of reviewing the Assurance Measures, BWSR staff identified that the partnership is making measurable progress towards plan goals utilizing the Watershed Based Implementation Funding. A summary of the review and recommendations provided by your Board Conservationist include:

Assurance Measure 1

- Local Government survey responses indicate that more communication/education is needed with the Policy Committee to improve their understanding of how the implementation funds are being spent.
- Future amendments to the plan should focus on using modeling, tools, and other resources to further refine priority areas for implementation in the watershed.
- Staffing levels to provide both the technical and administrative activities associated with these implementation funds should be assessed and potentially increased. Additional training for technical staff was also mentioned to ensure more work can be completed by existing and new staff.

Assurance Measure 2

- Overall, partners are doing a good job of focusing implementation to the established priority areas of the watershed but there are several projects that have been completed outside the priority areas for a variety of reasons (piggybacking with RCPP, lack of landowner interest). Partners should continue focusing on their priority areas moving forward.
- The partners had success with landowner engagement through the Watershed Conservation Planning Initiative (WCPI)-funded position. With the funding for that program coming to an end, the partners should consider investing more staff time towards similar efforts of conservation planning/farm walkovers to identify additional targeted projects in their priority areas.

Assurance Measure 3

- Shared staff (Nutrient Management Specialist, Soil Health Technician) have helped to identify projects and provide specialized technical support throughout the watershed. Frequent meetings, open communication, and a strong history of partnership have also been key to the success so far.

- Most of their milestones were met, and the grant work plan was completed on time and within budget with only minor revisions. These revisions were necessary due to construction delays with the Crooked Creek structure, new opportunities for program initiatives such as the CRP prairie strips practice, and additional funding sources that complemented activities in the work plan.

Assurance Measure 4

- Partners have been very successful in leveraging the WBIF to obtain additional outside or supplemental funding, particularly from Federal sources (RCPP, EQIP, 319). The partners should continue to pursue these additional funding sources to fully implement their plan.

General Conclusions

After a thorough review of the provided information including the Root River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan implementation progress, the watershed-based performance standards checklist, and analysis of survey results, BWSR staff have developed some recommendations for both the lead staff and partnership.

In brief review, the Root River Partnership reports achieving 16 of the 22 best standards or practices, and 8 of 11 high performance standards. The Root River Partnership has clearly demonstrated effectiveness in implementation of best management practices in priority areas within the landscape. The Partnership would benefit from continuing Annual Work Planning and discussions related to priority HUC 10s and where to focus future implementation efforts. Targeting outreach to priority areas would be beneficial and assist the partnership in making meaningful water quality reductions in areas where little or no implementation has occurred to date. Both the Policy Committee and Advisory Committee also feel additional Communication with the partnership would be beneficial.

The Root River Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan contains 210 action items that were reviewed. Progress on individual plan goals appears to be appropriate, with 176 activities identified as in progress, 9 identified as not started yet, 4 have been completed with goals met and even exceeded in some cases, and 21 had no information provided in order to make sufficient determination. The Field Practices Table (found in Appendix A) identified progress made toward the 5-Year Goal on 17 HUC 10s. Of the 17 HUCs, progress made is as follows: 8 have greater than 50% progress towards the 5-Year Goal, 7 have less than 50% progress, and 2 priority HUCs have had 0 progress. While the plan does not directly identify priority subwatersheds, the partnership has done a great job defining priority areas for each WBIF grant.

Commendations

Commendations are based on achievement of BWSR's high performance standards (see Findings, Part 2 and Appendix B, pages 63-64). These practices reflect above average operational effectiveness and level of effort.

The Root River Partnership is commended for:

- Involving the policy committee or board in project funding discussions and decision making
- Shared service opportunities leveraged between partners
- Updating and reviewing committee membership lists regularly
- Training efforts are made to policy committee on watershed related topics
- Coordinating with County Board, SWCD Board, WD Board, City/Township officials
- Cooperative projects/tasks with neighboring organizations, such as counties, SWCDs, WDs, tribal governments, and Non-Government Organizations

Action Items

Action items are based on compliance with BWSR's basic requirement performance standards (see Findings, Part 2 and Appendix B pages 42-43). Action items address lack of compliance with statutory requirements.

Root River Partnership has one action item to address at this time related to meeting statutory requirements/policy.

- **Action Item: Website for Grantee: must include all required information as identified within the grant agreement**

Partnership Recommendations

This section contains recommendations offered by BWSR to the Root River Partnership. The intention of these recommendations is to enhance the organization's delivery of effective water and related land resource management and service to the residents of the watershed. BWSR financial assistance may be available to support the implementation of some of these recommendations. See BWSR website for more information: https://bwsr.state.mn.us/prap-grants.

Recommendation 1: Improve Plan Progress Tracking

Responses from Planning Work Group members indicate one of the biggest challenges or limitations in successful plan implementation is lack of a consistent methodology or system for tracking. Multiple comments indicated a level of frustration that tracking was not done in the beginning of implementation and improvements could be made with consistency of partner tracking approach. Continue to work together as a partnership to establish a formal plan tracking process. Establishing a formal process will assist staff in determining and communicating progress towards plan goals.

Recommendation 2: Increase Communication Between Staff and Policy Committee Members

Survey responses provided by Policy Committee members indicated feeling uninformed on projects and plan progress. When ranking Communication, 25% of respondents stated they *Disagree* that they were kept informed, and input was sought. Potential considerations for increased communication include emails, memos, updates on projects, and invitation to events/field days within the watershed. Work to increase communication between staff and Policy Committee members and consider holding a work session to better define roles of each group.

Recommendation 3: Public Education with Watershed Focus

Tailoring educational messaging and resources is an important aspect of reaching specific watershed and subwatershed goals. Survey responses by Planning Work Group members indicated the partnership *rarely* (11.1%) provides outreach to specific landowners, while 22.2% stated *sometimes*. No responses indicated *always*. Narrowing and focusing messaging is necessary to reach the intended audiences. The partnership should consider dedicating staff time to expand the field walkover approach in priority subwatersheds. The partnership currently utilizes shared services. The partnership should determine what skillsets are needed to meet plan goals, and evaluate which skillsets are currently provided by partnership staff. Seek additional assistance if those skillsets are currently not available.

The Partnership is commended for working with the University of Minnesota to develop a Community Assessment and Engagement report for the watershed. Consider utilizing the results when working on communication and outreach efforts.

Recommendation 4: Increase engagement with Advisory Committee (including stakeholders)

Working to improve engagement of Advisory Committee members is extremely important. At the time this report was developed the stakeholder group had not been consulted or contacted in the past year. This is indicated in the checklist document. 18% of advisory committee members felt there was a potential to meet more often and 33% of individuals felt they were not consulted enough and could offer more expertise. Individuals from the

Advisory Committee have a unique skillset and are great resources. Additional steps to engage Advisory Committee members should be built into the Partnership's annual plan of work, activities, and processes.

Recommendation 5: Develop Formal Process to Rank Projects

Survey responses provided by Planning Work Group members indicated a need for a streamlined approach to ranking projects. When funding projects using WBIF, 22.2% stated cost effectiveness was *rarely* considered before implementing specific projects, 66.7% stated projects were *sometimes* located within highest priority areas, and 11.1% stated adjustable cost share rates based on priority levels were *rarely* used. Each of these items are important considerations when ranking projects. There are many examples throughout the state of ranking forms and spreadsheets. Consider developing a formal ranking process which incorporates the items mentioned above.

Recommendation 6: Annually Conduct Work Planning Exercise

The PRAP Assessment is intended to assist local governments in determining progress towards plan goals and activities. It is important to continually reevaluate activities throughout the life of the plan to determine whether the activity is still relevant or whether modifications are needed. Review of implementation progress took a considerable effort for local partners to identify accomplishments and determine status of action items. The partnership should review their implementation table (found in Appendix A) on an annual or biennial basis during work planning to help track and identify actions that should receive additional focus. Since the plan was developed, there has been a considerable amount of staff turnover within the watershed. Regularly reviewing the plan implementation table would be beneficial especially for new staff.

LGU Comments and BWSR Responses

The Root River Partnership was invited to comment on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations in the draft version of this report. The Root River Partnership provided the following letter outlining responses to the action item and recommendations contained in this report. BWSR acknowledges the Partnership's response and is available to provide assistance as needed.

Action Item: Website Reporting Requirements

Partnership Response: The Partnership expects to have website reporting requirements met by August 28th, 2023.

Recommendation 1: Improve Plan Progress Tracking

Partnership Response: This need is currently being worked on through the Partnership's 5-Year Assessment by Houston Engineering, and will be continued by the Root River Partnership Day-to-Day Contact. Houston Engineering plans to be complete with the 5-Year Assessment by December 31st, 2023.

Recommendation 2: Increase Communication Between Staff and Policy Committee Members

Partnership Response: Within the Partnership, SWCD staff will work to keep their respective County Representatives updated on a monthly basis, starting as early as July, 2023.

Recommendation 3: Public Education with Watershed Focus

Partnership Response: A shift in focus of use of Civic Engagement funds for more Watershed-Focused learning opportunities for the public will take place, starting as early as July, 2023.

Recommendation 4: Increase Engagement with Advisory Committee (Including Stakeholders)

Partnership Response: More frequent communication and meetings with the Advisory Committee will occur; meetings are currently being planned for early August, September, and potentially November in order to gain input for the next round of WBIF funding.

Recommendation 5: Develop Formal Process to Rank Projects

Partnership Response: The Planning Workgroup and Advisory Committee will work together to develop a formal ranking process for projects funded using Root River 1W1P funds; this joint effort among the Partnership will begin as early as August, 2023.

Recommendation 6: Annually Conduct Work Planning Exercise

Partnership Response: The Planning Workgroup and Advisory Committee will meet to discuss the Workplan of the next round of WBIF funding, as well as lay the groundwork for what the Partnership's yearly Work Planning Exercise will look like. This joint effort among the Partnership will begin as early as August, 2023.

