

Final Report

Clean Water Partnership Final Progress Report Cottonwood Streambank Inventory & Prioritization Project

Doc Type: Reporting/Final Report

Executive summary

Grant project summary

Project title: Cottonwood Streambank	Inventory and Prioritization	on Project		
Organization (Grantee): Redwood-Co	ottonwood Rivers Contro	l Area		
Project start date: 10/1/2012	Project end date:	8/31/2016	_ Report submittal	date: 9/30/2016
Grantee contact name: Kerry Netzke		Title:	Executive Directo	r
Address:1424 East College Drive, Su	iite 300			
City: Marshall		State: _M	MN	Zip: <u>56258</u>
Phone number: 507-532-1325	Fax: 800-915-3440	Email: ker	rry.netzke@rcrca.cc	om
Basin (Red, Minnesota, St. Croix, etc.) /Watershed & 8 digit HUC::	Cottonwood (07020008)	Counties:	Lyon, Redwood, Brown, and Cottonwood
☐ Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)/Watershed Resto on, Research ion	ration or Protection	Strategy (WRAPS)	Development
Final grant amount:\$297,000.00	Final total proj	ect costs: <u>\$684,5</u>	544.21	
Matching funds: Final cash: \$387,544.	<u>21</u> Fir	nal in-kind:	Fina	al Loan:
MPCA project manager: _ Mark Hanson	l			
For TMDL/WRAPS developme	nt or TMDL/WRAP	S implementat	tion projects o	only
Impaired reach name(s):				
AUID or DNR Lake ID(s):				
Listed pollutant(s):				

303(d) List scheduled start 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.)

Scheduled completion date:

Problem (one paragraph)

Annual total suspended solids (TSS) loading from the Cottonwood River in 1997 was estimated at over 330,000 tons, or 252 tons per square mile. Total phosphorus (TP) was estimated at 505 tons. Throughout the study period, flow weighted mean concentrations of TSS and nutrients on the main stem and most

tributaries exceeded expected values for minimally impacted ecoregion streams. By 2008, annual FLUX calculations from the Cottonwood River sampling site at New Ulm showed a total phosphorus delivery of 143.38 tons annually to the Minnesota River. This is equal to .109 tons per square mile loss of phosphorus included with 83.52 tons per square mile loss of total suspended *solids (www.rcrca.com)*. This is directly related to the turbidity impairment and contributes to the Minnesota River phosphorus loading. (*See http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl.html*)

Waterbody improved (one paragraph)

The Cottonwood River Watershed encompasses 1,312.23 square miles and is one of thirteen major watersheds in the Minnesota River Basin. The River originates on the Coteau des Prairies, flowing eastward approximately 152 miles to the Minnesota River with a drop in elevation of about 750 feet. This topography results in periodic spring and summer flooding in the central portion of the watershed. At times, damages are severe. A related implication is rapid transport of sediment and attached nutrients from inadequately treated cropland during spring snowmelt and spring and summer rainfall events. Rapid transport of sediment and attached nutrients stems from cropland during spring snowmelt and spring and summer rainfall events. The purpose of this project is to facilitate watershed land-use changes within these watersheds that will lead to phosphorus reductions necessary to meet goals set forth in the Lower Minnesota River Dissolved Oxygen TMDL. Implementing groundwater infiltration and phosphorus reducing conservation practices through new funded best management practices will help achieve reductions outlined in the TMDL plan and the respective rivers' implementation plans. The impairment to the Minnesota River has not been delisted.

Project highlights (one paragraph)

As of August 31, 2016, cumulative project expenditures were \$684,544.21, consisting of \$297,000 of grant cash and \$387,544.21 of local match. The \$189,700 available for cost-share assistance resulted in the completion of: 5 grade stabilizations, 34 water and sediment control basins (WSCBs), 9,965 feet of grassed waterway, and 1,629.2 feet of streambank stabilization with estimated pollution reductions of: 1,050.63 lbs/yr of total phosphorus, 1,055.95 tons/yr of soil saved, and 1,063.38 tons/yr of sediment captured. The cost-share from this grant assisted in \$757,951.88 of BMPs installed in the watershed.

A prioritization ranking form was developed using the best available information for projects reducing the transport of sediment and nutrients. During this grant, the Terrain Analysis for the entire Cottonwood River watershed was completed by Houston Engineering Inc. As future projects are considered for implementation and cost-share, the Terrain Analysis data will be coupled with the ACPF tool to target these projects on a field-scale level.

Partnerships (Name all partners and indicate relationship to project)

Brown SWCD & NRCS -- Cottonwood SWCD & NRCS -- Lyon SWCD & NRCS -- Redwood SWCD & NRCS

These partners provided project assistance by referring cooperators to RCRCA as well as processing additional costshare funding at the federal, state and local levels.

Area II Minnesota River Basin Projects, Inc.

This partnering joint powers organization provided engineering of the grade stabilization and WSCBs projects that exceeded the ability of RCRCA staff.

