

## **Section 1: Water Governance—Subcommittee on Water Policy**

*Draft for discussion. The following test has not been approved by the members of the subcommittee.*

**G1 Governance and Funding: SWCDs and Watershed Districts Rank=1**

**G2: Governance: Re-activation of Water Supply and Wastewater Advisory Council Rank=3**

**G3 Governance: Re-activation of the Legislative Water Commission, Rank=2**

**G4. Governance: Creating a Department of Water Resources Rank=4**

**G5 Governance: Streamlining Water Governance and Management Rank=5**

### **G1 Governance and Funding: Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) and Watershed Districts**

**Issue:** SWCD's are special-purpose units of government, established under state law, to carry out conservation programs at the local level. SWCDs work with landowners to provide technical expertise and financial assistance to maintain and improve the quality, quantity, distribution and sustainability of natural resources, including surface water, groundwater, soil, and ecological resources. Each SWCD has a five-member, locally elected, Board of Supervisors to set policy, provide local input, and ensure oversight and accountability for the district. Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) need stable sources of funding that does not depend on the Clean Water Fund. Funding has been a problem during each budget cycle—this is a policy recommendation from the Clean Water Council.

**Funding:** SWCDs receive local (county), general fund (state), as well as capacity funding. In FY16-17 and FY18-19, SWDCs received an additional \$11 million per year from a Clean Water Fund for capacity funding. During the 2019 legislative session, SWCDs were appropriated \$12 million per year from the Clean Water Fund for FY20-21 for capacity funding. Clean Water Funding has enabled SWCDs to hire resource professionals who work with landowners to design and install conservation practices in prioritized and targeted areas to achieve measurable water quality results. However, funds from the Clean Water Fund alter the planning efforts of the Clean Water Council and some suggest that this is not a sustainable use of the Clean Water Fund. Even with Clean water dollars, funding falls short of meeting current needs by about \$16 million dollars per year. Similar to other locally elected units of government who get state aid, SWCDs need an adequate, committed, and ongoing investment from the state. Without it, SWCDs may not be able to fully deliver on statutory obligations. In 2017, \$11 million was half of an estimated \$22 million annual shortfall. Revised estimates in 2018, showed SWCD funding shortfalls totaling \$28 million per year. The FY20-21 appropriation of \$12 million per year in Clean Water Funds brought the shortfall to just under \$16 million per year. This did not include project funding needs.

Watershed Districts are special-purpose LGUs authorized to manage water resources within boundaries that follow those of watersheds. The Minnesota legislature authorized the creation of watershed districts through the Watershed Act in 1955. There are

currently 46 watershed districts within the state, located mainly along the state's western boundary, the west central and south-east regions, and the metropolitan area, where 14 of the districts are located. Outside the metro area, most districts are organized within one or more of the 81 major watersheds, while within the metro area the scale is typically the sub watershed. Watershed districts have broad authorities, including the authority to adopt rules, regulate development, assess properties for benefits received, levy taxes to finance district administration, and acquire, construct and operate drainage systems and other water control structures. (See [http://www.bwsr.state.mn.us/planning/WD-WMO\\_overview.html](http://www.bwsr.state.mn.us/planning/WD-WMO_overview.html))

A bill (H. F. 1586) was introduced during the 2021 session by Representative Torkelson. The bill involved appropriating money for a feasibility study for merging soil and water conservation districts and watershed districts. The bill was referred to the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources Finance and Policy. Representative Hansen also introduced a bill that would have provided funds for SWCDs by increase in real estate recording fees. These bills did not move forward.

**Path Forward:** SWCDs general have strong support from the Legislature. However, increases to local taxes have not been supported. One suggested proposal could involve a phased-reduction in funding provided by the Clean Water Fund. This reduction could be balanced by a increased support from other sources This formula could, over time, reduce the burden on the Clean Water Fund while gradually increasing overall total funding to SWCD's. Funding increases could be comprised of three components. One-third could be provided equally to each of the SWCDs. The final third could be allocated, based on measures of performance, as well as merit-based proposals for environmental outcomes. Other suggestions include giving SWCDs taxing authority, and fixing funding for SWCS from the Clean Water Fund. The subcommittee should hold hearings to receive testimony regarding how best to provide permanent financial support for SWCDs as well as governance issues that involve SWCDs and Watershed Districts. Options could include combinations or cooperative efforts among SWCDs and Watershed Districts. Other options to be considered should include funding options from the tax bill, local fees, optional SWCD levy authority, new dedicated sales tax, and fees on property. A hearing would be held and a bill drafted, depending on support and input from stakeholders and subcommittee members.

