

# **GRANT COUNTY LOCAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 2010 TO 2015**



**Prepared by:  
The Grant County Environmental Advisory Council  
And  
Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Page Number**

**Environmental Advisory Council .....3**  
**Grant County Commissioners.....3**  
**Grant SWCD Supervisors .....3**

**I. Executive Summary**

- **Overview of the Local Water Management Plan .....4**
- **Revision and Summary of the Five-Year Focus Plan.....4**
- **Description of Priority Concerns .....4-5**
- **Summary of Goals and Actions (2005-2010 accomplishments).....5-8**
- **Ongoing Programs.....8**
- **Recommendations to Other Plans and Official Controls.....8-9**

**II. Goals and Objectives**

- **Priority Concern 1: Contaminated runoff .....9-10**
- **Priority Concern 2: Runoff Volumes.....10-11**
- **Priority Concern 3: Shoreland Management and Surface Water Use .....11-12**

**III. Implementation Schedule**

- **Acronyms for Cooperators and Potential Funding Sources.....13**
- **Priority Concern 1 .....13**
- **Priority Concern 2 .....14**
- **Priority Concern 3.....14**

## Environmental Advisory Council

Bob Aune.....County Planning Commission  
Chad Biss .....Township Member  
Odell Christenson.....SWCD/Township  
Terry Christenson.....Lake Association  
Bob Frarck.....Township Member  
Tom Gardner.....Lake Association  
Cary Hernandez.....MPCA  
Dan Gehrke.....Township Member  
Drew Mosburg.....NRCS  
Kevin Kotts .....DNR Area Game Mgr  
Paul Groneberg .....SWCD Supervisor  
Randy Larson .....SWCD Supervisor  
Greg Lillemon.....Land Management  
Joe Montonye .....Water Plan Administrator  
Gary Nelson .....Township Member  
Dan Persons .....Planning Commission  
Shawn Papon.....US Fish & Wildlife  
Jon Roeschlein.....Bois De Sioux Watershed District  
Larry Schneeberger .....Township Member  
Bob Shervey .....Township Member  
Jim Standish .....County Coordinator  
Mark Starner.....Township Member  
Scott Swenson.....Wheat Growers  
Pete Waller .....Board Water and Soil Resources  
Ron Woltjer .....County Commissioner  
Kerry Zimmerman.....Farm Service Agency

## Grant County Commissioners

Todd Schneeberger .....District #1  
Ron Woltjer .....District #2  
Keith Swanson.....District #3  
Tom Amundson.....District #4  
Philip Groneberg.....District #5

## Grant SWCD Supervisors

Theo Myron .....District #1  
Don Dally .....District #2  
Paul Groneberg .....District #3  
Odell Christenson .....District #4  
Randy Larson .....District #5

# I. Executive Summary

## **Overview of the Local Water Management Plan:**

Grant County is fortunate to have an abundant supply of water for recreation, agriculture, industry, and home use. By planning now, we can offset problems and avoid situations that could be costly and difficult to control. If we do not take action to protect and manage our own resources, it is very likely we will find ourselves working with programs that are not necessarily responsive to the local needs and concerns. It is important that programs dealing with natural resource protection assure no one segment of the population bears the burden of protecting these resources. Local residents and those involved with water related issues in the county are in the best position to determine priorities and set direction to assure local issues are addressed in the Local Water Plan.

In 2005 Grant County updated the Local Water Management Plan (LWMP) in accordance with Minnesota Statutes 103B. The Plan, which remains in effect for a period of ten years (December 31, 2005 to December 31, 2015), was approved by the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources on October 26, 2005 and the Grant county Board of Commissioners on November 2, 2005. The Grant Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD), has formally adopted the Local Water Plan as the SWCD Comprehensive Plan.