Results (one paragraph)

In 2014, verified FLUX loading from Cottonwood River sampling site at New Ulm measured total phosphorus delivery of 155.5 tons annually to the Minnesota River. This delivery is equal to 0.119 tons/sq. mile loss of phosphorus. Although loadings can vary greatly from year to year based on precipitation, the decreasing trend is promising. FLUX loadings from 2013, the lowest of recent years, were 60.8 tons annually (.05 tons/sq. mile) to the Minnesota River. The impairment to the Lower Minnesota River has not been delisted, although progress is being made by all upstream partners. New Soil Loss Ordinances have been adopted in addition to the 2015 Buffer Law that will establish buffers along watercourses. Both of these endeavors will reduce the amount of sediment, and attached phosphorus, from reaching the State's watercourses.

Work Plan Review

From the original Work Plan, the following changes had been made over the course of the grant period:

- Contractor Contact was changed from Douglas Goodrich to Kerry Netzke upon Goodrich's resignation in December 2013,
- Contractor Address was changed resulting from a move of the RCRCA office from Redwood Falls to Marshall,
- Change Order #1 was executed February 10, 2014 to edit Work Plan language to include additonal BMPs that slow hydrologic processes to reduce TSS deliver to the river, and
- Change Order #2 was executed April 5, 2016 to move excess funds from Obj. 1 BMP Technical and Implmentation and Obj. 2 Data Management and Analysis to Obj. 1B. BMP Cost-Share.

Objective Summary:

Objective 1: BMP Technical Assistance and Implementation

Task A: Promote BMP cost share availability and identify BMP projects.

- Sub-task 1: GIS and FSA air photos were used to identify erosion prone areas.
- Sub-task 2: Priority area BMP ranking form was used, along with RUSLE 2 calculations and the MN Phosphorus Index to evaluate each site.
- Sub-task 3: Based on survey information, a cost estimate was developed based upon the best conservation practice for that site. Landowner/cooperator signature for the cost-share contract was obtained.
- Sub-task 4: Landowner/cooperator obtained bids and scheduled BMP installation
- Sub-task 5: Pre-construction meetings with RCRCA, SWCD/NRCS, landowner/cooperator and contractor were held. Gopher State One Call (GSOC) confirmation was required prior to authorizing construction.
- Sub-task 6: Construction progress was monitored, project verified as completed, and as-built drawings were obtained prior to Board approval for cost-share payment.
- Sub-task 7: Outcomes were entered into eLINK upon project completion.
- Sub-task 8: Projects were photo documented; some projects used for web page promotion.

All subtasks were successfully completed for each cost-share project installed. The majority of the completed projects included other cost-share funding from a FY2013 Clean Water Fund (CWF) appropriate awarded to RCRCA. This grant was used to pay 25% of the project in addition to 50% provided by the CWF grant, and 25% by the landowner/cooperator. Under this formula, this grant may claim 1/3 of the associated pollution reductions. No problems were encountered with this task.

Task B: BMP cost share prioritization and project implementation.

 Cost-share contracts for prioritized and ranked projects were facilitated to not exceed 75% 319 costshare/or combined (state and federal) funding. Completed BMPS include: water and sediment control basins, grassed waterway, grade stabilization structures, and streambank stabilization/protection.

Cost-share assistance resulted in the completion of: 34 water and sediment control basins (WSCBs), 9,965 feet of grassed waterway, 5 grade stabilizations, and 1,629.2 feet of streambank stabilization. The cost-share from this grant assisted in \$757,951.88 of BMPs installed in the watershed, or 25% of the total cost. No problems were encountered with this task.

Task C: Promote and Implement MPCA low interest loan program

- *Sub-task1: MPCA low interest loans through County Environmental and Auditor offices were promoted.*
- Sub-task 2: Promote and work with County ordinances to require inspection and septic up-grades when a construction permit is required or change in ownership of the property.

\$111,875.90 of local match from low-interest septic loans was applied to this grant. The number of new and upgraded septic systems installed is available from MPCA. RCRCA continues to semi-annually report on the progress of the low-interest septic loans for Cottonwood, Murray and Redwood Counties until the loans expire June 30, 2017. No problems were encountered with this task.

Objective 2) Priority Project Inventory Development and Analysis

Task A: Geospatial Analysis GIS/ Ground Truthing Analysis GPS/ Develop Site Ranking SOP

- Sub-task 1: GIS was used to analyze geo-referenced historical photos for streambank recession rates.
- Sub-task 2: Sites were ground-truthed using GPS, measurement, and other on/near river reconnaissance.
- Sub-task 3: A site ranking SOP was developed for the best use of cost-share funds using criterion of calculated TSS reduction potential, likelihood of further movement, and property protection.

All subtasks were successfully completed. The developed ranking form and guidelines for its use are attached to this report. This information will be coupled with recently completed Terrain Analysis data to further target and prioritize BMPs. No problems were encountered with this task.

Objective 3) Grant Administration and Facilitation

Task A: Project management; maintain grant and loan requirements, reporting and payments

- Sub-task 1: Management of the project ensured adherence to the Work Plan.
- Sub-task 2: All grant agreement requirements were met.
- Sub-task 3: Semi-annual reports, quarterly payment requests, and the final report were submitted in timely fashion and in accordance to the grant agreement.