Appendix A. Plan Accomplishments and Field Practices Table

Progress Rating: **Not started/dropped** **Ongoing progress** **Completed/target met**

Assessment date: April 17th, 2023

Watershed Management Plan Name: RR1W1P

Organization Preparing Table: Root River Partnership

Root River Watershed - One Watershed One Plan: PRAP Watershed Assessment Table

Targeted Implementation Schedule
5-year Assessment and Evaluation

Resource of Concern	Resource of Concern Priority Category	Strategy	Action	Action Description	Accomplishments to Date	Actual Implementation Date	Next Steps	BWSR Scoring (to be completed by BWSR)
Resource Category: Groundwater - Water which is held underground within the pores of rocks and soils and which reaches the ground surface.								
Resource Category Goal - Manage groundwater to maintain or improve the quality and quantity of drinking water supplies and the linkage between surface and subsurface hydrologic systems.								
Drinking Water Supplies (public and private)	A	GW1- Nitrate-nitrogen	GW-1.1	Implement BMPs that manage surface runoff within Drinking Water Source Management Areas (DWSMAs), Source Water Protection Areas, and areas of high vulnerability to groundwater recharge such as sinkholes.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to prioritize work in these areas	Ongoing
			GW-1.2	Seal abandoned and unused wells, particularly those wells which may impact public or private drinking water supplies, such as those found within DWSMAs.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to pursue funding for well sealings	Ongoing

			GW-1.3	Develop nitrogen fertilizer management plans for agricultural producers for locations that are vulnerable to groundwater contamination from nitrates, which follow Best Management Practice recommendations	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
			GW-1.4	Complete the delineation and mapping of DWSMAs and the boundaries of Well Head Protection Areas.	All DWSMAs have been mapped Stewartville - 2017 Grand Meadow - 2014 LeRoy - 2020 Canton - 2013 Chatfield - 2017 Fountain - 2018 Harmony - 2023 Lanesboro - 2018 Mabel - 2018 Preston - 2015 Rushford - 2019 Rushford Village - 2016 Wykoff - 2017 Ostrander - 2018 Peterson - 2018 Spring Valley - 2019 Caledonia - 2018 Hokah - 2016 Houston - 2015 Spring Grove - 2018 Lewiston - 2020	Ongoing	Continue to keep DWSMAs updated as wells are updated	Complete
			GW-1.5	Use existing land use and zoning ordinances to manage possible sources of nitrate contamination (e.g., subsurface sewage treatment systems; manure management; land development).	Existing ordinances continue to be enforced	Ongoing	Continue enforcing these ordinances	Ongoing

			GW-1.6	Provide financial and technical assistance for the monitoring of nitrate levels in private wells.	Volunteer Nitrate Monitoring Network, Tap-In. Since 2016, the following districts have hosted the following number of nitrate clinics: Olmsted: 5 Winona: 1 Mower: 2 Fillmore: 12 Houston: 1	Ongoing	Continue providing this assistance with existing funding	Ongoing
			GW-1.7	Continue research to define sinkhole locations, map springsheds in plan area, model groundwater, and monitor basic flow.	This research is handled by DNR/MGS and is ongoing throughout the plan area	Ongoing	Include DNR/MGS on Advisory Committee for updates regarding this action item	Ongoing
			GW-1.8	Provide educational and financial assistance to bring Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) into compliance to reduce nitrogen loading from small, unsewered communities and homes with inadequate wastewater treatment.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue providing financial assistance using existing funding. Consider including in a future outreach campaign.	Ongoing
			GW-1.9	Implement BMPs within priority locations which reduce vertical movement of nitrate into groundwater.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue targeting practices in priority locations	Ongoing
		GW2- Total coliform	GW-2.1	Implement BMPs that treat surface runoff within DWSMA, Source Water Protection Areas, and springshed contributing drainage areas.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to prioritize work in these areas	Ongoing
			GW-2.2	Seal abandoned and unused wells, particularly those wells which may impact public or private drinking water supplies, such as those found within DWSMAs.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to pursue funding for well sealings	Ongoing

			GW-2.3	Develop manure/nutrient management plans, which follow Best Management Practice recommendations, for agricultural producers with land application locations that are vulnerable to groundwater contamination from bacteria.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
			GW-2.4	Construct animal waste management systems and manage water using runoff control measures in accordance with accepted design standards and practice.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to pursue funding for livestock waste systems	Ongoing
			GW-2.5	Identify, replace, or repair failing and deficient subsurface sewage treatment systems.	3 Septic system improvements	2016, 2020, 2022	Continue providing financial assistance using existing funding.	Ongoing
			GW-2.6	Use existing land use and zoning ordinances to manage potential risk factors from the disposal of wastes near and the application of manure near sinkholes.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Continue enforcing these ordinances	Ongoing
			GW-2.7	Maintain compliance with National Point Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits for point sources.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Support the work done by MPCA to maintain compliance	Ongoing
		GW3- Pesticides	GW-3.1	Implement BMPs that treat runoff within DWSMA, Source Water Protection Areas, and spring shed contributing drainage areas.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to prioritize work in these areas	Ongoing
			GW-3.2	Implement BMPs that treat or prevent runoff to karst features.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Prioritize funding towards practices that protect karst features	Ongoing
			GW-3.3	Promote the development of pesticide management plans for land application locations that are vulnerable to surface water and	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to direct landowners/pesticide users to MDA and U of M Extension for proper	Ongoing

				groundwater contamination from pesticides, which follow manufacturer recommendations.			pesticide use, storage and disposal.	
			GW-3.4	Maintain and improve soil health as a means of increasing soil organic matter and managing pesticide releases to groundwater.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing
			GW-3.5	Encourage the use of precision agriculture as means of efficient application of pesticides.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Incorporate precision ag into a future outreach campaign	Ongoing
			GW-3.6	Implement an education/outreach campaign for the responsible use and disposal of pesticides.	Local partners have participated in and encouraged the use of Household Hazardous Waste days, Pesticide Handlers Training, and the Tap-In program.	Ongoing	Incorporate pesticide management into a future outreach campaign. Continue to support and promote Household Hazardous Waste days, Pesticide Handlers Training and future drinking water contaminant programs.	Ongoing
			GW-3.7	Implement an education/outreach campaign to reduce the risk to groundwater from contaminants such as chloride, VOCs, heavy metals, pharmaceuticals, etc.	Local partners have participated in and promoted the Tap-In program. MPCA has completed a lot of work towards education/outreach to reduce GW risk to contaminants.	Ongoing	Incorporate information about these contaminants into a future outreach campaign	Ongoing
			GW-3.8	Monitor groundwater for pesticides and/or other contaminants.	This work is handled by MDA and MPCA currently	Ongoing	Support the work done by MDA and MPCA to	Ongoing

							monitor pesticides and other contaminants	
		GW4- Supply	GW-4.1	Develop and evaluate additional ground water data including long term trends in water levels, aquifer safe yields, and appropriation and permitting trends, to identify and describe whether a problem currently exists.	This work is handled by DNR currently	Ongoing	Support the work done by DNR and utilize the results in future work planning	Ongoing
			GW-4.2	Continue to support through the permit review process the Department of Natural Resources, Water Appropriation Permit Program, to manage groundwater supply and evaluate historical and projected future permitted uses and demand.	This work is handled by DNR currently. Local staff serve on Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP), and continually receive DNR wetland, surface water, and groundwater appropriation permits for review.	Ongoing	Support the work done by DNR through their permitting process	Ongoing
			GW-4.3	Encourage watershed residents through educational and outreach efforts to adopt conservation and water reuse practices, such as capturing stormwater for irrigation.	Fillmore SWCD promotes the use of and sells rain barrels, has provided technical assistance for rain gardens.	Ongoing	Utilize future WBIF funding to boost outreach and also provide financial assistance for urban BMPs	Ongoing
			GW-4.4	Implement BMPs in urban and rural areas that promote infiltration and groundwater recharge, such as soil heath improvements through increased organic content of soils.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing
			GW-4.5	Install additional, strategically located long-term groundwater observation wells in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, to monitor water levels.	DNR, MDA and Fillmore SWCD working to install a paired design set of observation wells south of Preston to monitor two different aquifers. Few	Ongoing	Continue to support the work of the DNR for observation well monitoring and working with DNR as funding allows to find more	Ongoing

					DNR observation wells exist in the RR 1W1P Plan area but all are monitored by the DNR.		cooperative landowners for more observation wells.	
Springsheds	C	GW5- Supply	GW-5.1	Develop and evaluate additional ground water data including long term trends in water levels, aquifer safe yields, and appropriation and permitting trends, to identify and describe whether a problem currently exists.	This work is handled by DNR currently	Ongoing	Support the work done by DNR and utilize the results in future work planning	Ongoing
			GW-5.2	Continue support through permit review of the Department of Natural Resources, Water Appropriation Permit Program, that manage groundwater supply and evaluate historical and projected future permitted uses and demand.	Staff serve on Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP), and continually receive DNR wetland, surface water, and groundwater appropriation permits for review	Ongoing	Support the work done by DNR through their permitting process	Ongoing
			GW-5.3	Implement BMPs in urban and rural areas that promote infiltration and groundwater recharge, such as soil heath improvements through increased organic content of soils.	Lawns to Legumes; Cover Crops; See Field Practices Table	Ongoing	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing
			GW-5.4	Install additional, strategically located long-term groundwater observation wells in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, to monitor water levels.	DNR, MDA and Fillmore SWCD working to install a paired design set of observation wells south of Preston to monitor two different aquifers. Few DNR observation wells exist in the RR 1W1P Plan area, but all are monitored by the DNR.	Ongoing	Continue to support the work of the DNR for observation well monitoring and working with DNR as funding allows to find more cooperative landowners for more observation wells.	Ongoing

			GW-5.5	Continue research to define sinkhole locations and map springsheds in plan area.	Fillmore SWCD partners with MNDNR and MDA for groundwater dye tracing yearly; this work includes yearly updates to the Karst Feature Database to update springs, sinkholes, groundwater flow paths and springsheds.	Ongoing	Continue partnership to support the work of DNR and MDA	Ongoing
			GW-5.6	Correlate springshed mapping and IBI scores to target water infiltration BMPs with critical trout habitat.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
Surficial-Subsurface Hydrologic Connections	B	GW6- Land use / Runoff	GW-6.1	Promote programs and BMPs that restrict activities on or near karst areas to protect water quality and promote safety.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Prioritize funding towards practices that protect karst features	Ongoing
			GW-6.2	Administer applicable bluffland protection zoning ordinances to control certain land uses and restrict vegetative alterations within bluff areas.	Existing ordinances continue to be enforced	Ongoing	Continue enforcing these ordinances	Ongoing
Resource Category: Surface Water - Water resulting from excess precipitation leaving the landscape and collecting in streams, rivers, creeks, wetlands, lakes and ponds								
Resource Category Goal - Manage surface waters to maintain or improve the quality and quantity of surface water supplies and obtain or maintain their beneficial uses.								
Streams and Rivers	A	SW1- Stream Stability	SW-1.1	Develop a comprehensive hydrologic and hydraulic model for culvert and bridge design to determine timing and magnitude of peak discharge of existing conditions, the duration of discharge, and base flow conditions.	Not Started	N/A	Determine whether this is needed, as it would cost a lot	Not Started
			SW-1.2	Set peak discharge, volume reduction goals and sediment load goals to achieve stable geomorphologic conditions.	MPCA (Emily Zanon) refined 25% reduction of 2-yr peak discharge goal in RR1W1P to set a water storage goal of an	Ongoing	Consider using existing data and studies to establish these goals in time for plan amendment	Ongoing

					additional 0.35 inches of runoff per acre (38,689.40 acre-feet for the entire Root HUC-8). This goal is outlined in the Root WRAPS Update (expected by end of 2023).		1) MPCA (Matt Drewitz & Emily Zanon) meeting with Anna Cates (UMN) to discuss water storage capacity of cover crops (late Spring/summer 2023) 2) Emily Zanon to reach out to MPCA modelers to refine sediment goals and other volume goals referencing the HSPF work from Le Sueur watershed.	
			SW-1.3	Quantify the volume reduction of improved soil health.	Not started	N/A	Partnering with MOSH; storage per acre of soil health practices	Not started
			SW-1.4	Increase water and sediment storage and infiltration within priority locations.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			SW-1.5	Define basic geomorphic characteristics for stable reaches including bank full discharge, channel cross sectional area, slope, and bed composition.	Ongoing (WARSSS complete for Crooked Creek, Vesta Creek & Watson Creek have DNR Geomorphology Reports)	Ongoing	Support the work completed by the DNR	Ongoing
			SW-1.6	Inventory the locations and cause of unstable stream and river reaches and prioritize them for implementing fixes.	Ongoing (WARSSS complete for Crooked Creek, Vesta Creek & Watson Creek have DNR Geomorphology Reports)	Ongoing	Local partners could work with DNR to complete this type of inventory using future WBIF funding	Ongoing