### **G3 Governance: Re-activation of the Legislative Water Commission**

**Issue and Path Forward:** Issues surrounding water are wide-ranging and highly varied across many landscapes and interest groups. Because water is important, complex, controversial, and costly, the development of water policy must be undertaken thoughtfully. This 12 member, bi-cameral and bipartisan commission, created by the 1989 Groundwater Protection Act, brought value so the Legislature by:

- Having dedicated staff to disseminate pertinent information from a large array of stakeholders so members can develop a broad and independent understanding of current and emerging water issues

- Providing a venue for members to equitably receive and discuss detailed technical information
- Creating a public forum for regular, in-depth interactions between legislators that can then inform legislative work on this subject
- Developing water expertise within a larger cadre of Legislators so they can become leaders on water policy

**Background:** The Legislative Water Commission (LWC) was created by the 1989 Groundwater Protection Act and was established in 1994. At that time, the LWC consisted of ten members. Five member were from the Senate and five members from the House of Representatives. Two subcommittees were established, one on groundwater and one on surface water. The LWC was originally charged with the review water policy reports and recommendations of the Environmental Quality Board, the biennial report of the Board of Water and Resources and other water-related reports as required by law or by the Legislature. The LWC was given authority to oversee activities of the Pollution Control Agency relating to water-pollution control. It also was changed with conducting public hearings as well as securing data and comments.

The LWC held annual hearings on groundwater. Data or information compiled by the LWC was to be made available to the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources and standing and interim committees of the legislature on request of the chair of the respective commission or committee. Members were to study the implementation and effects of sustainable agriculture, including current and potential practices and their effect on water and groundwater. Later, the LWC was abolished in 1996.

The Legislative Water Commission was re-established in 2014. The LWC then consisted of twelve members. Six members were from the Senate and six members are from the House of Representatives. Members from the Senate included three majority party members, appointed by the majority leader, and three minority party members appointed by the minority leader. The six members from the House of Representatives include three majority party members appointed by the Speaker of the House and three minority party members appointed by the minority leader. Members served at the pleasure of the appointing authorities and served until their successors are appointed or until a member was no longer a member of the legislative body that appointed the member to the commission. Members elected a chair and vice-chair. The chair convened meetings as necessary to conduct the duties prescribed by this section.

The LWC employed staff and contracted with consultants, as necessary, to enable the LWC to carry out its duties and functions. The LWC reviewed water policy reports and recommendations of the Environmental Quality Board, the Board of Water and Soil Resources, the Pollution Control Agency, the Department of Natural Resources, the Metropolitan Council, and other water-related reports as required by law or the legislature. The commission conducted public hearings and otherwise secured data and comments to make recommendations to the legislature. Data or information compiled by the LWC was made available to the Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources, the Clean Water Council, and standing and interim committees of the

legislature at the request of the respective commission, council, or committee. The committee coordinated with the Clean Water Council.

The Commission expired on July 1, 2019, and was replaced by the Legislative Coordinating Committee's Subcommittee on Water Policy. The duties and functions of the Subcommittee are in parallel with the former Commission.

**Path Forward: Prepare a bill that would re-active the LWC for a five year period. This would create the ability staff the LWC for a period of time that would result in interested and qualified applicants.**

**G2: Governance: Re-activation of Water Supply Systems and Wastewater Treatment Facilities Advisory Council (council).**

**Issue and Path Forward:** Re-activation of the council is needed to provide legislative input regarding water –supply systems, impacts of climate change, waste-water treatment facilities and operator education and certification. The council existed in the past and the Legislature did not remove the sunset provision. The activities of the committee were generally well accepted by members of the Legislature. Reactivation would ensure that water and wastewater professionals can provide input into agency rules and guidelines. The council would advise commissioners of the Department of Health and the Pollution Control Agency regarding classification of water-supply systems and wastewater treatment facilities, qualifications and competency evaluation of water supply system operators and wastewater treatment facility operators, and additional laws, rules and procedures that may be desirable for regulating the operation of water supply systems and of wastewater treatment facilities. The council would be an advisory council to the Minnesota Department of Health and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and does not have rule making authority.