All subtasks were successfully completed. A change to the Contractor contact and address was made in December 2013 upon the resignation of the initial contact person and move of the RCRCA office from Redwood Falls to Marshall. Two change orders were executed to edit the work plan and make best use of the available grant funds. No problems were encountered with this task and all grant funds were successfully expended.

Results

Measurements:

The Evaluation Plan outlined in the Work Plan includes:

1 – Continued water quality monitoring.

RCRCA continues to contract with MPCA to conduct Watershed Pollutant Load Monitoring Network (WPLMN) sampling for 3 sites within the Cottonwood River watershed. This contract covers 2017 through 2018 and is expected to be extended at least two years beyond 2018. Additionally, RCRCA will soon be contracting with MPCA for Storm Water Assessment Grant (SWAG) monitoring of 16 stream/river sites and 13 lakes within the Cottonwood River watershed beginning March 2017. This is the start of the Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) project for the Cottonwood River.

2 – BMP Tracking System and eLINK reporting of completed projects

Phosphorus reductions reaching the Minnesota River attributable to this project was estimated to be 3.052 tons/year (6,104.11 lbs/year) as identified in the work plan. This estimated reduction included the upgrade of noncompliant septic systems and reductions linked to the BMPs installed.

With other cost-share funding for these BMPs, careful attention was given to properly credit a proportionate amount of the pollutant reductions to the cost-share source. All projects have been entered in eLINK for their respective grant funding sources.

The following table illustrates the proposed versus actual BMP results:

BMP	Num	ıber	Cost	-Share	Sediment I	Reduction*	Phosphorus	Reduction**
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grade Stabilization	4	5	\$40,000	\$24,211.93	1,742.40 tons/yr	69.65 tons/yr	2,003.80 lbs/yr	63.55 lbs/yr
Grassed Waterway	3,000'	9,965'	\$18,000	\$11,658.87	2,788.29 tons/yr	40.53 tons/yr	3,167.96 lbs/yr	29.04 lbs/yr
WSCB	4	34	\$22,000	\$53,337.16	38.17 tons/yr	151.17 tons/yr	10.85 lbs/yr	156.01 lbs/yr
Streambank Stabilization	1,000'	1,629.2'	\$80,000	\$100,492.04	248.69 tons/yr	802.03 tons/yr	305.52 lbs/yr	802.03 lbs/yr
SUBTOTAL			\$160,000	\$187,900	4,817.55 tons/yr	1,063.38 tons/yr	5,488.13 lbs/yr	1,050.63 lbs/yr
Reductions attributed to CWF grant						1,778.44 tons/yr		1,750.28 lbs/yr
Reductions attributed to septic loans (bedrooms)	45	129					615.98 lbs/yr	1,765.69 lbs/yr
TOTAL			\$160,000	\$187,900	4,817.55 tons/yr	1,884.82 tons/yr	6,104.11 lbs/yr	4,566.60 lbs/yr

NOTE: Proposed columns stem from Tables 2 and 3 from the Work Plan (pgs. 9-10).

*Sediment reduction calculations were strictly reviewed by CWF staff. Formulas to be used for CWF projects resulted in less sediment reduction (and resulting phosphorus reduction) than initially estimated for this grant.

** Phosphorus reduction is directly linked to the sediment reduction. Some literature assumes 1.0 lb of Phosphorus per 1.0 lb of Sediment. Other literature uses 1.15 lbs of P per 1.0 lb of Sediment. Phosphorus calculations were computed by more than one professional and the computations did not use a consistent Phosphorus factor.

As you compare the proposed and actual columns above, several items become apparent:

1 – Landowner/cooperator participation was highest in the WSCB and Streambank Stabilization BMPs. Cost-share amounts were in higher demand for these types of BMPs.

2 - The proposed length of Grassed Waterways installed were nearly 3 times the proposed length, however there were only 3 projects. This type of BMP is generally less preferred over WSCB due to field chemical applications. Although these results show us that where the BMP is effective, the effective BMP length is much greater than those projects designed in previous years.

3 – The installation of WSCBs far exceeded initial estimates.

Products: (as attached to this report)

- 1 CRRP Cost Share Contract Ranking Form
- 2 Ranking Form Guidelines document
- 3 BMP Tracking Sheet

Photos:

Digital photos of the following grade stabilization, grassed waterway, WSCB and streambank stabilization projects completed by this grant are included with the submission of this report.



City of Springfield – Streambank Stabilization (2016)



Anderson – Grade Stabilization (2015)



Weedman -- Grassed Waterway (2015)



Ludeman --Water & Sediment Control Basin, WSCB (2015)

Public Outreach and Education:

Public outreach and education was not an identified task in the Work Plan.

Long-term results:

The estimated pollutant reductions attributed to the BMP projects completed by this grant have a minimum estimated life of 10 years, however the majority of the streambank stabilizations, WSCBs and grade stabilizations have longer life expectancies of at least 25 years. With proper operation and maintenance activities, the life expectancies may even be longer.

By incorporating BMPs that reduce or capture concentrated flow, additional damages downstream may be reduced or eliminated. Capturing the rain where it falls has been a key implementation strategy for projects located in the higher elevations of the Buffalo Ridge. Incorporating stormwater retention and projects that safely convey water to the receiving stream have proven to reduce the erosion and polluants carried with the stormwaters.

