# 10 Sustainability

Throughout the watershed management planning process numerous organizations and citizens have been involved (includes social indicator survey participants, see Chapter 8). This involvement is crucial for the success of watershed management implementation and achieving WQS.

### **10.1 Identified Partners**

#### 10.1.1 Regulatory Role

As part of the watershed management planning and implementation both the U.S. EPA and MDEQ provide regulatory oversight. Watershed management plans are reviewed and approved against U.S. EPA and MDEQ criteria. The review criteria supports the premise that watershed management plans should aid in reducing nonpoint source pollution and achieving WQS set forth by U.S. EPA and MDEQ. Both agencies manage and provide a source of funding for the creation and implementation of watershed management plans.

Drain Commissioners are public officials typically elected to a county office. They are tasked with administering Michigan laws related to flood protection, stormwater management and soil erosion. For the purpose of this WMP, the cooperation and involvement of county drain offices will result in infrastructure and land management improvements leading to a positive change in water quality.

Planning commissions and township officials have a significant impact on zoning and ordinances. A significant proportion of the Watershed land use is rural residential and agriculture. Reviewing zoning, ordinances and master plans for policies that support water quality improvement is crucial for the long term health of the Watershed. Michigan State University-Land Policy Institute has created a planning and zoning guidebook for local officials and is specifically targeted at rural water quality protection. This guide includes: essential elements to include in master plans and zoning ordinances, best management practices for protecting water quality, resource protection methods for protecting water quality and public education. What makes this guide especially useful and practical for implementation is the inclusion of sample language and examples of good, better and best. This guide will allow communities to self-assess where they are at in terms of policies that support water quality protection and improvement.

It is the recommendation of this WMP that planning commissions, township officials and municipalities work together to review their zoning and ordinances. If applicable, updates should be made based on resources such as, the guidebook created by Michigan State University-Land Policy Institute. Ideally, a watershed level assessment would take place to review zoning and ordinances on a comprehensive and collaborative level. This could be done in partnership with organizations like conservation districts, and non-profits (e.g. Mid-Michigan Environmental Action Council, Middle Grand River Organization of Watersheds, etc.).

Health departments are tasked with protecting the public health. One of the ways a health department does this is through the oversight for wells and septics. Health departments are typically located and operate on a county basis.

#### **10.1.2 Existing Infrastructure**

#### 10.1.2.1 Internal

The planning effort was led and facilitated by ECD. Coordination of meetings, data collection and inventory process, and communications with partners was accomplished through the leadership of ECD. As a result, ECD is the primary author of the plan. In the future, ECD will continue to drive the watershed management implementation process and help connect partners with funding sources and projects.

## 10.1.2.2 Planning Network

This WMP has benefited from a very active and involved steering committee. The organizations involved make-up the watershed planning network. Organizations involved include: Municipalities, County Drain Offices, Health Departments and Conservation Districts, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Michigan State University, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, etc. For a complete list of steering committee members see Appendix 15. The public was invited to participate in the steering committee through email newsletters, press releases, and presentations at the Land Use Lunch events coordinated by Mid-MEAC. Steering committee agendas, presentations, and information discussed were all posted online for public access. The public also provided input and comments through their participation in the social indicator survey (a full discussion of public feedback begins on page 144).

The participation of the steering committee helped inform the watershed management planning process of existing educational efforts, data collection, community knowledge, potential land use issues and landowner practices. Steering committee meetings were held regularly to maintain involvement as well as individual meetings to discuss specific implementation projects. Steering committee members were invited to participate in subcommittees that included: Information and Education, Watershed Management Plan Review and Technical.

Opportunity for review and input of the WMP was made available through the subcommittees and steering committee meetings. Individual chapters were developed through the subcommittees and the WMP review committee reviewed the full document in its entirety.

#### 10.2 Technical Assistance

Technical assistance resources to aid in the implementation of the WMP have been gathered. This list is intended to serve as a guide with the knowledge that new resources may arise and those listed below may change organizational priorities over time.

