


DATE: June 16, 2026

TO: Board of Water and Soil Resources' Members, Advisors, and Staff

FROM: John Jaschke, Executive Director 

SUBJECT: BWSR Board Meeting Notice – June 24, 2026

The Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) will meet on Wednesday, June 24, 2026, beginning at 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be held in the lower-level Board Room, at 520 Lafayette Road North, St. Paul and by Microsoft Teams. Individuals interested in attending the meeting through Teams should do so by either 1) logging into Teams through the provided [meeting link](#) or 2) join by audio only conference call by calling telephone number: 651-395-7448 and entering the conference ID: 204 685 425#.

The following information pertains to agenda items:

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Central Region Committee

1. **Valley Branch Watershed District 2026-2035 Watershed Management Plan**– In their updated Watershed Management Plan, the Valley Branch Watershed District (VBWD) organized goals and implementation activities into six broad prioritized resource-based issue categories from highest to lowest priority:
 - a. Surface water quality
 - b. Water quantity, flood risk, and climate resiliency
 - c. Stormwater management
 - d. Groundwater
 - e. Wetlands
 - f. Uplands/natural areas

Each goal included associated district tools to address specific issues. The VBWD is located in the east Twin Cities Metropolitan Area and encompasses 70 square miles, all of which drain to the St. Croix River. The VBWD will use this Plan over the next 10 years to protect and improve the water resources of the Valley Branch watershed. **DECISION ITEM**

Grants Program and Policy Committee

1. **FY26 and FY27 Lake Superior Basin Implementation Grants** – The Clean Water Council (CWC) FY26-27 Clean Water Fund and Policy recommendations recommended funding to support SWCD capacity in Lake Superior Basin in order to seek out and implement matching Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) funds and other federal funds in an amount of \$1 million to be formula distributed to North St. Louis SWCD, South St. Louis SWCD, Cook SWCD, Lake SWCD, and Carlton SWCD. The legislature appropriated \$500,000 in fiscal year 2026 and \$500,000 in fiscal year 2027. This agenda item is to allocate the funds consistent with the Clean Water Council recommendations and Legislative appropriation. **DECISION ITEM**

2. **FY2027 Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices Grants Program** - The board order authorizes the Fiscal Year 2027 Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices Grants Program awards. The Program consists of 1) Projects and Practices Grants and 2) Projects and Practices – Drinking Water Grants. The Grants Program and Policy Committee reviewed these recommendations on June 15, 2026, and recommends the attached order to the board. **DECISION ITEM**

Dispute Resolution Compliance Committee

1. **WCA Appeal (File 25-10) of an Exemption and No-Loss Decision, Brown County** – The appeal was filed with the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) on August 29, 2025, by the Appellant challenging a WCA Notice of Decision issued by the County regarding property known as Shirley’s Park and Country Retreat. The appeal contests the County’s August 1, 2025 decision denying the after-the fact exemption and no-loss application submitted following the issuance of a restoration order. The Appellant and the County had previously entered into a settlement agreement addressing earlier wetland impacts and wetlands located on the property. Subsequent alterations on the site resulted in issuance of a restoration order on April 23, 2025 and submission of an after-the-fact application. The record indicates that unauthorized wetland impacts occurred in connection with the development of the property.

In its August 1, 2025 decision, the County concluded that the Appellant’s application did not qualify for an exemption/no-loss. The County found that the purpose of the project was the construction and operation of a commercial campground and that the wetland impacts were not the result of agricultural activities.

The Appellant argues that the County’s decision was erroneous, and the actives qualify for an exemption. Specifically, the Appellant asserts eligibility for the agricultural activities exemption under Minn. Stat. 103G.2241 Subd. 1 (1) and Minn. Rule 8420.0420 Subp 2(A). The Appellant contends that the property meets the definition of agricultural land and that, to qualify for the exemption, wetland impacts need not be directly associated with agricultural activities or remain in agricultural use. The Appellant also requests authorization to supplement the record with additional evidence in the form of a wetland hydrology assessment.

The County argues that the principal use of the property is a campground for recreational vehicles and that the wetland impacts were directly related to the construction and operation of a commercial campground rather than agricultural activities. Accordingly, the County maintains that the wetland impacts do not qualify for the agricultural exemption. The County further argues that a wetland boundary cannot be challenged though an appeal of no-loss or exemption decision and instead must be addressed through a separate application process. Finally, the County contends that BWSR should not consider additional evidence that was not part of the record when the County rendered its decision.

The Dispute Resolution Committee (DRC) heard oral arguments from the parties during a public hearing held at the Central Office on May 8, 2026. After reviewing the record, written briefs, and oral arguments, the Committee unanimously voted to recommend affirming the Brown County’s decision, thereby denying the appeal.

The DRC also denied the Appellant’s request to supplement the record with additional evidence. The Committee determined that additional information was generated after the County issued its decision and that consideration of the information would require a separate application process.

Additional details and the rationale supporting the recommendation are provided in the Board Order. The DRC recommends that the BWSR Board approve the attached Order. **DECISION ITEM**

NEW BUSINESS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Bridging Conservation RFP Update** – The purpose of the Bridging Conservation program is to create new or expand existing outreach and education programs to non-native English-speaking communities about

conservation. Administered by the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR), this program provides funding to partners in engaging with non-native English-speaking communities.

During this Request for Proposals (RFP) period, a total of eighteen applications were submitted by NGO/nonprofits, watershed management organizations, cities, counties, and soil and water conservation districts by the close of the RFP date of April 2, 2026. These requests totaled \$614,512, exceeding the available funding of \$135,000. This allowed three grants to be awarded and one grant to be partially awarded.

INFORMATION ITEM

If you have any questions regarding the agenda, please feel free to contact me at 651-539-2587. We look forward to seeing you on June 24th.

**BOARD OF WATER AND SOIL RESOURCES
520 LAFAYETTE ROAD NORTH
ST. PAUL, MN 55155
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2026**

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

9:00 AM CALL MEETING TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MINUTES OF MAY 27, 2026 BOARD MEETING

PUBLIC ACCESS FORUM (10-minute agenda time, two-minute limit/person)

INTRODUCTION OF NEW STAFF

- Gretchen Asuncion, OAS Senior

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION

A conflict of interest, whether actual, potential, or perceived, occurs when someone in a position of trust has competing professional or personal interests, and these competing interests make it difficult to fulfill professional duties impartially. At this time, members are requested to declare conflicts of interest they may have regarding today's business. Any member who declares an actual conflict of interest must not vote on that agenda item. All actual, potential, and perceived conflicts of interest will be announced to the board by members or staff before any vote.

REPORTS

- Chair & Administrative Advisory Committee – Todd Holman
- Executive Director – John Jaschke
- Audit & Oversight Committee – Joe Collins
- Dispute Resolution and Compliance Report – Travis Germundson/Kevin Wilson
- Grants Program & Policy Committee – Mark Zabel
- RIM Reserve Committee – Jayne Hager Dee
- Water Management & Strategic Planning Committee – Joe Collins
- Wetland Conservation Committee – Jill Crafton
- Buffers, Soils & Drainage Committee – LeRoy Ose
- Drainage Work Group – Neil Peterson/Tom Gile

AGENCY REPORTS

- Minnesota Department of Agriculture – Thom Petersen
- Minnesota Department of Health – Steve Robertson
- Minnesota Department of Natural Resources – Sarah Strommen
- Minnesota Extension – Joel Larson
- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency – Katrina Kessler

ADVISORY COMMENTS

- Association of Minnesota Counties – Brian Martinson
- Minnesota Association of Conservation District Employees – Mike Schultz
- Minnesota Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts – LeAnn Buck
- Minnesota Association of Townships – Eunice Biel
- Minnesota Watersheds – Jan Voit
- Natural Resources Conservation Service – Troy Daniell

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Central Region Committee

1. Valley Branch Watershed District 2026-2035 Watershed Management Plan– Josh Norman – ***DECISION ITEM***

Grants Program and Policy Committee

1. FY26 and FY27 Lake Superior Basin Implementation Grants – Melanie Bomier – ***DECISION ITEM***
2. FY 2027 Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices Grants Program recommendations – Maggie Karschnia – ***DECISION ITEM***

Dispute Resolution Compliance Committee

1. WCA Appeal (File 25-10) of an Exemption and No-Loss Decision, Brown County – Kevin Wilson and Travis Germundson – ***DECISION ITEM***

NEW BUSINESS

1. Bridging Conservation RFP Update – Mandy Duong – ***INFORMATION ITEM***

UPCOMING MEETINGS

- BWSR Board meeting is scheduled for August 27th at 9:00 a.m. in Detroit Lakes and by MS Teams.