Using the information generated by the grant project, and coupling that knowledge with Terrain Analysis data, higher level targeting and prioritization of problem areas can be accomplished in the years to come. The measurability of this success may be accomplished through the continued monitoring of the water quality as it begins in 2017 with the Storm Water Assessment Grant (SWAG) and the Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) project for the Cottonwood River.

Section III – Final Expenditures

Project expenditures as of August 31, 2016, are attached as a separate spreadsheet.

CRRP Cost Share Contract Ranking Form

Name:_		Practice:			
Addres	5:	_ County:			
City:	State: Zip:	_ Township N	Name:		
Phone:	()	Twp:	Range:	Section:	
1.	Priority Management Area		• • • •	25 pt	
	(Cottonwood River Main Stem is the Priority	Management	Area)		
	Or General Cottonwood River Restoration Pro	oject Area		15 pt	
2.	Direct Surface Water Pollution Source			25 pt	
	Or Indirect Surface Water Pollution Source			15 pt	
3.	Off season construction (willing to destroy cr	ops to put in p	practice)	20 pt	
	Or construction will be finished by the 18 mo	onth start date		10 pt	
4.	BMP's primary function is to reduce sedimen	it and nutrient	transport	15 pt	
	Reduces sediment transport only			10 pt	
	Reduces nutrient transport only			5 pt	
5.	It is a TOP 10 cost shareable practice listed or	n page IV-16 o	f the 1993 Diagn	ostic study.5 pt	
	Copy of this list is included in information page	cket for landov	wner.		
6.	The project is addressing the most severe erc	osion problem	first	5 pt	
7.	Has other project sites and is willing to addre	ess them OR th	is is the only pro	blem5 pt	
	NOTES:			Total =	
				Maximum Point V High Priority Ran	alue = 100 .king = 80

Technician Completing Form: _____

Ranking Form Guidelines

Each cost share application must have a copy of the ranking form attached to it. The ranking will be done by one of the CRRP technicians. The ranked cost share applications will be prioritized from the highest to lowest with the highest score being submitted for approval first.

A High Priority designation will be issued to any contract that has a point score of 80 or above.

Clarifications on each ranking criteria:

- 25 points will be awarded to projects that are located in the priority management areas identified in the Cottonwood River Streambank Assessment Project Work Plan.
 15 points will be awarded to projects that lie outside the priority areas in the general Cottonwood River Restoration Project Area. This pertains to tributaries that make up the watershed contributing to the Cottonwood River.
- 2. 25 points will be awarded, based on evidence of a surface water pollution source. Observed surface tile intakes and run-off into a stream, ditch, lake or wetland would quality as direct sources, or 5 points will be awarded to the BMP for being an indirect source of surface water pollution. The watershed of the practice must drain to the surface water of concern. The technician designing the BMP will make this determination.
- 3. **20 points** will be awarded for off season construction to land owners willing to destroy their crop to put in the practice. These points are to reward persons that recognize that their problem needs immediate attention.

10 points will be awarded if the landowner agrees to complete the project within 18 months of approval of the cost share contract and does not want to destroy crops.

- 4. 15 points will be awarded if the BMP's primary function is to reduce soil and nutrient transport.
 10 points will be awarded if the BMP's primary function is to reduce soil transport only.
 5 points will be awarded if the BMP's primary function is to reduce nutrient transport. This is due to the fact that there is currently turbidity TMDL in development for the Cottonwood River Watershed, but no nutrient TMDLs are completed or in process.
- 5. **5 points** will be awarded to the BMP for being listed on the TOP 10 list of cost share practices listed on the back of this document.
- 5 points will be awarded if the person is addressing the worst erosion problem first.
 0 points will be awarded if there is another problem that should take precedence.
 This is intended to do two things:
 - 1 Help prioritize more than one cost share application from the same person

2 - If the technician observes an erosion problem that is of higher priority than the one applied for cost share on, then the lower point value will be awarded.

7. **5 points** will be awarded if the person has other potential project sites and is willing to address them or this is the only problem. This is to reward conservation minded persons for making changes that benefit the river.

Priority Best Management Practices

- 1. Wetland Restoration
- 2. Conservation Tillage
- 3. Nutrient Management
- 4. Riparian Buffer Strips
- 5. Streambank Protection (Rock Rip Rap or Bioengineered Protection)
- 6. Water/Sediment Control Basins
- 7. Small Multipurpose Dams/Impoundments
- 8. Terraces
- 9. Pasture Management/Livestock Exclusion
- 10. Open Tile Inlets replaced with Alternative Tile Inlets (ATI)