**Background:** The original Water and Wastewater Operators Certification Council was created in 1971. It had rule making authority regarding the classification of water supply systems, wastewater treatment facilities, and the certification of operators of the systems and facilities. The original council was sun-setted in 1995 when the Water Supply Systems and Wastewater Treatment Facilities Advisory Council was formed. The Water Supply Systems and Wastewater Treatment Facilities Advisory Council was reviewed by the Legislative Commission on Planning and Fiscal Policy (LCPFP) in 2013 as part of their biennial duty required by Minn. Stat. 3.885 Subd. 11. The LCPFP's 2013 Recommendations called for keeping the council and 2014 Minn. Laws Chap. 286 Art. 7 Sec. 1 extended the council's expiration date to June 30, 2019 when it was sun-setted.

**Path Forward: Solicit input from stakeholders, and prepare a bill for reactivation of the committee, with minor changes to the charge.**

**G4. Governance: Creating a Department of Water Resources**

**Issue:** A bill has been introduced that would combine water responsibilities and abolish some departments (SF2102, Senator Draheim). There may be benefits to reorganization, as well as unintended consequences. A One Water Agency has been proposed and studied in the past. These reviews have suggested recommendations for efficiency. There may be interest in moving forward with some of the existing recommendation for better inter-agency coordination or consolidation of agency roles and responsibilities.

**Background:** Water regulation and management is coordinated by several state, regional and local agencies. The many local water-management organizations may not be as effective as they could. Minnesota's waters also are governed by hundreds of laws, regulations, rules, and ordinances involving more than twenty federal agencies, more than six state agencies and many local units of government. These agencies have individual and specific missions and are sometimes bound by individual federal and state laws. These constraints create silos, overlaps, conflicts and contradictions in implementation.

Water governance in Minnesota is not very adaptive. The complex system may be standing in the way of achieving the clean water goals that our citizen's expectations. Several reports have suggested that Minnesota's water governance is in need of better coordination and have explored the need for reform. Each review offers options for improving water governance and suggests improvements. Those recommendations are summarized as follows:

There generally are two schools of thought on our current system of water governance. One suggests that state and local water governance is too complicated and involves too many state, local and regional agencies that do not cooperate and are not well integrated. An important argument is that the current system does not encourage state-wide or long-term water planning and policy. It has been suggested that these shortcomings could be addressed by combining state-level governance and management into a single "Department of Water". This scale of reform would be significant and would involve major changes to organizational structure and resources. A consolidated Water Department might be more efficient with improved and simplified services to the citizens of the state. However, because each of the existing agencies have specific mission and agreements with federal agencies, it is possible that there would be unintended consequences that might affect federal funding. A further complication is that each of the agencies have specific objectives related to water resources. For example, the water focus at the MDH is on safe drinking water and the focus at the MDA is on water and agriculture. Some of these specific objectives may be diluted and constituencies' less-well served, given new priorities of an all-encompassing Water Department. The restructuring of a large government agencies often involves significant realignment of personnel, each having unique program expertise and institutional memory. A change of this magnitude should involve considerable study and evaluation.

A second school of thought recognizes the strengths of the current system of cooperation among individual agencies. The Clean Water Land and Legacy Act has resulted in more and better coordination among staff across agencies. Advocates argue that the current system of strong, competing agencies, with specific duties and specific goals, promotes coordination as well as healthy competition among agencies. It focuses on the importance of specific agency missions and goals and allows for legislative, rather than administrative, resolutions of priorities, tradeoffs and conflicts.

