State of Wisconsin
Land and Water Conservation Board

PO Box 8911
Madison, WI 53708-8911
608-224-4630

Land and Water Conservation Board
Agenda

August 6, 2019

The Land and Water Conservation Board will meet on **August 6, 2019** beginning at **9:00 a.m.** in Boardroom 106 at the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection, 2811 Agriculture Drive, Madison, WI. The agenda for the meeting is shown below. A lunch break will be observed.

AGENDA ITEMS AND TENTATIVE SCHEDULE:

9:00 am 1. Call the Meeting to Order – **Mark Cupp, LWCB Chair**
   a. Pledge of allegiance
   b. Open meeting notice
   c. Approval of agenda
   d. Approval of June 4, 2019 meeting minutes

9:05 am 2. Public appearances*
   **Each speaker is limited to 5 minutes or less. Each speaker must complete a Public Appearance Request Card and submit it to a DATCP representative before the start of the meeting*

9:10 am 3. Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Vernon County – **Ben Wojahn, County Conservationist, Vernon County LWCD; Will Beitlich, Land Conservation Committee Chair**

9:55 am 4. Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Ashland County – **MaryJo Gingras, County Conservationist, Ashland County LWCD; George Mika, Land Conservation Committee Chair**

10:40 am 5. Report on 2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan – **Jennifer Heaton-Amrhein, DATCP, and MaryAnne Lowndes, DNR**

11:10 am 6. Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management

Mark Cupp, Chair • Dave Solin, Vice-Chair
Members: Brad Matson • Monte Osterman • Andrew Buttles • Ron Grasshoff
Eric Birschbach • Bobbie Webster • Andrew Potts • Sara Walling • Brian Weigel

		Plan revision for Barron County – **Tyler Gruetzmacher, County Conservationist, Barron County SWCD; Russ Rindsig, Land Conservation Committee Member**
11:55 am	7.	Lunch
12:40 pm	8.	Livestock Facility Siting Update – **Chris Clayton, DATCP**
12:55 pm	9.	Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Oneida County – **Michele Sadauskas, County Conservationist, Oneida County LWCD; Bob Mott, Conservation and UW-EX Education Committee Chair; Karl Jennrich, Department Head, LWCD/P&Z; Fred Heider, North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission**
1:40 pm	10.	Draft letter to Water Quality Task Force regarding nonpoint funding **– Mark Cupp, LWCB**
1:55 pm	11.	Agency reports a. FSA b. NRCS c. UW-CALS d. UW-Extension e. WI Land + Water f. DOA g. DATCP h. DNR
2:15 pm	12.	Planning for October 2019 LWCB meeting **– Mark Cupp, LWCB**
2:20 pm	14.	Adjourn

MINUTES
LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 4, 2019
Room 3
Chippewa County Courthouse
711 N. Bridge St., Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin

Item #1 Call to Order—pledge of allegiance, open meeting notice, approval of agenda, approval of April 2, 2019 LWCB meeting minutes.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Cupp at 9:02 a.m. Members Eric Birschbach, Ron Grasshoff, Andrew Buttles, Dave Solin, Monte Osterman, Bobbie Webster, Brian Weigel, Sara Walling, and Andrew Potts were in attendance. A quorum was present. Advisors Angela Biggs (NRCS) and Matt Krueger (WI Land + Water) also were present. Others present included Richard Castelnuovo, Lisa Trumble, and Chris Clayton, DATCP.

Clayton confirmed that the meeting was publicly noticed.

Chippewa County welcomed the board. The board made introductions, including new board members Bobbie Webster and Andrew Buttles.

Birschbach moved to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Solin, and the motion carried.

Osterman moved to approve the April 2nd meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Walling, and the motion carried.

Item #2 Public Appearances

No public appearance cards were submitted.

Item #3 Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Calumet County

Toni Reali, Calumet County Land and Water Conservation Department, and Pat Laughrin, Land and Water Conservation Committee Vice-Chair, made a formal presentation in support of a 10-year approval of the county's LWRM plan.

DATCP's review of the plan using the LWRM Plan Review Checklist found that the plan complies with all requirements of section 92.10, Wisconsin Statutes, and Chapter ATCP 50, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

Calumet County Land and Water Conservation Department provided written answers to the board's standardized questions, recent work plans and accomplishments, and other materials (available on LWCB's website: https://datcp.wi.gov/Pages/About_Us/LandWaterConservationBoard.aspx).

Board members and Calumet County representatives discussed the following: public perceptions of groundwater quality issues due to karst bedrock; the high value of 'boots on the ground' to address surface water and groundwater issues; pros and cons of the NRCS 590 nutrient management standard in addressing water quality issues; the use of demonstration farms as a means to introduce farmers to conservation needs and practices; the county's need for a depth-to-bedrock verification standard to implement the targeted performance standards; county tracking of nutrient management plan

implementation; county partners and resources needed to develop 9 key elements plans; the loss of farms and agricultural lands in the county, especially dairy.

Walling moved to recommend approval of Calumet County's plan revision for a period of 10 years, seconded by Potts, and the motion carried.

Item #4 Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Burnett County

Dave Ferris, Burnett County Land and Water Conservation Department, and Craig Conroy, Burnett County Natural Resources Committee, made a formal presentation in support of a 10-year approval of the county's LWRM plan.

DATCP's review of the plan using the LWRM Plan Review Checklist found that the plan complies with all requirements of section 92.10, Wisconsin Statutes, and Chapter ATCP 50, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

Burnett County Land and Water Conservation Department provided written answers to the board's standardized questions, recent work plans and accomplishments, and other materials (available on LWCB's website: https://datcp.wi.gov/Pages/About_Us/LandWaterConservationBoard.aspx).

Board members and Burnett County representatives discussed the following: methods to account for phosphorus loss reductions due to shoreline stabilization practices; county involvement in reclamation plans following non-metallic mining; regional partnership with other counties to control terrestrial invasive species; management of zebra mussel infestations in two lakes by containment; county efforts to help control aquatic invasive species.

Grasshoff moved to recommend approval of Burnett County's plan revision for a period of 10 years, seconded by Webster, and the motion carried.

Item #5 Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Chippewa County

Dan Masterpole, Chippewa County Land Conservation and Forest Management Department, and Dean Gullickson, County Land Conservation and Forest Management Committee, made a formal presentation in support of a 10-year approval of the county's LWRM plan.

