CHAPTER FOUR: IMPLEMENTATION


Many of the following implementation steps will require grant funding and/or cost share partnering with various stakeholders in order to be completed. The list is intended to be simplified and some may require feasibility and/or engineering studies prior to completely understanding the scope and estimated cost of each project. Each step is rated as a high, medium, and low priority. If possible, the high priority steps should be completed within the next five years. The medium priority steps should be completed within the next ten years and the low priority steps should be completed only as funding becomes available.

The following list of implementation steps are not listed by any particular order and/or ranking, however they are associated with the one of the four major goal areas identified in Chapter Three (many of the implementation steps could fit under more than one goal area):

GOAL 1: TO ENSURE THAT DRAINAGE AND SURFACE WATER IS PROPERLY MANAGED THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT

1. Permitting associated with the planned State Highway 23 bypass of Paynesville (High Priority; 2011 – 2013).

2. When the Regal Bridge is replaced, work towards better water retention (Low Priority).

3. Water retention pond/sediment basin west of Grove Lake next to Judicial Ditch 1 (High Priority; $75,000; 1-2 years).

4. Work on water retention for Regal, including installing curb, gutter, and retention ponds (Medium Priority; within 10 years).
Lake Koronis

5. Install tile on a landowner’s water holding site (Medium to High Priority; $70,000; 5 years).

6. Work on water retention and erosion reduction at Koronis Ministries (Medium to High Priority; 5 years)

Pirz Lake

7. Work to achieve and maintain steady acceptable water levels in Pirz Lake. (High Priority; 5 years)

Drainage Improvements

8. Ditch records modernization (Medium to High Priority; $50,000; 2-10 years).

9. Redetermination of benefits for ditch systems as requested possibly including County Ditch 4 and Judicial Ditch 11.

10. Beaver control as needed (High Priority; ongoing).

11. County Ditch 5 repairs, including cleanout and erosion sites (Medium to High Priority; $70,000; 1-5 years).

12. Water control structure in County Ditch 4 (in Meeker County) for control of water levels in nearby protected wetland (High Priority; $10,000; 5 years).

13. County Ditch 29 repairs, including cleanout, erosion sites, tree spraying, and beaver control (Medium Priority; $40,000; 1-5 years).

14. County Ditch 32 erosion repairs (Medium Priority; $100,000; 5-10 years).

15. County Ditch 38 outlet repair (Medium Priority; $40,000; 1-5 years).

16. County Ditch 42 repair from origin to Banker’s Slough (Medium Priority; $10,000; 5-10 years).

17. Cleanout County Ditch 43 from the outlet of Pigeon Lake (Medium Priority).
18. Repairs on County Ditch 40 from the outlet of Lake Koronis to the end (Low Priority).

19. Judicial Ditch 1 repairs, including cleanout (High Priority; $250,000; 1-5 years).

20. Cleanout repairs on Judicial Ditch 2 (High Priority; 10 years).

21. County Ditch 7 improvements, including erosion repairs, tree spraying, and beaver control (Medium Priority).

Miscellaneous as time and financing becomes available…

22. Removal of sediment and/or the deepening of Mud Lake between Rice and Koronis Lakes (Low Priority; $20+ million).

GOAL 2:
TO MINIMIZE OR REDUCE PRIORITY POLLUTANTS TO SUSTAINABLE LEVELS

23. Provide assistance to the City of Paynesville on developing a stormwater discharge study (High Priority).

24. Provide septic certification inspections ($150,000) and provide low interest loans (High Priority; $700,000; ongoing).