**Path Forward:** Discuss benefits and consequences of agency consolidation and formulate a plan for action.

## **G5 Water Governance: Streamlining Water Governance and Management**

**Issue:** Minnesota is a recognized leader in managing water, including safe drinking water. However, the state may want to consider revising water policy and governance to address new challenges. With as many as eight agencies involved in managing water, there is a general perception of silos, turf protection, and non-cooperation. To be truly effective, greater governance and water management is needed to integrate and to coordinate activities and programs. The issues and concerns are similar to Issue G4 and Issues G4 and G5 should be discussed together. However, some opportunities for greater communication are described below:

**Path Forward:** The UM report (University of Minnesota, 2020) recommends creation of a coordinating entity. It was suggested that this be accomplished with an interagency team that could coordinate activities across agencies. The report suggests that this be completed with an existing entity such as the Clean Water Council Interagency Coordinating Team. This existing team understands the collective work of the agencies and stakeholders. This effort would provide the foundation for a coordinated water management, including drinking water. Others have suggested the creation of a consolidated Department of Water. Hearings on these issues are needed and to consider possible legislation.

**Background:** Minnesota's water policy has shaped by the state's early dependence on agriculture and has evolved over time. This evolution involved transition from draining excess water to improving agriculture to the protection and restoration of our waters; from farming practices that did not recognize adverse impacts on natural resources and natural systems to statewide adoption of soil and water conservation practices; and from discharge of raw sewage and pollutants into water bodies to increased implementation of water quality standards. Water policy changes also reflect decisions and actions made in other areas that include energy, land use, transportation, public health, and economic development.

In Minnesota, water is a public resource and the state reserves the right to regulate the use of water within its boundaries and to determine the scope of private water rights. The state holds title to public waters and the lands beneath them in trust for the general public. Private rights to water are governed by "riparian doctrine" where traditional common law doctrine of riparian rights apply. This doctrine implies that owners of the adjacent land and the groundwater beneath it and have use rights over water bodies touching that land. However, in Minnesota, riparian doctrine has been modified through legislatively enacted regulations and riparian rights to water are not absolute. Rather, they give adjacent landowners the right to reasonable use and enjoyment of a water body as long as that use does not interfere with the public's rights or the rights of other riparian owners.

A fundamental question is whether the governance structure for water should be changed. Existing recommendations provide a framework for thinking about an inter-agency approach to protect and preserve water for future generations. Several reports have evaluated water governance and reform. This body of information can be summarized as follows:

There generally seem to be two schools of thought on our current system of water governance. One school of thought suggests that state and local water governance is too complicated and involves too many agencies that do not cooperate and are not well integrated. An important argument is that the current system does not encourage statewide or long-term water planning and policy. The restructuring of a large governmental agency would involve significant realignment of personnel, each having unique program expertise and institutional memory. That change is considered in Issue G4.

A second school of thought recognizes strengths of the current system of cooperation among individual agencies. The Clean Water Land and Legacy Act has resulted in more and better coordination among staff across agencies. Advocates argue that the current system of strong, competing agencies, with specific duties and specific goals, promotes coordination as well as healthy competition among agencies. It focuses on the importance of specific agency missions and goals and allows for legislative, rather than administrative, resolutions of priorities, tradeoffs and conflicts.

Four papers are fundamental that suggest options for greater interagency cooperation:

Brand and others, 1990, suggested that the numerous state and local water-management organizations in Minnesota are not as effective as they might be because the state's waters are governed by hundreds of laws, regulations, rules, and ordinances involving more than twenty federal agencies, more than six state agencies, and many local units of government. These agencies each have individual and specific missions and are bound by individual federal and state laws. These constraints create silos, overlaps, conflicts and contradictions in implementation. Water governance is not as adaptive, flexible or resilient as it could be. Over time, a multiplicity of state, regional and local water-management organizations have been created that contribute to challenging patchwork of entities.

Helland (2000) pointed out a disconnection between groundwater, surface water, and land use in water management. He stated that there were many state agencies involved in water management while there is no single entity in charge. Helland also suggested that there should be a process to ensure that agencies focus on the resource as a whole rather than on individual programs. He argued that scales of decision-making for land and water issues were mismatched. Land use decisions are often local while water is regulated and enforced at state and federal scale. This results in an inability to coordinate surface water, groundwater, and land-use with respect to water management.

In 2011, the University of Minnesota published a report on water sustainability (University of Minnesota, 2011). This report, which included many of the state's water experts, was conducted at the request of the Minnesota Legislature in response to the passage of the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment. The Legislature directed the University to construct a framework to describe what was needed to accomplish the goals and needs that drove the passage of the amendment. The result was the publication of the Minnesota Water Sustainability Framework that laid out pressing issues needed to ensure sustainable water, strategies, and recommendations for how to meet these challenges. Several suggestions for revised water governance were included.