DATCP's review of the plan using the LWRM Plan Review Checklist found that the plan complies with all requirements of section 92.10, Wisconsin Statutes, and Chapter ATCP 50, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

Chippewa County Land Conservation and Forest Management Department provided written answers to the board's standardized questions, recent work plans and accomplishments, and other materials (available on LWCB's website: https://datcp.wi.gov/Pages/About_Us/LandWaterConservationBoard.aspx).

Board members and Chippewa County representatives discussed the following: efforts to create an Agricultural Enterprise Area in a priority watershed; efforts needed to stem the loss of dairy farms; the county's plans to use social media to increase outreach efforts.

Weigel moved to recommend approval of Chippewa County's plan revision for a period of 10 years, seconded by Solin, and the motion carried.

DRAFT

Item #6 Agriculture-Related Risk Factors for Private Well Contamination in NE Wisconsin

Borchardt presented a summary of recent research results from a study in Northeastern Wisconsin that identifies agricultural-related risk factors for private well contamination. His research objectives included: 1) Estimate county-wide contamination rate for nitrate and indicator bacteria as related to depth-to-bedrock; 2) Determine source of fecal contamination using viruses and fecal markers; and 3) Identify risk factors for private well contamination using statistical models. One main finding of the study was that groundwater contamination decreases with greater distance from manure lagoons. Borchardt suggested that future research could look at factors for decreasing risks to private well contamination by modeling the addition of conservation practices.

Item #7 Board discussion on DATCP Secretary report on study of alternative funding sources and preparation of written testimony regarding the speakers task force on water quality

Cupp summarized the board's ongoing discussion related to the need to study alternative funding sources for the state's nonpoint program. Krueger reported on attending a recent symposium at UW-Stevens Point on alternative funding sources for conservation and observed that there were no clear outcomes nor direction forward as a result of those discussions. Cupp recommended that the LWCB develop written testimony for Representative Novak and other legislators on the state's Water Quality Task Force. The board discussed this recommendation and agreed to consider a draft letter at the August LWCB meeting that expresses the need to establish alternative funding sources to address specific soil and water conservations goals. The LWCB agreed to work with agency staff and Wisconsin Land + Water to gather the information necessary for identifying alternative funding sources that would generate revenue to accomplish specific tasks. Cupp set a deadline of July 1st for LWCB members to contribute any issues that will be placed in the draft letter, for board review at its meeting on August 6th.

Item #8 Agency Reports

Agencies provided written reports in lieu of oral reports to the LWCB.

Item #9 Planning for August 2019 LWCB meeting

- Preliminary Joint DATCP and DNR allocation plan, dependent on status of the state budget
- Four counties will present full LWRM plan revisions to the board

Items #10-12 Travel to Arrowhead Farms for lunch

The LWCB traveled to Arrowhead Farms for lunch and heard the following presentations at Arrowhead Farms:

- Dave Johnson and others of Arrowhead Farms gave an overview of farm operations with a focus on nutrient management and irrigation practices. Chippewa County LCFMD staff and consultants provided additional information.
- Kevin Masarik from UW-Stevens Point reported on groundwater quality in Wisconsin, including local approaches, results, and next steps.

Item #13 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

DRAFT

Eric Birschbach, Secretary Date

Recorder: CC, DATCP

DRAFT

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ State of Wisconsin

DATE: **July 25, 2019**

TO: **Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors**

FROM: **Lisa K. Trumble, DATCP** Lisa K. Trumble
Resource Management Section,
Bureau of Land and Water Resources

SUBJECT: **Recommendation for Approval of the *Vernon County Land and Water Resource Management Plan***

Action Requested: This is an action item. The department has determined that the Vernon *County Land and Water Resource Management Plan* meets applicable statutory and rule requirements and requests that the LWCB make a recommendation regarding approval of the plan consistent with the Board's guidance.

Summary: The plan is written as a 10 year plan, and if approved, the plan would remain in effect through December 31, 2029, and would be subject to a five year review prior to December 31, 2024.

DATCP staff reviewed the plan using the checklist and finds that the plan complies with all the requirements of section 92.10, Wisconsin Statutes, and Chapter ATCP 50, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

To qualify for 10 year approval of its plan, Vernon County must submit an annual work plan meeting DATCP requirements during each year of its 10 year plan approval.

Vernon County held a public hearing on January10, 2019, as part of its public input and review process. The Vernon County Land Conservation Committee received County Board approval for its plan before receiving a recommendation of approval from the LWCB.

Materials Provided:
- LWRM Plan Review Checklist
- Completed LWRM Plan Review form
- 2018 workplan with accomplishments and current 2019 workplan

Presenters: Ben Wojahn, Vernon County Conservationist
Will Beitlich, Land Conservation Committee Chair

ARM-LWR-167 (August, 2017)

Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
Agricultural Resource Management Division
2811 Agriculture Drive, PO Box 8911
Madison WI 53708-8911
Phone: (608) 224-4608

Land and Water Resource Management (LWRM)

LWRM Plan Review Checklist

Wis. Stats. § 92.10 & Wis. Adm. Code § ATCP 50.12.

County: VERNON Date Plan Submitted for Review: 1/21/2019

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county convene a local advisory committee that included a broad spectrum of public interests and perspectives (such as affected landowners, partner organizations, government officials, educational institutions)	☒	☐	1

II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND COUNTY BOARD APPROVAL	Date(s)
1. Provide the dates that the local advisory committee met to discuss the development of the LWRM plan and the county plan of work	10/29/18 12/3/18 01/3/19
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan[1]	1/10/19
3. Provide the date of county board approval of the plan, or the date the county board is expected to approve the plan after the LWCB makes its recommendation.[2]	4/16/19

III. RESOURCE ASSESSMENT AND WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the plan include the following information as part of a county-wide resource assessment:			
a. Soil erosion conditions in the county[3], including:			
i. identification of areas within county that have high erosion rates or other soil erosion problems that merit action within the next 10 years	☒	☐	19, 27-28
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county[3], including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	☒	☐	6
ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources	☒	☐	8-10

[1] Appropriate notice must be provided for the required public hearing. The public hearing notice serves to notify landowners and land users of the results of any determinations concerning soil erosion rates and nonpoint source water pollution, and provides an opportunity for landowners and land users input on the county's plan. Individual notice to landowners is required if the landowners are referenced directly in the LWRM plan. DATCP may request verification that appropriate notice was provided.

[2] The county board may approve the county LWRM plan after the department approves the plan. The plan approved by the county board must be the same plan approved by the department. If the department requires changes to a plan previously approved by the county board, the department's approval does not take effect until the county board approves the modified plan.