## **Revision and Summary of the Five-Year Focus Plan:**

This Amendment contains an updated Five-Year Focus Plan. The Grant County Environmental Advisory Council was delegated with the responsibility of overseeing the development of the new Five-Year Focus Plan. The Environmental Advisory Council conducted two meetings during the planning process to review and update the goals, objectives and actions addressed in the plan, as well as solicit input from the public, other local units of government, State and Federal agencies. While the original Priority Concerns for the 10-year plan have not changed, some action items have been deleted because they were completed and some action items have been added to address current issues and concerns. The Priority Concerns are listed below with a brief summary and estimated cost of the actions proposed to be implemented in the Five-Year Focus plan.

## **Description of Priority Concerns:**

Information collected through public meetings and participation was analyzed and used to develop three priority concerns. The process used to collect this information and identify priority concerns is thoroughly described in the Priority Concerns Scoping Document in Appendix A. of the Grant County Local Water Management Plan 2005-2015. The three priority concerns identified to focus water management efforts in Grant County are as follows:

### **Priority Concern 1: Contaminated runoff from both urban and agricultural land entering surface waters.**

Uncontrolled runoff from agricultural land and urban areas are contributing to the decline of surface water quality through sedimentation and nutrient loading of the counties streams, wetlands, lakes and rivers. Within the County, certain reaches of the Pomme de Terre, Chippewa, and Mustinka rivers are listed as impaired on the federal 303(d) list. A list containing the specific reaches and pollutant/stressors is located on the MPCA web site:

<http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/water/water-types-and-programs/minnesotas-impaired-waters-and-tmdls/assessment-and-listing/303d-list-of-impaired-waters.html>.

**Estimated cost-----\$486,000.00**

**Description of Priority Concerns: (continued)**

**Priority Concern 2: Excessive runoff water volumes from urban and agricultural land.**

Excessive stormwater runoff volume from urban areas as well as agricultural areas is contributing to flooding problems in all watershed areas of the County. This problem is generally related to drainage and land use conversion.

**Estimated cost-----\$225,000.00**

**Priority Concern 3: Management of shoreland areas and surface water use. Specifically, on natural environment lakes, rivers, and sensitive areas on recreational, and general development lakes.**

Grant County has many shallow lakes located in the Chippewa, Pomme de Terre and Mustinka river watersheds. These lakes are beginning to experience development pressure as the availability of land on recreational lakes has diminished. Grant County recognizes the importance of establishing shoreland management ordinances and surface water use ordinances that adequately protects sensitive areas and natural environment lakes.

**Estimated cost-----\$200,000.00**

**Summary of Goals and Actions:**

The following is a summary of the goals and actions contained in the Grant County Local Water Management Plan to address the three priority concerns. This summary also provides a brief description of the accomplishments from 2005 to 2010. While it is difficult to determine the exact reduction in runoff volumes and pollutants, it is believed that these accomplishments have had a significant positive impact on the surface water resource. Utilizing RUSLE 2 it was determined that these accomplishments resulted in the following estimated reductions:

**Estimated annual Sediment reduction-----333,428 tons/year**  
**Estimated annual Phosphorus reduction-----212,908 pounds/year**

**Priority Concern 1: Contaminated runoff from both urban and agricultural land entering surface waters.**

- Promote and implement vegetated buffers adjacent to all surface water resources.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS 2005 – 2010**

**Continuous Conservation Reserve Program (CCRP)**

**CP21-Filter Strip-----13,447.6 acres**  
**CP22-Riparian Buffer----- 391.8 acres**  
**CP18C-High Salts----- 355.9 acres**  
**State Native Buffer program----- 51.0 acres**  
**Lakeshore buffer projects (Pomme De Terre, Elk and Barrett lakes) ----- 3 projects**

- Protect existing buffers adjacent to protected waters from development through the County Shoreland Ordinance.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS 2005-2010**

**Grant County Shoreland Ordinance**

*Revised August 2008 requires;*

1. Maintenance or creation of buffer during the platting process on all new developments.
2. Maintenance, or creation, of a buffer on agricultural land as a result of grade/fill permit applications.
3. Requires 50 foot riparian buffer adjacent to shoreland as a condition of approval for subdivisions.

