MINNESOTA (REGION 5)

A Snapshot of Minnesota's TMDL Program (August 2008)

7771	-	•
The	KA.	CICC
1110	Du	$\omega \omega \omega$

Key Agency/Department & website

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/index.html

TMDL Program Structure/Placement

Housed in Regional Division, Watershed Section

By the Numbers

Number of Impaired Waters 1,732 Number of Causes of Impairment 2,575

Top Five Causes of Impairment

Mercury
 Turbidity
 Nutrients

4. Cause Unknown-Impaired Biota

5. Pathogens

Approximate Number of TMDLs Developed Annually 100 (+ approx. 500

mercury in '07 &

'08)

Total Number of TMDLs Approved (1995 to present, incl. any est'd by EPA) 1097 (99

conventional; 998

mercury)

Total Number of TMDLs Approved in 2005/2006/2007

7/24/556
2008 303d/Integrated Report Submission Status (Date)

EPA has taken

final action

Approximate Number of FTEs Working on TMDL Issues 66 (incl. 36 tech &

admin for dev't & impl'n; 30 for monitoring & assess't)

TMDLs

EPA Under Consent Decree to Develop TMDLs?

Broad-Scale? (e.g., watershed, multi-jurisdictional, etc.)

Y

Non-TMDL Options

Use of Non-TMDL Options to Address Impaired Waters?

Example(s) 9 listings included in Region 5's Environmental Accountability

Project (CALM Category 4b)

Funding

Approximate Annual Budget for TMDL Program \$37 million (incl.

\$7 million for assess't & monitoring, \$10 Primary Source(s) of TMDL Program Funding

million for dev't, & \$20 million [through 5 agencies] for PS and NPS impl'n) state funds (monitor/assess't, dev't, impl'n); federal 319 funds (impl'n)

TMDL Implementation

TMDL Implementation Required?

Y

Innovations

Example(s) of Any Innovative Approach(es) Employed

- --statewide mercury TMDL; major watershed TMDL (8-digit HUC) covering all pollutant parameters; master contract of prequalified consultants; frequent use of load duration curve approach
- --new stormwater policies and guidance
- --TMDL staff liaisons from stormwater and wastewater programs to improve program integration
- --basin-wide wastewater permit and trading system
- --currently developing measurement framework and information management system
- --the majority of our TMDLs are developed by third parties that receive state funding and are contracted by the state, which creates strong local involvement component to build buy-in for ultimate implementation; the MPCA provides technical assistance and oversight throughout the TMDL development process; our program is heavily influenced by the state's Clean Water Legacy Act of 2006, which set new goals, priorities, and funding for monitoring, TMDL development, restoration, and protection activities

TMDLs that Represent a Particular Achievement

--Statewide Mercury TMDL (approx. 1,000 impairments to date)

http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/tmdl-mercuryplan.html

--Major watershed TMDL (8-digit HUC) for the Des Moines watershed covering all pollutant parameters http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/project-westforkdesmoines.html

- --Shingle Creek Chloride TMDL (strong example of MS4 cooperation for TMDL development and implementation) http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/project-shinglecreek-chloride.html
- --Lake Pepin Nutrient and Turbidity watershed TMDL (covers half the state, western Wisconsin; pilot for stakeholder involvement)

http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/tmdl-lakepepin.html

--Minnesota River Dissolved Oxygen TMDL (catalyst to a basin permit and trading effort for 40 existing facilities and future new/expanding facilities) http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/basins/mnriver/mnriver-phosphoruspermit.html

Barriers

Top Three Barriers to TMDL Development

- 1. resources, despite infusion of funding from a new state law, the Clean Water Legacy Act
- 2. inadequate standards and rules to address NPS problems
- 3. although a plan is being developed, we need a systematic watershed approach: integrating monitoring, TMDL development, implementation, and protection programs
- 4. challenges from ag interests and stormwater permittees

Top Three Barriers to TMDL Implementation

- 1. ag: lack of authority over BMP adoption, lack of interest in voluntary measures, fear of regulation
- 2. inadequate resources for BMPs
- 3. inadequate measurement system to gauge success