ADJOURN

**BOARD OF WATER AND SOIL RESOURCES
520 LAFAYETTE ROAD NORTH
LOWER-LEVEL BOARD ROOM
ST. PAUL, MN 55155
WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2026**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Eunice Biel, Jayne Hager Dee, Jill Crafton, Joe Collins, Kevin Paap, Kevin Wilson, LeRoy Ose, Lori Cox, Mark Zabel, Mike Runk, Neil Peterson, Paul Fish, Ron Staples, Ted Winter, Todd Holman, Jason Garms, DNR; Joel Larson, University of Minnesota Extension; Melissa Lewis, MPCA; Steve Robertson, MDH; Thom Petersen, MDA

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT:

Andrea Fish, Rachel Mueller, Tom Gile, Travis Germundson, Adam Beilke, Craig Engwall, Marcey Westrick, Mike Nelson, Julie Westerlund, Justin Hanson; Moriya Rufer, Janna Fitzgerald, Ryan Hughes, John Shea, Maggie Karschnia, Suzanne Rhees

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brian Martinson, AMC; Jan Voit, Minnesota Watersheds; LeAnn Buck, MASWCD; Dave Jones, NRCS; Alex Trunnell, MN Corn; Brad Jordahl Redlin, MDA; Michael Miller, Marcus Jardine

Chair Todd Holman called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**
26-25 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA - Moved by Kevin Paap, seconded by Jill Crafton, to adopt the agenda as presented. *Motion passed on a roll call vote.***

**
26-26 **MINUTES OF APRIL 22, 2026 BOARD MEETING – Moved by Joe Collins, seconded by Ron Staples, to approve the minutes of April 22, 2026, as circulated. *Motion passed on a roll call vote.***

PUBLIC ACCESS FORUM

No members of the public provided comments to the board.

REPORTS

Chair & Administrative Advisory Committee – Chair Todd Holman reported the EQB didn't meet this month. Met with John Miley, District Manager for Stearns Soil Water and Conservation District, community based watershed planning in his area is still ongoing. Encourages everyone to get out and see what is going on in the conservation landscape.

Acting Executive Director's Report – Andrea Fish reported a legislative updated will be presented later in the agenda. The application period for the Assistant Director position for Policy and Programs has closed and is under review with the Human Resources Director. A Tribal affairs update was given.

Audit and Oversight Committee – Joe Collins reported they have not met.

Dispute Resolution and Compliance Report – Kevin Wilson reported they recently had two hearings and appreciates the participation of committee members. Travis Germundson reported they didn't have any new appeals filed since the last report. There are currently 16 pending appeals and an update was provided. Recommendations from the DRC are on the agenda for today.

Jayne Hager Dee asked if the parties involved decide to appeal the DRCS's decision that it would go to the Minnesota Court of Appeals. Travis stated that is correct.

Chair Todd Holman joined the meeting at 9:15 a.m.

Grants Program & Policy Committee – Mark Zabel reported they met and have an item on the agenda for today and another for June.

RIM Reserve Committee – Jayne Hager Dee reported they have not met.

Water Management & Strategic Planning Committee – Joe Collins reported they have not met and are scheduled to meet June 1st.

Wetland Conservation Committee – Jill Crafton reported they have not met.

Buffers, Soils & Drainage Committee – LeRoy Ose reported they have not met.

Drainage Work Group (DWG) – Neil Peterson reported they have not met, there is a meeting scheduled for June 11th in St. Cloud.

AGENCY REPORTS

Minnesota Department of Agriculture – Thom Petersen reported they released their Soil Health Equipment Grants. He provided a legislative update stating there was a boost in the sustainable aviation fuel credit and some language around the carbon intensity of the fuel that'll be produced.

Jill Crafton asked if there is a diversity of plants grown for sustainable aviation fuel. Commissioner Petersen stated there is a chance for a lot of diversity.

Ted Winter asked where camelina is processed today. Commissioner Petersen stated there is a facility in Fargo North Dakota.

Lori Cox stated that since we have late term knowledge of pollution issues, it would be good to know if camelina processing does or does not create the same types of pollution problems for all Minnesota. Lori asked about the carbon intensity score it takes to produce the monocrop as well as other monocrops. Commissioner Petersen stated that camelina is designed to be our relay crop and with deep roots it can be a perennial too, it's a ways off from a monocrop.

Minnesota Department of Health – Steve Robertson reported a legislative update. Grants are available for private wells from now through July 17th for local, regional, or Tribal governments that support private well testing and mitigation outreach. Information is available on their website. There is a new quarterly report for the nitrate response in southeast Minnesota relative to the private wells and is available on their website.

Jayne Hager Dee asked how they are prioritizing municipality lead pipe replacements and how do they mix that with state and federal funds. Steve stated they have an inventory of public water systems with their lead service lines and use that to inform how money is distributed to support replacement work. Stated there is not enough federal or state money. The money they have available now will get them halfway through 2027 construction season and will be an ongoing effort to meet that need. Jayne asked if there are homes that have lead piping too. Steve stated they address both the private and public service lines.

Ted Winter asked if there are unidentified water lines in the ground. Steve stated there is a significant percentage that is not identified and is part of the ongoing work.

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources – Jason Garms reported they had a successful fishing opener. Electronic licensing systems are about to go live with their first phase. A legislative update was provided.

Paul Fish thanked them for the work they've done fighting fires in Northern Minnesota.

Minnesota Extension – Joel Larson reported the deadline for submitting abstracts for the Water Resources Conference in October is this Friday. Mid to late July, their private wells education team is hosting a private well testing clinic in Crow Wing County. July 23rd is a soil health focused field day at the Swift County Fairgrounds. July 9th there is an irrigation field day in Becker.

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency – Melissa Lewis reported a legislative update. Impaired waters list went on notice last week; there are 45 bodies of water being delisted. West River Dairy requested to increase their permit capacity.

ADVISORY COMMENTS

Association of Minnesota Counties – Brian Martinson reported on a legislative update. The first three weeks in June they will be meeting with their members about what the results of the legislative session were and what they want them to work on.

Lori stated she hopes they're telling counties that the Clean Water Council has asked for public input, and she believes that window closes in July. Brian stated they are engaging their members, and partners are engaging theirs as well to be active in this space.

Minnesota Association of Conservation District Employees – No report was provided.

Minnesota Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts – LeAnn Buck reported a legislative update. They will have eight regional meetings in the month of June. Thanked the BWSR Board for their work.

Minnesota Association of Townships – Eunice Biel reported a legislative update. Board of Director's District meetings will be held in August. Their key issues and resolutions will be discussed ahead of the annual meeting in December. There will be election training for election judges at the primary and general elections. The Minnesota Association Town Hall Review will have sessions in Otsego on June 5th.

Minnesota Watersheds – Jan Voit reported a legislative update. They are working on proposed changes to the plumbing code. Jan has been working with the new Clean Water Council Member, April Swenby to get her up to speed on things that are important to watershed districts and watershed management that are funded through the Clean Water Fund. They are working on a resolution process for their annual meeting on resolutions in August.

Joe Collins stated the plumbing issue is a big issue and thanked Jan for her work. Board Members agreed this is an important issue.

Natural Resources Conservation Service – Dave Jones reported operating with 238 full time employees and are down about 100 staff people since the start of the Trump Administration and the DRP. They are advertising a position for field operations in the northeast area. Stated funding in Minnesota has been a challenge. Minnesota will fund about 10 to 15% of applications across their programs and RCPP is even less than that. There will be some technical assistant funds available dedicated specifically to TSPS. They are close to spending their 25% on the RPP Program. NRCS will be advertising their local workgroup meetings and will have the dates posted mid-June.

Chair Holman called a recess at 10:16 a.m. and reconvened at 10:25 a.m.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Grants Program and Policy Committee

Grant Noncompliance Policy Revision – Adam Beilke presented the Grant Noncompliance Policy Revision.

BWSR grant recipients are responsible for managing State grant funds in compliance with statutes, rules, grant agreements, BWSR grant management procedures and other applicable laws and requirements. BWSR has developed the Grant Noncompliance Policy to define levels of noncompliance and establish expectations for grantees and BWSR staff to address these concerns. The Board first approved a Grant

Noncompliance Policy on June 24, 2015. The current version of the policy was approved on May 28, 2025.

Recently, the Office of Grants Management (OGM) updated Policy 08-05 on Managing Fraud Risk and Reporting Responsibilities. Updates included further details on responsibilities for reporting, notifying, and responding to suspected fraud or misuse in grants or grant programs as well as steps agencies must take to effectively manage the risk of fraud or misuse in grant programs.

BWSR staff have identified revisions to the Grant Noncompliance Policy that are necessary to ensure we are addressing fraud and misuse in compliance with OGM Policy 08-05. Proposed revisions also reflect the development of procedures for staff to carry out the policy. Grants Program & Policy Committee reviewed the proposed changes on May 18, 2026, and recommend approval to the Board.

Mark Zabel asked if it's adopted, will it be effective today with the procedures being published in July. Adam stated the procedures are being developed and will be available in July.

Lori Cox asked what we're voting on today if the procedures are still in flux and changing. Adam stated we are voting on the policy. The procedure document is an internal document.

Jayne Hager Dee asked if those that currently have grants will be notified about the policy change. Adam stated communications will be sent out.

Ted Winter asked if staff will be reviewing the grants and applications and enforcing the new changes like they have in the past. Adam stated both internally as well as the Office of Grants Management will be providing more training to staff that work directly with grants to make sure they're up to date on what to look for on any potential red flags for broader misuse. They are confident they'll be able to continue managing grants.

Paul Fish stated at the committee meeting, it was determined that the fraud issue with funds we spend is minimal, hardly any with this organization. Adam stated they do a good job at managing the resources they have as they move forward.