[3] Counties should support their analysis of soil and water conditions by referencing relevant land use and natural resource information, including the distribution of major soil types and surface topographic features, and land use categories and their distribution. Sec. ATCP 50.12(3)(b) requires that a county assemble relevant data, including relevant land use, natural resource, water quality and soil data.

iii. identification of areas within the county that have water quality problems that merit action within the next 10 years.	☒	☐	Chap 1
2. Does the LWRM plan address objectives by including the following:			
a. specific water quality objectives identified for each watershed based upon the resource assessment, if available	☒	☐	11-15
b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available	☒	☐	11-15
Other comments: Using priority farm strategy to prioritize soil erosion issues. Using TMDL for objectives and target reductions			

IV. DNR CONSULTATION	**Yes**	**No**	**Page**
1. Did the county consult with DNR[4] to obtain water quality assessments, if available; to identify key water quality problem areas; to determine water quality objectives; and to identify pollutant load reduction targets, if any; and to review NR 151 implementation	☒	☐	21

Other comments: DNR worked with Vernon County

____

V. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	**Yes**	**No**	**Page**
1. Does the LWRM plan include the following implementation components: :			
a. A voluntary implementation strategy to encourage adoption of farm conservation practices	☒	☐	46
b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan	☒	☐	39-40
c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations	☒	☐	46
d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems	☒	☐	45
e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	☒	☐	43

[4] While requirements for DNR consultation may be satisfied by including relevant DNR representatives on the advisory committee, counties may also need to interact with DNR staff in central or regional offices to meet all of the consultation requirements. DNR may point counties to other resources to obtain information including consultants who can calculate pollutant load reduction targets.

2. Does the LWRM plan (or accompanying work plan) estimate:			
a. expected costs of implementing the plan including cost-sharing for conservation practices needed to achieve plan objectives	☒	☐	Ch. 6
b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	☒	☐	Ch. 6
3. Does the LWRM plan describe a priority farm strategy designed to make reasonable progress in implementing state performance standards and conservation practices on farms appropriately classified as a priority	☒	☐	42

Other comments: _____

VI. OUTREACH AND PARTNERING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy to provide information and education on soil and water resource management, conservation practices and available cost-share funding	☒	☐	43
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	☒	☐	2-3

Other comments: _____

VII. WORK PLANNING AND PROGRESS MONITORING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the county's most recent annual work plan[5] do both of the following:			
a. Provide measurable performance benchmarks	☒	☐	NA
b. Identify priorities	☒	☐	NA
2. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy and framework for monitoring county progress implementing its plan including methodology to track and measure progress in meeting performance benchmarks and plan objectives	☒	☐	47

Other comments:

VIII. EPA SECTION 319 CONSIDERATIONS

1. IS THE COUNTY WORKING WITH DNR TO SEEK EPA APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN AS MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF A 9 KEY ELEMENT PLAN UNDER SECTION 319 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT: Not at this time

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

[5] Counties must submit annual work plan by no later than April 15th of every year to meet the requirement in s. ATCP 50.12(2)(i) for counties to have multi-year work plans.

Staff has reviewed the above-referenced county LWRM plan based on the criteria required in s. ATCP 50.12, Wis. Admin. Code, and s. 92.10, Stats., and has determined that the plan meets the criteria for DATCP approval of this plan. This checklist review is prepared to enable the LWCB to make recommendations regarding plan approval, and for DATCP to make its final decision regarding plan approval.

Staff Signature: Lisa K. Trumble Date: 07/17/2019

Land and Water Conservation Board
County Land and Water Resource Management Plan
Review of LWRM Plan Revisions

County: Vernon

Implementation Covering Past Five Years and Future Directions

Answer these four questions in writing (not to exceed 4 pages)

1. Provide a representative number of accomplishments within the last five years that can be directly traced to activities identified in multiple work plans. For each accomplishment, explain how the planning process helped the county achieve its outcome, including planning adjustments that helped better target county activities.

   Our department is proud of the many accomplishments that we have achieved over the last five years. With our Land & Water plan identifying our local driven priorities, we have been able to achieve and make strides towards Vernon County's greatest conservation needs.
   BMP practice installation, including utilizing SWRM, NOD, and EQIP funding, has been a primary focus of our work plans and accomplishments. BMP accomplishments also directly tie in well to our ambitious Farmland Preservation Program.
   Farmland Preservation has been a growing success. Through our departments' ambitious efforts, Towns are steadily developing and adopting Farmland Preservation Zoning Ordinances. In 2009 Vernon County had two Towns with FPP Zoning Ordinances. Now, we have 5 Towns with FPP Zoning, and another three actively pursuing these efforts. Our FPP accomplishments (193 Certificates of Compliance) also compliment significant portions of our work plans as the program contributes to greater participation from farmers and landowners in Nutrient Management (3368 new acres in 2018), farm walkovers, and NR 151 compliance. As always, the Nutrient Management Farmer Education Classes (17 attendees in 2018) continue to be a priority for our department, and an important option for our Farmers.
   Outreach and education has thrived in the last five years. The LWRM plan helps to identify the importance of our programs. Without the plan, it would be easy for outreach and education to get lost in the "daily grind" of our responsibilities. We held nine Cover Crop events over the past two years. Managed Grazing (3 events) is always a priority for our education field days, and is a consistent theme woven into all of our Soil Health events. We held a few large Soil Health events featuring Ray Archuletta with over 200 attendees.
   Youth Education has been completely resurrected in the past five years. We currently teach over 700 students each year about a conservation topic that is chosen at the national level. Then the students create a poster for our Youth Conservation Poster Contest. Our annual awards banquet is a very positive event that allows us to celebrate the youth, as well as the farmers and conservation landowners in our community.
   Our department works directly with our farmers, including with Farm Bureau and our Local Farmer-led Watershed Councils, to have high quality and impactful.

Trout stream restoration, bank stabilization, and associated practices remain a priority for Vernon County. These efforts greatly reduce impacts from flooding, protect farm resources, and can have a staggering reduction of phosphorus and sediment loss. Goals have been met and exceeded in this category, and we are on the advent of forming new and strengthened partnerships in order to continue to enhance Water Quality and In-stream habitat, as identified in our LWRM plan.
Dealing with Flood related issues, including maintenance and repairs of our 22 PL566 Dam structures, continues to be a significant factor in our work plans. Arguably, no efforts have a greater impact on reducing soil erosion, and protecting farmer resources, than our Dam structures. Despite the very regular, record storm events, our department continues to have considerable success.

2. Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in recent work plans. For each area identified, explain the work plan adjustments that were made to refocus planned activities. If no areas are identified, explain how the county was able to make progress in all the areas planned.

Our Department has been able to accomplish the majority of our work plan. As can be expected, most of the action items in our plan are ongoing, as a Conservationist's job is never done!

Items including outreach and education have far exceeded our stated goals. More bread and butter accomplishments, including BMP practices, Nutrient Management, and Farmland Preservation, have met expectations and are ongoing.

The primary activity that has not yet been met is the full development and utilization of a tracking system. This effort has been a long saga which includes working with three different companies, trying to come up with funding, and watching what other Counties have found for solutions. Fortunately, we now have finally secured funding, and we are working with GCS to complete our FPP and NR 151 tracking system.

3. Describe the county's approach to implementation of its priority farm strategy including outreach, farm inventories and making use of multiple funding sources. How has the county evaluated the effectiveness of its priority farm strategy and used this information to improve implementation of the agricultural performance standards and conservation practices on farms?

Our current priority farm strategy is rooted in Farmland Preservation. Through FPP, we are able to offer farmers the incentive to not only work with us initially, but also to continue to maintain their conservation practices, NR 151, and Nutrient Management Plans. This strategy has proven to be very effective, as we have steadily increased the number of Towns with FPP zoning and the number of farms eligible for the Tax Credit and NR 151 performance standards compliance. From our evaluations, we can conclude that this strategy has worked because most farmers choose to continue with the compliance. This sustained compliance leads to a better rate of return on our conservation efforts.

Moving forward we will also allow Farmer/Landowner Led Watershed groups to help determine our priority farm strategies. That is one reason why we include these farmers in our Citizen Advisory Committee during the development of our most recent LWRM plan.

4. Provide representative examples that show changes in direction in the county's LWRM plan and annual work plans, with specific examples provided showing adjustments in goals, objectives or planned activities.

Our LWRM plan largely remains consistent over the years. That being said, we are adjusting our plan in order to address changing weather patterns and to utilize innovative approaches to accomplish our locally led conservation priorities.

Focusing on Farmer-led initiatives is a new priority. This strategy allows us to have the farmers take the lead, for us to hear them, and for them to influence their neighbors who may be later adopters of conservation.

We now have a goal of doing more watershed modeling. This will largely involve the utilization of EVAAL, and will allow us to focus on priority areas with the greatest cost benefit. We are focusing our EVAAL efforts in areas where we are having success in developing Landowner/Farmer led watershed groups. Along with Watershed Modeling, we also plan to work on the development of at least one 9 Key element plan. The goal of this plan will be to help secure available funding opportunities, to engage Watershed Groups in the planning process, and to have a Watershed specific plan that complements our LWRM plan.

The historic, and far too common flooding events are also having an impact on our priorities. Now that our County has experienced at least three, 500 year storm events, we can no longer behave as if these floods are unique or isolated incidents. For that reason, we have now made sure that our LWRM plan will have greater parity with Vernon County Emergency Management's Multi-hazard mitigation plan. Modeling, flood mitigation, and far reaching goals to enhance how we retain water on the landscape and now explicitly identified in our work plan. We are also continuing to work with a broad range of partners in order to help secure resources in research, BMP priorities, and good land management promotion. Whether it is the utilization of prairie buffer strips, or priority placement of grade stabilization structures, we are working across departments and agencies to make impactful progress on erosion, runoff, and flooding to our landowners.

Annual Work Plans

Attach both of the following:

a. The most current annual work plan, prepared in the current format from DATCP, and addresses all required items such as needed funding and staff hours.

b. The work plan for the previous year that includes a column that identifies the progress in implementing the planned activities for that year.

Presentation Regarding County Resource Concerns

Prepare and present an 8-10 minute snapshot to the board regarding county resources and management issues. The county must prepare one of following as part of this brief presentation:

a. A PowerPoint (showing what your county looks like, can include maps), or
b. A hand out (2 page max)

Guidance on Board Review Process

The LWCB's review supplements, but does not replace compliance with the DATCP checklist for LWRM plan approval. This encourages and supports honest presentations from the county. The county is strongly encouraged to have the LCC chair or committee member be a part of the presentation to the Board to contribute policy and other insights to the discussion. The goal of the review is not to fail counties. The board recognizes the dynamic nature of the planning process. Board members are interested in how counties tackle priorities over time and how they respond to changing conditions in pursuing their priorities. The board will evaluate a county's planning and implementation based on how well the county balances and prioritizes the following: agricultural performance standards, other state priorities (impaired waters, FPP checks), and local priorities. When needed, the Board will provide constructive support to counties to improve the quality of their planning.

Land Conservation Committee Notification

The LCC was provided a completed copy of this form (including attachments) on: 1/10/19

Signature of Authorized Representative: __ Benjamin [illegible] ____**Date:** _03/19/19___
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

Send completed form and attachments to:
Lisa.Trumble@wi.gov

VERNON COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	*Practice installation 5 waterways, 3 well abandonment, 2 Waste Storage, 1-2 Waste Storage abandonment &* *100% of cost-share dollars spent* *NM planning and training 40 farmers through NMP trainings; 50 NMP's reviewed for compliance* *Transect Survey Completed* *4-6 Towns* *NMP SEG Funds100 % cost-share dollars spent* *Contour Strips1,000 acres of contour strips marked* *FPP and Landowner Tracking* *Database completed and farmers info fully populated* *Landscape-scale surveys and/or inventories1-2* *Assist Towns with FPP3-5* *Annual Mailings to FPP Claimants* *Press releases for FPP* *Informational At least three events and 150 farmers reached meetings for FPP* *Assist NRCS with EQIP* *Cover Crop Outreach10-20 Landowners; at least 2 outreach events*	62 inspections performed 165 of compliance certificates, compliance schedules or letters issued 236 Landowners served 869 staff hours expended for design and installation 1,200 acres contour striped 172 of farms in compliance with a performance standard 57 of NM plans reviewed 100% Cost-share dollars spent 1 Transect Survey Completed 70% tracking software completed 6 towns assisted with FPP 2 mailings sent out FPP 5 press releases published 6 farmer education events with over 250 attendees
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	*Stream Crossings2-3 installed* *Farm Walkovers At least 20* *NOD runoff grants/landowner assistance 1-2* *Manure Spreaders Calibrated At least 3*	900 staff hours expended for design and installation 100% cost-share dollars spent 1 NOD grant applied for 3 manure storage permits issued or obtained *3 managed grazing plans*