GRANT: 5	W55326 "Cottonwood 6"	\$189,700.00					BMF	TRACKING SI	fer											
SPOKEN .	FOR/NOT SPENT:	\$0.00			1															
SPENT: DC2	SPEND:	\$ 189,700.00 (j \$0.00	final pay +	partial pay)																
county	cont_num	coop I name		city	state z	ip	r s ws i	j	vit date	actual cost	cost share	25% match	part pay	part date	final pay	final date b	mp # instal 6	elink soil elir	nk sed eli	nk pho
Bedwood	CP319-01-06 (FY13CWA-32-01)	Pfarr	alen	Lamberton	NM	56152	T109 R36 S30	29063	3/7/2013	\$ 6,983.59	\$ 1,749.3	9 \$ 1,745.90			\$ 1,749.39	12/7/2013	638 0.333	8.79	8.79	8.79
e.	CP319-02-06 (FY13CWA-33-01)	Pfarr	Glen	Lamberton	NW	56152	T109 R36 S30	29063	3/7/2013	\$ 4,995.09	\$ 1,251.2.	7 \$ 1,248.77			\$ 1,251.27	12/7/2013	638 0.333	7.45	7.45	7.45
Bedwood	CP319-03-06 (FY13CWA-34-01)	Pfarr	Glen	Lamberton	NW	56152	T109 R36 S30	29063	3/7/2013	\$ 10,403.48	\$ 2,606.0	7 \$ 2,600.87			\$ 2,606.07	12/7/2013	638 0.667	8.50	8.50	8.50
n.	CP319-04-06 (FY13CWA-35-01)	Burdorf/Johnson		New Ulm	NM	56073	T110 R30 S33	29001	6/6/2013	\$ 29,800.00	\$ 7,450.0) \$ 7,450.00			\$ 7,450.00	9/5/2013	580 0.333	27.17	27.17	27.17
Brown	CP319-05-06 (FY13CWA-36-01)	Treml	.eon		MN		T109 R33 S32		5/2/2013				CANCELLED	3/8/2014			638			
Brown	CP319-06-06 (FY13CWA-37-01)	Kral	Alan	New Ulm	NM	56073	T109 R30 S05	29001	5/2/2013	\$ 12,500.00	\$ 2,625.0	0 \$ 3,125.00			\$ 2,625.00	1/15/2015	410 1	4.24	4.24	4.24
• Brown	CP319-06-06 (FY13CWA-37-01)	Kral A	Alan	New Ulm	NM	56073	T109 R30 S05	29001	11/7/2013	\$ 2,318.75	\$ 332.6	3 \$ 579.69			\$ 332.68	1/15/2015	410 A			
Brown	CP319-07-06 (FY13CWA-38-01)	Stark TWP Stark TWP	Sellner	Sleepy Eye	NM	56085	T109 R32 S16	29006	6/6/2013	\$ 9,800.00	\$ 2,450.0	0 \$ 2,450.00			\$ 2,450.00	10/3/2013	580 0.333	14.15	14.15	14.15
Redwood	CP319-08-06 (FY13CWA-39-01)	Veenstra	Gary	Springfield	MN	56087	T109 R37 S24	29062	8/1/2013		- \$	- \$					638 1			
Brown	CP319-09-06 (FY13CWA-40-01)	Brown County		New Ulm	NM	56073	T109 R32 S16	29006	9/5/2013	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 3,250.0	0 \$ 3,250.00			\$ 3,250.00	10/3/2013	580 0.333	84.91	84.91	84.91
Brown	CP319-10-06 (FY13CWA-41-01)	Leavenworth Township		Sleepy Eye	MM	56085	T109 R33 S12	29010	9/5/2013	\$ 10,373.41	\$ 2,593.3;	5 \$ 2,593.35			\$ 2,593.35	12/7/2013	580 0.333	15.70	15.70	15.70
Brown 29	CP319-11-06 (FY13CWA-42-01)	Youngerberg	Jennis	Springfield	MN	56087	T108 R35 S29	29017	9/5/2013	\$ 9,355.00	\$ 2,338.7;	5 \$ 2,338.75			\$ 2,338.75	12/7/2013	580 0.333	13.60	13.60	13.60
ryon	CP319-12-06 (FY13CWA-14-01)	NW Farm MGMNT		Marshall	MN	56258	T110 R41 S07	29101	9/5/2013	\$ 26,585.00	\$ 11,938.7;	5 \$ 6,646.25			\$ 11,938.75	1/2/2014	638 0.333	24.00	24.00	24.00
