



# Final Report Format

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

*Doc Type: Reporting/Final Report*

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

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

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

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

## Executive summary

---

### Problem

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

### Waterbody improved

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

### Project highlights

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

### Results

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

## Body of main report

---

### Section I – Work plan review

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

### Section II – Grant results

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

- **Measurements:** Please describe your evaluation plan and its results.
  - What tools did you use, what methods did you use to gather information?
  - If you did a survey, what was the sample size and what was the response rate, how did you analyze the results, evaluate the monitoring data, etc.?
  - If you have measurable environmental results, such as pounds of chemicals reduced, best management practices installed, pollutants prevented, waste eliminated, changes in water quality, resources conserved, etc., also include those here or under the appropriate project objective.
- **Products:** Please list, and attach copies of any documents or products that have been produced during the reporting period, including monitoring data (if applicable, including the electronic summary of all data for the EQulS data base), brochures, articles, special reports, tapes, CDs, etc. Provide relevant project photographs.

**Note about photos:** Photos may be scenes of the water resource in question and/or may illustrate installations, BMPs, or other measures that help show what the project accomplished. **Attached electronic files (e.g., JPGs) are preferred.**

**Note for TMDL/WRAPS development projects and TMDL/WRAPS implementation projects:** All project monitoring data must be approved in the EQulS data system and all best management practices implementation activities must be inputted into the state eLINK system before the final report will be approved and final project payment will be made.

- **Public outreach and education:** If part of your work plan, please evaluate the effectiveness of public participation and education plans for the project. Also include the total numbers from project outreach and education activities, such as number of people reached, educational materials distributed, workshop participants, etc.
- **Long-term results:**
  - Do the results of this project build capacity that can increase the likelihood of long-term outcomes, such as:
    - environmental problems identified or understood
    - land use changes in the watershed
    - recommendations created
    - consensus for action created
    - increased ability to solve similar problems in the future, etc.?
    - if so, how?
  - Did you form new partnerships or alliances as a result of the project? If so,
    - What longer-term impact will this have on the project?
    - What future efforts are anticipated as a result of the partnership(s)?
    - Describe any activities you are aware of by others that benefited from the results of your project and/or resulted in implementation of similar projects in other locations.
  - Is there a plan to continue the project beyond the end date of the grant agreement or contract? If so, explain.
  - Describe how you shared the results of your project. List any information or technology transfer and dissemination (newsletters, web sites, training, reports, disseminated project activities, accomplishments, and lessons to the general public). Where and to what audiences have you made presentations?
  - What other audiences (media, businesses, other agencies, etc.) would be most interested in the results of this project?
  - Please describe any lessons learned during this project that would be valuable for future projects, even if the project didn't succeed as expected. What other recommendations or advice would you make for future activities related to this priority project area?
  - Please provide any feedback or suggestions that you would like to share with the MPCA to improve their grant programs.

### Section III – Final Expenditures

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

Please complete this grant project summary and copy/paste into your final report.

## Grant project summary

---

Project title: GBERBA Conservation Drainage Partnership Program

Organization (Grantee): Greater Blue Earth River Basin Alliance

Project start date: June 8, 2015 Project end date: June 30, 2018 Report submittal date: July 2018

Grantee contact name: Kay Gross Title: GBERBA Administrative Coordinator

Address: 339 9<sup>th</sup> Street

City: Windom State: MN Zip: 56101

Phone number: 507-831-1153 x3 Fax: 507 831 2928 Email: kay.clark@windomnet.com

Basin (Red, Minnesota, St. Croix, etc.) Le Sueur 07020011 Blue Earth 07020009 County: Blue Earth, Brown, Cottonwood, Faribault, Freeborn, Jackson, Le Sueur, Martin, Watonwan, and Waseca Counties  
Watershed & 8 digit HUC:: Watonwan 07020010

### Project type (check one):

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

## Grant funding

---

Final grant amount: \$147,200.00 Final total project costs: \$304,672.58

Matching funds: Final cash: \$126,536.96 Final in-kind: \$30,935.62 Final Loan: \$0.00

MPCA project manager: Paul Davis

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

---

Impaired reach name(s): \_\_\_\_\_

AUID or DNR Lake ID(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Listed pollutant(s): \_\_\_\_\_

303(d) List scheduled start date: \_\_\_\_\_ Scheduled completion date: \_\_\_\_\_

*AUID = Assessment Unit ID*

*DNR = Minnesota Department of Natural Resources*

## Executive summary of project (300 words or less)

---

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

### Problem

As of 2010, thirty-nine stream reaches in the Greater Blue Earth River Basin (GBERB) were listed as impaired for turbidity. Located in Southern Minnesota, the GBERB consists of the Blue Earth, Le Sueur, and Watonwan major watersheds. Agricultural row crops dominate the landscape with 85% of the land use in the basin. Not only are the DNR protected waters conveying water but so are an additional 719 miles of public open ditches that extend into headwater areas. Achieving water quality goals in the 39 impaired stream reaches of the GBERB requires protection of ditches in headwater areas. GBERBA staff and partners saw the need for a more focused, coordinated effort to address this problem.

### Waterbody improved

Four Conservation Drainage projects received cost share from this grant. The 4 projects had a total of 119 new side inlet structures on public drainage systems in headwater areas of the Blue Earth and Le Sueur Major Watersheds.

## **Project highlights**

The highlights are the projects and practices listed above, along with the strengthened partnerships between staff and elected officials in the watershed. Local Drainage Staff implementing the alternative side inlets have numerous reports of positive landowner interactions regarding the placement and design of the BMP. The practice allows for better field operations for the landowner and a water quality benefit for the public.

## **Results**

The 119 new practices listed above will prevent a total of 452.1 Tons of sediment and 519.9 pounds of Phosphorus per year from reaching the surface water body. An engineering worksheet to facilitate quick estimates for Side Inlet projects and a "Conservation and Drainage Projects" booklet were developed during the grant period to continue to assist the effort for years to come.

---

## **Partnerships** (Name all partners and indicate relationship to project)

This project helped strengthen the partnership between the County and SWCD staffs within the Greater Blue Earth River Basin Alliance. GBERBA members include County and SWCD staffs from Blue Earth, Brown, Cottonwood, Faribault, Freeborn, Jackson, Le Sueur, Martin, Waseca, and Watonwan Counties. We also had an opportunity to develop a partnership with the Water Resources Center at Minnesota State University – Mankato and a local engineering firm in ISG based out of Mankato, MN.

---

## **Pictures**

A powerpoint presentation of the photos of installation and finished product has been included.