VERNON COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

	Manure Storage permit2-5 *Manure Storage Assistance3-6* *Other practices including barnyard/roof gutter2* *Managed Grazing Plans2-3* *Access Road s3* *Review/Revise Manure Storage Ordinance1* *Runoff Manure Complaint follow-up5-20*	*3Access Roads* *3 Grassed Waterways* *1 Manure Storage Ordinance reviewed* *3 Well abandonments* *1 underground outlet*

- *Water quality*

Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	*Streambank projects 3* *Runoff mitigation on public lands 3* *Perennial Buffer Demonstration* *PL566 dams maintained*	20 landowners contacted 2 educational events held serving 100+ landowners 1-3 Buffer demonstrations *3 Streambank stabilization* *22 dams maintained*

- *Forestry*

Forestry	*Forest Management Plans 2-3* *Stream Crossings 1* *Acres Planned 70*	*Forest Management Plan 2* *Acres Planned 70*

- *Invasive*

Invasive species	*West Fork Survey of Invasives 1* *Control Site Demo 1* *Control of site 1* *Mutli-Agency Collaboration On-going effort, at least 2 partner organizations* *Invasive Species cooperative grant*	*2 Grant Administered* *1 Site Control* *2 Multi Agency collaborations* *1 applied for*

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	*Wildlife damage program 1 continued program* *Tree and plant sales 15-20,000 Trees sold* *Public Land Tree Planting 1-2000 trees*	*1 Wetland restoration* *1 Wildlife damage program* *15,000 trees sold* *1,000 trees planted on public land* *450 trees planted with school groups*

- *Urban*

Urban issues	*Water Quality Trading Interact with at least 2 communities; follow-through as they are available*	*Work with 2 communities to pursue WQT*

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	*Tainter Watershed Producer-led Continued assistance with development of watershed group, grant writing, and other facilitation*	*Watershed group facilitation of at least 4 meetings* *1 grant administered* *At least 20 landowners in West Fork Watershed*

	West Fork Landowner led watershed group EVAAL	*Work with DNR to perform EVAAL modeling in Tainter Watershed*

- *Other*

Other	*PL 566 22 Structures inspected, operated, and maintained* *Non-metallic gravel and sand quarries 47* *Parks Maintained All parks maintained and continually improved* *Flood Debris related Issues County-wide, private and public, significant and on-going, multifaceted.*	*22 Dams maintained and inspected* *Number of inspections* 47 Non Metallic Mine inspections completed Annual report completed # of permits issued

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits		
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	2	2
Manure storage closure	1-2	1-2
Livestock facility siting	1-2	1-2
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	47	47
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	Na	Na
Shoreland zoning	Na	Na
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	Na	Na
Other		

VERNON COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	*50*
For FPP	*50*
For NR 151	*25*
Animal waste ordinance	1-2
Livestock facility siting	1-2
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	0
Nonmetallic mining	47

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	2
Field days	7
Trainings/workshops	10
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	Over 700 students
Newsletters	1
Social media posts	Partners, but not us
News release/story	12

Table 5: Staff Hours and Expected Costs (staff can be combined or listed individually)

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	2080	$87,300
Technician	*2080*	*$73,530*
Support Costs	*2080*	*$72,830*
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Ex. Bonding	*N/A*	*$120,000*
Ex. SEG	*N/A*	$160,000

VERNON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS 2018
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	*Practice installation 5 waterways, 3 well abandonment, 2 Waste Storage, 1-2 Waste Storage abandonment &* *100% of cost-share dollars spent* *NM planning and training 40 farmers through NMP trainings; 50 NMP's reviewed for compliance* *Transect Survey Completed* *4-6 Towns* *NMP SEG Funds100 % cost-share dollars spent* *Contour Strips500-2,000 acres of contour strips marked* *FPP and Landowner Tracking* *Database completed and farmers info fully populated* *Landscape-scale surveys and/or inventories1-2* *Assist Towns with FPP3-5* *Annual Mailings to FPP Claimants* *Press releases for FPP* *Informational At least three events and 150 farmers reached meetings for FPP* *Assist NRCS with EQIP* *Cover Crop Outreach10-20 Landowners; at least 2 outreach events*	62 inspections performed 188 of compliance certificates, compliance schedules or letters issued 33 Landowners served 2,080 staff hours expended for design and installation 1,200 acres contour striped 172 of farms in compliance with a performance standard 157 of NM plans reviewed 100% Cost-share dollars spent 1 Transect Survey Completed 78% tracking software completed 8 towns assisted with FPP 2 mailings sent out FPP 5 press releases published 6 farmer education events with over 250 attendees
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	*Stream Crossings2-3 installed* *Farm Walkovers At least 20* *NOD runoff grants/landowner assistance 1-2* *Manure Spreaders Calibrated At least 3*	900 staff hours expended for design and installation 100% cost-share dollars spent 1 NOD grant applied for 3 manure storage permits issued or obtained

VERNON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

	Manure Storage permit2-5 *Manure Storage Assistance3-6* *Other practices including barnyard/roof gutter2* *Managed Grazing Plans2-3* *Access Road s3* *Review/Revise Manure Storage Ordinance1* *Runoff Manure Complaint follow-up5-20*	*3 managed grazing plans* *3Access Roads* *3 Grassed Waterways* *1 Manure Storage Ordinance reviewed* *3 Well abandonments* *1 underground outlet* *6 complaints follow-up*

- *Water quality*

Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	*Streambank projects 3* *Runoff mitigation on public lands 3* *Perennial Buffer Demonstration* *PL566 dams maintained*	20 landowners contacted 2 educational events held serving 100+ landowners 1-3 Buffer demonstrations *3 Streambank stabilization* *22 dams maintained*

- *Forestry*

Forestry	*Forest Management Plans 2-3* *Stream Crossings 1* *Acres Planned 70*	*Forest Management Plan 2* *Acres Planned 70*

- *Invasive*

Invasive species	*West Fork Survey of Invasives 1* *Control Site Demo 1* *Control of site 1* *Mutli-Agency Collaboration On-going effort, at least 2 partner organizations* *Invasive Species cooperative grant*	*2 Grant Administered* *1 Site Control* *2 Multi Agency collaborations* *1 applied for*

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	*Wildlife damage program 1 continued program* *Tree and plant sales 15-20,000 Trees sold* *Public Land Tree Planting 1-2000 trees*	*1 Wetland restoration* *1 Wildlife damage program* *15,000 trees sold* *1,000 trees planted on public land* *450 trees planted with school groups*