^{гоон}	CP319-13-06 (FY13CWA-16-01)	Cauwels B	3ob	Tyler	MN	56178	T110 R41 S26	29105	11/7/2013	\$ 38,169.11	\$ 7,713.7.	7 \$ 9,542.28			\$ 7,713.77	10/2/2014	412 0.333	22.73	22.73	22.73
Lyon	CP319-14-06	Cauwels	3ob	Tyler	NM	56178	T110 R41 S26	29105	11/7/2013		•	- \$	COMBINED W	TH CP13-0	6					
Lyon	CP319-15-06 (FY13CWA-43-01)	Tholen	Randy	Balaton	MM	56115	T110 R42 S24	29096	10/3/2013		•		CANCELLED	5/2/2014			638			
Lyon	CP319-16-06 (FY13CWA-44-01)	Meulebroeck	Mark	Balaton	NM	56115	T110 R41 S20	29102	10/3/2013	\$ 10,167.00	\$ 2,541.7;	5 \$ 2,541.75			\$ 2,541.75	12/7/2013	638 0.333	6.07	6.07	6.07
Redwood	CP319 17-06 (FY13CWA-18-01)	Pfarr G	Glen	Lamberton	NM	56152	T109 R37 S14	29062	4/3/2014	\$ 13,859.24	\$ 316.4	2 \$ 3,464.81			\$ 316.42	5/7/2015	638 0.333	17.71	8.85	8.85
Redwood	CP319 18-06 (FY13CWA-45-01)	Bloemke	noC	Sleepy Eye	MN	56085	T109 R33 S20	29022	4/3/2014	\$ 19,431.56	\$ 4,857.8	9 \$ 4,857.89			\$ 4,857.89	1/15/2015	580 0.333	212.50	212.50	212.50
Redwood	CP319 19-06 (FY13CWA-09-01)	Pfarr V	/emon	Lamberton	NM	56152	T109 R36 S19	29063	5/1/2014	\$ 16,880.00	\$ 4,220.0	0 \$ 4,220.00			\$ 4,220.00	11/15/2014	580 0.333	30.10	30.10	30.10
-0	CP319 20-06 (FY13CWA-46-01)	Dallenbach	lin	Walnut Grove	MN	56180	T110 R38 S19	29049	5/1/2014	\$ 59,871.30	\$ 7,091.1	0 \$ 14,967.83			\$ 7,091.10	6/4/2015	410 0.333	2.09	2.69	2.09
Bedwood 65	CP319 21-06 (FY13CWA-47-01)	Nettiewyynntt Farms		Tracy	NM	56175	T110 R39 S17	29035	7/3/2014	\$ 39,638.20	\$ 5,708.7.	2 \$ 9,909.55			\$ 5,708.72	8/13/2014	410 0.333	17.67	17.67	17.67
Pedwood	CP319 22-06 (FY13CWA-20-01)	Nettiewyynntt Farms		Tracy	NM	56175	T110 R39 S17	29035	6/5/2014	\$ 52,950.55	\$ 1,627.0	0 \$ 13,237.64			\$ 1,627.00	11/14/2015	638 0.333	9.74	9.74	11.21
Bedwood 38	CP319 23-06 (FY13CWA-21-01)	Nettiewyynntt Farms		Tracy	NM	56175	T110 R39 S17	29035	6/5/2014	\$ 38,689.50	\$ 2,426.9.	5 \$ 9,672.38			\$ 2,426.95	10/1/2015	638 0.333	10.92	10.92	12.56
Brown	CP319-24-06 (FY13CWA-48-01)	Sellner	Jean	Sleepy Eye	NM	56185	T109 R32 S17	29006	9/8/2014	\$ 49,498.00	\$ 1,216.3.	5 \$ 12,374.50			\$ 1,216.35	1/15/2015	638 0.333	4.55	16.27	4.55
Brown	CP319-25-06 (FY13CWA-22-01)	Milford Township		New Ulm	NM	56073	T110 R31 S34	29002	7/3/2014	\$ 11,000.00	\$ 2,750.0	0 \$ 2,750.00			\$ 2,750.00	11/15/2014	410 0.333	12.75	12.75	12.75
Redwood	CP319-26-06 (FY13CWA 08-01)	Jeckell	Elmer	Lamberton	NM	56152	T109 R37 S25	29063	12/4/2014	\$ 28,500.00	\$ 7,125.0.	0 \$ 7,125.00			\$ 7,125.00	3/6/2015	580 0.333	203.44	203.44	203.44
 Lyon 	CP319-27-06 (FY3CWA 24-01)	NW Farm MGMNT		Marshall	¥	56258	T110 R41 S07	29101	10/2/2014	\$ 3,650.00	\$ 912.5.	0 \$ 912.50			\$ 912.50	5/7/2015	638 0.333	5.67	5.67	5.67