Table 59. Organizations Specializing in Technical

			Technical /	Assistance Ex	Technical Assistance Expertise Area		
							Cost Share
		Public			Residential	Land	and/or
Organization	Agriculture	Health	Zoning/Planning	Outreach	Management	Management	Funding
NRCS	×					×	×
MDARD-MAEAP	×			X		×	
Health Departments		×		X	X		
Drain Offices	×		X		X	X	
MSUE	×	×	X	X	X	×	
Conservation Districts	×			X	X	×	
Tri-County Regional							
Planning Commission			X	×	X		
Habitat Groups				X		×	
MDNR				X		×	×
Recycling Programs				X	X		
MID-MEAC			×	X	×		
MSU (IWR,							
departments and	×	*	×	×	×	×	
30000	<	<	4	<	4	<	
l ownships and Municipalities			×	×	×		
Land Conservancies			×			×	
Farm Land							
Preservation Program			X			×	×
County and City Parks				X		×	
MGROW				X			
West Michigan							
Kegional Planning Commission			×	×	×		

# **10.3 Potential Sources of Funding**

Funding resources to implement the WMP have been gathered. This list is intended to serve as a guide with the knowledge that new sources may arise and those listed below may change funding priorities over time.

Table 60. Funding Resources for Watershed Implementation

	Type of					
Funder	Funding	Cycle	Project Areas	Amount	Match	Website
			Education and training,	\$20,000-		
			Stormwater management,	\$50,000,		
EPA and		RFP-November,	Communities and water quality	Average		
USFS-Urban		Application Due-	data, Promote access to urban	award		http://www.nfwf.org/fivestar
Waters	Grant	February	waterways	\$25,000	1 to 1	/Pages/home.aspx
				\$20,000-		
				\$50,000,		
EPA and		RFP-November,	Wetland, riparian and in-stream	Average		
USFS-Five		Application Due-	habitat restoration, Education	award		http://www.nfwf.org/fivestar
Star	Grant	February	and training	\$25,000	1 to 1	/Pages/home.aspx
				\$10,000-		
		April, July and	Non-point source runoff	\$1.5		
		December	(agricultural and cities), Green	million,		
		(letter of	infrastructure, Regional work to	Average	Contact	
Joyce		inquiry and	advance policies to protect and	award	program	
Foundation	Grant	proposal)	restore Great Lakes	\$200,000	office	http://www.joycefdn.org/
SARE-		RFP-August,				
Research		Preposals-		Average	Contact	
and		October, April-	Broad range of sustainable	award	program	http://www.northcentralsare
Education	Grant	Full Proposals	agricultural interests	\$173,000	office	.org/
			Broad range of sustainable	Individual		
			0	\$7,500,		
			is awarded to a farmer who	Partner		
		RFP-August,	wants to investigate and learn	\$15,000 and	Contact	
SARE-Farmer		Proposals-	more about a certain topic of	Group	program	http://www.northcentralsare
Rancher	Grant	November	interest.	\$22,500	office	.org/
						http://www.fws.gov/birdhabi
		Application Due-		\$40 million		tat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard
USFS	Grant	March or July	Wetland restoration	available	1 to 1	/US/index.shtm
			Implementing physical,		25%,	
			vegetative and managerial best		Except	
		RFP-July, Letter	management practices and		conservat	
		of Intent-	information and education	Minimum	ion	
		August,	activities as identified in an	request	easement	
		Proposals-	approved watershed	\$25,000, No	requires	
MDEQ	Grant	October	management plan	maximum	50%	www.michigan.gov/deq
		RFP-February,				
		Application Due-		\$250,000		
MDEQ	Grant	March	Water quality monitoring	available	25%	www.michigan.gov/deq