**
26-27 Moved by Jayne Hager Dee, seconded by Mike Runk, to approve the Grant Noncompliance Policy Revision. ***Motion passed on a roll call vote.***

Dispute Resolution Committee

WCA Appeal (File 25-9) of a No-Loss Decision, Morrison County – Kevin Wilson, Travis Germundson and Craig Engwall presented the WCA Appeal (File 25-9) of a No-Loss Decision, Morrison County.

The appeal was brought before BWSR on August 25, 2025, by Marvin Stroschein (Appellant) to challenge a Wetland Conservation Act Notice of Decision involving property located in Morrison County. The appeal contests the Morrison SWCD Board of Supervisors' July 25, 2025 approval of a no-loss determination.

The July 25, 2025 decision concluded that the application submitted by Ellen Kalahar-Grissom (Applicant) to construct an access road through wetlands located within an established township cartway qualified for a no-loss determination. This determination was based on findings that the wetlands were incidental in nature and had developed in areas that were previously non-wetland. In addition, the District determined that easterly portion of the road qualifies for a de minimus exemption.

Darling Township established a cartway to provide the Applicant with legal access to a landlocked parcel.

The established cartway extends approximately 3,400 linear feet across the Appellant's property through wetland and is to be constructed within the footprint of a pre-existing roadbed. Based on recommendations from the Technical Evaluation Panel, the SWCD concluded that the pre-existing roadbed had reverted back to wetland by actions, the purpose of which was not create wetland. The existence and location of the pre-existing roadbed were documented through historical aerial imagery and on-site observations.

The Appellant argues that the establishment of a cartway does not grant the Applicant the ability to impact wetlands and further contends that the record lacks sufficient evidence that a historic roadbed was located in that area. Finally, the Appellant asserts that the SWCD improperly applied the exemption.

The Dispute Resolution Committee heard oral arguments from the parties to the appeal during a public hearing held at the Central Office on April 23, 2026. After reviewing the record, written briefs, and oral arguments, the Committee determined that the Morrison SWCD did not make an erroneous decision and unanimously voted to recommend affirming the Morrison SWCD's decision, thereby denying the appeal.

In addition, the DRC denied the appellant's request to supplement the record with additional evidence. The Committee determined that the existing Morrison SWCD record contains substantial evidence supporting the decision and that the appellant failed to provide adequate justification to warrant inclusion in the record of additional evidence.

Additional details and the basis for the recommendation are included in the Board Order.

Chair Holman thanked Kevin Wilson for chairing this committee.

**
26-28 Moved by Kevin Wilson, seconded by Joe Collins, to approve the WCA Appeal (File 25-9) of a No-Loss Decision, Morrison County. ***Motion passed on a roll call vote.***

NEW BUSINESS

eLINK Overview – Adam Beilke and Marcey Westrick presented eLINK Overview.

eLINK is BWSR's grant management system, used to track all grants from initial award through final closeout. The system supports the full grant lifecycle — distributing grant agreements, capturing applications and funding requests, and monitoring progress. BWSR also uses eLINK to track pollution reduction benefits, cumulative funding over time, and project locations at the statewide, county, watershed, or individual-project level. Staff will provide the board with an overview of the system.

Joe Collins stated he likes the mapping feature.

Jill Crafton asked if there's room for innovation or lessons learned. Marcey stated they have added practices over time.

2026 Legislative Update – Andrea Fish and Mike Nelson presented 2026 Legislative Update.

A brief update on legislation passed this session that impacts BWSR's work or funds projects into the coming fiscal years.

Commissioner Petersen thanked them for their work on the wetland piece.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

- Water Management and Strategic Planning Committee is scheduled for June 1st at 12:30 p.m. in St. Paul and MS Teams.
- Drainage Work Group is scheduled for June 11th at 11:00 a.m. in St. Cloud.
- Next BWSR Meeting is scheduled for 9:00 AM, June 24, 2026, in St. Paul and by MS Teams.

Chair Holman adjourned the meeting at 11:27 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Todd Holman
Chair

Dispute Resolution and Compliance Report

June, 9 2026

By: Travis Germundson

No new appeals have been filed since the previous report, the total number of pending appeals remains at **12**.

Format note: New appeals that have been filed since last report to the Board. ~~Appeals that have been decided since last report to the Board.~~

File 26-9 (April 17, 2026) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for a property located in Wright County. The Restoration Order regards the unauthorized wetland impacts associated with the installation of additional drain tile. The petition contends that alterations qualify for the agricultural activities exemption associated with Natural Resources Conservation Services' Certified Wetland label of Prior Converted Cropland. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending submission of a complete after-the-fact application and for the LGU to issue a final decision on the application.*

~~File 26-8 (April 13, 2026) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for a property located in Wabasha County. The Restoration Order regards the unauthorized wetland impacts associated with the installation drain tile. The petition contends that the activity qualifies for an agricultural activities exemption associated with Natural Resources Conservation Services' Certified Wetland label of Prior Converted Cropland. *Status: The Restoration Order was rescinded and the appeal withdrawn.*~~

~~File 26-7 (March 26, 2026) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for a property located in Wright County. The Restoration Order regards the unauthorized impacts to 0.54 acres of wetland. The petition asserts that the county highway department's past alternations caused the area to become wetland. *Status: The appeal was denied and the Restoration Order affirmed.*~~

File 26-6 (March 26, 2026) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for a property in Wright County. The Restoration Order regards the unauthorized impacts of 1.43 acres or wetland association with the installation of agricultural drain tile. The petition asserts that the area was not identified as wetland prior to the installation of drain tile. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending submission of a complete after-the-fact application and for the LGU to issue a final decision on the application.*

File 26-5 (February 6, 2026) This is an appeal of a WCA Replacement Order for a property located in Mille Lacs County. The Replacement Order regards the unauthorized impact of 36,390 sq. ft. of wetland impact. The petition contends that the area is not wetland, and any such activity is exempt. The petition indicates that an application for a no-loss has been submitted to the local unit of government (LGU) concurrently with the appeal. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending LGU's decision on an after-the-fact no-loss application.*

File 26-1 (January 8, 2026) This is an appeal of a WCA Replacement Order in Otter Tail County. The Replacement Order regards the unauthorized impact of 0.8 acres of wetland impact. The petition contends that the area is not wetland and if any impact occurred in wetland, such activity is exempt. The petition indicates that an application for a no-loss has been submitted to the local unit of government (LGU) concurrently with the appeal. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending submission of a complete after-the-fact application and for the LGU to issue a final decision on the application.*

~~File 25-18 (December 12, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA No-loss decision in Pine County. The appeal challenges the County's denial of a no-loss decision, asserting that the wetland areas in question are incidental. This involves the same property and wetland area associated with a pending appeal of a WCA Restoration Order (Appeal File 25-8) *Status: The appeal was remanded back to the County to develop an*~~

adequate record that considers a written Technical Evaluation Panel report. The County approved the no-loss application on June 1, 2026 under remand in opposition of the Technical Evaluation Panel recommendation of denial.

File 25-17 (December 11, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order in Sherburne County. The Restoration Order regards the unauthorized impact of approximately 3.5 acres of wetland. The petition contends that the area is not wetland, and any excavation/drainage in or around the area qualifies for a no-loss. The petition also indicates that an application for a no-loss has been submitted to the local unit of government concurrently with the appeal. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance for the local unit of government to issue a final decision on the after-the-fact application.*

File 25-16 (November 21, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA Replacement Plan decision for a property in Crow Wing County. The appeal challenges the denial of a replacement plan application for the development of a residential lot. According to the county the lot is subject to existing development restrictions. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending the local unit of government's (LGU) decision on a local building permit appeal. The LGU denied the building permit appeal and now that decision is being challenged in District Court.*

File 25-13 (October 23, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for a property located in Otter Tail County. The Restoration Order regards the placement of 2,000 sq. ft. of fill in a wetland adjacent to Long Lake. The petition contends that the current landowners are not responsible for the alleged violation. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending the local unit of government's (LGU) decision on the after-the-fact exemption and no-loss application submitted concurrently with the appeal. The LGU approved in part the no-loss application. That decision was appealed, and on March 4, 2026, the petition was denied and the decision was affirmed. (see appeal File 26-2). BWSR's decision has now been appealed to the Court of Appeals.*

File 25-12 (October 22, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for a property located in Otter Tail County. The Restoration Order regards the placement of 3,400 sq. ft. of fill in a wetland associated with two areas adjacent to Long Lake. The petition contends that the current landowners are not responsible for the alleged violation. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending the local unit of government's (LGU) decision on the after-the-fact exemption and no-loss application submitted concurrently with the appeal. The LGU denied the no-loss application. That decision was appealed, and on March 4, 2026, the petition was denied and the decision was affirmed. (see appeal File 26-4). BWSR's decision has now been appealed to the Court of Appeals*

File 25-11 (September 25, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for a property located in Otter Tail County. The Restoration Order regards the placement of 4,000 sq. ft. of fill in wetland adjacent to Long Lake. The petition contends that the current landowners are not responsible for the alleged violation. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending the local unit of government's (LGU) decision on the after-the-fact exemption and no-loss application submitted concurrently with the appeal. The LGU denied the no-loss application. That decision was appealed, and on March 4, 2026, the petition was denied and the decision was affirmed. (see appeal File 26-3). BWSR's decision has now been appealed to the Court of Appeals.*