- Promote and implement agricultural best management practices such as; conservation tillage and nutrient management on agricultural lands near surface water resources that have established vegetated buffers.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS 2005 - 2010**

**Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EOIP)**

Nutrient management-----	28,500 acres
Conservation tillage-----	30,380 acres
Pest management-----	7,280 acres
Water and Sediment Control Basins-----	63 basins
Ag Waste closure-----	2 sites
Grazing systems -----	4 systems
Grassed waterways-----	4 acres

**AgBMP Loan program**

Low interest loans (\$513,500) for conservation tillage equipment-----16 loans

**Continuous Conservation Reserve Program (CCRP)**

CP38E-Back Forty Pheasant Habitat-----	718.1 acres
CP17A- Living Snow Fence-----	79.2 acres
CP16A-Farmstead Windbreak-----	208.4 acres
CP5A-Field Windbreak-----	326.3 acres
CP 8a Grassed Waterway-----	6.1 acres

- Encourage compliance with stormwater rules and ordinances by continuing public education and promotion of stormwater best management practices.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS 2005 - 2010**

*Grant County Shoreland Ordinance was revised August 2008 and requires; Subdivision approval process requires implementation of BMP's thru the approval process and site permitting for new construction.*

*35 lake shore owners attended Rain garden workshop sponsored by Lake Associations on Pelican, Pomme de Terre, and Barrett lakes. 25 of these landowners have expressed an interest and desire to complete projects on their property when cost-share funding can be obtained.*

**Priority Concern 2: Excessive runoff water volumes from urban and agricultural land.**

- Promote and implement the restoration of drained wetlands.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS 2005 -2010**

**Continuous Conservation Reserve Program (CCRP)**

*CP23A-Wetland Restoration and Buffer----- 2,479.4 acres*

*CP27/28-Farmed Wetland and Buffer----- 2,133.9 acres*

*CP37-Duck Nesting Habitat----- 534.8 acres*

**Wetland Reserve Program (WRP)**

*18 easements----- 1,212 acres*

**RIM/WRP**

*4 easements ----- 370 acres*

**Grant County Shoreland Ordinance**

*Wetland restorations are encouraged but not required during plat review process.*

- Promote the installation of stormwater retention basins when more than an acre of impervious surface is constructed.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS 2005 -2010**

*Grant County Shoreland Ordinance revised August 2005 requires MPCA stormwater rules are implemented on all construction activities with more than an acre of impervious surface.*

**Priority Concern 3: Management of shoreland areas and surface water use. Specifically on natural environment lakes, rivers, and sensitive areas on recreational and general development lakes.**

- Protect and improve water quality, and fish and wildlife habitat of protected surface water resources by initiating a process to reclassify lakes or portions of lakes where appropriate and clearly defining and mapping sensitive areas.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS 2005 -2010**

*The Grant County Protected Waters Inventory map was amended. The Not Shoreland Classified Lakes (NOTSL) are now included as Natural Environment Lakes under the Grant County Shoreland Ordinance. In addition, several lakes were reclassified from General Development or Recreational Development to Natural Environment Lakes. Bays on Recreational and General Development Lakes were also reclassified as Natural Environment. A map containing these changes can be found in the Grant County Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.*

- Identify and implement a process of enacting surface water use regulations on selected lakes and or portions of lakes and rivers.

**Ongoing Programs:**

Grant County continues to administer several programs that are vital to achieving the goals set forth in the Local Water Plan, including those related to floodplain and shoreland management, solid waste management, subsurface sewage treatment systems and the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA). Annual E-link reports are completed for the above programs that provide grant funding through the Natural Resources Block Grant (NRBG). The continued funding through the NRBG will be vital in achieving the goals objectives and actions that have been identified in the Five-Year Implementation Plan.

The Grant SWCD, Office of Land Management, NRCS, and FSA continue to work as a partnership to improve water quality and reduce excessive runoff in Grant County. These efforts and achievements are possible due to good working relations and by implementing such conservation programs as: State Cost-Share, CCRP, CSP, EQIP, RIM/WRP, WCA, Shoreland management, and the AgBMP Loan program.