Table 60. Funding Resources for Watershed Implementation

	Type of					
Funder	Funding	Cycle	Project Areas	Amount	Match	Website
			Environmental projects that			
			reach broad segment of the			
			community, foster			
			organizational capacity building			
			and sustainability, assist			
			citizens whose needs are not			
		RFP-	being met by existing services,			
Capital		January/Februa	meet emerging needs, innovative			
Region		ry, Application	and have high probability of			
Community		Due-	leading to new solutions and are	\$5,000-		http://www.crcfoundation.or
Foundation	Grant	March/April	collaborative	\$20,000	1 to 1	<u>g/</u>
			Conservation initiatives for		Contact	http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/w
		Contact local	farmers as defined by the Farm	Contact	local	ps/portal/nrcs/site/national
NRCS	Cost Shai	office	Bill	local office	office	/home/
			Installing conservation practices			
			to reduce sedimentation to	Watershed		
Great Lakes			improve water quality, harbor	projects \$1-	Not	
Basin-Soil			maintenance, fish and wildlife	\$250,000,	required	
Erosion and			habitat, recreational facilities	Small	but	
Sediment		Application Due-	and experiences and the public-	projects \$1-	encourag	http://www.glc.org/basin/in
Control	Grant	September	works systems	\$30,000	ed	dex.html
		'	Development and adoption of	,		
			innovative conservation			
			approaches and technologies.			
			Projects are expected to lead to	Maximum		
			the transfer of conservation	award		
			technologies, management	amount not		
NRCS-		RFP-	systems, and innovative	to exceed 1		
Conservatio		February,Prepo	approaches into NRCS policy,	million.	1 to 1	
n		sal Due- March,	technical manuals, guides and	Single and	from non-	http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/w
Innovation		Full Proposal	references, or to the private	multi-year	Federal	ps/portal/nrcs/main/nation
Grants	Grant	Due- May	sector.	projects.	sources	al/programs/financial/cig/
	o. u	,	Improve fish and other aquatic	\$25,000-\$1		
			organism populations by	million (or		
DNR-Aquatic		RFP- February,	protecting intact and	yearly		http://www.michigan.gov/dn
Habitat		, ,	rehabilitating degraded aquatic	maximum		r/0,4570,7-153-
Program	Grant	March	habitat.	available)	10%	58225 67220,00.html
DNR-	Grane		Enhance the quality of existing	\$15,000-	1070	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Wildlife		RFP- February,	game species habitat or create	yearly		http://www.michigan.gov/dn
Habitat			new high quality game species	maximum		r/0,4570,7-153-
Program	Grant	March	habitat.	available	10%	58225_67395,00.html
- 5	- Crume			Average	2070	
				Award		
				\$460,000,		
		Preposals Due-		Funding		
Great Lakes		February,	Project areas vary from year to	Range		
Protection		Reviewed by	year. Fund projects that are	\$20,000-	Not	http://glpf.org/working-with-
Fund	Grant	Board in June	regional and larger in scale.	\$1.5 million	required	us/projects-wanted
	Static			7 2.0 111111011	. equited	ST, S. SJOSS WALLOW
			Sustain, restore and protect fish,			
			wildlife and habitat in the Great			
			Lakes basin. Projects awarded			
Sustain our		Preposals Due-	for on-the-ground habitat	\$25,000-		
Great Lakes	Grant	February	restoration and enhancement.	\$1.5 million	1 to 1	www.nfwf.org/easy grants
C. Cat Lakes	Joranic	. Cor dury	1 cotor a don and chilanechicht.	141.2 HIIIIIOII	1 10 1	****** grants

# 10.4 Tracking Progress: Updating the WMP

The intent of the WMP is to serve as a living document. To achieve this, the WMP will require updating and ECD will serve as the leading organization for this task.

The following components should be incorporated into the WMP in the future:

- Dissolved Oxygen TMDL once approved by U.S. EPA
- Incorporation of critical zones once future *E.coli* monitoring is completed
- Removal of critical zones once implementation projects have been completed and improved water quality is demonstrated
- Adjustment of subwatershed priorities over time

Lastly, the sustainability of the WMP should be evaluated and tracked over time. This can be achieved through the following parameters:

- Are there enough resources to accomplish the implementation plan, I/E strategy and monitoring strategy?
- Are stakeholders continually involved in the implementation and updating of the WMP?
- Is the WMP achieving regional collaboration?

# **10.5 Sustainability Summary**

The WMP has laid a foundation to achieve sustainability over time. Numerous partners and networks have been identified to aid in regulation, technical assistance, organizational infrastructure and funding. Whether not sustainability is achieved can largely be measured by the extent of continued steering committee involvement and the implementation of on the ground projects.

Table 62. Implementation task and responsible contribution partner

Implementation Task	Lead Contributing Partner		
	(Steering Committee Member)		
Facilitate committees and meetings; coordinate	ECD; TCRPC-GLRC; MGROW		
with other counties	ECD, TERPC-GERC, MIGROW		
Collect additional data and update the WMP	ECD; TCRPC-GLRC; MGROW		
when new data are available			
Coordinate and implement BMP strategies	All stakeholders		
Implement information and education strategy	ECD; TCRPC-GLRC; MGROW		
Implement future monitoring plan	ECD; TCRPC-GLRC; MGROW		
Communicate with MDEQ in regards to the			
TMDLs and implementation progress and water	ECD		
quality impacts			