File 25-10 (August 29, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA Notice of Decision for a property located in Brown County. The appeal challenges the denial of an after-the-fact exemption and no-loss determination. The appeal contends that the local administrative process is flawed and disputes the conclusion that the property does not qualify for the agricultural activities' exemption. This appeal involves the same property and wetland area associated with a pending appeal of a WCA Restoration Order (File 25-7). *Status: A decision to grant and hear the appeal was made on September 22, 2025. A hearing before the Dispute Resolution Committee was held on May 8, 2026.*

File 25-9 (August 25, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA no-loss decision for a property located in Morrison County. The appeal challenges the approval of a no-loss decision that was made under remand (File 24-9) for a township cartway. The petition contends that the incidental wetland determination is being applied in error. *Status: The appeal was denied and the local unit of governments' decision affirmed.*

File 25-8 (July 24, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for property located in Pine County. The Restoration Order regards the placement of 62,640 sq. ft. of fill in wetland associated with a housing development. *Status: The appeal has been placed in abeyance and the Restoration Order stayed for the submittal of a complete application and final decision by the local unit of government (LGU). An application for an after-the-fact no-loss determination was denied by the LGU on November 18, 2025 and that decision was appealed and remanded back to the LGU (File 25-18). The County approved the no-loss application on June 1, 2026 under remand in opposition of the Technical Evaluation Panel recommendation of denial.*

File 25-7 (June 6, 2025) This is an appeal of a WCA Restoration Order for a property located in Brown County. The Restoration Order regards the unauthorized placement of fill material in a wetland associated with the expansion of a Campground/RV Park. The petition contends that the applicant still operates a farming operation that qualifies for an agricultural activities' exemption. An application for exemption, and no-loss have been submitted to the local unit of government (LGU) concurrently with the appeal. *Status: The appeal was placed in abeyance pending LGU's final decision on the after-the-fact exemption and no-loss application. The LGU denied the application. That decision was appealed and then granted to be heard by the Dispute Resolution Committee (File 25-10).*

Summary Table for Appeals

Type of Decision	Total for Calendar Year 2025	Total for Calendar Year 2026
Order in favor of appellant	1	
Order not in favor of appellant	5	4
Order Modified	1	
Order Remanded	1	
Order Place Appeal in Abeyance	4	2
Negotiated Settlement		
Withdrawn/Dismissed	1	1

Buffer Compliance Status Update: BWSR has received Notifications of Noncompliance (NONs) on 85 parcels from the 13 counties BWSR is responsible for enforcement. Currently there are 9 Corrective Action Notices (CAN), and 14 Administrative Penalty Orders (APO) issued by BWSR that are still active. Of the actions being tracked over 61 of those have been resolved.

Statewide 43 counties are fully compliant, and 44 counties have enforcement cases in progress. Of those counties (with enforcement cases in progress) there are currently 380 NONs, 320 CANs, and 34 APOs actively in place. Of the actions being tracked over 3,280 of those have been resolved.

**Disclaimer: These numbers are generated monthly from BWSR's Access database. The information is obtained through notifications from LGUs on actions taken to bring about compliance and may not reflect the current status of compliance numbers.*

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Central Region Committee

1. Valley Branch Watershed District 2026-2035 Watershed Management Plan – Josh Norman –
DECISION ITEM

steadily, with the majority (>25%) of the VBWD being classified as residential, and that number is expected to rise in the coming decades with anticipated population growth, putting increased pressure on the water resources within the watershed. With 11 DNR public waterbody-designated lakes, two trout streams, and public lands like the Lake Elmo Regional Park Reserve and a portion of Afton State Park boasting many recreational opportunities to residents and visitors, the VBWD is a uniquely positioned watershed in the metro.

Plan Process and Highlights

On March 3, 2023, the VBWD sent notification of initiation of the planning process for the development of the 2026-2035 Watershed Management Plan (Plan) to the plan review agencies and other parties as required by MR 8410, and solicited each agency's priority issues, summaries of relevant water management goals, and water resource information. An initial planning meeting/public kickoff event was hosted by the Board of Managers on December 12, 2023. The VBWD convened a Technical Advisory Committee that included the plan review authorities and other governmental units within the watershed that met on December 13, 2024, and June 25, 2025. VBWD continued to solicit input on the draft Plan from relevant stakeholders up to and during the release of the 60-day draft Plan in November of 2025.

VBWD organized goals and implementation activities into six broad prioritized resource-based issue categories (in order from highest to lowest priority):

1. Surface water quality
2. Water quantity, flood risk, and climate resiliency
3. Stormwater management
4. Groundwater
5. Wetlands
6. Uplands/natural areas

Each goal included associated district tools to address specific issues. The newest iteration of this Plan is largely shaped from past accomplishments and progress toward meeting continuing goals. Plan priorities are mostly similar to those in the 2015 Plan. Water quality across the watershed remains stable in many basins but are still degraded in others. There are many properties with elevated flood risks due to prolonged wet conditions, underscoring the need for climate resiliency efforts in the watershed. There are planned studies that are aimed at understanding emerging issues such as chloride and climate resiliency and to identify areas for improvement. Several proposed water quality and quantity projects, such as a restoration of the main stem of Valley Creek and a landlocked basin flood risk reduction (acquisition/floodproofing), could greatly move the needle toward meeting goals if funding becomes available. Continuation of monitoring, inter-agency coordination, small scale BMP cost-share, and regulation will continue the success the VBWD has consistently achieved over the years.

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources
520 Lafayette Road North
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155

In the Matter of the review of the Watershed Management Plan for the **Valley Branch Watershed District**, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 103B.231, Subdivision 9.

**ORDER
APPROVING
A WATERSHED
MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Whereas, the Board of Managers of the Valley Branch Watershed District submitted a Watershed Management Plan (Plan) on April 13, 2026, to the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (Board) pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 103B.231, Subd. 9, and;

Whereas, the Board has completed its review of the Plan;

Now Therefore, the Board hereby makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Order:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Watershed District Establishment.** The Valley Branch Watershed District (VBWD) was established on November 13, 1968, primarily to address existing flooding problems and prevent future flooding. Since that time, VBWD's role has expanded to address all facets of water resources management. In 1972, VBWD adopted rules and regulations and began reviewing proposed developments in the watershed. In 1975, VBWD began its formal permit program. The VBWD prepared its first-generation watershed management plan that the Board approved in March 1986.
- 2. Authority of Plan.** The Metropolitan Surface Water Management Act requires the preparation of a watershed management plan for the subject watershed area, which meets the requirements of Minnesota Statutes Sections 103B.201 to 103B.251. The current VBWD watershed management plan was approved by Board Order on September 23, 2015. Subsequently, the VBWD completed two minor amendments in 2025.
- 3. Nature of the Watershed.** The VBWD is located mostly within Washington County with a small portion extending into Ramsey County in the eastern portion of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Its 70 square mile jurisdiction includes the entire drainage area of Valley Creek and covers portions of 15 cities and townships. VBWD is bounded by South Washington Watershed District to the south, Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District to the west, Rice Creek and Browns Creek Watershed Districts to the north, and the Middle St. Croix Watershed Management Organization and the St. Croix River to the east, the latter of which the entire VBWD drains to. Land use is developing steadily, with the majority (>25%) of the VBWD being classified as residential, and that number is expected to rise in the coming decades with anticipated population growth, putting increased pressure on the water resources within the watershed. Among the VBWD's water resources are 11 DNR public waterbody-designated lakes and two trout streams.
- 4. Plan Development and Review.** On March 3, 2023, the VBWD sent notification of initiation of the planning process for the development of the 2026-2035 Watershed Management Plan (Plan) to the plan review agencies and other parties as required by MR 8410, and solicited each agency's priority issues, summaries of relevant water management goals, and water resource information. An initial planning meeting/public kickoff event was hosted by the Board of Managers on December 12, 2023. The VBWD

convened a Technical Advisory Committee that included the plan review authorities and other governmental units within the watershed that met on December 13, 2024 and June 25, 2025. VBWD continued to solicit input on the draft Plan from relevant stakeholders up to and during the release of the 60-day draft Plan in November of 2025.

The draft Plan was submitted to Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR), other state and regional review agencies, and local governments for the formal 60-day review period on November 24, 2025, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 103B.231 Subd. 7. The VBWD prepared a written response to the 60-day comments and sent responses to reviewers on February 24, 2026. A public hearing was held on March 12, 2026. The VBWD sent a final draft Plan to State and Regional Review Agencies on April 13, 2026. Comments received during the 90-day review period indicated that most reviewers did not have additional comments, however, the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) noted that one of their previous comments about listing the uppermost bedrock layers in chronological order should still be addressed. MDH recommends rewording during the next opportunity to edit the Plan.