			SW-1.7	Promote BMPs that enhance hydrologic storage by increasing upland perennial native vegetation in areas that provide connections to expand riparian access. These actions also provide benefits to restoring stream stability and equilibrium where it is found to be impaired.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			SW-1.8	Complete restoration projects that provide multiple benefits, such as enhanced hydrologic function, while also providing connectivity benefits for aquatic and terrestrial habitats.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Prioritize projects that provide multiple benefits	Ongoing
		SW2- Riparian Condition	SW-2.1	Develop a comprehensive hydrologic and hydraulic model for culvert and bridge design to determine timing and magnitude of peak discharge of existing conditions, the duration of discharge, and base flow conditions.	See SW-1.1	See SW-1.1	See SW-1.1	Not started
			SW-2.2	Determine the location and value of existing barriers relevant to fish management and aquatic invasive species (AIS) control.	Stressor identification in the Root (2015 & 2021) identified barriers on Rice Creek (07040008-581; beaver dams) and Corey Creek (07040008-631; perched culvert @ CR17 xing). Stressor identification was also conducted in Upper Iowa (2018) & Miss R. -Reno (2018) but the following waters are warmwater: identified barrier on Deer Creek (07060002-520;	Cycle 1 SID report published in January 2015 (MPCA) Cycle 2 SID report published in March 2022 (MPCA)	Continue to document fish barriers and communicate with MPCA to include in future SID work.	Ongoing

					perched culvert @ State Line Rd xing)			
			SW-2.3	Reduce agricultural damages for lands inundated by 10-year or more frequent flood events by encouraging alternative agricultural practices.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Prioritize projects located in flood prone areas	Ongoing
			SW-2.4	Stabilize and/or restore degraded sections of stream and river reaches to reduce bank failure and mass wasting that complement upstream BMPs.	See SW-1.8	See SW-1.8	See SW-1.8	Ongoing
			SW-2.5	Prepare and maintain formal maps to define the boundary of the riparian area adjacent to perennial streams and rivers, as a means to focus the implementation of incentive-based initiatives.	Buffer Law Maps	Ongoing	Continue to monitor riparian area buffers and update maps as needed as streams continue to naturally meander and change.	Ongoing
			SW-2.6	Implement BMPs within riparian areas that improve connectivity within riparian corridors and floodplains.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Consider directing some future WBIF funding for projects to improve connectivity	Ongoing
		SW3 - Sediment	SW-3.1	Maintain soil loss tolerance at a level equal to or less than an amount considered sustainable from a soil health and fertility perspective from urban and rural lands.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing
			SW-3.2	Facilitate agricultural producer implementation of BMPs which are focused on and maintain soil health, such as tillage and residue management, nutrient and manure management, crop rotation methods, and the use of cover crops.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing

			SW-3.3	Complete sufficiently detailed sediment mass balances for affected reaches, which identify the relative magnitude of sediment source leading to impairments.	Sediment Budget for Root River watershed completed by Patrick Belmont in 2016	2016	Consider information from this report in future plan amendment	Ongoing
			SW-3.4	Implement the State of MN soil loss ordinance to protect soil health and sustainability.	Soil loss ordinance didn't get applied statewide as initially thought. Local ordinances are currently in place in Fillmore, Mower, Olmsted, and Winona Counties	Ongoing	Consider revising this action item in future plan amendment	Ongoing
			SW-3.5	Implement BMPs that reduce sediment loading within waterbodies by treating surface runoff to ditches, streams, and rivers and by stabilizing gullies and gully heads.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue prioritizing practices that reduce sediment loading	Ongoing
			SW-3.6	Implement water and sediment storage BMPs in priority locations to reduce the capacity of streams and rivers to generate and transport sediment by storing water to manage the rate, volume, and duration of runoff.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			SW-3.7	Stabilize and or restore degraded sections of stream and river reaches to reduce bank failure and sediment deposition into waterbodies.	56 grade stabilizations, 3 streambank protections	2017-2021	Continue identifying opportunities for streambank projects	Ongoing
			SW-3.8	Encourage stormwater sediment reduction in rural subdivisions and urban areas.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Consider using future WBIF funding to provide financial assistance for stormwater BMPs	Ongoing
		SW4 - E. coli	SW-4.1	Implement BMPs that treat surface runoff within priority locations.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue implementation efforts to install these projects	Ongoing

			SW-4.2	Implement BMPs within priority locations that promote soil health, thereby increasing water retention and decreasing surface runoff.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing
			SW-4.3	Encourage the development and implementation of manure / nutrient management plans, which follow Best Management Practice recommendations, for agricultural producers with land application locations that are vulnerable to surface water contamination from pathogenic bacteria.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
			SW-4.4	Construct animal waste management systems and runoff control measures for animal feeding operations in accordance with design standards and practice.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to pursue funding for livestock waste systems	Ongoing
			SW-4.5	Identify and repair or replace failing and noncompliant subsurface sewage treatment systems.	3 Septic system improvements	2016, 2020, 2022	Continue providing financial assistance using existing funding sources	Ongoing
			SW-4.6	Use existing land use and zoning ordinances to manage potential risk factors including possible sources of pathogenic bacterial contamination (e.g., subsurface sewage treatment systems; manure management; land development, concentrated livestock access to streams).	Existing ordinances continue to be enforced	Ongoing	Continue enforcing these ordinances	Ongoing
			SW-4.7	Encourage implementation of BMPs that reduce stormwater runoff as a source of pathogenic bacteria.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Consider using future WBIF funding to provide financial assistance for stormwater BMPs	Ongoing

			SW-4.8	Use managed and rotational grazing methods to manage animal wastes.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Grazing/Soil Health Specialist position	Ongoing
			SW-4.9	Maintain compliance with National Point Discharge Elimination System Permits for point sources.	This work continues to be handled by MPCA	Ongoing	Support the work done by MPCA to maintain compliance	Ongoing
			SW-4.10	Construct animal waste storage systems that allow land application consistent with an approved manure / nutrient management plan.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
		SW5- Nitrate-nitrogen	SW-5.1	Implement BMPs within priority locations that reduce nitrate-nitrogen loading to waterbodies by treating surface and shallow sub-surface runoff before entering ditches and streams.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue implementation efforts to install these projects	Ongoing
			SW-5.2	Implement storage BMPs within priority locations which reduce delivery of nitrate-nitrogen runoff to surface waters.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			SW-5.3	Implement BMPs within priority locations that promote soil health, thereby increasing water retention and decreasing surface runoff.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing
			SW-5.4	Encourage the development and implementation of nutrient management plans for agricultural producers for locations that are vulnerable to groundwater contamination from nitrates, which follow BMP recommendations.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
			SW-5.5	Provide educational and financial assistance to bring Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) into compliance to reduce nitrogen loading	See SW-4.5	See SW-4.5	See SW-4.5	Ongoing

				from small, unsewered communities and homes with inadequate wastewater treatment.				
			SW-5.6	Implement feedlot runoff controls that reduce nitrogen loading of waterbodies by treating or reducing runoff of contaminated water.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to pursue funding for livestock waste systems	Ongoing
			SW-5.7	Use existing land use and zoning ordinances to manage potential risk factors including possible sources of nitrate contamination (e.g., subsurface sewage treatment systems; manure management; land development).	See SW-4.6	See SW-4.6	See SW-4.6	Ongoing
			SW-5.8	Construct animal waste storage systems that allow land application of manure consistent with an approved nutrient management plan.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
		SW6- Total phosphorus	SW-6.1	Implement BMPs within priority locations that reduce phosphorus loading to waterbodies by treating surface and shallow sub-surface runoff before entering ditches and streams.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue implementation efforts to install these projects	Ongoing
			SW-6.2	Implement storage within priority locations which reduce delivery of phosphorus runoff to surface waters.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			SW-6.3	Implement BMPs within priority locations that promote soil health, thereby increasing water retention and decreasing surface runoff.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing
			SW-6.4	Encourage the development and implementation of nutrient management plans for agricultural producers.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing

			SW-6.5	Provide educational and financial assistance to bring Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) into compliance to reduce nutrient loading from small, unsewered communities and homes with inadequate wastewater treatment.	3 Septic system improvements	2016, 2020, 2022	Continue providing financial assistance using existing funding sources	Ongoing
			SW-6.6	Implement feedlot runoff controls that reduce nutrient loading of waterbodies by treating or reducing runoff of contaminated water.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue to pursue funding for livestock waste systems	Ongoing
			SW-6.7	Use existing land use and zoning ordinances to manage potential risk factors including possible sources of nutrient contamination (e.g., subsurface sewage treatment systems; manure management; land development).	See SW-4.6	See SW-4.6	See SW-4.6	Ongoing
			SW-6.8	Implement BMPs to reduce phosphorus runoff in rural subdivisions and urban areas.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Consider using future WBIF funding to provide financial assistance for stormwater BMPs	Ongoing
			SW-6.9	Construct animal waste storage systems that allow land application of manure consistent with an approved nutrient management plan.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
			SW-6.10	Maintain compliance with wastewater treatment plant point source permit requirements.	The work of maintaining compliance continues to be handled by the municipality in coordination with MPCA	Ongoing	Support the work done by MPCA to maintain compliance	Ongoing
		SW7 - Dissolved Oxygen/Temperature	SW-7.1	Implement BMPs that provide perennial vegetative cover within the riparian corridor to decrease bank erosion, increase stream shading, and reduce water temperature.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue implementation efforts to install these projects	Ongoing

			SW-7.2	Implement BMPs within priority locations that reduce the flow of runoff to streams and rivers including surface water storage BMPs.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			SW-7.3	Encourage the development and implementation of nutrient management plans for agricultural producers, which follow BMP recommendations to reduce algae growth.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
			SW-7.4	Restore degraded sections of stream and river reaches to increase habitat for the aquatic biological community.	3 Streambank and shoreline protections	2018-2020, 2022	Continue identifying opportunities for streambank projects	Ongoing
Flooding	B	SW8 - Flooding (Landscape Impacts)	SW-8.1	Define, develop, and maintain an agricultural flood prone map.	Action not needed; Existing tools accomplish this action	N/A	Existing tools: DNR WHAF tool by soil type; FEMA floodplains	Completed
			SW-8.2	Use various programs to provide landowners with economically viable alternatives for use of land in flood prone areas.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue outreach to landowners on new and existing easement programs	Ongoing
			SW-8.3	Maintain public infrastructure to provide drainage at the anticipated level of service to minimize flood damage to agricultural land both upland and downstream of the managed systems.	Maintenance of existing public infrastructure continues to be a county responsibility	Ongoing	Continue engaging with county staff to identify opportunities for local partners to support these efforts	Ongoing
			SW-8.4	Implement practices that provide a minimum 10-year level of protection for agricultural lands, including upland and floodplain storage projects.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			SW-8.5	Complete hydrologic analyses for the installation of new and improved subsurface tile systems which reasonably ensure adequate tile system function.	Not started	N/A	Will be pursued as a driver of stressors	Not started