More recently, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA, 2013), in cooperation with other state water management agencies, developed recommendations for improving Minnesota's system of water governance. This evaluation was authorized by the Minnesota Legislature in 2011 (Laws 2011) Session, Chapter 2, Article 4, and Section 33). The Legislature asked the MPCA to evaluate water-related statutes, rules, and governing structures to streamline, strengthen, and improve sustainable water management.

A more recent report drinking water report (UM, 2021) further recommends minor changes to the statutory framework that clarifies connections among agencies and reinforces common goals to both public health and the environment. The report suggested a need for greater coordination across different scales of governance from the local level to the statewide level. Because policy and governance have evolved over time, and in response to specific issues, Minnesota's governance structure remains complicated, fragmented and diffuse. Certain aspects of Minnesota's water management system continue to confuse and frustrate many local units of government and citizens, resulting in continued calls for reform. There are long-standing concerns that Minnesota's water governance is inefficient and in need have better coordination.

Most of these reports suggest that water management has improved as the result of the Clean Water Land and Legacy Act. Most of these reviews do not recommend consolidation of the authority for managing water into a single agency because there are good reasons for the delegation of authority across the agencies. These reports make the following recommendations for improved water governance:

- Synchronize water management programs into a Water Management System
- Clarify the Roles, Responsibilities and Authority of Local Governmental
- Improve the delivery of water-permitting services at the regional level
- Clarify the Role of the Clean Water Council
- Increase Emphasis on the Responsibilities of Local Watershed Authorities involved in the One-Watershed/One-Plan Process
- Implement a Comprehensive Statewide Conservation Priority Process
- Strengthen Land Use Planning Focusing on Water:
- Increase Legislative Support Capacity for Water Issues
- Require that state-owned lands be examples of conservation



- Increase Interagency Water Management on Long-Term Sustainability:
- Increase support for the voluntary Minnesota Agricultural Water Quality Certification Program
- Revise Water Policy to Include Principles of equity
- Examine alternatives for wastewater and storm water conservation and reuse
- Ensure that statutes regarding water policy is integrated across agencies and scales of governance and encourage integration.
- Ensure that state environmental and natural resource policies aligned with water sustainability goals that efficiently direct on-the- ground actions.
- Support and strengthen landowner and land occupied efforts to stem nonpoint source pollution and soil loss, using voluntary best management practices and by strengthening existing statutes relating to soil loss and soil health. While the quality of Minnesota’s water resources have improved significantly over the decades since the federal Clean Water Act, most of this improvement has come from control of point sources, while non-point sources largely go unregulated.
- Update existing Laws and Rules
- Create flexibility in water laws across landscapes:
- Analyze the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Possible Changes to Wetland Regulations:
- Provide Consistency of Enforcement Authority among State Agencies

**Path Forward: Discuss options and feasibility of options for greater agency cooperation and coordination**

**Selected References:**

- Brand, Martha C. and Joseph M. Finley, 1990. Minnesota’s Groundwater Protection Act: A Response to Federal Inaction, 16 Wm. Mitch. L. Rev. 911-947.
- Bush Foundation. Focus on Outcomes: Redesigning Minnesota’s Local Government Services, 2011. [http://www.bushfoundation.org/solutions/engagement/redesigning Minnesota’s local government services](http://www.bushfoundation.org/solutions/engagement/redesigning_Minnesota's_local_government_services)
- Citizens League, 1985. A Strategy for the Water belt. A Citizens League Report. Approved November 22, 1985. Minneapolis.
- Citizens League, 2009. To the Source: Moving Minnesota’s Water Governance Upstream. Report of the Citizens League Water Policy Study Committee.
- Clean Water Legacy Act (Laws 2006, c. 251, §§1-17). Clean Water Council established.
- DNR. Long-Term Protection of the State’s Surface Water and Groundwater Resources.
- DNR, 2010. Long-Term Protection of the State’s Surface Water and Groundwater Resources.
- Easter, K. William and Jim Perry, eds., 2011. *Water Policy in Minnesota: Issues, Incentives, and Action*. RFF Press, New York–London.
- EQB (Environmental Quality Board), 1987. Protecting Minnesota’s Waters: An Agenda for Action in the 1987-1989 Biennium. Minnesota State Planning Agency.
- EQB, 1989. Protecting Minnesota’s Waters: Priorities for the 1989-1991 Biennium. Minnesota State Planning Agency.
- EQB, 1989. The 10-Year Agenda for Protecting Minnesota’s Waters, a Working Paper