5. **Local Review.** The VBWD distributed copies of the draft Plan to local units of government for their review pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 103B.231 Subd. 7. Local written comments and edits were received from the Rice Creek Watershed District, Brown's Creek Watershed District, and Washington County. VBWD responded in writing to all comments.
6. **Metropolitan Council (Council) Review.** During the 60-day review, the Council commended the VBWD for developing a watershed management plan that includes a thoughtful overview of the makeup of the watershed, as well as a discussion of what makes this watershed unique and with a comprehensive listing of issues, associated goals, policies, and strategies. Several comments were regarding typos in the plan or requesting additional clarity. The Council advised the VBWD to adopt more up-to-date data on population forecasting, and to make a clearer connection between some implementation items with goals. During the 90-day review, the Council again commended the VBWD for their work on this plan, and stated that all of their comments on the 60-day draft were incorporated.
7. **Department of Agriculture (MDA) Review.** MDA did not provide any comments on this Plan, but recommended approval during the 60-day review.
8. **Department of Health (MDH) Review.** During the 60-day review, MDH commended the VBWD for addressing MDH priority issues, including chloride in groundwater, flooding and climate change implications for drinking water and public health, the potential for infiltrated stormwater to transport pollutants to groundwater, and others. MDH recommended adding language tying public health considerations to water reuse goals, adding language identifying MDH as a potential grant source, modifying language relating to groundwater availability, and modifying language clarifying MDH's role in administration and enforcement for the MN Well Code. MDH also recommended adding additional language elucidating MDH's responsibilities in terms of groundwater protection. MDH recommended that the Plan differentiate between health risk levels and maximum contaminant levels, that the plan acknowledge that PFAS monitoring in private wells is a joint venture between MPCA and MDH, that the "Potential Pollutant Sources" section include chloride from water softeners, that a discussion should be added about the Lake Elmo/Oakdale Special Well Boring Constriction area in the associated subwatersheds, that the GRAPS report be referenced in the Lower St. Croix 1W1P section, and that a groundwater section be added to the St. Croix River subwatershed section to specifically mention PFOS. During the 90-day review, MDH recommended that uppermost bedrock layers be ordered from youngest to oldest. MDH again commended VBWD for the Plan, and recommended approval by the Board.
9. **Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Review.** During the 60-day review, the DNR provided several comments. The DNR provided more up-to-date data on Ordinary High-Water Levels for several waterbodies in the VBWD. The DNR recommended several sections to be revised, including a goal about

suitable areas for infiltration stormwater BMPs, a discussion on the benefits of native plants, and that more relevant online sources for native plants for stable shorelines be added. The DNR also recommended that a discussion on rare and natural communities be added into the narrative of the Plan, and that more information on threatened and endangered species regulation be added. During the 90-day review period, the DNR stated that all of their comments for the 60-day draft were incorporated.

10. **Pollution Control Agency (PCA) Review.** During the 60-day review period, the PCA commended the VBWD for creating a well-written plan that was concise and thorough. The PCA did not have any other comments.
11. **Department of Transportation (DOT) Review.** The DOT did not provide formal comment.
12. **Board Review.** During the 60-day review, Board staff thanked the VBWD for holding Technical Advisory Committee meetings during plan development to provide input on early drafts. Board staff commended the VBWD for including implementation activities related to important issues such as climate resiliency, chloride pollution, and water reuse. Board staff expressed interest in VBWD's plan to buy flood-prone properties in landlocked basins. Board staff suggested clarifications to several parts of the Plan for increased reader comprehension. Staff also had comments on goal measurability and other suggestions to help bring the plan into conformance with Minnesota Statutes Sections 103B.201 to 103B.251 and Minnesota Rules 8410. Staff also sent unofficial typographical, grammatical, and formatting comments. Staff felt the Plan was revised as necessary to provide required Plan content.
13. **Plan Summary.** The VBWD organized goals and implementation activities into six broad resource-based categories (in order from highest to lowest priority):
 - surface water quality
 - water quantity, flood risk, and climate resiliency
 - stormwater management
 - groundwater
 - wetlands
 - uplands/natural areas

Each goal included associated district tools to address specific issues. The newest iteration of this Plan is largely shaped from past accomplishments and progress toward meeting continuing goals. Plan priorities are mostly similar to those in the 2015 Plan. Water quality across the watershed remains stable in many basins but are still degraded in others. There are many properties with elevated flood risks due to prolonged wet conditions, underscoring the need for climate resiliency efforts in the watershed. There are planned studies that are aimed at understanding emerging issues such as chloride and climate resiliency and to identify areas for improvement. Several proposed water quality and quantity projects, such as a restoration of the main stem of Valley Creek and a landlocked basin flood risk reduction (acquisition/floodproofing), could greatly move the needle toward meeting goals if funding becomes available. Continuation of monitoring, inter-agency coordination, small scale BMP cost-share, and regulation will continue the success the VBWD has consistently achieved over the years.

14. **Central Region Committee Meeting.** On June 1, 2026, the Board's Central Region Committee and staff met in St. Paul and online to review and discuss the final Plan. Those in attendance from the Board's committee were Joe Collins, Jayne Hager-Dee, Jill Crafton, Mike Runk, Annie Felix, and Grant Wilson. Others in attendance included Board staff Josh Norman and Marcey Westrick, John Hanson and Greg Williams from Barr Engineering, representing VBWD, and Manager Rick Gelbmann from the VBWD Board of Managers. After presentation and discussion, the committee unanimously recommended approval of the Plan to the full Board.

CONCLUSIONS

1. All relevant substantive and procedural requirements of law and rule have been fulfilled.
2. The Board has proper jurisdiction in the matter of approving the Watershed Management Plan for the Valley Branch Watershed District (VBWD) pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 103B.231, Subd. 9.
3. The VBWD Watershed Management Plan, attached to this Order, defines the water and water-related problems within the VBWD's boundaries, possible solutions thereto, and an implementation program through 2035.
4. The attached Plan is in conformance with the requirements of Minnesota Statutes Sections 103B.201 to 103B.251.

ORDER

The Board hereby approves the attached Valley Branch Watershed District's Watershed Management Plan submitted on April 13, 2026.

Dated at Saint Paul, Minnesota this 24th day of June 2026.

MINNESOTA BOARD OF WATER AND SOIL RESOURCES

Todd Holman, Chair
Board of Water and Soil Resources



June 24, 2026

Valley Branch Watershed District Board of Managers
c/o John Hanson, District Engineer
P.O. Box 838
Lake Elmo, MN 55042

Dear Chair and Board Members:

I am pleased to inform you that the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (Board) has approved the Valley Branch Watershed District (VBWD) Watershed Management Plan (Plan) at its regular meeting held on June 24, 2026. For your records I have enclosed a copy of the signed Board Order that documents approval of the Plan. Please be advised that the VBWD must adopt and implement the Plan within 120 days of the date of the Order, in accordance with MN Statutes 103B.231, Subd. 10.

The board, technical advisory committee members, consultants, and all others involved in the planning process are to be commended for their work on developing the Plan. With continued implementation of your Plan, the protection and management of the water resources within the watershed will be greatly enhanced to the benefit of the residents. The Board looks forward to working with you as you implement this Plan and document its outcomes.

Please contact Board Conservationist, Josh Norman at 651-757-2302, josh.norman@state.mn.us, or at the central office address for further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Todd Holman
Chair

Enclosure

CC: Greg Williams, Barr Engineering (via email)
Reid Christianson, MDA (via email)
Abby Shea, MDH (via email)
Megan Moore, DNR (via email)
Katie Kowalczyk, DOT (via email)
Maureen Hoffman, Met Council (via email)
Melinda Neville, MPCA (via email)
Marcey Westrick, BWSR (via email)
Josh Norman, BWSR (via email)
File Copy

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Grants Program and Policy Committee

1. FY26 and FY27 Lake Superior Basin Implementation Grants – Melanie Bomier – ***DECISION ITEM***
2. FY2027 Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices Grants Program Recommendations – Maggie Karschnia – ***DECISION ITEM***

BOARD ORDER

Fiscal Year 2026 and Fiscal Year 2027 Lake Superior Basin Implementation Grant Program

PURPOSE

Award Fiscal Year (FY) 2026 and FY 2027 Lake Superior Basin Implementation Grants to five Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) in the Lake Superior Basin.

RECITALS/FINDINGS OF FACT

- A. The Laws of Minnesota 2025, Regular Session, Chapter 36, Article 2, Section 6 (q) appropriated \$500,000 in fiscal year 2026 and \$500,000 in fiscal year 2027 to provide support to SWCDs and other local governments and partner organizations in the Lake Superior Basin to leverage Great Lakes Restoration Initiative or other federal Great Lakes funding to implement prioritized activities.
- B. The Board has authorities under Minnesota Statute 103B.101 to award grants and contracts to accomplish water and related land resources management.
- C. The Board has authority under Minnesota Statute 103B.3369 to provide program-based grants to local governments who are responsible for implementing elements of applicable portions of watershed management plans, comprehensive plans, local water management plans, or comprehensive watershed management plans, developed or amended, adopted and approved, according to chapter 103B, 103C, or 103D.
- D. The Board has identified eligible recipients of these funds as soil and water conservation districts in the Lake Superior Basin to ensure the efficient implementation of funds using existing public infrastructure and for consistency with the FY26-27 Clean Water Fund and Policy Recommendations Report from the Clean Water Council.
- E. The Grants Program and Policy Committee, at their May 18, 2026, meeting, reviewed the proposed allocations and Board Order and recommended approval to the Board.

ORDER

The Board hereby:

1. Authorizes staff to develop the Lake Superior Basin Implementation Grant program requirements for the fiscal year 2026 and fiscal year 2027 appropriations.
2. Approves the proposed allocations for the Lake Superior Basin Implementation Grants to five SWCDs in the amounts listed in the attached table using the fiscal year 2026 and fiscal year 2027 appropriations. *(Table 1)*
3. Authorizes staff to approve work plans and enter into grant agreements for this purpose.