			SW-8.6	Implement practices (e.g., increasing perennial cover in headwater catchments) that increase hydrologic storage and stability throughout the landscape, including upland areas high in the watershed to reduce flooding.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
		SW9 - Flooding (Infrastructure Impacts)	SW-9.1	Publish and make available the most current floodplain maps.	Flood maps are maintained and posted on DNR/FEMA websites	Ongoing	Consider a link to the DNR/FEMA websites on partner websites and including them in future communications	Ongoing
			SW-9.2	Use the floodplain management ordinance and land use and zoning approvals to minimize the likelihood of future flood damages.	Existing ordinances continue to be enforced	Ongoing	Continue enforcing these ordinances	Ongoing
			SW-9.3	Evaluate the need for, develop, and implement capital improvement projects to address areas currently subject to damage.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue budgeting WBIF funds to develop and implement these projects	Ongoing
			SW-9.4	Use proper hydrologic and hydraulic design standards for road crossings to provide flood protection, while considering fish passage and environmental needs.	County Capital Improvement plans; culverts and bridges up for replacements are being sized appropriately	See Field Practices Table	Continue engaging with county staff to identify opportunities for local partners to support these	Ongoing
			SW-9.5	Develop a comprehensive hydrologic and hydraulic model for culvert and bridge design to determine timing and magnitude of peak discharge of existing conditions, the duration of discharge, and base flow conditions.	See SW-1.1	See SW-1.1	See SW-1.1	Not started
			SW-9.6	Set peak discharge, volume reduction goals and sediment load goals to achieve stable geomorphologic conditions.	See SW-1.2	See SW-1.2	See SW-1.2	Ongoing

			SW-9.7	Quantify the runoff volume reduction benefits of improved soil health.	See SW-1.3	See SW-1.3	See SW-1.3	Not started
Wetlands	B	SW10- Wetlands	SW-10.1	Implement and enforce applicable county ordinances and the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) to retain wetland quantity, function, and value.	Enforcement of WCA and other applicable county ordinances continues	Ongoing	Continue enforcing these ordinances/programs	Ongoing
			SW-10.2	Promote BMPs which enhance, restore, or create wetlands and provide hydrologic storage in the upland portions of the watershed.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			SW-10.3	Locate and identify all calcareous fens not yet on the DNR Commissioner's List.	This is the responsibility of the DNR	Ongoing	Continue to support the work being done by DNR	Ongoing
Resource Category: Landscape Features - Visible natural features and characteristics of the landscape, often which are prominent or unique.								
Resource Category Goal - Manage landscape features to maintain or improve the water resources of the Root River 1W1P boundary area.								
Riparian Corridors	B	LF1- Riparian Vegetation	LF-1.1	Define areas subject to frequent flooding as the minimum riparian area to be managed on all rivers and streams. For public waters and public ditches, the minimum area identified as frequently flooded will be targeted for additional BMP implementation.	Flood maps are maintained and posted on DNR/FEMA websites.	2019	Consider targeting practices in flood prone areas	Ongoing
			LF-1.2	Identify and field-verify areas where additional riparian buffers or alternative practices are needed.	The "Other Waters" provision of the Buffer Law was completed by SWCDs in the watershed back in 2017	2017	Complete	Complete
			LF-1.3	Implement perennial vegetative BMPs in riparian areas, promote lateral connectivity to the floodplain, provide financial opportunity to landowners from non-productive riparian land, adhere to mandated shoreland and state buffer	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue implementation efforts to install these projects	Ongoing

				law requirements, and utilize alternative practices as needed that support the function of healthy riparian corridors.				
			LF-1.4	Provide educational materials, consultations, and workshops to landowners and agricultural producers about riparian BMPs, including compensation and incentive programs for land adjacent to streams.	365 nutrient management plans and landowner contacts	2018-2021	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
			LF-1.5	Implement managed and rotational grazing methods and animal access control BMPs.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue funding the shared Grazing/Soil Health Specialist position	Ongoing
			LF-1.6	Identify land areas suitable for recreational opportunities, such as trout fishing and public water access.	This is the responsibility of the DNR	Ongoing	Continue to support the work being done by DNR	Ongoing
			LF-1.7	Provide education and outreach materials about trespass regulations and their relation to public access and stream fishing regulations.	This is the responsibility of the DNR	Ongoing	Continue to support the work being done by DNR	Ongoing
			LF-1.8	Provide education and outreach materials online and in print depicting a map of stream public access points by county to optimize public accessibility.	DNR maintains this mapping on their website	Ongoing	Utilize this resource in future communications	Ongoing
			LF-1.9	Provide input to and complete mapping of other waters potentially subject to buffer requirements.	The "Other Waters" provision of the Buffer Law was completed by SWCDs in the watershed back in 2017	2017	Complete	Complete

Aquatic Habitat for Fish, Macroinvertebrates, and Aquatic Life	C	LF2- Aquatic Habitat	LF-2.1	Implement BMPs that provide perennial and woody native vegetative cover within the riparian corridor.	Minnesota Buffer Law; See Field Practices Table	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
Trout Streams	C	LF3- Trout Streams	LF-3.1	Determine the location and value of existing fish barriers relevant to trout fisheries management and AIS control.	Stressor identification in the Root (2015 & 2021) identified barriers on Rice Creek (07040008-581; beaver dams) and Corey Creek (07040008-631; perched culvert @ CR17 xing). Stressor identification was also conducted in Upper Iowa (2018) & Miss R. -Reno (2018) but the following waters are warmwater: § identified barrier on Deer Creek (07060002-520; perched culvert @ State Line Rd xing) § R-3 reservoir likely limiting fish migration for South Fork Crooked Creek (07060001-574)	Ongoing	Continue to support MPCA/DNR efforts	Ongoing
			LF-3.2	Identify stream reaches with self-sustaining brook trout populations and implement practices to manage these reaches.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			LF-3.3	Identify stream reaches with self-sustaining brown trout populations and implement practices to manage those reaches.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided

			LF-3.4	Identify stream reaches where stocking of rainbow trout yearlings provide the public with a put-take angling opportunity and implement practices to manage these reaches.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			LF-3.5	Identify stream reaches where stocking of rainbow trout fingerlings provide multiple year classes to anglers and implement practices to manage those reaches.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
Areas of Moderate and High Biodiversity	C	LF4- Habitat	LF-4.1	Administer zoning regulations that encourage development practices which preserve and enhance natural areas. Higher priority should be given to areas where high, medium-high and medium Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) wildlife and habitat scores within the Wildlife Action Network (WAN) are located.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			LF-4.2	Implement BMPs to manage native plant and animal communities, such as forestland, prairies, wetlands, oak savannahs, etc.	CRP, CREP, RIM, wetland restorations, CP-43 prairie strips; See Field Practices Table	Ongoing	Continue to promote and support these programs	Ongoing
			LF-4.3	Identify parcels adjacent to areas of moderate and higher biodiversity and/or areas of high, medium-high and medium Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) wildlife and habitat scores within the Wildlife Action Network (WAN) and promote BMPs to protect and enhance biodiversity.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			LF-4.4	Promote protection of lands identified as areas of moderate, high, and outstanding biodiversity and/or areas of high, medium-high and medium Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) wildlife and habitat scores within the Wildlife	SE RIM program is just being developed for bluff land that will look to target diverse habitats	Ongoing	Continue development	Ongoing

				Action Network (WAN) through such programs as acquisition, property tax credits and easements.				
	C	LF5- Plant Communities	LF-5.1	Perform education and outreach initiatives targeted to general public / landowners in moderate and high biodiversity areas about threats of invasive species, and ways to prevent / control them.	County Fair booth with AIS messaging and info on terrestrial invasives	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			LF-5.2	Perform education and outreach initiatives targeted to landowners in moderate and high biodiversity areas and/or areas of high, medium-high and medium Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) wildlife and habitat scores within the Wildlife Action Network (WAN) about landowner benefits of natives, and potential downfalls of invasives.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			LF-5.3	Pursue funding, such as Cooperative Weed Management Areas and aquatic and terrestrial invasive species grants to provide technical and financial assistance to control/manage invasive species within and contributing to quality habitats for terrestrial and aquatic species.	Fillmore SWCD held Cooperative Weed Management grants with emphasis on Japanese Hops and Buckthorn; Winona SWCD has done extensive work towards the eradication of Oriental Bittersweet in Winona County; Fillmore SWCD is currently working towards getting a list of landowners together for invasive plant management (buckthorn, knotweed, etc.) to be able	Ongoing	Continue to pursue funding and provide technical and financial assistance	Ongoing

					to get a Conservation Corps (or similar) crew. Houston County has been getting a CWMA grant for invasives in Pastures for the last few years. All stream reaches in Winona County have been walked, aquatic and terrestrial invasives have been reported.			
			LF-5.4	Maintain current and historical GIS records of invasive species using the MNDNR database.	EDDMApps maintains invasive species records	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
Karst Formations	C	LF6- Karst Formations	LF-6.1	Develop and maintain a karst feature data base capable of producing maps for the plan area.	See DNR's Geospatial Commons for the updated (10/3/2022) Karst Features Database layer	Ongoing	Continue to support DNR efforts	Ongoing
			LF-6.2	Implement BMPs in areas that help protect the natural features, such as caves, sinkholes, springs and algific talus slopes, associated with karst geology.	Buffers around sinkholes, cleaning up old dump sites/sinkholes, buffers around springs; goat prairie restorations; See Field Practices Table	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			LF-6.3	Promote and implement programs and incentives including, but not limited to RIM, ACEP, CRP, wetland banking and tax credits.	From RR SWCD: Are always promoting RIM. Lots of new CRP going in. No new RIM easements in years.	Ongoing	Continue to promote RIM, ACEP, CRP, CREP, wetland banking, tax credits, etc.	Ongoing
Resource Category: Social Capacity - The collective understanding of water related matters within the community and the ability to respond to and resolve water related issues.								

Resource Category Goal - Broaden the collective understanding of water issues and build a robust and resilient system for maintaining and improving water resources.								
Public Knowledge of and Behavior Relative to Water Issues	B	SC1- Public Education / Outreach	SC-1.1	Provide school presentations and other educational efforts tailored to youth.	Annual field conservation days, annual forestry field days, annual prairie walk days, annual Envirothons, annual Ag in the classroom presentations, annual county fair booth displays, karst exhibit at Eagle Bluff, annual TUNE Camp at Eagle Bluff, annual farm safety days, annual tractor PTO safety days, annual 6th grade days, annual 5th grade tree presentations, we are water traveling exhibit, tours of field offices	Ongoing	Continue current efforts and/or expand to other opportunities	Ongoing
			SC-1.2	Provide and distribute educational materials through various multi-media methods about local water management, the impacts of decisions, and actions the public can take to make a difference.	RR Watershed Facebook page, annual reports, annual newsletters, annual county fair booths, annual 6th grade conservation days	Ongoing	Continue pursuing a shared position dedicated to outreach/communication	Ongoing
			SC-1.3	Host meetings for the public regarding monitoring results and assessments from Root River Watershed 1W1P monitoring activities.	Could talk about involvement with WRAPs Cycle 2 work	2020-2023	Continue supporting and communicating the work done by MPCA on monitoring and assessments	Ongoing
			SC-1.4	Host annual meetings for local government officials about the condition of water resources,	5 Advisory committee meetings	2018-2021	Completion of the mid-point assessment and	Ongoing

				progress made, and results and assessments from Root River Watershed 1W1P monitoring activities.			presentation to Policy Committee	
			SC-1.5	Seek out opportunities and entities to do more cooperative education and outreach activities.	Science Sundays events hosted by Friends of the Root River	Ongoing	Engage with additional stakeholder groups and utilize WBIF funds to support education events	Ongoing
Landowner and Producer Engagement in Water Management	A	SC2- Engaged Landowner and Producers	SC-2.1	Develop a standard methodology for landowner/agricultural producer meetings, including the creation of maps showing existing BMPs that will provide a feedback loop for measuring the strategy.	4 farmer-led council group meetings	2018-2019	Utilize PTMApp outputs along with tracked practices to help inform field walkovers	Ongoing
			SC-2.2	Provide cooperative education efforts and demonstration projects to promote agricultural BMP's including, but not limited to: nutrient management, conservation tillage, buffers, soil testing, pesticide application, etc.	226 field walkovers, 23 field days	2018-2023	Engage with additional stakeholder groups and utilize WBIF funds to support education events	Ongoing
			SC-2.3	Develop new techniques to promote conservation efforts, such as administering a local certification training program or partnering with agribusiness retailers to recommend appropriate BMPs.	Work has been completed by Truterra, fishers and farmers	Ongoing	Pursue future partnership opportunities with local agronomists/co-ops	Ongoing
			SC-2.4	Provide one-on-one consultations with landowners and agricultural producers about agricultural BMPs, field productivity benefits of BMPs, and available financial incentive options for funding them.	365 nutrient management plans and landowner contacts, 226 field walkovers	2018-2023	Continue dedicating WBIF funds to the shared positions and for staff time to complete field walkovers	Ongoing
			SC-2.5	Continue to develop and maintain a database inventory of existing BMPs with associated costs of implementation.	eLINK and local table	2017-2023	Continue efforts to track implementation	Ongoing