- EQB, 1991. Water Quality Program Evaluation. Overview Adopted by Minnesota EQB.
- EQB, 1991. Minnesota Water Plan: Directions for Protecting and Conserving Minnesota's Waters. Minnesota State Planning Agency.
- EQB, 1992. 1991 Minnesota Water Research Needs Assessment. EQB Water Research Advisory Committee. Minnesota State Planning Agency.
- EQB, 1994. 1995-97 Water Policy Report: A Focus on Ground Water.
- EQB, 1995. Meeting Minnesota's Water and Wastewater Needs: A Working Paper. Minnesota State Planning Agency.
- EQB. 1996. Saving Resources: Meeting Minnesota's Water and Wastewater Needs.
- EQB, 1998. Soundings: A Minnesota Water Plan Assessment.
- EQB, 1999. Preparing for Minnesota Water Plan 2000. Public Review Draft.
- EQB, 2000. Minnesota Watermarks: Gauging the Flow of Progress 2000-2010. Minnesota Planning.
- EQB, 2005. Protecting Minnesota's Waters: Priorities for the 2005-2007 Biennium. A Biennial Report of the Environmental Quality Board.
- EQB and Clean Water Cabinet, 2006-2008. Preliminary Water Supply Vision and Strategies. (working papers)
- EQB, 2007. Protecting Minnesota's Waters: Priorities for the 2008-2009 Biennium. A Biennial Report of the Environmental Quality Board.
- EQB and DNR, 2007. Use of Minnesota's Renewable Water Resources: Moving Toward Sustainability.
- EQB. 2008. Managing for Water Sustainability: Report of the EQB Water Availability Project.
- EQB and DNR. *Use of Minnesota's Renewable Water Resources: Moving toward Sustainability.*
- EQB. 2008. *Managing for water sustainability: Report of the EQB water availability project.* St. Paul: Environmental Quality Board.
- EQB. *Managing for Water Sustainability: Report of the EQB Water Availability Project.*
- Freshwater Society, 2008. Water is Life: Protecting a Critical Resource for Future Generations. Report to the Freshwater Society Board by the Freshwater Society Guardianship Council.
- Garvey, Edward, Philip Gersmehl and Dwight Brown, 1986. Minnesota Water Rights and Regulations. Public Report Series #5. The Water Resources Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.
- Geert R. Teisman and Jurian Edelenbos, Towards a Perspective of System Synchronization in Water Governance: A Synthesis of Empirical Lessons and Complexity Theories. International Review of Administrative Sciences, March 2011, vol. 77 no. 1, <http://ras.sagepub.com/content/77/1/10179183>.
- Gieseke, Timothy, 2002. Draft Water Unification Plan.
- Water Governance Evaluation required (Laws 2011 1st Special Session, c 2, art. 4, §33); Governor's Executive Order #11-32 re
- Governor's Executive Order #12-04 re wetland policy; "One watershed - one plan" legislation (Laws 2012, c 272, §32)
- [/wrc.umn.edu/watersustainabilityframework/](http://wrc.umn.edu/watersustainabilityframework/)
- Ground Water Management Strategy Issue Team Report, 1985. Minnesota State Government Issues: Executive Branch Policy Development Program.
- Helland, John, 1986. State Water Management: Reorganization and Consolidation. Minnesota House Research Information Brief.
- Rob Johansson and Faye Sleeper, Implementing the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and Minnesota's Clean Water, Land, and Legacy Amendment, 53, *Water Policy in Minnesota: Issues, Incentives and Action* (2011).