MINNESOTA BOARD OF WATER AND SOIL RESOURCES

Todd Holman, Chair
Board of Water and Soil Resources

Date: _____

Table 1: FY2026/FY2027 Lake Superior Basin Implementation Grant Allocations

Organization	FY2026/FY2027 Grant Amount
Carlton SWCD	\$190,000
Cook SWCD	\$190,000
Lake SWCD	\$190,000
North St. Louis SWCD	\$190,000
South St. Louis SWCD	\$190,000
Total	\$950,000

BOARD ORDER

Fiscal Year 2027 Clean Water Fund Competitive Grant Program Awards

PURPOSE

Authorize the Fiscal Year 2027 Clean Water Fund Competitive Grant Program Awards.

FINDINGS OF FACT / RECITALS

1. The Laws of Minnesota 2025, Chapter 36, Article 2, Section 6 (b) appropriated \$6,000,000 for the Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices Grant Program with up to 50 percent available for land-treatment projects and practices that benefit drinking water.
2. On January 28, 2026, the Board authorized staff to distribute and promote a request for proposals (RFP) for Clean Water Fund Competitive Grants and to utilize unallocated funds from prior Clean Water Fund fiscal years for the fiscal year 2027 Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices Grant Program (Board order #26-05).
3. A RFP was noticed on February 11, 2026 with a submittal deadline of March 25, 2026.
4. Applications were scored and ranked by the interagency committees on May 26, 2026.
5. On June 9, 2026, BWSR's senior management team reviewed staff's recommendation for allocations and recommended approval to the Grants Program and Policy Committee.
6. The Grants Program and Policy Committee, at their June 15, 2026 meeting, reviewed the recommendations for award allocations and recommended approval to the Board.

ORDER

The Board hereby:

- a) Approves the allocation of funds to each applicant in the amounts listed in the attached allocation tables.
- b) Authorizes staff to approve work plans and enter into grant agreements for these funds consistent with the appropriations and the RFP.
- c) Authorizes staff to fund additional applications fully or partially in rank order and may separately or in combination: i. reallocate funds returned from previous years' Clean Water Fund Competitive grant programs, ii. reallocate funds that become available if funded projects are withdrawn or do not receive work plan approval by September 18, 2026, unless extended for cause, or iii. reallocate funds that are modified due to a reduction in the state funding needed to accomplish the project.

Dated at St. Paul, Minnesota, this June 24, 2026.

MINNESOTA BOARD OF WATER AND SOIL RESOURCES

Todd Holman, Chair
Board of Water and Soil Resources

Date: _____

Attachments:

- FY2027 Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices Allocation Table
- FY2027 Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices - Drinking Water Allocation Table

FY2027 Clean Water Fund Projects and Practices Allocation Table

#	Grant ID	Title of Proposal	Grantee	Total (\$)
1	C27-0008	Blaine Parks Targeted WQ improvements Phase 1	Coon Creek WD	\$ 500,000
2	C27-0030	Fish Lake Alum Treatment	Prior Lake-Spring Lake WD	\$ 796,270
3	C27-0020	Phase III Project Implementation-Dobbins Creek Restoration	Cedar River WD	\$ 280,000
4	C27-0033	Spring Lake West Iron-Enhanced Sand Filter	Prior Lake-Spring Lake WD	\$ 1,034,825
5	C27-0039	Delisting Goose Lake	Carnelian-Marine-St. Croix WD	\$ 470,000
6	C27-0003	2027 Red Lake County SWCD Nonstructural Land Management Project	Red Lake SWCD	\$ 371,000
7	C27-0023	Reeds Lake Ravine and Shoreline Stabilization	Waseca SWCD	\$ 299,000
8	C27-0016	MSTR South Branch Snake River Priority Channel Stabilization Project	Middle-Snake-Tamarac Rivers WD	\$ 248,400
9	C27-0035	Eagle Lake Internal Load Reduction Project	Sherburne SWCD	\$ 704,234

TOTAL: \$ 4,703,729

FY2027 Clean Water Fund Project and Practices - Drinking Water Allocation Table

#	Grant ID	Title of Proposal	Grantee	Total (\$)
1	C27-0048	Drinking Water Protection Through SSTS Fix-Ups	Anoka CD	\$ 199,232
2	C27-0037	Hibbing Drinking Water Protection Implementation Action and Community Coordination Project	Hibbing, City of	\$ 85,000
3	C27-0002	2027 Dakota County Well Seal Grant Program	Dakota County	\$ 100,000
4	C27-0031	Thief River Falls SWAA Non-Structural Land Management	Pennington SWCD	\$ 210,000
5	C27-0028	Mt. Simon Aquifer Well Decommissioning	Watonwan SWCD	\$ 382,360
6	C27-0038	Nitrate and Water Use Reduction in Targeted Sherburne County DWSMAs and Townships - Phase II	Sherburne SWCD	\$ 231,225
7	C27-0027	Southeast MN Nitrate Reduction and Water Protection Program	Fillmore SWCD	\$ 309,000
8	C27-0036	Protecting Gem Lake's Groundwater: A Community Well Sealing Project	Vadnais Heights, City of	\$ 240,000
9	C27-0013	2027 Ramsey County Well Sealing Program	Ramsey County	\$ 125,000

TOTAL: \$ 1,881,817

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Dispute Resolution Committee

1. WCA Appeal (File 25-10) of an Exemption and No-Loss Decision, Brown County – Kevin Wilson and Travis Germundson – **DECISION ITEM**

In its August 1, 2025 decision, the County concluded that the Appellant's application did not qualify for an exemption/no-loss. The County found that the purpose of the project was the construction and operation of a commercial campground and that the wetland impacts were not the result of agricultural activities.

The Appellant argues that the County's decision was erroneous, and the actives qualify for an exemption. Specifically, the Appellant asserts eligibility for the agricultural activities exemption under Minn. Stat. 103G.2241 Subd. 1 (1) and Minn. Rule 8420.0420 Subp 2(A). The Appellant contends that the property meets the definition of agricultural land and that, to qualify for the exemption, wetland impacts need not be directly associated with agricultural activities or remain in agricultural use. The Appellant also requests authorization to supplement the record with additional evidence in the form of a wetland hydrology assessment.

The County argues that the principal use of the property is a campground for recreational vehicles and that the wetland impacts were directly related to the construction and operation of a commercial campground rather than agricultural activities. Accordingly, the County maintains that the wetland impacts do not qualify for the agricultural exemption. The County further argues that a wetland boundary cannot be challenged through an appeal of no-loss or exemption decision and instead must be addressed through a separate application process. Finally, the County contends that BWSR should not consider additional evidence that was not part of the record when the County rendered its decision.

The Dispute Resolution Committee (DRC) heard oral arguments from the parties during a public hearing held at the Central Office on May 8, 2026. After reviewing the record, written briefs, and oral arguments, the Committee unanimously voted to recommend affirming the Brown County's decision, thereby denying the appeal.

The DRC also denied the Appellant's request to supplement the record with additional evidence. The Committee determined that additional information was generated after the County issued its decision and that consideration of the information would require a separate application process.

Additional details and the rationale supporting the recommendation are provided in the Board Order. The DRC recommends that the BWSR Board approve the attached Order.

Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources
Dispute Resolution Committee
520 Lafayette Road North
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

In re: WCA Appeal of an Exemption and No-Loss
Decision, Brown County

**FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,
AND ORDER**

BWSR File No. 25-10

This matter came to the Board of Soil and Water Resources (BWSR) for a final order from an appeal concerning the denial of an exemption and no-loss determination. The petitioner is Brian Domeier. The respondent is Brown County.

On May 9, 2025, Domeier applied for an after-the-fact/no-loss determination related to activities on his property that were subject to a restoration order. Separately, Domeier appealed the restoration order. On August 1, 2025 Brown County denied the application for an after-the-fact/no-loss determination (the “No-Loss Decision”). Domeier timely appealed the No Loss Decision to BWSR pursuant to Minn. R. 8420.0905. The parties submitted briefs, and the matter was referred to BWSR’s Dispute Resolution Committee for hearing, which was held on May 8, 2026.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND RESOLUTION

1. It is uncontested that Domeier placed fill in certain areas that he now operates as a campground. Domeier and the County dispute whether the area in question was a wetland.

Is Brown County’s decision that that impacted areas were wetlands protected by the Wetland Conservation Act (“WCA”) clearly erroneous?

- a. Brown County determined that the impacts were within a protected wetland based on: (1) a 2019 delineation; (2) a 2024 settlement agreement between the County and Domeier in which Domeier agreed not to work in the impacted areas; and (3) the absence of any new evidence that the impacted areas had ceased to be wetlands.
- b. The Dispute Resolution Committee voted 5-0 to recommend affirming the Brown County Decision. While the delineation from 2019 is not dispositive of the issue of

whether the impacted areas were wetlands at the time they were impacted, it is reliable evidence of their status as wetlands. In addition, there were extensive prior enforcement proceedings between the County and Domeier based on the 2019 delineation that culminated in a settlement agreement to resolve the issues of where Domeier could and could not place fill. In that agreement, Domeier agreed not to place fill in the impacted areas as part of that settlement agreement.

c. [Insert BWSR decision]

2. Domeier contends that even if the impacted areas were protected wetlands, his activities were exempt from the WCA either because they were impacts to prior converted agricultural lands pursuant to Section 103G.2241, subd. 1(1) of WCA (the “Prior Converted Agricultural Exemption”), or because they were impacts to lands that were planted with crops in six of the ten years prior to the adoption of the WCA in 1991 (“Six-in-Ten Exemption”).

