



Section I – Work Plan Review: Briefly outline any approved changes from the original work plan, staff, or participating organizations.

The Jefferson German Lakes CWP project was awarded grant funds in 2004. The project length was September 30, 2004 to September 30, 2008. In October of 2005, Carrie Mueller, project representative, left Le Sueur County to pursue a family based business. On December 21, 2005 Lauren Klement was hired. Gene Krautkremer of the SWCD remained the “Watershed Specialist” for the project.

The Jefferson German Lakes CWP Project had changes to the work plan approved in May 2008. This grant had a Shoreland BMP component but it did not have grant funds tied to it. The work plan revision moved funds from other categories into Shoreland and monitoring. The education component had an environmental assessment flyover added to it.

Please list and give a brief report on each activity/task identified in your work plan 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.

Goal 1. Reduce Pollutant Loadings through Implementation of BMP's

Objective 1: Maintain Watershed Specialist (Le Sueur County SWCD)

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p38

Objective 2: Treat Priority Feedlots

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p40

Objective 3: Target Highly Erodible Land in Four Priority Subwatersheds for BMP Installation

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p41. Revised, combined with Goal 2, Objective 3, p51.

Objective 4: Oversee Operation and Maintenance of BMP's

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p42

Objective 5: Upgrade Non – Complying Individual Sewage Treatment Systems

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p32 Revised

Activities accomplished under Goal One include:

- A watershed specialist has been maintained, improving coordination between the watershed project and the county conservation field office. This has been key to the successful implementation of agricultural BMP's, specifically one terrace system and a ravine stabilization and grass buffers, to reduce nutrient loading to the system.
- Corrections have been made to the priority feedlots within the watershed
- 206 on-site septic systems have been upgraded or installed new within the watershed
- Soil Grid Sampling for Phosphorus was accomplished through three ag producers
- Drainage workshop attended
- Drainage inventory was completed through a challenge grant so up to date drainage information is now available
- Assisted with the development of the sanitary sewer district
- A ag producer contacted the watershed specialist regarding harvestable buffer incentive but nothing came of it when the crop prices rose in 2007

Goal 2. Increase Public Awareness of Water Quality Issues

Objective 1: Public Information Materials

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p43. Revised, elimination of Environmental Audit Program, p45 and elimination of Facilitators List, p46

Objective 2: Develop Demonstration Sites Implementing Specific BMP's within the Watershed

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p47. Revised, elimination of Sign Up Fairs, p50 and elimination of Focus Group discussions, p53.

Activities accomplished under Goal Two include:

- Aquatic plant issues education occurred through an organized presentation & discussion, in cooperation with Minnesota State University, Mankato
- News releases were written for the Lake Association newsletter and for local newspapers
- Environmental Assessment Flyover was conducted on October 12, 2007
- Informational meeting was held in the spring of 2008 regarding results of the flyover
- The project coordinator met with the Lake Association biannually with a project update

Goal 3. Improve Coordination of Watershed Activities

Objective 1: Maintain a Citizen's Steering Committee

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p54

Objective 2: Define Areas Needing Better Local Controls to Prevent/Reduce Nutrient Loading

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p54

Objective 3: Participate in the Revision of the Le Sueur County Comprehensive Water Management Plan

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p54

Activities accomplished under Goal Three include:

- The steering committee was the Lake Association. A report was made to them annually
- Areas of concern were defined in the phase I project. Project BMPs were based on first come first serve due to time constraints. Swede's Bay and West Jefferson were priority lake areas due to the poorest water quality within the chain of lakes.

Goal 4. Evaluate the Project's Effectiveness

Objective 1: Develop a Lake and Watershed Monitoring Program

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p56

Objective 2: Maintain Citizen-Based Monitoring of the Lakes using the Citizen Lake Monitoring Program. Promote Citizen Stream Monitoring

*Implementation Plan 1995-1998 p58

Activities that were accomplished for Goal Four include:

- Citizen lake monitoring has continued, while tributary inflow monitoring has been non existent
- In-lake monitoring by Blue Water Science occurred for three years. This data was also to be used for comparison when the sewage pipe was installed around the lake.
- All water quality data collected through all phases of the CWP project were entered into STORET in 2006 and then entered in annually thereafter
- A lakeshed management plan was not accomplished. This will occur through the current TMDL process

Goal 5. Reduce Pollutant Loadings Through Implementation of Shoreland BMP's

Objective 1: Up to seven shoreland BMP projects will be installed in shoreland areas by August 2008.