			SC-2.6	Support and encourage farmer led initiatives, such as Farmer Led Councils and local advisory committees, that promote conservation through peer based outreach and performance based incentives.	4 farmer-led council group meetings 3 Organic Farmer/Soil Health meetings led by local farmers in Houston County.	2018-2019	Return to convening advisory committee meetings on a regular basis	Ongoing
			SC-2.7	Develop a comprehensive civic engagement plan.	Uof M plan: discussion on shared staff position to help coordinate and implement outreach/communications	2020	Continued discussions on shared staff position	Ongoing (Partially completed)
Water and Business Community	C	SC3- Business Role	SC-3.1	Identify and document types of benefits that businesses derive from the use of water resources.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SC-3.2	Provide and distribute educational materials through various multi-media methods about local water management, the impacts of business decisions, and the economic value of water quality and quantity.	We are Water Exhibit, County Fair booths	Ongoing	Continue to provide and distribute educational materials	Ongoing
			SC-3.3	Convene a conference tailored to the local business community, in partnership with local organizations such as, Chamber of Commerce, Economic Development Authority and business associations, local businesses/employers, to learn about local water issues and network with other businesses that capitalize on water and land resources.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SC-3.4	Solicit participation from local business for volunteer and sponsorship opportunities.	Soil health sponsorships	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

Technology, Tools, and Existing Capabilities	C	SC4- Staff Capacity / Admin	SC-4.1	Encourage local governmental unit staff, local agency staff, and certified crop advisors to attend trainings on newly developed technology and tools relevant to water resource management.	Staff attend trainings which may contain information on new tools for BMP design	Ongoing	Continue to encourage local staff to attend trainings	Ongoing
			SC-4.2	Develop a database for sharing and maintaining water resource management data, including local GIS data layers and local monitoring data.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SC-4.3	Collaborate and coordinate with participating local government units through shared services for plan implementation.	Mower SWCD's most recent GreenCorps member; Fillmore SWCD Nutrient Management Specialist and serves Area 7; Fillmore SWCD is shared through Area 7 for cover crops, grazing specialist, fencing, etc. Dan doing targeted outreach throughout the Root River Watershed.	Ongoing	Continue to look for ways to efficiently use shared services/positions	Ongoing
			SC-4.4	Identify and prioritize opportunities to secure long-term and consistent funds through grants, partnerships, and other sources.	Funding secured through multiple sources so far: WBIF, RCPP, EQIP, CWF Competitive grants	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
		SC5- Emerging Issues	SC-5.1	Identify and address emerging issues during the Plan's annual evaluation and local work plan development.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			SC-5.2	Consider a plan amendment, if necessary, due to an emerging issue.	N/A	N/A	Amendment will be pursued closer to the 10-year point.	Ongoing

Resource Category: Sustainability of Communities - The endurance, resilience and interconnectedness of systems and processes which support a community, including the economy, culture, politics and ecology.								
Resource Category Goal - Improve or maintain communities' cultural, economic, natural, and water resources.								
Livability	A	SUST1- Livability of Community	SUST-1.1	Solicit stakeholder input about plan activities from a diverse, interdisciplinary group that includes local planning and zoning staff in order to integrate the economic, environmental and social policies into water resource management.	5 Advisory Committee meetings	Ongoing	Return to convening advisory committee meetings on a regular basis	Ongoing
			SUST-1.2	Develop public outreach and education initiatives and implementation programs dedicated to preventing urban and rural point and nonpoint water pollution to avoid more costly restoration projects in the future.	District newsletters, district newspaper inserts, articles, Facebook posts, direct mailings, annual reports Dan's outreach work throughout the watershed.	Ongoing	Continue pursuing a shared position dedicated to outreach/communications	Ongoing
			SUST-1.3	Promote initiatives to improve wastewater management practices.	Winona County completed 1 SSTS fix in the RR plan area, using both 1W1P funds and ARPA funding	Ongoing	Continue pursuing a shared position dedicated to outreach/communications	Ongoing
			SUST-1.4	Identify opportunities to fund sustainable forest management, prairie, wetland and other natural area preservation and restoration through grants and partnerships.	5 forestry management projects through Tulibee Lakes HFHW	2016-2018	Promote a new RIM program for SE MN that focuses on protecting bluffland landscape	Ongoing
			SUST-1.5	Coordinate with public and private entities to protect and enhance wildlife habitat, fisheries habitat, riparian corridors, and vegetative habitat, through programs such as easements and acquisition.	Approximately 68,500 acres currently enrolled in easements for all of Fillmore, Houston, Mower, Olmsted, and	Ongoing	Promote a new RIM program for SE MN that focuses on protecting bluffland landscape	Ongoing

					Winona counties as of 8/31/22			
Rural Environmental Health	C	SUST2- Rural Sustainability	SUST-2.1	Tailor recommended BMPs to each field based on the economic and environmental capacity of each area of a field, such as precision agriculture.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Continue to support landowners and tailor recommend BMPs for their operation	Ongoing
			SUST-2.2	Encourage rental agreements that allow long-term practices to build soil health or that include conservation language.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Continue to encourage rental agreements that allow long-term practices to build soil health/include conservation language.	Ongoing
			SUST-2.3	Develop nutrient and manure management plans for agricultural producers which follow BMP recommendations to build soil health and maximize efficiency.	See Field Practices Table	Ongoing	Continue funding the shared Nutrient Management Specialist position	Ongoing
			SUST-2.4	Encourage BMPs, such as conservation tillage, cover crops, crop rotation, managed pasture and grazing and animal waste management within priority locations that promote soil health and improve organic content of soils.	See Field Practices Table	Ongoing	Utilize upcoming State and Federal funding opportunities to expand soil health programming	Ongoing
			SUST-2.5	Promote education and financial incentives for solid and hazardous waste disposal to reduce chemical and nutrient contamination of water.	County Household Hazardous Waste Days	Ongoing	Continue to promote and volunteer to assist with household hazardous waste collection days	Ongoing
			SUST-2.6	Create awareness of existing regulations, rules, and ordinances pertaining to proper waste disposal.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

			SUST-2.7	Provide educational materials, consultations, and workshops to landowners and agricultural producers about BMPs, including compensation and incentive programs for marginal and sensitive lands.	Ongoing through existing programs and events. In Rural communities this is being increased with the MDH or MDA LATs	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			SUST-2.8	Promote programs that recognize and/or provide incentives to landowners for the multiple benefits resulting from implementation of BMPs, including improved water quality, resilience against flood damage, and protected/enhanced wildlife habitat and biodiversity.	Ongoing through existing programs and events. In Rural communities this is being increased with the MDH or MDA LATs	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			SUST-2.9	Promote the natural meandering of streams to decrease stream velocity for reducing flood impacts and enhance recreational and fish and wildlife habitat value.	Houston County streambank project in 2022. Winona County Rush Creek, Ahrendals Creek, Trout Run	Ongoing	Continue to promote the natural meandering of streams to reduce flooding impacts and enhance recreational, fish and wildlife habitat value.	Ongoing
Urban Environmental Health	C	SUST3- Urban Sustainability	SUST-3.1	Inspect, maintain and improve the integrity of existing urban structures that route and treat stormwater runoff to prevent downstream stream erosion and flooding and improve water quality.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SUST-3.2	Inventory and assess need for additional urban infrastructure to prevent downstream flooding and water quality degradation from storm events.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SUST-3.3	Promote the natural meandering of streams to decrease stream velocity for reducing flood impacts and enhance recreational and fish and wildlife habitat value.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided

			SUST-3.4	Promote increased public access to natural features such as streams, wetlands and rivers.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SUST-3.5	Promote urban BMPs for lawn and managed green spaces (parks, golf courses) that include soil testing and proper use, amount, method and timing of fertilizer/pesticide application.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SUST-3.6	Implement urban BMPs that reduce the delivery of sediment, nutrients, and pesticide loads to surface water by treating runoff through infiltration, filtration, and uptake.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SUST-3.7	Provide technical and financial assistance to bring Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) into compliance to reduce improper waste disposal from small, unsewered communities and homes with inadequate wastewater treatment.	3 Septic system improvements	2016, 2020, 2022	Continue providing financial assistance using existing funding.	Ongoing
			SUST-3.8	Promote education and financial incentives for solid and hazardous waste disposal to reduce chemical and nutrient contamination of water.	County Household Hazardous Waste Days	Ongoing	Continue to promote proper hazardous waste disposal	Ongoing
			SUST-3.9	Assess capacity to productively reuse stormwater runoff.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
Land Use	C	SUST4- Managed Land Use	SUST-4.1	Meet all statutory requirements of the State of Minnesota (MN Rules 6120.250- 3900) which regulate the subdivision, use, and development of shorelands of public waters, in addition to the Buffer and Soil Erosion Legislation.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing

			SUST-4.2	Administer zoning regulations that encourage growth near urban areas to preserve natural areas and large habitat blocks.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SUST-4.3	Promote programs and BMPs that restrict activities on or near karst features to protect water quality and promote safety.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No information provided
			SUST-4.4	Administer Minnesota Rules Chapter 7080 through 7083 to manage Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) and protect surface and ground water quality.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			SUST-4.5	Comply with all applicable rules and regulations to promote the protection of cultural and historic resources reflective of Native American heritage and early pioneer settlements.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			SUST-4.6	Administer applicable bluffland protection zoning ordinances to control certain land uses and restrict vegetative alterations within bluff areas.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			SUST-4.7	Administer Minnesota Statutes Chapter 103F Soil Erosion Law to minimize loss of soil and productivity.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
			SUST-4.8	Administer the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) to retain wetland quantity, function, and value.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing
Resource Category: Water Resources Infrastructure - The natural and man-made systems important for managing the rate, volume and quality of water.								
Resource Category Goal - Maintain or improve the natural and man-made systems used for managing the rate, volume and quality of water in the Root River 1W1P Area.								
Drainage Systems	B	WI1- Drainage Design	WI-1.1	Develop and maintain an inventory and map of known field tile drainage locations in the plan area.	Dodge County has tile drainage maps	Ongoing	Local staff should consider whether this action item is feasible or should be	Ongoing

							removed in an amendment	
			WI-1.2	Implement drainage management BMPs to control ground water elevation, reduce water volume yield, and remove pollutants from tile discharge prior to entering surface waters.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Consider utilizing WBIF funds or pursuing MDM funds for any potential projects	Ongoing
			WI-1.3	Support research that characterizes the quantity and quality of tile drainage and its impacts on recharge to local groundwater aquifers. Encourage projects that monitor the outfalls of select agricultural tile lines to better understand effects to ecosystem functions.	Likely addressed through the DNR's Evaluation of Hydrologic Change Tech Summary and recent studies completed by Patrick Belmont (including the Sediment Budget for the Root River)	Ongoing	Consider information from these reports in future plan amendments	Ongoing
		WI2- Drainage BMPs	WI-2.1	Implement BMPs that provide perennial vegetative cover within the riparian corridor to increase stream roughness, decrease bank erosion.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue implementation efforts to install these projects	Ongoing
			WI-2.2	Implement BMPs that provide volume reduction and/or storage within priority locations.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			WI-2.3	Develop a comprehensive hydrologic and hydraulic model for culvert and bridge design to determine timing and magnitude of peak discharge of existing conditions, the duration of discharge, and base flow conditions.	See SW-1.1	See SW-1.1	See SW-1.1	Not started
			WI-2.4	Set peak discharge, volume reduction goals and sediment load goals to achieve stable geomorphologic conditions.	See SW-1.2	See SW-1.2	See SW-1.2	Ongoing

		WI3- Infrastructure Development	WI-3.1	Plan for and implement updates for existing public infrastructure based on anticipated changes in weather patterns and rainfall intensity due to global climate change.	Crooked Creek flood control structure	Ongoing	Encourage the use of NOAA Atlas 14 in public infrastructure design	Ongoing
			WI-3.2	Pursue funding to support construction of new BMPs and enhancement of existing BMPs to expand storm water management capacity.	City of Harmony - 1 rain garden	2016	Consider using future WBIF funding to provide financial assistance for urban stormwater BMPs	Ongoing
			WI-3.3	Work with landowners and drainage authorities to install two-stage ditch systems for multiple benefits including improved drainage and ditch bank stability and sediment transport, increased habitat (e.g., riffle and pool habitat in low flows) and pollutant removal of nitrogen.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Ongoing	Ongoing
Point Sources	C	WI4- SSTS Adequacy	WI-4.1	Provide technical and financial assistance to bring SSTSs into compliance to reduce improper waste disposal from small, unsewered communities and homes with inadequate wastewater treatment.	3 Septic system improvements	2016, 2020, 2022	Continue providing financial assistance using existing funding.	Ongoing
		WI5- Wastewater Discharge	WI-5.1	Maintain compliance with National Point Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits for point sources.	This work continues to be handled by MPCA	N/A	Support the work done by MPCA to maintain compliance	No information provided
Water Retention Systems	B	WI6- Water Retention	WI-6.1	Identify and field-verify areas where GIS land cover information indicates the need for temporary flood storage, including the potential temporary storage of floodwaters using the transportation system and using best available hydrology data.	Hydro conditioning has been completed and a re-run of PTMApp will be completed soon	Ongoing	Utilize storage practice locations from PTMApp to help identify potential projects	Ongoing
			WI-6.2	Inventory and assess existing flood storage practices on landscape.	See WI-6.1 I believe some of this work was completed for	See WI-6.1	See WI-6.1 Consider whether this inventory work should be	Ongoing

					portions of Fillmore County to identify potential cleanouts during the SWCD's CWF grant for the Field To Stream Project. DNR checks on large PL566 structures on a regular basis for maintenance.		expanded throughout the watershed	
			WI-6.3	Repair and maintain storage capacity of existing landscape flood storage practices.	See Field Practices Table East Willow Creek Flood Control Structure (E-3) was restored using Targeted Watershed grant in 2017-2019	See Field Practices Table	Consider utilizing future WBIF or other funds for repair of larger structures	Ongoing
			WI-6.4	Implement additional flood storage practice BMPs within prioritized areas.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue focus on storage practices in priority areas	Ongoing
			WI-6.5	Implement permanent plantings, preferably natives, to increase infiltration.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Continue targeting practices in priority locations	Ongoing
			WI-6.6	Implement BMPs such as wetland restorations and/or step pools.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Consider directing staff time to identify potential wetland restorations	Ongoing
		WI7- Stormwater / Construction Erosion	WI-7.1	Encourage the use of BMPs on active construction sites to reduce amount of erosion. Refer to MN Rule Chapter 7090 Storm water regulatory program for guidance for activities	Currently handled by County/City staff	Ongoing	Support the work done by local staff to implement this action	Ongoing

				that do not fall under permitting requirements or are in non-MS4 communities.				
			WI-7.2	Encourage the use of post construction BMPs that decrease compaction of soil in active construction sites.	See Field Practices Table Currently handled by County/City staff	See Field Practices Table	Support the work done by local staff to implement this action	Ongoing
			WI-7.3	Encourage and implement BMPs that treat urban stormwater discharge.	See Field Practices Table	See Field Practices Table	Consider using future WBIF funding to provide financial assistance for stormwater BMPs	Ongoing
		WI8- Low Impact Development	WI-8.1	Promote local, county and development proposals that incorporate Low Impact Design or Minimum Impact Design technologies.	Not started	N/A	MPCA / DNR led- may provide materials	Not started
			WI-8.2	Promote incorporation of Low Impact Design strategies into local zoning ordinances.	Not started	N/A	MPCA / DNR led- may provide materials; P&Z Departments- annual invitation to discuss; MS4 focus	Not started
			WI-8.3	Review and update local regulations that address storm water erosion and runoff control, grading plan approval, and grading drainage standards.	Existing ordinances/regulations are in place and continue to be enforced	Ongoing	Continue enforcing these ordinances/regulations	Ongoing

BWSR = Board of Water and Soil Resources; DNR = Department of Natural Resources; MDA = Minnesota Department of Agriculture; MPCA = Minnesota Pollution Control Agency; NRCS = Natural Resources Conservation Service; USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; TU = Trout Unlimited; Extension = University of Minnesota Extension Services; MGS = Minnesota Geological Survey; MnDOT = Minnesota Department of Transportation; 1W1P PWG = One Watershed, One Plan Planning Work Group; USGS = U.S. Geological Survey; TNC = The Nature Conservancy; FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency; SEMN WRB = Southeast Minnesota Water Resources Board, TWPS = Townships; FSA = Farm Service Agency, NOAA = National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; DEED = Department of Employment and Economic Development

Root River Watershed - One Watershed One Plan: PRAP Watershed Assessment Table
Field Practices Table*

		Assessment / Evaluation					
		Reporting Measurable Goal					
HUC 10 Name	**Treatment Group Type & Number of BMPs**	**Metric**	**Amount (Number of BMPs / yr.)**	**5-Year Reporting Goal (Number of BMPs)**	**Actual Number of BMPs Implemented**	**% Progress toward 5-Year Reporting Goal**	**Type of BMPs Implemented**
Bear Creek	Storage (23) Source Reduction (77)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10 / yr	50	19	38%	Pond Push-up, Brush Management, Cover Crop, Critical Area Planting, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales, Terrace
Canoe Creek	Storage (1) Filtration (2) Source Reduction (4)	Number of BMPs / yr.	3.5 / yr	18	0	0%	
City of Rushford - Root River	Storage (20) Filtration (21) Infiltration (2) Source Reduction (47)	Number of BMPs / yr.	9 / yr	45	29	64%	Forestry Management, Brush Management, Critical Area Planting, Well Decommissioning, Diversion, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales, Tree-Shrub Establishment

Cold Water Creek-Upper Iowa River	Storage (12) Source Reduction (88)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10 / yr	50	6	12%	Cover Crop, Well Decommissioning, Grassed Waterway and Swales
Crooked Creek^	Storage (23) Source Reduction (81)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.4 / yr	52	47	90%	Pond Push-up, Pond Maintenance, Waste Management System, Waste Storage Facility, Brush Management, Cover Crop, Critical Area Planting, Waste Facility Cover, Pond for Water Use, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales
Headwaters Upper Iowa River^	Storage (9) Filtration (5) Source Reduction (86)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10 / yr	50	9	18%	Conservation Cover, Well Decommissioning, Grassed Waterway and Swales
Middle Branch Root River^	Storage (15) Filtration (2) Source Reduction (85)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.2 / yr	51	36	71%	Cover Crop, Well Decommissioning, Filter Strip, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales
Money Creek^	Storage (28) Filtration (6) Source Reduction (68)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.2 / yr	51	19	37%	Septic System Improvement, Brush Management, Cover Crop, Grade Stabilization, Streambank and Shoreline Protection
Mormon Creek-Mississippi River	Storage (17) Filtration (2) Source Reduction (68)	Number of BMPs / yr.	8.7 / yr	44	10	23%	Pond Push-up, Waste Management System, Brush Management, cover Crop, Grade Stabilization
North Branch Root River	Storage (16) Filtration (6) Source Reduction (79)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.1 / yr	51	34	67%	Alternative Tile Intake- Gravel Inlet, Cover Crop, Well Decommissioning, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales, Terrace, Water and Sediment Control Basin
Root River	Storage (19) Filtration (14) Source Reduction (70)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.3 / yr	52	44	85%	Pond Push-up, Pond Maintenance, Waste Management System, Brush Management, Cover Crop, Diversion, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales, Forage and Biomass Planting, Terrace
Rush Creek^	Storage (29) Filtration (20) Source Reduction (56)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.5 / yr	53	34	65%	Forestry Management, Pond Maintenance, Brush Management, Cover Crop, Critical Area Planting, Closure of Waste Impoundments, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales
South Branch Root River^	Storage (20) Filtration (4) Infiltration (1)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.1 / yr	51	48	95%	Pond Maintenance, Waste Management System, Conservation Cover, Cover Crop, Well Decommissioning, Filter Strip, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales, Lined Waterway or Outlet, Forage and Biomass Planting, Terrace, Waste Treatment

	Source Reduction (76)						
South Fork Root River^	Storage (23) Filtration (1) Source Reduction (79)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.3 / yr	52	112	217%	Forestry Management, Pond Push-up, Pond Maintenance, Waste Storage Facility, Brush Management, Conservation Cover, Contour Buffer Strips, Cover Crop, Critical Area Planting, Well Decommissioning, Waste Facility Cover, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales, Forage and Biomass Planting, Sinkhole Treatment, Access Road, Terrace, Waste Treatment
Trout Run-Root River	Storage (19) Source Reduction (80)	Number of BMPs / yr.	9.9 / yr	50	20	40%	Cover Crop, Well Decommissioning, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales
Upper Iowa River	Filtration (10) Source Reduction (17)	Number of BMPs / yr.	2.7 / yr	14	0	0%	
Winnebago Creek	Storage (14) Source Reduction (89)	Number of BMPs / yr.	10.3 / yr	52	21	41%	Pond Push-up, Brush Management, Cover Crop, Critical Area Planting, Grade Stabilization, Grassed Waterway and Swales, Streambank and Shoreline Protection
			Total	**781**	**488**		

Key

^Indicates WBIF priority HUC-10 subwatershed (HUC 12 priority subwatersheds not shown on Field Practices Table)