- *Urban*

Urban issues	*Water Quality Trading Interact with at least 2 communities; follow-through as they are available*	*Work with 2 communities to pursue WQT. Initial*

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	*Tainter Watershed Producer-led Continued assistance with development of watershed group,*	*Watershed group facilitation of at least 4 meetings* *1 grant administered*

	grant writing, and other facilitation *West Fork Landowner led watershed group* *EVAAL*	*At least 20 landowners in West Fork Watershed* *Work with DNR to perform EVAAL modeling in Tainter Watershed*

- *Other*

Other	*PL 566 22 Structures inspected, operated, and maintained* *Non-metallic gravel and sand quarries 47* *Parks Maintained All parks maintained and continually improved* *Flood Debris related Issues County-wide, private and public, significant and on-going, multifaceted.*	*22 Dams maintained and inspected* *Number of inspections* 47 Non Metallic Mine inspections completed Annual report completed # of permits issued

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits		
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	2	2
Manure storage closure	1-2	1-2
Livestock facility siting	1-2	1-2
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	47	47
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	Na	Na
Shoreland zoning	Na	Na
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	Na	Na
Other		

VERNON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	*50*
For FPP	*50*
For NR 151	*25*
Animal waste ordinance	1-2
Livestock facility siting	1-2
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	0
Nonmetallic mining	47

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	2
Field days	7
Trainings/workshops	10
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	Over 700 students
Newsletters	1
Social media posts	Partners, but not us
News release/story	12

Table 5: Staff Hours and Expected Costs (staff can be combined or listed individually)

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	2080	$92,000
Technician	*2080*	*$80,000*
Support Costs	*2080*	*$76,500*
Remaining Staff		$340,000
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Ex. Bonding	*N/A*	*$120,000*
Ex. SEG	*N/A*	$160,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ State of Wisconsin

DATE: **July 25, 2019**

TO: **Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors**

FROM: **Lisa K. Trumble, DATCP** Lisa K. Trumble
Resource Management Section,
Bureau of Land and Water Resources

SUBJECT: **Recommendation for Approval of the *Ashland County Land and Water Resource Management Plan***

Action Requested: This is an action item. The department has determined that the Ashland *County Land and Water Resource Management Plan* meets applicable statutory and rule requirements and requests that the LWCB make a recommendation regarding approval of the plan consistent with the Board's guidance.

Summary: The plan is written as a 10 year plan, and if approved, the plan would remain in effect through December 31, 2029, and would be subject to a five year review prior to December 31, 2024.

DATCP staff reviewed the plan using the checklist and finds that the plan complies with all the requirements of section 92.10, Wisconsin Statutes, and Chapter ATCP 50, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

To qualify for 10 year approval of its plan, Ashland County must submit an annual work plan meeting DATCP requirements during each year of its 10 year plan approval.

Ashland County held a public hearing on July 8, 2019, as part of its public input and review process. The Ashland County Land Conservation Committee will present the LWRM plan for County Board approval after receiving a recommendation for approval from the LWCB.

Materials Provided:
- LWRM Plan Review Checklist
- Completed LWRM Plan Review form
- 2018 workplan with accomplishments and current 2019 workplan

Presenters: MaryJo Gingras, Ashland County Conservationist
George Mika, Land Conservation Committee Chair

ARM-LWR-167 (August, 2017)

Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
Agricultural Resource Management Division
2811 Agriculture Drive, PO Box 8911
Madison WI 53708-8911
Phone: (608) 224-4608

Land and Water Resource Management (LWRM)

LWRM Plan Review Checklist

Wis. Stats. § 92.10 & Wis. Adm. Code § ATCP 50.12.

County: ASHLAND Date Plan Submitted for Review: 7/2/2019

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county convene a local advisory committee that included a broad spectrum of public interests and perspectives (such as affected landowners, partner organizations, government officials, educational institutions)	☒	☐	I, 11

II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND COUNTY BOARD APPROVAL	Date(s)
1. Provide the dates that the local advisory committee met to discuss the development of the LWRM plan and the county plan of work	4/26, 7/8
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan[1]	7/8/19
3. Provide the date of county board approval of the plan, or the date the county board is expected to approve the plan after the LWCB makes its recommendation.[2]	September

III. RESOURCE ASSESSMENT AND WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the plan include the following information as part of a county-wide resource assessment:			
a. Soil erosion conditions in the county[3], including:			
i. identification of areas within county that have high erosion rates or other soil erosion problems that merit action within the next 10 years	☒	☐	13
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county[3], including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	☒	☐	50-51
ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources	☒	☐	45,49, 53

[1] Appropriate notice must be provided for the required public hearing. The public hearing notice serves to notify landowners and land users of the results of any determinations concerning soil erosion rates and nonpoint source water pollution, and provides an opportunity for landowners and land users input on the county's plan. Individual notice to landowners is required if the landowners are referenced directly in the LWRM plan. DATCP may request verification that appropriate notice was provided.

[2] The county board may approve the county LWRM plan after the department approves the plan. The plan approved by the county board must be the same plan approved by the department. If the department requires changes to a plan previously approved by the county board, the department's approval does not take effect until the county board approves the modified plan.

[3] Counties should support their analysis of soil and water conditions by referencing relevant land use and natural resource information, including the distribution of major soil types and surface topographic features, and land use categories and their distribution. Sec. ATCP 50.12(3)(b) requires that a county assemble relevant data, including relevant land use, natural resource, water quality and soil data.

iii. identification of areas within the county that have water quality problems that merit action within the next 10 years.	☒	☐	59
2. Does the LWRM plan address objectives by including the following:			
a. specific water quality objectives identified for each watershed based upon the resource assessment, if available	☒	☐	54-56
b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available	☒	☐	App B
Other comments:			

IV. DNR CONSULTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county consult with DNR[4] to obtain water quality assessments, if available; to identify key water quality problem areas; to determine water quality objectives; and to identify pollutant load reduction targets, if any; and to review NR 151 implementation	☒	☐	3,8
Other comments: _____			

V. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan include the following implementation components: :			
a. A voluntary implementation strategy to encourage adoption of farm conservation practices	☒	☐	69-75
b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan	☒	☐	20-22
c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations	☒	☐	69,71
d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems	☒	☐	App F
e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	☒	☐	69,71, 74,
2. Does the LWRM plan (or accompanying work plan) estimate:			
a. expected costs of implementing the plan including cost-sharing for conservation practices needed to achieve plan objectives	☒	☐	App C
b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	☒	☐	App C

[4] While requirements for DNR consultation may be satisfied by including relevant DNR representatives on the advisory committee, counties may also need to interact with DNR staff in central or regional offices to meet all of the consultation requirements. DNR may point counties to other resources to obtain information including consultants who can calculate pollutant load reduction targets.