Brown	CP319-28-06 (FY13CWA-49-01)	Roiger	-enis	Sanborn	W	56083	T109 R32 S17	29017	10/2/2014	\$ 12,390.71	\$ 3,097.6	7 \$ 3,097.68			\$ 3,097.67	12/5/2014	580 0.333	28.90	28.90	28.90
Brown	CP319-29-06 (FY13CWA-26-01)	Zeig	-arry	New Ulm	Z	56073	T109 R31 S11	29003	10/2/2014	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 1,800.0	0 \$ 1,800.00			\$ 1,800.00	6/4/2015	580 0.333	14.17	14.17	14.17
Brown	CP319-30-06 (FY13CWA-51-01)	Veenstra	Gary	Springfield	MM	56087	T108 R35 S14	29017	1/15/2015	\$ 36,842.80	\$ 21,362.9	5 \$ 7,184.35			\$ 21,362.95	8/4/2016	580 0.78	24.68	24.68	24.68
Hedwood	CP319-31-06 (FY13CWA-25-01)	Delleaborh	-ty an	Lamberton		20192	1109 H3/ S15	29062	GTU2///G	\$ 70,964,40	\$ 4,3/5.U	0 \$ 4,3/5.00			\$ 4,3/5.00 \$ 1 152 18	3102/41/11	580 0.333	14.16	14.16	14.16
51				Ctordon		00100	100 200 213	20000	01/2/10	¢ 67.747.05	9 E 704 A	0 0 0,210.10			¢ E 704.42	3/3/2013	410 0.000	26.00	00.02	00.02
-2	CF319 33-08 (FT 13CWA 20-01)	Moodmon K	'out	Tmov		5617E	T110 D41 C2E	20105	0/1/2/10	¢ 11 FEF 11	¢ 0,/04.4	0 0 10,300.70			¢ 0,/04.40	0/0/2013	410 0.000	20.00	1 50	1 70
Brown	CI 313 37 33 (1 1 1 3 3 4 4 1)	Kramoraiot	Inthot	Cloopy Evo	MAN	ECODE -	T100 D20 C04	20102	0/0/2010	++-000°1 = 0	4 C) 1 CO 1	e 5,001		14/20146	÷ , , , , ,	0107/1/01	412 0C.0	00.c	CC-T	7.70
	CF319 33-00 (F113CWA 33-01)		Volucit			00000	1103 1134 304	00000	0/0/2013	¢ 16 500 00	¢ 2 500 01			01 07 14/	¢ 2 500 00	7 (7)0016	030	11	11	
333	CF319 30-00 (F1 13CWA 34-01) CP319 37-06 (FV13CWA 65-01)	City of Sovinofiald	ayiinuu	Springled	NM	- 78087	T100 B34 S10	00000	0/0/2010 0/10/015	¢ 72.180.00	4 0,000.0	0 0 1,010,00 0 £ 708 00			¢ 3,033.33	0/1/2010	1000 000 1	11.30	10.10	E0 10
32						10000		2020	2102/01/0	+ FU, 100.00	0.000,1 +	00.00.10 • •			00.000,11 0	0107/1/0	T I I I	0T-2C	OT CC	0T-CC
	CP319 38-06 (FY13CWA 56-01)	Ludeman E	2en	Iracy	Z	201/2	1109 H40 S08	29038	GTU2/01/8	\$ /,404.00	0.1051.0	1,851.00			\$ 1,801.00	6102/41/11	638 0.333	2.00	2.00	2.00
r 8	CP319 38-0/	Volimer	Javid	Lamberton	Z	26196	1109 H3/ SZ/	29062	3/3/2016	\$ 18,305.00	\$ 13,729.1	3 \$ 4,5/6.3/			\$ 13,729.13	8/4/2016	580 1	19.13	19.13	19.13
Bedwood 30	CP319 39-06	Imker J.	lay	Lamberton	NM	56152	T109 R37 S26	29063	6/9/2016	\$ 23,927.00	\$ 17,945.2.	5 \$ 5,981.75			\$ 17,945.25	9/1/2016	580 1	26.00	26.00	26.00
Cottonwoc	od CP319 40-06	Simonsen	lay	Sanborn	NM	56083	T108 R36 S08	29067	6/9/2016	\$ 10,500.00	\$ 7,875.0	0 \$ 2,625.00			\$ 7,875.00	9/1/2016	580 1	39.00	39.00	39.00
65 ⁻										\$ 792,378.88	\$ 189,700.0	0 \$ 193,756.73	\$ \$		\$189,700.00			1,055.95	L,063.38 1,	050.63
же Кех 7-2		Contract cancelled																		
38		Contract not begun						_												
64								_												