***Content of table submitted by Root River Partnership**

Appendix B. Performance Standards

PRAP Watershed-Based Assessment Part 2-Performance Standards 2022

Watershed-Based Performance Standards

Watershed Partnership Name: Root River One Watershed One Plan

Performance Area		Performance Standard	Level of Review	Rating		
	★ High Performance standard ■ Best Standard/practice ● Basic Requirement		I Annual Compliance II BWSR Staff Review & Assessment	Yes, No, Unsure or N/A		
				YES	NO	Unsure or N/A
General Administration	■	Financial Reports provided to Elected Official Committee/Board on an annual basis.	II	X		
	●	eLINK Grant Report(s): submitted on time (annual or biannual if funds exceed $500,000)	I	X		
	●	Conflict of Interest Policy exists and is reviewed/signed by the JPE or fiscal agent	I		X	
	●	Annual financial audits are completed on time (if applicable)	I	X		
	■	Develop and implement an annual work plan (outside of WBIF grant)	II		X	
	■	Individual partner governing boards/councils are updated on annual proposed workplan activities	II	X		
	●	Assurance measures completed for WBIF	I	X		
	■	Obtain stakeholder input within the last year	II		X	
	●	Coordinator or lead staff person identified for the partnership	I	X		
	■	Operational guidelines for fiscal procedures exist and are current	II	X		
	■	Partnership annually evaluates progress towards water quality goals identified in the CWMP	II		X	
	★	Shared services opportunities are leveraged between partners	II	X		
	■	Financial tracking system outside of eLINK used at minimum annually by the watershed partnership	II	X		
	■	Project accomplishments tracking system outside of eLINK used annually by the watershed partnership	II		X	
Elected Official Committee/Board	■	Elected Official Committee/Board updated at least annually on accomplishments and progress towards plan goals	II		X	
	★	Training: efforts are made to inform on watershed related topics	II	X		
	■	Training: basic orientation is provided to new members and new member representatives	II	X		
	●	Each participating member has adopted the comprehensive watershed management plan	I	X		
	■	All participating partners are implementing the comprehensive watershed management plan	II	X		
	■	Reviewed governing documents (bylaws, formal agreements) within the last 5 years (if applicable)	II	X		
	★	As defined by the implementation agreement, the policy committee or board is involved in project funding discussions or decision making	II	X		
	★	Staff has open (2-way) communication with members	II	X		
	■	Committee membership reviewed/updated annually	II	X		
	★	Self-assessment completed in last 5 years or more if identified in your CWMP	II		X	
	★	Short-term and long-term plan priorities evaluated on an annual basis	II		X	
Staff, Agency, Other Advisors	●	Staff and Agency partners participate in plan updates/revisions/amendments	I			N/A
	■	As described in the CWMP, are data collection/monitoring activities being used to evaluate progress	II	X		
	■	As noted in the CWMP, are watershed water quality/hydrologic trends monitored/reported	II	X		
	■	Members meet at least once annually	II	X		
	★	Committee membership list reviewed/updated regularly	II	X		
	■	Agency members provide updates on accomplishments regularly	II	X		

PRAP Watershed-Based Assessment Part 2-Performance Standards 2022

	★	Water quality trends tracked for priority water bodies	II	X		
Staff Committee	★	Members meet at least three times a year and reviews plan goals and actions	II		X	
	■	Members participate in annual work planning related to their CWMP	II		X	
	●	Members completed the five-year evaluation as defined within their CWMP	I			IN PROGRESS
	■	Members each provide the partnership coordinator their individual accomplishments for annual reporting	II	X		
Communication & Coordination	■	Partnership Website(s): Specific to comprehensive planning effort/plan is maintained & accomplishments are regularly updated.	II	X		
	●	Partnership Website(s): Contains accomplishments, progress towards plan goal, board meeting, contact information, etc.	I		X	
	■	Communication piece: sent within last 12 months (newsletter, press release, newspaper, social media) that highlight work and program opportunities	II	X		
	■	Public education materials contain a watershed focus	II	X		
	Communication Target Audience:					
	★	Coordination with County Board, SWCD Board, WD/WMO Board, City/Township officials	II	X		
	★	Partnerships: cooperative projects/tasks with neighboring organizations, such as municipalities, counties, SWCDs, WDs/WMOs, tribal governments, non-government organizations	II	X		

Appendix C. Summary of Survey Results

Internal Survey: Root River Policy Committee Questions and Responses

The Policy Committee meets every (N=12):	
Month	9.1%
Two Months	0.0%
Three Months	72.7%
Four Months	18.2%
Six Months	0.0%
Other	0.0%

The amount of meetings we hold is (N=12):	
Not enough, we could meet more often	0.0%
About right	100.0%
Too much, we meet more than necessary	0.0%
Other (please specify)	0.0%

Based on your experience, indicate your level of agreement about the partnership in the following areas (N=12):

Performance Characteristic	Rating (percent of responses)					
	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree Not Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**	**Don't Know**
Communication *(they keep us informed and seek our input)*	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	8.3%
Completing Plan Priorities (their projects are consistent with plan goals and objectives)	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	50.0%	33.3%	8.3%
Initiative (they are willing to do what is necessary to get work done, including initiating change)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	41.7%	8.3%
Timelines and Follow-through (they are reliable and meet deadlines)	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	66.7%	16.7%	8.3%
Cooperation (they are easy to work with and seek opportunities to address priorities)	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	41.7%	33.3%	8.3%

When selecting projects, which statement best describes the partnership's attempt to select projects in priority areas (N=11):	
All the time- the partners focus on priority areas for implementation	45.5%
Some of the time- the partners try to get projects in the priority area	36.4%
Not actively- the partners fund based off landowner interest with location as secondary	0.0%
Unsure- we are not involved	18.0%

Overall, which best describes how well informed you are on partnership efforts (N=12):	
Great, we are kept well informed and know what's happening	50.0%
Good, we receive communication, but we could receive more	41.7%
Poor, we have no idea what's happening	0.0%
Unsure	8.3%

How often do you report back to your board on the partnership's efforts (N=11):	
Monthly	27.3%
Twice Annually	0.0%
Quarterly	63.6%
Annually	9.1%

Overall, how would you rate the working relationship of the LGU partners (N=11):	
Strong, they work well together most of the time	45.5%
Good, there are clearly some minor issues they occasionally work through that may cause issues	54.5%
Poor, they have some clear issues that impact their ability to function as a unit	0.0%
Non-existent, there are major breakdowns that need to be addressed	0.0%

At this stage of plan implementation, do you have any additional thoughts on how the partnership could improve
SWCD supervisors are provided information ahead of time because they make motions on projects and accept dollars at their respective board meetings. County Commissioners are not provided communication and feel a bit in the dark.

Internal Survey: Root River Planning Work Group (Local Government Staff) Questions and Responses

Question: Does the Partnership have a formal working agreement for implementation (N=9):	
Yes	100.0%
No	0.0%

Day to Day Work in Implementing Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan (N=9):	Planning Work Group Ratings (percent)				
	Weekly	Monthly	Biannually	Annually	As Needed
How often you consult the CWMP	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	11.1%	44.4%
How often are priority projects discussed	0.0%	33.3%	22.2%	11.1%	33.3%
How often do non-priority projects get implemented	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	77.8%
How often is the policy committee consulted on project funding decisions	0.0%	0.0%	44.4%	0.0%	55.6%
How often are policy documents and bylaws reviewed and updated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%
How often are plan goals or outcomes reviewed	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%
How often are new data and trends discussed	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%

Projects Funding by WBIF Only (N=9):	Planning Work Group Ratings (percent)				
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Are projects located within the highest priority areas	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%
Is cost-effectiveness considered before implementing a specific project	0.0%	22.2%	33.3%	33.3%	11.1%
Do you provide outreach to specific landowners	0.0%	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%	0.0%
Do you adjust cost-share rates based on priority levels	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	11.1%
Do you have any shared services with other partnerships	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%

Question: What are the most successful aspects of the current structure?
Additional funding for SWCDs
The joint powers agreement is informal enough that the policy committee is supportive of the partnership, while giving staff flexibility and leveraging to work together to spend money and put projects on the ground.
The collaboration makes implementation more flexible
We all share the common goal of promoting conservation and working hard to get effective practices and projects on the ground. The SWCD staff work together very well and if more funding is needed those have not used their funds will provide it to whomever needs it.
Everyone is very comfortable to speak and bring up concerns and everyone is engaged
Funds are leveraged (ex $ + EQIP$= 90% cost share)
Receiving funds allows staff to get work done
Funding is well distributed among the SWCDs. Only one level of cost-share (90%) rather than different rates for different practices

Question: What are the biggest challenges or limitations of the current structure
One Watershed One Plan is time consuming with meetings for SWCD staff. Too much coordination for the fiscal agent and day to day contact.
A lot has been learned since the Root went through the pilot program. There are tools used in other watershed areas that could aid the Root in implementation, prioritizing projects, and sharing data between LGUs for reporting. It can be difficult working with advisory committees instead of joint powers board because they are limited on authority or may not understand their authority. It is also difficult to have a rotating committee and new membership.
Change-over in staff and not all partners track progress the same way
Not having a tracking spreadsheet has been difficult. The Root River Partnership is starting to work with Houston Engineering on the 5-year Assessment and a form of project tracking has been put together which will continue to be built upon. It can also be difficult to conduct a meaningful policy committee meeting.
Very few of the people that started this endeavor in 2014 are still around (staff turnover). Also, there appears to be confusion over the function of the policy committee. While members do not want to be a joint powers board, actions appear to contradict that.
The plan has lots of objectives, and the document is not user friendly.
Tracking was not set up from the beginning making it difficult now (x2)
More communication needed with policy committee members that do not know the work of the partners.

Question: What kind of changes would you like to see made to make things work more smoothly or easily
More consistence between plans with one tracking tool for practices supported by BWSR and compatible with eLINK
More streamlined approach to ranking projects, sharing data with partners, invoicing, etc.
Consistent tracking of progress (x2)
It would be nice if the Policy Committee were a Joint Powers Board entity so the partners would not have to take the risk of holding a large WBIF grant.
Less reporting, or just report on what the SWCDs do

Comments regarding Partnership Working Relationship:

- One Watershed One Plan added additional meetings for SWCDs that are not always cost effective if you don't have strong support from the County or other flexible funds.
- Equal efforts may not make sense depending on the percentage of the watershed in the County.

Question: Do you have any additional thoughts on how the planning and implementation partnership could be more effective
Fiscal Agent training and consistency across watershed for handling of funds and tracking needed
The Root Partnership and SE Minnesota could benefit from shared services, shared contracting and shared positions to help move the dial towards meeting plan goals.
We are not actively involved with the partnership
More guidance from BWSR on 5-year assessment
Do not know what to do with staff turnover- it is difficult to get someone to take the lead when they haven't been around for very long.
Funding is directed to SWCDs, with work being carried out within the County boundaries/jurisdictions.