40 Shoreland site visits were conducted on Jefferson German Lakes for stabilization and violation issues from 2006-2008

The project workplan was revised to move funds into Shoreland Projects. For over three years, no one inquired about cost share for shoreland BMPs after many promotional efforts. Spring of the final year people came out from no where calling for participation in the cost share program. By project end, 10 shoreland owners committed to cost share projects for rain gardens and native plantings. Two shoreland owners withdrew, one stating she was going to do this on her own in two phases and the other was for health reasons and was unable to install the rain garden. Funds will now go to a difficult neighborhood access lot restoration.

Section II – Grant Results

Measurements: Please describe your evaluation plan and its results.

What tools did you use, what methods did you use to gather information? *Since this was a phase II with a completed workplan, information was gathered and incorporated into the workplan.*

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.? *A septic questionnaire was sent out by the County Board in 2006 to all shoreland residents (approximately 930 residents) regarding the idea and concerns of piping sewage away from the lake to a sewage treatment plant.*

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. *Seven watershed residents will have installed rain gardens on their properties. Two neighborhood associations will have completed shoreland restorations to reduce erosion and runoff to their public access lots.*

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 STORET data base), brochures, articles, special reports, tapes, CDs, etc. Provide relevant project photographs. *Flyover report, Lake Report, STORET information*

Note about photos: Photos may be scenes of the water resource in question and/or may illustrate installations, Best Management Practices (BMPs), or other measures that help show what the project accomplished. **Attached electronic files (e.g. JPGs) are preferred.** For questions about photos, please contact your regional MPCA Public Information Officer or Jennifer Groebner at 651-296-7706. **Photos will be submitted. Flyover results on a CD were sent to the Project Manager.**

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.

Public outreach and education included newsletter articles on a quarterly basis to over 800 residents, news releases to local newspapers and a water quality overview meeting for all shoreland residents of Le Sueur County (approximately 20 from Jefferson/German). A septic maintenance workshop, which had a good turnout from Jefferson German (approximately 30 attended from the J/G watershed) due to the controversial sewage pipe.

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: I feel that many shoreland residents understand the importance of improving water quality on the Jefferson German chain of lakes. The lake association has a newsletter that has quality articles in it regarding water quality. Le Sueur County Environmental Services has a column that is dedicated to water quality in each issue.

Land use changes in the watershed: Land use in the watershed stayed primarily the same. Rural areas, agriculture and highly populated shoreline with small lots.

Recommendations created: At this point in the project, getting projects on the ground was difficult. Now that rain gardens and native plantings are becoming more known, we hope that funds will be available to keep the momentum moving forward with shoreline BMPs being installed. There was a push for the creation of a sewer subordinate district. This process did not have a well thought out planned process and it has been put on hold by the county board at this time. For this to succeed, the organization needs to fully develop this and then present it to the county board.

Increased ability to solve similar problems in the future, etc.? The project has increased awareness and people are calling in with violations they see and many residents call in to find out what they can and can't do with their shoreline. That alone is a sign of success.

Did you form new partnerships or alliances as a result of the project? The sewage pipe is a long term result that grew out of the project. Though it is on hold right now, the county board requested a new committee to be created. I made the recommendation of providing a plan instead of asking the county board what to do next. County boards like to be informed and decisions based on recommendations, not the other way around.

What future efforts are anticipated as a result of the partnership(s)? The Jefferson German chain of lakes is listed on the 2008 303d list so the project is moving into the TMDL phase with monitoring occurring in 2009 and 2010.

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. Two shoreland owners are going to put in shoreland projects without grant money. These projects will be native plantings. One ag producer did soil grid sampling on manure applied fields through the project but never turned in his claim, he paid for this on his own.

Is there a plan to continue the project beyond the end date of the grant agreement or contract? If so, explain. The project will continue into the TMDL phase.

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? Dissemination of project activities occurred through news releases, public meetings, Lake Association meetings and a presentation to the county board.

What other audiences (media, businesses, other agencies, etc.) would be most interested in the results of this project? MN DNR, Civic groups, County Board, Planning and Zoning Commission, excavating contractors, master gardeners and schools (Natural Resources classes).

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? Lessons learned on this project occurred when the present project coordinator was hired and the project was behind in just about everything aspect. What was out of everyone's control was the 2003 budget cuts. The County was scrambling to look for budget funds to keep the position responsible for the Clean Water Partnerships staffed. In 2004, the position was being reviewed and the job description rewritten. The first payment had never been received though records showed it was requested, the workplan had to be written and the project had to be promoted extensively because it was over a year behind in schedule. The coordinator had a range of problems with communication with the previous project manager with requests for money up to STORET not being submitted to the St. Paul office. Reports were submitted to the project manager but the wrong reports were sent to the St. Paul office. The coordinator ended up working directly with the St. Paul office on several occasions. A new project manager took on the project in mid spring of 2008 and has kept up with project requests and has been readily available for questions and concerns.