- Karkkainen, Bradley C., 2011. Minnesota Water Law: A Unique Hybrid. In Easter and Perry, Water Policy in Minnesota, 71-88.
- League of Women Voters. 2007. Examining a state agency: Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. St. Paul: League of Women Voters Minnesota.
- Legislative–Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources. 2008. Minnesota statewide conservation and preservation plan. St. Paul. Minnesota DNR. 2010. Long-term protection of the state's surface water and groundwater resources. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.
- Minnesota Environmental Initiative, 2009. Land and Water Policy Project Report, July 7, 2009
- Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Farm Bill, PL 110-234) increases support for ethanol production
- Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment (MN Constitution, Article XI, §15) Clean Water Fund established. Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council created
- Minnesota House of Representatives Research Department. A Survey of the Groundwater Act of 1989. Prepared by John Helland, Legislative Analyst (2001).
- Minnesota House of Representatives, Land and Water Resources Committee Final Report, Interim 1969-1970. Accessed April 26, 2012 at <http://archive.leg.state.mn.us/docs/pre2003/other/l287.pdf>.
- Minnesota Planning, 1996. Crosscurrents: Managing Water Resources.
- Minnesota Water Planning Board, 1981. *Toward Efficient Allocation and Management: Special Study on Local Water Management*. A Report of the Minnesota Water Planning Board to the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources and Governor Albert H. Quie.
- Minnesota DNR. 2000. *Minnesota's Water Supply: Natural Conditions and Human Impacts*. St. Paul, MN: Waters Division, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.
- Minnesota Environmental Initiative. 2009. *Land and water policy project*. Minneapolis: MEI.
- Minnesota Planning, 2002. Charting a Course for the Future: Report of the State Water Program Reorganization Project.
- MPCA, 2013, Water Governance Evaluation: available online at: [www.pca.state.mn.us](http://www.pca.state.mn.us)
- MPCA (Minnesota Pollution Control Agency), 1980. Water Quality Management: Minnesota's 208 Plan.
- MPCA, 2007. Minnesota's Groundwater Condition: A Statewide View. Accessed March 21, 2012 at <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=6395>
- MPCA, 2010. Continuing Planning Process: State of Minnesota's Water Quality Management Program. Accessed September 20, 2012 at <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15647>
- Minnesota Water Planning Board, 1979. *Toward Efficient Allocation and Management: A Strategy to Preserve and Protect Water and Related Land Resources*.
- Minnesota Water Planning Board, 1981. *Toward Efficient Allocation and Management: Special Study on Local Water Management*. A Report of the Minnesota Water Planning Board to the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources and Governor Albert H. Quie.
- Minnesota Water Planning Board. 1982. *Partnerships in Water Management: Minnesota's Challenge of the 1980s*. Summary of the Special Study on Local Water Management.
- Nonpoint Source Pollution Issues Team Report, 1986. Presented to Energy/Environment/Resources Subcabinet. Minnesota State Government Issues: Executive Branch Policy Development Program.
- Office of the Legislative Auditor, State of Minnesota, 2007. Evaluation Report: Watershed Management. January 2007. Accessed September 21, 2012 at <http://www.auditor.leg.state.mn.us/ped/pedrep/watersheds.pdf>

- State Planning Agency, Water Resources Coordinating Committee, 1970. Minnesota Water and Related Land Resources: First Assessment.
- State Planning Agency, 1985. Water Agency Merger Study, 1984-1985. Accessed April 18, 2012 at <http://archive.leg.state.mn.us/docs/2010/other/101000.pdf>
- State Planning Agency, 1989. The Minnesota Ground Water Protection Act of 1989: A Summary.
- State Planning Agency, Water Resources Coordinating Committee. *Minnesota Water and Related Land Resources: First Assessment* (1970).
- Teisman, Geert R. and Jurian Edelenbos, 2011. Towards a Perspective of System Synchronization in Water Governance: A Synthesis of Empirical Lessons and Complexity Theories. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, March 2011, vol. 77 no. 1.
- University of Minnesota Center for Studies of the Physical Environment, 1973. Environmental Decision-Making in Minnesota: An Overview, Applicability of Innovations in Other States to Minnesota, and Alternatives. Report to the State Planning Agency.
- University of Minnesota, Center for Science, Technology and Public Policy, 2011. Hennepin County Water Governance Project: An Application of Design Thinking to Governance.
- University of Minnesota, Water Resources Center, 2011. Minnesota Water Sustainability Framework. Accessed April 18, 2012 at <http://> MN Session Laws 2009, c 37, § 4 directs DNR groundwater study preparation
- Water Governance Evaluation required (Laws 2011 1st Special Session, c 2, art. 4, §33); Governor's Executive Order #11-32