External Survey: Root River Advisory Committee (Agency Partner and Local Stakeholders) Questions and Responses

Question: How often have you interacted with the planning partnership (N=12):	
Not at all	33.3%
A few times	0.0%
Several times a year	50.0%
Monthly	8.3%
Weekly	8.3%
Daily	0.0%

Question: The amount of advisory committee meetings held is (N=11):	
Not enough, we could meet more often	18.2%
About right	63.6%
Too much, we meet more than necessary	0.0%
Other (please specify)	18.2%

Based on your experience working with the partnership, please indicate your level of agreement with the statements (N=12):

Performance Characteristic	Rating (percent of responses)					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree not Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Communication *(they keep us informed and seek our input)*	0.0%	16.7%	8.3%	41.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Completing Plan Priorities (their projects are consistent with plan goals and objectives)	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%
Equal efforts made by partners (everyone's pulling their weight)	0.0%	8.3%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	25.0%
Initiative (they are willing to lead the charge)	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	41.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Timelines and Follow-through (they are reliable and meet deadlines)	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	58.3%	8.3%	16.7%
Cooperation (they are easy to work with and seek opportunities to address agency priorities)	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%	41.7%	16.7%

Is the Advisory Committee consulted (N=9):	
Too much, they rely too heavily on the committee to make local decisions	0.0%
About right, they keep us informed and request assistance when needed	66.7%
Not enough, we could provide more expertise on certain issues	33.3%
Never, they do not ask for outside assistance	0.0%

How would you rate the working relationship of the LGU partners from an outside perspective (N=8):	
Strong, they work well together most of the time	87.5%
Good, there are clearly some minor issues they occasionally work through that may cause issues	12.5%
Poor, they have some clear issues that impact their ability to function as a unit	0.0%
Non-existent, there are major breakdowns that need to be addressed	0.0%

Comments regarding Partnership Working Relationship:

- The Root River Partnership reflects an excellent example of local partnership. Excellent collaboration and it's apparent all involved care for watershed resources
- There could be easier access to information about project accomplishments.
- Despite staff turnover, there is a strong partnership in place.

Do you have additional thoughts on how well the CWMP process has worked for this watershed at this stage in plan implementation?
The partnership is doing an effective job in implementing projects on the ground to meet plan priorities. There is little effort given to finding ways to leverage funding and engage partners to accomplish more.
Given this was the original pilot, the process has worked well, primarily due to the strong partnership.
Being a pilot, they have navigated the Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan process very well. They do a great job changing course when needed and sharing what they've learned to others.
There have been gaps due to staff transition, COVID, and lack of meetings. The partnership can do better.
Future plan amendments could benefit the partners to establish clear priority areas in the watershed to focus on. Getting the Advisory Committee back to meeting on a regular basis would help with communication and provide opportunity for partnership.

Appendix D. Assurance Measures Documentation

Watershed Based Implementation Funding Update

Optional form used to gather information on watershed based implementation funding assurances

Name

First | Last

Organization

Email

Watershed Planning Area Name

Root River

Assurance Measure 1: Understand contributions of prioritized and targeted work to achieve measurable clean water goals

This measure is meant to assess the progress a partnership is making toward the watershed plan's goals and the estimated impact on priority water resources for this grant period..

	Never	Rarely	Occasionlly	Often	Always	N/A
To what extent did practices, projects and programs address an identified measurable goal from the watershed plan	○	○	○	◉	○	○

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Always	N/A
To what extent were identified practices, projects and programs in the watershed plan accelerated by WBIF to help achieve the intended outcomes from the grant work plan?	○	○	○	◉	○	○

What is helping the partnership achieve the goals of the grant work plan?

Teamwork among the local partners. Outreach and planning from the WCPI planners. Leveraged funding from RCPP and other sources.

What is hindering the partnership in achieving the goals of the grant work plan?

Willingness of policy committee/individual boards to dedicate funding to needed staff time. Plan content/available tools to target. Contractor availability. Delays with federal funding.

Assurance Measure 2: Review progress of implementing programs, projects and practices in identified priority areas.

Scale of effort

	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good	N/A
What was the level of effort placed in high priority areas of the watershed?	○	○	○	◉	○	○

If applicable, what type of landowners were the subject of landowner contact efforts?

Private landowners/operators in priority subwatersheds.

What percentage of the landowners in the High priority area(s) were contacted?

100% in WCPI subwatersheds; unknown in others

What kinds of landowner contact methods were used?

Mailings/letters with follow-up phone calls to set up site/field visits. Website/social media, radio spots, and news releases were also used.

Which methods of landowner contact were the most successful?

Letters/phone calls that led to site visits were most successful. The outreach strategy works as a communication system with direct and indirect methods.

What was the rationale for implementing actions using WBIF in areas not designated as high priority?

Lack of landowner interest/readiness to implement in priority areas. RCPP piggybacked projects did not always align with priority areas.

Are there other practices, projects and programs that the partnership would like to highlight that were not directly funded by WBIF?

2 DNR streambank restoration projects and a stormwater erosion control project for the North Branch of the Root River. The CWF Drinking Water Protection helped fund projects in our watershed that address our groundwater priority issues.

Scale of effort

	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good	N/A
Overall how would you rate the partnership's effort to address issues in identified high priority areas?	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Assurance Measure 3: Completion of Watershed Based Implementation Fund grant work on schedule and within the budget

What did the partnership do to set itself up for success? (staffing plans, project waiting list, communication plans, etc)

The planning work group met often as a team which allowed for continued communication and collaboration. Flexibility was given with the funding of individual projects based on local policy and time constraints. Shared staffing to help identify projects and provide technical support for soil health and nutrient management was critical.

Workplan schedule and milestones

	All milestones were met	The majority of milestones were met	Most milestones were met	Some milestones were not met	No milestones were met
To what extent did the partnership meet the grant workplan schedule and milestones?	○	◉	○	○	○

Workplan budget

	Not at all	Minor adjustments needed	Workplan adjustments within grantee discretion	Workplan adjustments approvals needed	Grant amendment needed
To what extent did the grant work plan get implemented within budget?	○	○	◉	○	○

If applicable, what was the primary reason that milestone schedule adjustments were needed?

N/A, milestones were not adjusted.

What were the reasons that budget adjustments (regardless of scope) were needed?

Delays in construction of the Crooked Creek project, staff turnover, new program initiatives such as the prairie strip program, and additional grants/funding sources all contributed to work plan revisions.

What lessons were learned that will influence subsequent grant work plans?

Flexibility needs to be provided to take advantage of new opportunities along the way but with enough detail to focus efforts where projects are ready to go to meet grant timelines.

Assurance Measure 4: Leverage of funds beyond the state grant

What supplemental and/or outside funding sources were available to the partnership to implement the watershed plan within the grant time frame?

RCPP-1W1P, Federal EQIP, WCPI, 319 Feedlot Grant, CWF Drinking Water Protection, NFWF funding

To what extent did the partnership obtain outside or supplemental funding sources?

$500,000 in federal funds were leveraged through the RCPP-1W1P. Additional funding was secured from Fishers and Farmers as well as the Nature Conservancy. About 47% of cost-share assistance provided came from Federal match.

Did the state's WBIF investment contribute to success in securing supplemental and/or outside funds?

(●) Yes ( ) No

In what way did WBIF contribute to successfully obtaining supplemental or outside funding?

By providing a source of match to leverage these additional funds. By having a completed 1W1P, funding was obtained from the Regional Sustainable Development Partnership for civic engagement planning.

Were local base funding expenditures consistent with plan expectations during the grant period?

(●) Yes ( ) No

Are there other monetary or non-monetary types of leverage (new partnerships, expertise, etc.) that the partnership would like to highlight?

One new partnership would be with the Minnesota Well Owners Organization (MNWOO) to promote drinking water education, testing and treatment. The WCPI has involved NRCS in watershed efforts and provided funding for conservation planning and engineering assistance.

Appendix E. Comment Letter

Root River Partnership
900 Washington St. NW, Preston, Minnesota 55965
Phone: 507-765-3878, Ext. 3
www.fillmoreswcd.org

August 28th, 2023

BWSR PRAP Staff
Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources
520 Lafayette Road North
St Paul, MN. 55155

Dear BWSR PRAP Staff,

Thank you for preparing the Root River Partnership PRAP and presenting it to the Partnership on May 22nd, 2023.

The Partnership achieved 6 of 7 basic requirements. The 7th basic requirement involves website reporting requirements. The action item needs to be addressed within 18 months. The Partnership expects to have website reporting requirements met by August 28th, 2023.

The Partnership achieved 16 of 22 best performance standards/practices. The Partnership received 6 recommendations, based on the unachieved best performance standards/practices.

1. **Improve Plan Progress Tracking**
    a. This need is currently being worked on through the Partnership's 5-Year Assessment by Houston Engineering, and will be continued by the Root River Partnership Day-to-Day Contact. Houston Engineering plans to be complete with the 5-Year Assessment by December 31st, 2023.
2. **Increase Communication Between Staff and Policy Committee Members**
    a. Within the Partnership, SWCD staff will work to keep their respective County Representatives updated on a monthly basis, starting as early as July, 2023.
3. **Public Education with Watershed Focus**
    a. A shift in focus of use of Civic Engagement funds for more Watershed-Focused learning opportunities for the public will take place, starting as early as July, 2023.
4. **Increase Engagement with Advisory Committee (Including Stakeholders)**
    a. More frequent communication and meetings with the Advisory Committee will occur; meetings are currently being planned for early August, September, and potentially November in order to gain input for the next round of WBIF funding.

The mission of the Fillmore Soil and Water Conservation District is to promote natural resource stewardship by providing educational, technical and financial assistance.

Root River Partnership
900 Washington St. NW, Preston, Minnesota 55965
Phone: 507-765-3878, Ext. 3
www.fillmoreswcd.org

5. **Develop Formal Process to Rank Projects**
    a. The Planning Workgroup and Advisory Committee will work together to develop a formal ranking process for projects funded using Root River 1W1P funds; this joint effort among the Partnership will begin as early as August, 2023.
6. **Annually Conduct Work Planning Exercise**
    a. The Planning Workgroup and Advisory Committee will meet to discuss the Workplan of the next round of WBIF funding, as well as lay the groundwork for what the Partnership's yearly Work Planning Exercise will look like. This joint effort among the Partnership will begin as early as August, 2023.

The Partnership also received commendations for meeting 8 of the 11 high-performance standards:

1. Involving the Policy Committee in project funding discussions and decision making
2. Shared service opportunities leveraged between partners
3. Updating and reviewing committee membership lists regularly
4. Water quality trends are tracked for priority water bodies
5. Training efforts are provided to Policy Committee on watershed related topics
6. Coordinating with County Board, SWCD Board, WD Board, City/Township officials
7. Cooperative projects/tasks with neighboring organizations, such as counties, SWCDs, WDs, and Non-Government Organizations.
8. Staff have open (2-way) communication with Policy Committee members

The Partnership would like to thank BWSR staff for their time and effort into a thorough PRAP process for the group and for assisting us in finding ways to improve the Partnership.

Sincerely,

Duane Bakke

Duane Bakke
Root River Policy Committee – Chair
Fillmore County Commissioner

Hours spent on the PRAP process by the Partnership: 97 hours

The mission of the Fillmore Soil and Water Conservation District is to promote natural resource stewardship by providing educational, technical and financial assistance.

Appendix F. Program Data

Time required to complete this review

Root River Partnership: 96 Hours

BWSR Staff: 90 Hours

Schedule of Watershed-based Assessment

BWSR PRAP Performance Review Key Dates

- November 9th, 2022: Initial meeting with Plan Work group staff
- January 30th, 2023: Initial meeting with Root River Policy Committee
- February 13th, 2023: Survey of Root River Policy Committee, Local Government staff and Partners
- May 22nd, 2023: Presentation of Draft Report to Root River Policy
- September 20, 2023: Date Transmittal of Final Report to LGU

NOTE: BWSR uses review time as a surrogate for tracking total program costs. Time required for PRAP performance reviews is aggregated and included in BWSR's annual PRAP report to the Minnesota Legislature.