25. Provide low interest loans to upgrade priority feedlots (High Priority; $300,000).

26. Work on water retention, septic, and sanitary sewer issues for Hawick (Low Priority or as requested).

27. Georgeville septic upgrades and stormwater retention (Low Priority).

28. Repair river erosion west of County Road 6 in Kandiyohi County (HighPriority; $300,000; 5 years).

Rice Lake

29. Erosion sites (Medium Priority; $125,00; 5-10 years).

Lake Koronis

30. Erosion repairs (Medium to High Priority; $500,000; 5-10 years).

31. Water retention sites (Medium to High Priority; $100,000; 5 years).
GOAL 3:
TO IMPROVE STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION,
COOPERATION AND COORDINATION IN IMPLEMENTING
THE DISTRICT’S INITIATIVES

32. Assist with implementing the Rice Lake TMDL (High Priority; $142,000; 2011).

33. Work with the City of Paynesville on various Wellhead Protection Area implementation issues (High Priority).

34. Continue partnering with lake associations and other key stakeholders on implementing water planning strategies (High Priority; ongoing).

35. Assist with finishing the Lake Koronis Recreational Trail around Lake Koronis in areas where the trail may impact water quality. (Medium Priority).

36. Publish a district annual report and make it available to key partners in a timely matter each year (High Priority; ongoing.)

GOAL 4:
TO RAISE PUBLIC AWARENESS ON A NUMBER OF KEY ISSUES AND DISTRICT ACTIVITIES

37. Continue the District’s water quality monitoring efforts (High Priority; ongoing).

38. Develop a website for the District (High Priority; $5,000; 2-5 years).

39. Continue to partner with other local agencies, organizations and schools to provide educational opportunities throughout the watershed district (High Priority; ongoing).

40. Provide newsletters to district residents as available (Medium Priority, ongoing).

41. Alert district residents to projects which may impact them by way of postcards, letters, brochures, public meetings, news releases and website postings (High Priority, ongoing).

42. Provide press releases about district projects (High Priority; ongoing.)
Section B:  
Plan Administration

Plan Coordination

Managing the water resources of the NFCRWD is a complicated task, involving many local, State and Federal agencies, as well as private citizens and special interest groups. For any water management activity to be successful, a well-coordinated effort is needed. The NFCRWD is committed to working with all of its stakeholders to ensure proper management of its water resources.

Implementation Timetable

Coordination of the Overall Plan’s initiatives will commence with the Board of Managers adoption of the plan. Initiatives will be carried out throughout the lifetime of the plan, which is scheduled to be a ten-year plan (2011 – 2020). The implementation plan contained in this chapter, however, is intended to be updated in five years (in 2015).

Role of the District in Implementation

The District recognizes the importance of water resource management and the role citizens and local units of government play in decision making. The Overall Plan’s goals, objectives, policy guidelines and action items are a reflection of the water related concerns in the NFCRWD. Implementation will be based on current needs and availability of funding.

The last section of this Chapter lists the estimated expenditures per action identified in the Overall Plan. The District realizes that in order to complete all of the action items listed, additional funding beyond the District’s budget will likely be necessary. The District, through various sources, will actively pursue outside funding opportunities as they become available.

Other Agencies Roles in Implementation

Throughout the Overall Plan, the stakeholders involved in the District’s interests are mentioned. It is intended that relationships with these entities can be further enhanced throughout the coordination of the plan’s initiatives.
Recommendations for State Programs

To implement the initiatives set forth in the Overall Plan, continued cooperation between the District and various State agencies is necessary. In an effort to increase coordination in this effort, the District respectfully makes the following recommendations regarding State agency programs.

- The District should be informed of State agency program changes and the availability of funding.
- Data collected by State agencies should be readily shared with the District to avoid duplicative efforts.
- State agencies should continue to provide local and/or regional staff to assist local officials with agency programs.
- State agencies should provide greater flexibility to districts in setting annual work plan priorities. Priorities should be based upon current needs, availability of funding and changes in State initiatives and regulations.

Intergovernmental Conflicts/Resolution Process

In the development of the Overall Plan, no intergovernmental conflicts arose. In the event of an intergovernmental conflict, the Board of Managers shall request the Advisory Committee to intervene and informally negotiate resolution of the conflict. If the committee does not resolve the conflict, the District shall petition the BWSR for a contested case hearing.