Another lesson learned was planning a shoreland management workshop for all three CWP projects. Only five people registered and therefor the series had to be cancelled.

The time spent determining if piping sewage to a sewage water treatment center delayed septic upgrades of failing systems. People waited with updating their systems to see if it were going to move forward. Late 2007 and 2008, the number of septic systems upgraded increased.

Please provide any feedback or suggestions that you would like to share with the MPCA to improve their grant programs. Project managers should be accountable for their projects just as the county is accountable to the success of the project.

Thank you very much for the grant funds for Jefferson German Chain of Lakes. We appreciate it.

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.

Grant Project Summary

Project title: Jefferson-German Lakes Improvement Project, Phase IIC
Organization (Grantee): Le Sueur County
Project start date: October 1, 2004 Project end date: September 30, 2008 Report submittal date: October 30, 2008
Grantee contact name: Lauren Klement Title: Environmental Resources Specialist
Address: 88 South Park Avenue
City: Le Center State: MN Zip: 56057-1600
Phone number: 507-357-8540 Fax: 507-357-8541 E-mail: lklement@co.le-sueur.mn.us
Basin (Red, Minnesota, St. Croix, etc.): Upper Lower Mississippi County: Le Sueur

Project type (check one):

- Clean Water Partnership (CWP) Diagnostic
- CWP Implementation
- Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Development
- 319 Implementation
- 319 Demonstration, Education, Research
- TMDL Implementation

Grant Funding

Final grant amount: \$55,000 Final total project costs: \$595,723
Matching funds: Final cash: \$7,856 Final in-kind: \$532,867 Final Loan: NA
Contract number: 800-05 (Agreement # CFMS A63086) MPCA project manager: Shaina Keesely

For TMDL Development or TMDL 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.)

The Jefferson German Lakes Improvement Project, located in Le Sueur County Minnesota, began October 1, 2004. The project ended on September 30, 2008. \$55,000 was awarded to this watershed to put BMPs on the ground along with monitoring the water quality of the lakes.

The highlight of the project was the increase in interest about rain gardens and native plantings on the shoreline. Two neighborhood associations used grant funds for cost share on restoring their access lots. One homeowner on the second tier of shoreland installed a rain garden in a highly visible spot along a walking trail. Six rain gardens were installed on shoreline. Soil grid sampling was done on agricultural fields that had livestock manure applied. Four livestock producers participated in this. The results of this project was that after meeting with the farmers to discuss the results with the Soil and Water Conservation District representative, they agreed to not apply manure to the areas in their fields that were mapped to have excessive phosphorus.

Dissemination occurred through news releases, public meetings, and lake association meetings and through the lake association quarterly newsletter. Citizen lake monitoring volunteers continued to participate in the MPCA Citizen Lake Monitoring Program.

Goals (Include three primary goals for this project.)

- 1st Goal: Reduce Pollutant Loadings Through Implementation of Shoreland BMP's
- 2nd Goal: Reduce Pollutant Loadings Through Implementation of BMP's (Ag and Septic)
- 3rd Goal: Increase Public Awareness of Water Quality Issues

Results that count (Include the results from your established goals.)

- Six rain gardens were installed on home shoreline properties (five on Jefferson, one on German); Four of these are located in one neighborhood.
 - One rain garden was installed on a secondary lot with high visibility along a walking path
- 1st Result: • Two neighborhood access lots were restored
- Soil grid sampling was conducted on manure-spread fields of three livestock producers;
 - One livestock producer did soil grid sampling on his own working with University of Minnesota Extension Educator. The producer never requested his reimbursement.
- 2nd Result: • Seventy-three septic systems were upgraded 2004 through 2006.
- Aquatic plant issues education occurred through an organized presentation & discussion, in cooperation with Minnesota State University, Mankato Water Resources Center
 - News releases were written for the quarterly lake association newsletter and for local newspapers
 - Environmental Assessment Flyover was conducted on October 12, 2007
 - Informational meeting was held in the spring of 2008 regarding results of the flyover
 - The project coordinator met with the Lake Association annually with project updates
- 3rd Result: _____

Picture (Attach at least one picture, do not imbed into this document.)

Description/location:

Jefferson German Rain Garden cost share project second year 2008

Jefferson Lake

Acronyms (Name all project acronyms and their meanings.)

Partnerships (Name all partners and indicate relationship to project)

Le Sueur County

Le Sueur County Environmental Services

Jefferson German Lake Association

Blue Water Science