**Recommendations to Other Plans and Official Controls:**

1. The Grant County Environmental Advisory Council recommends statewide revision of the Shoreland Regulations. While Grant County recognizes that they can adopt a more restrictive County Shoreland Ordinance that adequately protects shallow lakes and sensitive areas, it would provide greater consistency for the state to provide a minimum statewide standard that adequately addresses water quality, and fish and wildlife issues created by the unforeseen development of natural environment lakes and sensitive areas on recreational and general development lakes.
2. The Grant County Environmental Advisory Council recommends that the State of Minnesota through the Department of Natural Resources review laws and policies related to the permitting of aqua-cultural activities in wetlands and natural environment lakes. Specifically, it is believed that it is inappropriate to issue a permit for this use without proper notification and input from all riparian landowners and local officials.



**Recommendations to Other Plans and Official Controls: (continued)**

3. The current TMDL process is too complex and not understandable by the general population. MPCA and State Policy makers need to come to understand that if actual improvements are to be made in water quality it will be the result of landowners changing land use practices and installing best management practices on their property, with the assistance of local agencies. The current process adopted by MPCA to determine and address impairments is too complex for many landowners and local officials to understand. If landowners are not able to understand why they are being asked to change land use practices it is unlikely that they will implement best management practices.
4. Since 2002 there has been a sizeable decline in state funding to local units of government for water quality protection projects through Natural Resource Block Grants to County's and General Service funds and State Cost-Share funds to SWCD's. Grant County recognizes the need to protect these valuable resources and has made significant investments of local funds in this effort. Grant County also recognizes that the benefits of improved water quality are shared by all of the residents of the State of Minnesota. If Grant County and the State of Minnesota are going to be successful in accomplishing the goal of improving water quality the State of Minnesota needs to accept a greater share of the financial burden. The Grant County Environmental Advisory Council recommends that the BWSR Board work with the state legislature and Governors office to insure that the state of Minnesota provides increased funding to local units of government through the NRBG, General Service and State cost-Share programs.
5. Grant County recommends that State and Federal agencies that are utilizing TMDL impairment data as a tool for program participation become familiar with this information so agencies are using the same impairment information as MPCA is providing to County's and posting on the MPCA web site. It is not appropriate for local agencies to be telling landowners that they have land located in a watershed that contributes to impaired waters based on MPCA information and then have another state or federal agency refute that information. This issue has been specific to the scoring on RIM/WRP projects in Grant County. All state, local and federal resource agencies need to be on the same page if we are going to be successful in improving water quality through the TMDL process.
6. Grant County recommends that BWSR add a requirement to the water planning process that calls for the appropriate State agency or other entities to respond to the issues brought forward under this section "Recommendations to Other Plans and Official Controls".

**II. Goals and Objectives**

**Priority Concern 1:**

**Contaminated runoff from both urban and agricultural land entering surface waters.**

*Objectives and Actions*

**Objective A**

**Encourage and promote urban and agricultural land use practices to protect surface water resources.**

**Actions**

1. Promote the use of existing federal, state and local conservation programs that reduce soil erosion and sedimentation through the establishment of buffer strips, wetland restorations, field windbreaks, and grassed waterways.

Estimated cost:-----\$350,000.00

**Actions (continued)**

2. Promote participation in the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) and Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) to establish and maintain BMPs such as conservation tillage and nutrient management in conjunction with established buffer strips.  
Estimated cost:-----\$5,000.00

3. Promote and implement the upgrading of individual sewage treatment systems in rural and lakeshore areas.  
Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

4. Promote and implement the use of animal waste management systems for feedlot facilities.  
Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

5. Encourage the proper application, storage, and disposal of agricultural, industrial, and household chemicals and their containers.  
Estimated cost:-----\$5,000.00

6. Assist volunteers with surface water monitoring activities on high priority lakes and rivers to determine and evaluate point and non-point pollution sources. Insure that data collected through these efforts is entered into STORET.  
Estimated cost:-----\$5,000.00