Plan Evaluation

To successfully implement the Overall Plan, periodic review is necessary. The District should review the plan at least once every two years in order to ensure that the NFCRWD’s “vision” remains both accurate and constructive. Any changes can be documented as an amendment to the plan. The plan can be amended by the recommendation of the Advisory Committee to the Board of Managers, or the Board of Managers can propose an amendment to the plan by resolution to the Advisory Committee.

Major Plan Amendment Procedure

The Overall Plan is intended to extend through December 31, 2020; however, the District may propose amendments to the plan prior to that. The following procedures will be used by the District for major amendment proposals to the Overall Plan.
1. When issues are brought to the attention of the District with regard to the need for amendments to its adopted Overall Plan, the District will refer that person, group, local unit of government, or agency to the District’s Advisory Committee.

2. The District’s Advisory Committee will review the issue and may, if necessary, undertake studies relating to the issue. After review, the committee will determine whether the Overall Plan should be amended.

3. If the District’s Advisory Committee determines that the Overall Plan should be amended, it will make recommendations to the Board of Managers. The Board of Managers shall approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.

After development, a proposed amendment to the Overall Plan must be submitted for local review and comment in the following manner. The District must submit the proposed plan amendment to all local units of government wholly or partly within the District, the applicable regional development commission (if any) and other counties or watershed management organizations within the same watershed unit and groundwater system that may be affected by the proposed plan amendment. Each local unit of government must review the proposed amendment, along with its own water and land-related land resources plans and/or official controls, and comment on the fiscal and policy ramifications of the amendment. Comments from local review must be submitted to the Board of Managers within 60 days after receiving a proposed plan amendment for comment, unless the Board of Managers determines that good cause exists for an extension of this period and grants an extension. The Board of Managers must conduct a public hearing on the proposed plan amendment after the 60-day period is completed, but before it is submitted to the State.

After conducting the public hearing, the Board of Managers must submit the proposed plan amendment, all written comments and a record of the public hearing to the BWSR for review. The BWSR must complete the review within 90 days after receiving the proposed Overall Plan amendment and supporting documentation. The BWSR must consult with the Departments of Agriculture, Health, Natural Resources, Pollution Control, Planning Agency, Environmental Quality and other appropriate State agencies during the review.

The BWSR may disapprove a proposed amendment if it determines the amendment is not consistent with State law or the principles of sound hydrologic management, effective environmental protection or efficient management. If the amendment is disapproved, the BWSR must provide a written statement of its reasons for disapproval. The disapproved Overall Plan amendment may be revised by the Board of Managers and resubmitted for approval by the BWSR within 120 days after receiving notice of disapproval, unless the BWSR extends the period for good cause. The decision of the BWSR to disapprove the amendment may be appealed by the Board of Managers to District Court. The Board of Managers must adopt and begin implementation of its amended Overall Plan within 120 days after receiving notice of approval of the amendment from the BWSR.
Minor Plan Amendment Procedure

If an amendment to the Overall Plan is considered to be minor in nature, the following process will be followed:

1. The Board of Managers will receive a recommendation from the Advisory Committee for an amendment to the Overall Plan.

2. At the Board of Manager’s meeting, where the amendment is introduced, the District will hold a public hearing to explain the amendments and publish a legal notice of the hearing at least ten (10) days before the date of the hearing in the official District newspaper.

3. The District will send copies of the amendment to the BWSR Board Conservationist assigned to the District for review and comment.

General Information

All amendments adopted by the District will be printed in the form of replacement pages for the Overall Plan. Each page will show deleted text as stricken and new text as underlines on draft amendments, as needed, and include the effective date of the amendment. The District will maintain a distribution list of agencies and individuals who have received a copy of the Overall Plan and the District shall distribute copies of the amendment(s) within thirty days of adoption.