Is Brown County’s decision that the areas impacted by the fill were being used as a campground, and not an agricultural property at the time of the fill, and therefore not subject to the Agricultural Exemption clearly erroneous?

- a. Brown County based its decision on evidence showing clear conversion of the impacted areas to a campground prior to the fill activities in question, and on the basis that the purpose of the fill was not agricultural, but rather to support camping activities.
- b. The Dispute Resolution Committee voted 5-0 to recommend affirming the Brown County Decision. Substantial evidence supports a finding that Domeier had converted the areas of the property in question to use as a commercial campground prior to placement of the fill. The Dispute Resolution Committee also concluded that the purpose of the fill was not agricultural, making the Prior Converted Agricultural Exemption and Six-in-Ten Exemption unavailable.

c. [Insert BWSR decision]

3. Domeier contends that Brown County staff were not authorized to make final decisions on his application.

Were Brown County staff authorized to make a final decision on the application at issue, or did the final decision need to go to the Brown County Board for final approval?

- a. Brown County concluded that staff was authorized to make final decisions on the application.
- b. The Dispute Resolution Committee voted 5-0 to recommend affirming the Brown County Decision. The Dispute Resolution Committee concluded that extant rules and statutes allow staff to make final determinations on the application.

c. [Insert BWSR decision]

4. Domeier sought to have additional materials not presented to Brown County entered into the record in this matter. In particular, Domeier tendered a report from a consultant opining that the entire impacted areas may not have been wetlands at the time of the fill, without reaching any final conclusion. Brown County opposes the inclusion of these materials.
 - a. The Dispute Resolution Committee voted 5-0 to recommend against admission of the additional materials into the record on the basis that no showing had been made by Domeier of any good reason why these materials were not presented to Brown County at the time of the decision. In addition, the materials are not dispositive of any issue, they merely opine that further delineation efforts may be warranted.
 - b. [Insert BWSR decision]

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Through an LLC he controls, Domeier owns operates a campground (“the Campground”) in Brown County. Domeier purchased the property at issue in October 2018. (Ex. 126 at 1329.) The property is now known as Shirley’s Park and Country Retreat, having a place of business at 17434 Lakeside Ave, New Ulm, MN 56073.

2. The Campground has been the subject of extensive prior enforcement activities by the county. These activities concern two wetlands, generally referred to in the record as “W1” and “W2.”

3. Brown County completed a wetland delineation at the Campground in August 2019 (“2019 Delineation”). (Exs. 143 at 1401-1453; 144 at 1454.) At that time, Brown County marked the boundary of the wetland at issue in this appeal, identified as W1, using 2-foot lath stakes. (Ex. 143 at 1451.) The delineator also noted a potential second wetland in the area that became W2. (*Id.*)

4. After receiving the delineation report, Domeier applied for a joint no-loss and wetland boundary/type application. (Ex. 142 at 1385.) In the application, Domeier stated he would be creating a campground “near a wetland” and he would “create roads/driveway near wetland.” (Ex. 142 at 1390. 1393.)

5. A technical evaluation panel (“TEP”) visited the property in September 2019 in connection with the no-loss application and concurred with the established W1 boundary. (Ex. 139 at 1380.)

6. At the time of the TEP’s September site visit, the TEP observed “recent fill” within the W1 boundary for a road. *Id.*

7. The County issued its decision on the no-loss application in November 2019. The County determined that Domeier’s proposal “for the creation of [a] campground” does not meet the criteria for a no-loss decision in W1. (Ex. 138 at 1377.)

8. Domeier placed additional fill into the W1 wetland in the spring/summer of 2020. (Ex. 134 at 1349.)

9. In July of 2021, Brown County caused a restoration order (the “2021 Restoration Order”) to be served by the Department of Natural Resources to correct the fill issues, after attempts at achieving voluntary compliance did not succeed. (Ex. 133 at 1344.)

10. The 2021 Restoration Order adopted the boundaries from 2019 Delineation. (Ex. 134 at 1355, 1357.) Domeier did not have an approved replacement plan for the fill impacts and no exemptions applied. The order required Domeier to remove the fill from W1 and W2, or submit an after-the-fact application to the County. *Id.* at 1350.

11. In response to the 2021 Restoration Order, Domeier asserted that the W1 wetland was not in fact a wetland. (Exs. 130-132.) The TEP revisited the site, and reconfirmed the existence of wetlands W1 and W2. (Ex. 132 at 1341.) Domeier did not timely appeal the 2021 Restoration Order, which became final. (Ex. 126 at 1330.)

12. To resolve the restoration order, Domeier and Brown County negotiated towards a replacement plan. (*E.g.* Ex. 122, 126.) Domeier and Brown County initially agreed to a resolution pursuant to which Domeier would purchase .16 acres of wetland credits. (Ex. 118.) A TEP member appealed this resolution of the 2021 Restoration Order, and in a prior BWSR decision, BWSR remanded the case back to Brown County finding that insufficient evidence supported various determinations made by Brown County. (Ex. 115.)

13. After extensive negotiation and Brown County's denial of additional applications for a replacement plan by Domeier, Domeier appealed a denial of a replacement plan to BWSR in September of 2023. (Ex. 65.)

14. The DNR issued Domeier a cease and desist order in January of 2024 for additional violations of WCA at the site. (Exs. 62, 63.)

15. In March of 2024, Domeier and Brown County resolved the replacement plan issues with an agreement (the "2024 Settlement Agreement"). Under the 2024 Settlement Agreement, Brown County agreed not to pursue replacement for an already constructed turnaround located in W1, and Domeier agreed to submit a replacement plan application for wetland impacts associated with W2 and be bound by the W1 and W2 wetland boundaries of the 2019 delineation.

16. The W1 boundary was included in the 2024 Settlement Agreement as GPS coordinates on an aerial photograph, and Brown County agreed to not seek any further remedies for the turnaround already constructed in the W1 wetland (Ex. 60):



17. The 2024 Settlement Agreement also included an express provision about future work:

The landowner agrees that the County must agree in writing to any proposed impacts to WI or W2 before he conducts any further work that could result in a wetland impact. The landowner must submit a replacement plan, separate from the replacement plan outlined in [the 2024 Settlement Agreement], with his additional proposals and receive County approval before conducting such work.

18. Pursuant to the 2024 Settlement Agreement, Domeier submitted a new replacement plan for impacts to W2, which was approved by Brown County and there were no appeals to BWSR. (Exs. 53, 56, 57.)

19. In November of 2024, Brown County discovered that Domeier had constructed new accessways inside the W1 wetland to provide access from the turnaround to campsites he constructed outside the W1 wetland, in violation of the 2024 Settlement Agreement (Ex. 48):



20. After further investigation requiring a search warrant, the DNR issued a restoration order at the request of Brown County for the new work. (Exs. 22, 28.)

21. Domeier did not perform the work required by the new restoration order, and also constructed a new building inside the W1 wetland. (Ex. 21.) At Brown County’s request, the DNR issued an amended restoration order to encompass the new building on May 9, 2025 (the “2025 Restoration Order”).

22. Domeier appealed the 2025 Restoration Order, and made the application for an after-the-fact determination/no loss determination that led to this appeal. (Ex. 16.) The 2025 Restoration Order is the subject of a currently stayed appeal with BWSR. (Ex. 10.)

23. On August 1, 2025 staff for Brown County denied the exemption/no-loss application challenged here.

24. Domeier sought to supplement the record with a report from a consultant dated November 25, 2025 (the “Boll Report”). In the Boll Report, Wes Boll opines that there is available evidence that suggests the W1 wetland was misclassified as a wetland, and that additional study is warranted.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. BWSR has jurisdiction to hear this appeal pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 103G.2242, subd. 9, and Minn. R. 8420.0905, subp. 4.

2. The WCA and associated rules allow a party to seek a no-loss determination from the regulating local unit of government that activities in or adjacent to a wetland will not have an impact on them. Minn. Stat. § 103G.2242, subd. 2; Minn. R. 8420.0410.

3. The criteria for a no-loss determination are set forth in rule. Minn. R. 8420.0415. In general, the rule sets forth certain types of activities that will have only a temporary or allowable impact, and permits a no-loss determination as to these activities. Minn. R. 8420.0115(B-H). In the absence of a specific exemption, the burden is on the applicant to show that excavations within a covered wetland will not impact the wetland. Minn. R. 8420.0115(A).

4. Minn. R. 8420.0111, subp. 32 defines “impact” as follows:

“Impact” means a loss in the quantity, quality, or biological diversity of a wetland caused by draining or filling of wetlands, wholly or partially, or by excavation in the permanently and semipermanently flooded areas of type 3, 4, or 5 wetlands, as defined in subpart 75, and in all wetland types if the excavation results in filling, draining, or conversion to nonwetland.

5. Brown County’s conclusion that Domeier’s fill activities impacted a wetland are supported by substantial evidence, and are not clearly erroneous. There is no dispute that Domeier placed gravel fill in the W1 wetland to construct access paths from the turnaround to additional campsites. Aerial photographs clearly show the fill. (Exs. 48, 60.)