7. Encourage all of the cities in Grant County to install buffer strips, or storm-water retention basins at the outlets of storm sewers. Assist the cities in obtaining grant funds to install these BMPs.  
Estimated cost:-----\$5,000.00

8. Promote the establishment of buffer strips, rain gardens and wetlands in urban and lakeshore areas. Assist the lake associations and cities in obtaining grant funds to provide landowners with cost-share incentives.  
Estimated cost:-----\$50,000.00

9. Utilize LIDAR data to increase the acres farmed under precision agricultural techniques to more efficiently utilize nutrient inputs.  
Estimated cost:-----\$5,000.00

10. Encourage and promote the maintenance of permanent vegetation within county and township road right of ways.  
Estimated cost:-----\$4,000.00

11. Promote pasture management BMPs that prevent the overgrazing of pasturelands adjacent to surface waters.  
Estimated cost:-----\$2,000.00

12. Work in cooperation with the Pomme de Terre river association to implement BMP's outlined in the TMDL implementation plans for turbidity and fecal Coliform on the Pomme de Terre River.  
Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

**Actions (continued)**

13. Work in cooperation with Traverse SWCD, Stevens SWCD, Bigstone SWCD, West Ottetail SWCD, and Bois De Sioux Watershed District to implement BMP's outlined in the TMDL implementation plan for turbidity on the Mustinka River.

Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

14. Work in cooperation with the Chippewa River project to implement BMP's outlined in the TMDL implementation plan for turbidity and fecal Coliform on the Chippewa River.

Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

15. Encourage and promote the replacement, and or relocation of ground water wells where surface water runoff has the potential to contaminate ground water.

Estimated cost:-----\$5,000.00

**Priority Concern 2:**

**Excessive runoff water volumes from urban and agricultural land.**

*Objectives and Actions*

**Objective A**

**Improve stormwater runoff quality and reduce quantity by increased utilization of stormwater management practices throughout the County.**

**Actions**

1. Enforce existing state law regarding a one rod grassed buffer strip on either side of new and improved county and joint county drainage ditches.

Estimated cost:-----\$ unknown

2. Promote the use of vegetated buffer strips, to reduce runoff, erosion, and sedimentation.

Estimated cost:--(Same as action one priority one)-----\$ NA

3. Promote the voluntary restoration of drained wetlands through CRP, RIM/ WRP and other programs, to increase water storage, provide filtration of sediment and pollutants, and increase wildlife habitat.

Estimated cost:--(Same as action one priority one)-----\$ NA

4. Protect existing wetlands through the Wetlands Conservation Act to retain existing water storage, provide filtration of sediment and pollutants, and maintain wildlife habitat.

Estimated cost:-----\$200,000.00

5. Coordinate with the Bois de Sioux Watershed District, County Highway Department and Local Townships to develop an inventory of all roads and ditch authority culverts in the County.

Estimated cost:-----\$ unknown

6. Promote the use of rain gardens and other best management practices that reduce runoff rates in urban and lake shore areas.

Estimated cost:--( Same as action eight priority one)-----\$ NA

**Actions (continued)**

7. Ensure that storm water runoff issues are addressed in any new development within the shoreland area. By requiring and reviewing a copy of the storm water permit and storm water pollution prevention plan before issuing any shoreland zoning permits.

Estimated cost:-----\$ unknown

8. Promote the modification of ditch systems, when landowners on the ditch system desire to restore drained wetland basins.

Estimated cost:-----\$0.00

9. Encourage through information and education a reduction in impervious surface within the shoreland and urban areas.

Estimated cost:-----\$5,000.00

10. Encourage the County Commissioners and County Planning Advisory Commission to adopt county wide zoning that provides for improved storm water runoff protection through sub division ordinances.

Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

**Priority Concern 3:**

**Management of shoreland areas and surface water use, specifically on natural environment lakes, rivers and sensitive areas on recreational and general development lakes.**

*Objectives and Actions*

**Objective A**

**Protect and improve the water quality, and fish and wildlife habitat of protected surface water resources of Grant County by initiating a process to reclassify tributary streams where appropriate, and clearly defining and mapping sensitive areas.**

**Actions**

1. Utilize current technology and available data to review current classification of county tributary streams based on hydrology, and drainage area, to determine if the current classification is appropriate.