• Available in alternative formats Page 11 of 12

wq-cwp2-02 • 9/16/15

$ \frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$			ORK P	LAN BUDC	BET/EXPE	NDITURE	S AS OF:	August 31	, 2016						
Algebra (1)	Objectives	unit cost	Ĭ	Quantity Exp/budget	Local Match Budgeted	Grant Cash Budgeted	Total Budgeted	Cumulative Local Match Expended	Cumulative Grant Cash Expended	Cumulative Total Expended	Local Match Budget Balance	Grant Cash Budge t Balance	Total Budget Balance	Amount Requested this Voucher	Amount Previously Requested
And the state and answer were state and and answer were state and and answer were state and answer were state and answer were state and and answer were state and answer were state and answer were state and and answer were state and						Γ									
	Objective 1) BMP Technical Assistance and Implementation						\$0.00			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
And Mercanic International and Mercanic Internatio International and Mercanic International and Mercanic I	Task A: Technical and implementation activities relating to BMPfunding (Obj. 1; Task B)	\$31.00	754	\$23,368.00		\$23,368.00	\$23,368.00		\$23,368.00	\$23,368.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,883.96	\$20,484.0
Induction Induction <t< td=""><td>Task B: BMP cost sharing, prioritization and ranking. Task C: Promote and Implement MPCA low interest loan prooram</td><td>\$8.200.00 per</td><td>15.00</td><td>\$229,700.00 \$123.000.00</td><td>\$40,000.00 \$123.000.00</td><td>\$189,700.00</td><td>\$229,700.00 \$123.000.00</td><td>\$193,756.73</td><td>\$189,700.00</td><td>\$383,456.73 \$111.875.90</td><td>-\$153,756.73 \$11.124.10</td><td>\$0.00</td><td>-\$153,756.73 \$11,124,10</td><td>\$81,897.26 \$0.00</td><td>\$107,802.7</td></t<>	Task B: BMP cost sharing, prioritization and ranking. Task C: Promote and Implement MPCA low interest loan prooram	\$8.200.00 per	15.00	\$229,700.00 \$123.000.00	\$40,000.00 \$123.000.00	\$189,700.00	\$229,700.00 \$123.000.00	\$193,756.73	\$189,700.00	\$383,456.73 \$111.875.90	-\$153,756.73 \$11.124.10	\$0.00	-\$153,756.73 \$11,124,10	\$81,897.26 \$0.00	\$107,802.7
Matrix														0000	
Bit of the preparementation Implementation	Total Objective 1			\$376,068.00	\$163,000.00	\$213,068.00	\$376,068.00	\$305,632.63	\$213,068.00	\$518,700.63	-\$142,632.63	\$0.00	-\$142,632.63	\$84,781.22	\$128,286.7
Schurch Frangerating Schur Frangeratin Schurch Frangerating Sc	Objective 2)Priority Project Inventory Development and Analysis						\$0.00		\$0.00	80.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.0
Secart fung (and and starting (and and and and and and and and and and															
Tatical fields Tatical	GIS/Ground Truthing Analysis Relating to Project Suitability	\$25.00	1371	\$34,272.00		\$34,272.00	\$34,272.00		\$34,272.00	\$34,272.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,190.75	\$15,081.2
Bench J Characterian Col	Total Objective 2			\$34,272.00	\$0.00	\$34,272.00	\$34,272.00	\$0.00	\$34,272.00	\$34,272.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,190.75	\$15,081.2
	Objective 3) –Grant Administration and Facilitation						\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.0
		\$20,000/yr	4 yr.	\$80,000.00	\$80,000.00	\$70.580.00	\$80,000.00 \$70,520,00	8C.119,18\$	10 085 0C\$	\$81,911.58	86.119,18- 00.02	\$0.00 00.02	8C.119,18-	\$0:00 \$5 \$61 31	4 910 10 8
Income Incom Incom Incom <td>CORCA Support Staff</td> <td>\$20.00/hr</td> <td>703 hrs</td> <td>\$14,060.00</td> <td></td> <td>\$14,060.00</td> <td>\$14,060.00</td> <td></td> <td>\$14,060.00</td> <td>\$14,060.00</td> <td>\$0.00</td> <td>\$0.00</td> <td>\$0.00 \$0.00</td> <td>\$2,772.90</td> <td>\$11,287.1</td>	CORCA Support Staff	\$20.00/hr	703 hrs	\$14,060.00		\$14,060.00	\$14,060.00		\$14,060.00	\$14,060.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00 \$0.00	\$2,772.90	\$11,287.1
Ruge Statute S	Office Supplies	\$ 750.00/yr	4 yr.	\$3,000.00		\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00		\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$489.67	\$2,510.3
TEMIZED PROGRAM ELEMENT BUDGET read objected 3130,000 314,0124	illeage/reent/expenses/professional servces	\$ 755.00/yr	4 yr.	\$3,020.00		\$3,020.00	\$3,020.00		\$3,020.00	\$3,020.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,020.0
TENIZED PROGRAM ELEMENT BUDGET Image <	Total Objective 3			\$129,660.00	\$80,000.00	\$49,660.00	\$129,660.00	\$81,911.58	\$49,660.00	\$131,571.58	-\$1,911.58	\$0.00	-\$1,911.58	\$8,823.88	\$40,836.1
Train from State f	TEMIZED PROGRAM ELEMENT BUDGET		ĺ												
Poject Grand Total Total Breneric 53.27.00 80.00 81.91.1.55 84.77.10 84.17.1.15 84.000 81.00.1 80.000 81.00.1.5 80.000 81.00.1.5 80.000 81.00.1.5 80.000 81.00.1.5 80.000 81.00.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.2.1 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.2.1 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.2.1 81.01.1.5 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 81.01.2.1 80.000 80.000 80.000 80.000 80.000 80.000 80.000		Total Hement		376.068.00	8163.000.00 S	213.068.00	\$376.068.00	\$305.632.63	\$213.068.00	\$518.700.63	\$142.632.63	\$0.00	-\$142.632.63	\$84.781.22	\$128.286.7
Total Benerici S12 Androide S12 Androide S13 Android		Total Bement	8	34,272.00	00.00	34,272.00	\$34,272.00	\$0.00	\$34,272.00	\$34,272.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,190.75	\$15,081.25
Project Grand Total mode 329,000.00 329,000.00 329,000.00 310,000.00 310,000.00 310,000.00 310,000.00		Total Hement	3	129,660.00	80,000.00 \$	49,660.00	\$129,660.00	\$81,911.58	\$49,660.00	\$131,571.58	\$1,911.58	\$0.00	-\$1,911.58	\$8,823.88	\$40,836.12
Project Grand Total Sastana Sastana <td></td> <td></td> <td>Ì</td> <td></td>			Ì												
	Project Grand Total				\$243,000.00	\$297,000.00	\$540,000.00	\$387,544.21	\$297,000.00	\$684,544.21	-\$144,544.21	\$0.00	-\$144,544.21	\$112,795.85	\$184,204.1