6. Substantial evidence supports Brown County's conclusion that the W1 wetland was a wetland at the time of the fill, based on the 2019 delineation and Domeier's agreement in the 2024 Settlement Agreement that the area depicted in that agreement was a wetland.

7. Domeier's argument that the delineation of a wetland cannot be achieved by agreement is not legally relevant here. Domeier is correct that collusive agreements between landowners and local units of government could be problematic, and in those circumstances not binding. But there is no argument here that the 2024 Settlement Agreement was collusive. To the contrary, the evidence establishes that it was the product of extensive, highly contentious enforcement actions and negotiations. In addition, the 2024 Settlement agreement was implemented through the submission of a replacement plan, which is subject to review and objection from members of the TEP. There was a past objection by a TEP member to a settlement between Brown County and Domeier. There was no objection to the 2024 Settlement Agreement.

8. The 2024 Settlement Agreement is admissible as an admission of Domeier that the areas in which he placed fill are wetlands. Domeier would also likely be estopped from contesting the status of the W1 wetland as a wetland given his entry into the 2024 Settlement Agreement which provided significant benefits to him, including Brown County's agreement not to pursue violations for the turnaround and a reduced impact area and replacement ratio for W2.

9. BWSR concurs in Brown County's determination that the Prior Converted Agricultural Exemption and Six-in-Ten Exemption do not apply here. The evidence clearly shows that the impacted areas had been converted to use as a campground several years prior to the fill in question, and that the purpose of the fill is to provide access to campsites. BWSR also concurs in Brown County's conclusion that the Six-in-Ten Exemption appearing in rule has been superseded by the statutory Prior Converted Agricultural Exemption, and is no longer available.

10. BWSR concludes that Brown County staff had authority to make a final decision on Domeier's application. The relevant portions of the WCA define a "local unit of government" to include a county board of commissioners "or their delegate." Minn. Stat. § 103G.005, subd. 10i. Here, Brown County delegated decision-making on exemption and no-loss determinations to staff through Section 717.1 of its zoning ordinance.

11. BWSR concludes that Brown County was not required to provide an administrative appeal to the county board. While the requirement still appears in rule, the requirement was removed from statute in 2011. *See* Laws of Minnesota 2011, ch. 107, art. 1, sec. 68. The rule has not been amended to reflect the statutory change, but the intent of the statutory change to remove this requirement is clear.

12. BWSR concludes that Domeier has not met the requirements in statute or rule for the submission of the Boll Report as additional evidence in this appeal. The applicable rules provide that BWSR generally conducts an on-the-record review of the local unit of government's decision, using the same record materials. Minn. R. 8420.0905, subp. 4(F). An exception exists where there is new information that is material to the appeal and the party seeking the admission of the evidence can show good cause why the evidence was not presented below. Here, Domeier has shown no good cause for not presenting the Boll Report. While it did not exist at the time of the county's August 1, 2025 decision, that is because Domeier did not hire Boll to prepare the report in time for the August 1, county decision -- and there was time to do so. There is nothing that would have prevented Domeier from securing the Boll Report or an actual delineation in time to present to Brown County. The report is also not material to the disposition of the appeal. The Boll Report is not a delineation and does not opine that the W1 wetland is not a wetland. Rather it suggests that the W1 wetland may not be a wetland. Given the 2019 delineation and Domeier's

agreement in the 2024 Settlement Agreement not to perform work inside the W1 wetland, the Boll Report would not change BWSR's conclusion that substantial evidence supports Brown County's decision.

13. Any Finding of Fact more appropriately deemed a Conclusion of Law, or the reverse, should be deemed as such.

ORDER

The August 1, 2025 decision of Brown County denying the application of an exemption and a no-loss determination is affirmed.

MINNESOTA BOARD OF WATER AND SOIL RESOURCES

Dated: June 24, 2026

By: _____
Todd Holman, Chair

NEW BUSINESS

1. Bridging Conservation RFP Update – Mandy Duong – ***INFORMATION ITEM***

Program Update: Bridging Conservation FY26

The purpose of the Bridging Conservation program is to create new or expand existing outreach and education programs to non-native English-speaking communities about conservation. Administered by the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR), this program provides funding to partners in engaging with non-native English-speaking communities.

During this Request for Proposals (RFP) period, a total of eighteen applications were submitted by NGO/nonprofits, watershed management organizations, cities, counties, and soil and water conservation districts by the close of the RFP date of April 2, 2026. These requests totaled \$614,512, exceeding the available funding of \$135,000. This allowed three grants to be awarded and one grant to be partially awarded.

Table 1. Bridging Conservation FY26 Application Summary

Applications	Amount Requested	Amount Available	Difference	Awards
18	\$614,512	\$135,000	\$479,512	4 (with 1 partially awarded)

Table 1 – Bridging Conservation FY26 Application Summary

Table 2. Bridging Conservation FY26 Summary of Awards

Grant ID	Application Name	Application Title	Award
C26-0174	Midtown Greenway Coalition	Conservation Champions: Cultivating Community and Habitat	\$34,500.00
C26-0179	Monarch Joint Venture	Rooted in Community: Expanding Access to Pollinator Conservation	\$22,950.00
C26-0193	Metro Blooms	Bridging Pollinator Conservation: Multilingual Access to the Lawns to Legumes Program	\$44,000.00
C26-0187	Lyndale Neighborhood Association	Reconnect Repair and Regrow Lyndale	\$33,550.00 (partial)
Total:			\$135,000.00

Table 2 – Bridging Conservation FY26 Summary of Awards

Application Summary

C26-0174 Midtown Greenway Coalition

Conservation Champions: Cultivating Community and Habitat

\$34,500.00

This project will engage non-native English-speaking residents along the Midtown Greenway in hands-on, culturally relevant conservation education rooted in urban habitat and pollinator stewardship. Participants will explore 15 new pollinator gardens along the Greenway, as well as other urban habitats, and engage in interactive conservation activities focused on soil health, pollinator habitat, and sustainable land practices. The Greenway, which runs through multiple neighborhoods with significant immigrant and BIPOC populations, will serve as an accessible outdoor classroom where participants can build practical skills while connecting conservation concepts to their daily lives and cultural knowledge. Programming will be designed with multiple levels of engagement. At least 350 participants from non-native English-speaking communities will take part in accessible, family-friendly activities, while a core group of peer educators will deepen their knowledge through repeat participation and leadership opportunities. Outreach will be led by trusted community outreach coordinators, including a Somali/East African coordinator and a Latino/Hispanic community coordinator, ensuring culturally specific engagement and sustained participation.

C26-0179 Monarch Joint Venture

Rooted in Community: Expanding Access to Pollinator Conservation

\$22,950.00

Monarch Joint Venture (MJV) will expand access to monarch and pollinator conservation by developing and delivering culturally relevant, Spanish-language educational resources in collaboration with community partners for non-native English-speaking urban and beginning farmers, community gardeners, and backyard growers in the Minneapolis–Saint Paul metro area. The project will build upon MJV's existing pollinator education materials, including established resources for backyard gardeners, as well as beginner-friendly materials currently being developed. Leveraging these resources, MJV will focus on adapting content for Spanish-speaking audiences through translation, format modification, and input from community partners to ensure materials are relevant and easy to use. Outputs will include translated handouts and habitat guides, pollinator habitat signage, and short-form instructional videos that demonstrate how to install and maintain pollinator habitat in urban gardens and small-scale agricultural settings. To support hands-on learning and reduce barriers to participation, MJV will deliver Spanish-language pollinator habitat workshops at the Minneapolis Monarch Festival in 2026 and 2027, offered through multiple sessions throughout the day. By combining accessible resources, practical instruction, and collaboration with community partners, this project will reduce barriers to participation and support increased adoption of pollinator-friendly practices in urban and community-managed spaces.

C26-0193 Metro Blooms

Bridging Pollinator Conservation: Multilingual Access to the Lawns to Legumes Program

\$44,000.00

Through this project, Metro Blooms will expand access to the Lawns to Legumes program via translation services in Spanish, Somali, and Hmong. Language barriers currently limit participation in Lawns to Legumes for many Minnesota residents whose preferred language is not English. This project will provide translation services at live program events, including webinars, workshops, and sessions with coaches. This project will pilot targeted outreach and engagement with Spanish-speaking communities in the Twin Cities metro area to better understand how language access and culturally relevant outreach can increase participation in conservation programs. By reducing language barriers, this project will help more Minnesotans participate in pollinator conservation and create habitat that supports pollinators, improves water quality, and strengthens community stewardship of local landscapes.

C26-0187 Lyndale Neighborhood Association

Reconnect, Repair, and Regrow Lyndale

\$33,550.00

Lyndale is a neighborhood of immigrants—Somali, Mexican, Ecuadorian, among others—and Lyndale Neighborhood Association's (LNA) goal is to properly reach, engage with, and uplift their immigrant neighbors and their work, passions, and needs. This project will offer a series of workshops in LNA's community gardens, which host a combined total of 74 plots in the two sites. These workshops will be open to the general public, and will be led in, or translated into, the relevant languages reflecting LNA's community: Spanish and Somali. In 2027, This project will also form an Environmental Leadership team comprised of local non-native English speakers and this group will plan workshop series for the coming year, building on the previous year's workshops, and filling in educational and cultural gaps.