Estimated cost:-----\$30,000.00

2. Where the current classification is documented to be inappropriate based on the selected parameters described in item 1 above, the County will petition the Commissioner of DNR to reclassify the tributary stream into the appropriate class or establish a sub-class for portions of the stream.

Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

3. Work with the County Planning Advisory Commission to clearly define the parameters of sensitive areas.

Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

4. Develop a county wide map of sensitive areas based on the defined parameters for sensitive area utilizing GIS technology, LIDAR data, and Soils mapping.

Estimated cost:-----\$15,000.00

**Actions (continued)**

5. Encourage the County Commissioners and County Planning Advisory Commission to amend the shoreland ordinance to increase the current shoreland district on rivers from 300 feet to 1,000 feet.

Estimated cost:-----\$5,000.00

**Objective B**

**Identify a process of enacting surface water use regulations on selected lakes, portions of lakes and rivers.**

**Actions**

1. Provide educational opportunities to lake associations, landowners and elected officials on the potential benefits of surface water use regulations.

Estimated cost:-----\$10,000.00

2. Work in cooperation with riparian landowners and the public to develop ordinances on lakes of high priority to landowners and stakeholders.

Estimated cost:-----\$25,000.00

3. Work in cooperation with local township boards to identify and implement surface water use ordinances on locally selected lakes.

Estimated cost:-----\$25,000.00

4. Conduct landowner surveys in cooperation with the township boards to gauge the interest in adopting surface water use regulations on lakes within that township.

Estimated cost:-----\$25,000.00

**Objective C**

**Identify and prioritize selected shallow lakes for accelerated fish and wildlife habitat protection activities.**

**Actions**

1. Encourage the DNR, landowners and sportsman's groups to engage in a process of selecting and prioritizing shallow lakes for increased protection through designation as waterfowl management lakes or waterfowl feeding and resting areas.

Estimated cost:-----\$20,000.00

2. Promote the control and elimination of exotic species.

Estimated cost:-----\$25,000.00

### III. Implementation Schedule:

#### Acronyms for Cooperators and Potential Funding Sources are as Follows:

CWF: Clean Water Fund  
 BWSR: MN Board of Water and Soil Resources  
 DNR: MN Department of Natural Resources  
 NRCS: Natural Resources Conservation Service  
 SWCD: Grant Soil and Water Conservation District  
 GC: Grant County  
 OLM: Office of Land Management  
 FSA: Farm Service Agency  
 TWP: Townships  
 LA: Lake Associations  
 GSW: Grant County Solid Waste  
 MPCA: Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
 MDA: Minnesota Department of Agriculture  
 USFWS: United States Fish and Wildlife Service  
 BDSWD: Boise de Sioux Watershed District  
 GCHWY: Grant County Highway Department  
 SG: Sportsman's groups ie. Ducks Unlimited, Pheasants Forever etc.  
 CC: Crop Consultants  
 Potential Funding – NRBG stands for projects/programs funded in part by Local Water Management program grants and funding.

**These costs do not include cost-share or incentive payments to landowners.**

Implementation Schedule 2011 to 2015				
Priority 1 – Contaminated runoff				
	Cooperators	Cost	Potential Funding	Duration
Objective A Encourage and promote urban and agricultural land use practices to protect surface water				
Actions	SWCD, NRCS, FSA, TWP, OLM, GC, SG	\$350,000	NRBG, CWF, BWSR, FSA, NRCS, SWCD, BDSWD, SG, MPCA	2011-15
1	SWCD, NRCS	\$5,000	CWF, NRBG, BWSR, NRCS, BDSWD	2011-15
2	SWCD, OLM, MPCA	\$10,000	NRBG, BWSR, MPCA, MDA	2011-15
3	SWCD, NRCS, MPCA	\$10,000	CWF, NRCS, MPCA, MDA	2011-15
4	GSW, SWCD, MPCA	\$5,000	GSW, MPCA, NRBG, MDA	2011-15
5	SWCD, MPCA	\$5,000	CWF, MPCA	2011-15
6	MPCA, SWCD, LA	\$5,000	NRBG, MPCA, LA, CWF	2011-15
7	Cities, SWCD, LA	\$50,000	NRBG, CWF, BWSR, MPCA, LA, DNR, Cities	2011-15
8	SWCD, NRCS, OLM, CC	\$5,000	NRBG, NRCS, CWF, BWSR, MDA, GC	2011-15
9	SWCD, GC, TWP	\$4,000	NRBG, GC, TWP	2011-15
10	SWCD, NRCS, MDA, FSA	\$2,000	NRBG, BWSR, CWF, MPCA, FSA, NRCS, MDA	2011-15
11	SWCD, OLM, GC	\$10,000	MPCA, BWSR, CWF	2011-15
12	SWCD, OLM, GC	\$10,000	MPCA, BWSR, CWF	2011-15
13	SWCD, OLM, GC	\$10,000	MPCA, BWSR, CWF	2011-15
14	SWCD	\$5,000	MDA	2011-15
15				

**Total Cost: \$486,000**

Implementation Schedule				
Priority 2 – Runoff Volume				
	Cooperators	Cost	Potential Funding	Duration
Objective A: Improve stormwater runoff quality and reduce quantity by increased utilization of stormwater management practices throughout the County				
Actions	GC	unknown	Ditch systems	2011-15
1				
2	Same as action one priority one	NA	Same as action one priority one	2011-15
3	Same as action one priority one	NA	Same as action one priority one	2011-15
4	OLM,SWCD,BWSR	\$200,000	BWSR,GC	2011-15
5	BDWSD,GCHWY,TWP	unknown	BDWSD	2011-15
6	OLM,LA,DNR,SWCD	NA	NRBG,MPCA,LA,SG,CWF,DNR	2011-15
7	OLM,SWCD,MPCA	unknown	NRBG,OLM,GC,MPCA	2011-15
8	SWCD,NRCS,USFWS,DNR,GC,BDWSD	0	BDWSD,GC	2011-15
9	SWCD,MPCA,OLM	\$5,000	NRBG,MPCA,BDWSD	2011-15
10	OLM,GC,TWP	\$10,000	GC,TWP	2011-15

**Total Cost: \$225,000**

Implementation Schedule				
Priority 3 – Shoreland Management and Surface Water use				
	Cooperators	Cost	Potential Funding	Duration
Objective A: Initiate process to reclassify tributary streams and clearly define and map sensitive areas.				
Actions	OLM,SWCD,DNR	\$30,000	NRBG,OLM,DNR	2011-15
1				
2	OLM,DNR,LA,TWP	\$10,000	OLM,DNR	2011-15
3	SWCD,OLM,LA,DNR	\$10,000	OLM,DNR	2011-15
4	OLM	\$15,000	OLM	2011-15
5	SWCD,OLM	\$5,000	GC,DNR,NRBG	2011-15
Objective B: Identify a process of enacting surface water use regulations on selected lakes, portions of lakes and rivers.				
Actions	OLM,SWCD,DNR,LA,SG	\$10,000	NRBG,GC,LA,BWSR,DNR,SG	2011-15
1				
2	OLM,DNR,LA,TWP	\$25,000	OLM,DNR	2011-15
3	OLM,LA,DNR	\$25,000	OLM,DNR	2011-15
4	OLM	\$25,000	OLM	2011-15
Objective C: Identify and prioritize selected shallow lakes for accelerated fish and wildlife habitat protection activities				
Actions	DNR,OLM,SWCD,SG,GC,TWP	\$20,000	DNR,USFWS	2011-15
1				
2	OLM,DNR,SWCD,LA,TWP	\$25,000	DNR,USFWS,BWSR	2011-15

**Total Cost: \$200,000**