3. Does the LWRM plan describe a priority farm strategy designed to make reasonable progress in implementing state performance standards and conservation practices on farms appropriately classified as a priority	☒	☐	72

Other comments:

VI. OUTREACH AND PARTNERING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy to provide information and education on soil and water resource management, conservation practices and available cost-share funding	☒	☐	68, Chap4
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	☒	☐	23, Chap 4

Other comments: _____

VII. WORK PLANNING AND PROGRESS MONITORING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the county's most recent annual work plan[5] do both of the following:			
a. Provide measurable performance benchmarks	☒	☐	NA
b. Identify priorities	☒	☐	NA
2. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy and framework for monitoring county progress implementing its plan including methodology to track and measure progress in meeting performance benchmarks and plan objectives	☒	☐	chap 3&5

Other comments: _____

VIII. EPA SECTION 319 CONSIDERATIONS

1. IS THE COUNTY WORKING WITH DNR TO SEEK EPA APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN AS MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF A 9 KEY ELEMENT PLAN UNDER SECTION 319 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT: Currently have an approved plan for the Marengo River Watershed

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has reviewed the above-referenced county LWRM plan based on the criteria required in s. ATCP 50.12, Wis. Admin. Code, and s. 92.10, Stats., and has determined that the plan meets the criteria for DATCP approval of this plan. This checklist review is prepared to enable the LWCB to make recommendations regarding plan approval, and for DATCP to make its final decision regarding plan approval.

Staff Signature: Lisa K. Trumble Date: July 24, 2019

[5] Counties must submit annual work plan by no later than April 15th of every year to meet the requirement in s. ATCP 50.12(2)(i) for counties to have multi-year work plans.

Land and Water Conservation Board
County Land and Water Resource Management Plan
Review of LWRM Plan Revisions

County: ASHLAND COUNTY

Implementation Covering Past Five Years and Future Directions

Answer these four questions in writing (not to exceed 4 pages)

1. Provide a representative number of accomplishments within the last five years that can be directly traced to activities identified in multiple work plans. For each accomplishment, explain how the planning process helped the county achieve its outcome, including planning adjustments that helped better target county activities.
   ACTIVITY: Provide technical assistance and cost-share to reduce erosion and "slow-the-flow" practices. Activity is also listed in the Lake Superior Collaborative Action Plan and Lake Superior Biological Conservation Strategies.
   GOAL: 20+ conservation practices cost-shared and implemented.
   ACCOMPLISHMENT: 63 conservation practices cost-shared and implemented.
   PLANNING: The planning process helped target regional plans with similar natural resource management priorities. Identifying priorities listed in other plans allowed LCC staff/supervisors to determine whether they merited "priority" in our updated workplan. Priorities listed in other plans are identified in Ashland's 2020-2024 Work Plan.

   ACTIVITY: Provide farmers technical assistance and cost-share for NR 151 & BMPs. Activity is also listed in the Lake Superior Collaborative Action Plan and Marengo River Watershed Action Plan (9 Key Element Plan).
   GOAL: 20+ conservation practices cost-shared and implemented.
   ACCOMPLISHMENT: 34+ conservation practices cost-shared and implemented.
   PLANNING: The planning process fostered prioritization of cost-share to agricultural practices piggy-backed with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). This enabled greater cost-effectiveness and yielded more practices installed overall.

   ACTIVITY: Provide cost-share and technical assistance for well abandonment. Activity is also listed in the Marengo River Watershed Action Plan (9 Key Element Plan).
   GOAL: 5+ wells properly abandoned.
   ACCOMPLISHMENT: 12 wells properly abandoned and cost-shared.
   PLANNING: The planning process with LWCD staff and supervisors helped identify known locations where old wells were no longer in use. It also helped identify regional plans with similar natural resource priorities.

   ACTIVITY: Encourage farmers to develop Nutrient Management Plans (NMP).
   GOAL: 5 landowners and 1000 acres.
   ACCOMPLISHMENT: 4 new Nutrient Management Plan totaling 952 acres. Total Nutrient Management Plans in Ashland County = 18 plans; 8,376 acres.
   PLANNING: The planning process enabled the LWCD to work with Sue Porter and Stephanie Schneider to offer farmer education courses. Planning with our UWEX

Agricultural Extension Agent has allowed for new plan development and annual updates of existing plans.

ACTIVITY: Encourage participation/enhance the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP).
GOAL: Create Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA), Revise Farmland Preservation Plan.
ACCOMPLISHMENTS: Developed the Fields, Waters and Woods AEA in 2014. Ashland County includes 4 Farmland Preservation Agreements with 765.64 acres and an additional 1386.45 acres enrolled in FPP in AEAs. The county revised it's Farmland Preservation Plan in 2016 and is currently pursuing Farmland Preservation Zoning.
PLANNING: The planning process helped identify goals for the 2016 Ashland County Comprehensive Plan including protection and expansion of agricultural lands. The goals of the LWRM Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and Farmland Preservation Plan compliment each other related to farmland goals. Farmland and agricultural goals identified in the Ashland County Comprehensive Plan are implemented by the LWCD.

ACTIVITY: Promote BMPs for slope stability, erosion control and water quality.
GOAL: 20+ conservation practices cost-shared and implemented.
ACCOMPLISHMENTS: 37+ conservation practices cost-shared and implemented, including Streambank protection, Livestock fencing, Critical area stabilization, Livestock watering, and Stream crossings. In 2017, we implemented a $42,000 WDNR Surface Water Grant for a streambank protection project on the Outstanding Resource Water (ORW) Brunsweiler River.
PLANNING: The planning process enabled the LWCD to work collaboratively with NRCS, the WDNR, and Superior Rivers Watershed Association to implement similar management priorities identified by each entity. It also fostered a WDNR Surface Water Grant application by the LWCD to further utilize additional funding sources.

ACTIVITY: Promote native species through the annual Tree and Shrub Sale.
GOALS: Host annual Tree & Shrub Sale. Promote only natives in riparian restorations.
ACCOMPLISHMENTS: 46,675 native plants sold from 2014-2018 Tree & Shrub Sales. 17 acres of wetlands developed and enhanced with native species. 7,000 feet of field windbreaks planted with native trees.
PLANNING: This process identified other regional plans with similar goals and promoted collaboration with NRCS and the US Fish & Wildlife Service. Promoting native species as an activity is also listed in the Lake Superior Lake-wide Management Biological Conservation Strategies and the Marengo River Watershed Action Plan.

2. Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in recent work plans. For each area identified, explain the work plan adjustments that were made to refocus planned activities. If no areas are identified, explain how the county was able to make progress in all the areas planned.

ACTIVITY: Encourage a drinking water testing program.

The county was unable to implement this program due to lack of staffing resources. The department employed two full-time positions; a County Conservationist and a Conservation Technician. There was no capacity. In the 2020-2024 work plan, a partnership with UW Stevens Point Center for Watershed Science and Education and the Ashland County Health Department, as well as a grant to offset residential costs for drinking water well testing have been identified as activities to help promote collaboration and build capacity.

ACTIVITY: Promote implementation of the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). Ashland County has 3 contracts. Enrollment has been challenging for many reasons. A 300' minimum buffer requires farmers to give up valuable farmland, clay soil on steep ravines make grass control and tree survival nearly impossible, steep ravines require arduous hand planting, and the state's 28-step paperwork is a constraint.

OTHER CHALLENGES:

1) Limited staff - Ashland County is economically depressed and is not able to support hiring additional LWCD staff. It relies on staff funding through DATCP. However, DATCP is not fully funding the staffing allocation as required by statute. The LWCD currently has 2 FTEs hired through DATCP and county funds. It is in great need of an additional FTE.

2) Nutrient Management and Farmland Preservation Plans - Of Ashland's 52,428 farmland acres (USDA 2017 Census of Agriculture), 16% are covered by a NMP and 20% are enrolled in FPP. The LWCD continues to offer cost-share to promote enrollment in the programs, however, it is challenging due to lack of staff and program requirements.

3) GIS tracking for Farmland Preservation Plans - the county has been unable to develop and implement a GIS tracking system for compliance tracking of Nutrient Management and Farmland Preservation due to lack of staff. The LWCD tracks compliance, practices, visits, and Nutrient Management checklists in an Excel spreadsheet.

4) Changing climate and uncommon precipitation events - has challenged implementation of conservation practices. Late spring and early fall rain events and cool temperatures in recent years have constricted the construction and planting season. The LWCD worked with the Northern Institute of Applied Climate Science at Michigan Technological University to incorporate the most recent science and adaptation strategies into our LWRM Plan to account for variable future conditions when making land management decisions. We encourage the Land and Water Board to promote these adaptation approaches in LWRM Plans state-wide.

5) Proximity to Lake Superior along with extensive wetlands, rivers and lakes make prevention and control of aquatic invasive species (AIS) a concern. We currently employ a grant funded AIS Coordinator and will work toward a permanent position.

3. Describe the county's approach to implementation of its priority farm strategy including outreach, farm inventories and making use of multiple funding sources. How has the county evaluated the effectiveness of its priority farm strategy and used this information to improve implementation of the agricultural performance standards and conservation practices on farms?

   There is high demand for technical, cost-share, and regulatory services administered through the LWCD. To efficiently and effectively meet these demands, the LWCD identified the following categories to prioritize farms and water resource areas:

   High Priority

   •Farms located within the Lake Superior Basin, for practices that meet or exceed nutrient management performance standards.

   •Farms located within impaired watersheds and have an approved management plan, with highest priority for practices that address the identified impairments (Marengo River).

   •Status reviews for compliance with NR151 Standards for farms that are in cost sharing, permitting, or other programs that require compliance with state standards (Animal Waste Management Ordinance, Livestock Siting, Farmland Preservation Program, other voluntary cost share programs (DNR, DATCP SEG).

•In response to public complaints or staff observations. Highest priority is assigned to sites where there is an immediate threat to fish, wildlife, and habitat; sites with severe resource impacts, and sites where compliance is cost-effective.

Medium Priority
•Farms located within watersheds of ORW or ERW waters.
•Farms located in watersheds of impaired waters where no management plan exists.
•In response to public complaints or staff observations. Medium priority is assigned to sites where impact is less severe and achieving compliance is not as cost-effective.

Low Priority for Services
•All other operations

The LWCD will conduct status reviews with a NR 151 checklist of livestock operations to determine the extent of compliance. The status review information is stored in the tracking spreadsheet. The LWCD will upload review results to a GIS tracking system based on available staff time. The results will be reviewed with the landowner. The LWCD will offer technical assistance and cost share to pursue full compliance in situations where it has not been achieved. The LWCD will continue to provide information and farmer education workshops in coordination with UW Extension, WDNR, and DATCP. It will also provide education through one-on-one work with farmers, farmer trainings (soil health, nutrient management, no-till), conservation tours, and the annual Tree and Shrub Sale. The LWCD will continue to seek funding through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), DATCP, and other sources.

4. Provide representative examples that show changes in direction in the county's LWRM plan and annual work plans, with specific examples provided showing adjustments in goals, objectives or planned activities.

Ashland County incorporated adaptation strategies from NIACS in many of its 2020-2024 Work Plan Activities to account for future climate variability. In addition, the LWCD is working closely on Ashland's wastewater facility overflow crisis, and is also committed to AIS control and education. New Work Plan activities include, but are not limited to:
1. Establish baseline data and develop drinking water well monitoring county-wide. (*)
2. Plan for variable future hydrologic conditions utilizing adaptive system design. (*#)
3. Assist City of Ashland with wastewater/storm water BMPs, provide outreach to reduce wastewater facility overflows, and promote residential rain barrels and rain gardens. (#)
4. Establish an AIS Coordinator to implement education, control, and prevention. (^*#)

^ Supports actions listed in the Lake Superior Collaborative Action Plan 2019 (LSCAP).
* Supports Northern Institute of Applied Climate Science (NIACS) Adaptation Strategies: Agriculture, Forests, Forest Watersheds & Non-Forest Wetlands.
# Supports actions listed in Lake Superior Lake-Wide Management Plan: Biological Conservation Strategies.
+ Supports actions listed in the Marengo River Watershed Action Plan (MRWAP).

Annual Work Plans

Attach both of the following:

a. The most current annual work plan, prepared in the current format from DATCP, and addresses all required items such as needed funding and staff hours.

b. The work plan for the previous year that includes a column that identifies the progress in implementing the planned activities for that year.

Presentation Regarding County Resource Concerns

Prepare and present an 8-10 minute snapshot to the board regarding county resources and management issues. The county must prepare one of following as part of this brief presentation:

a. A PowerPoint (showing what your county looks like, can include maps), or
b. A hand out (2 page max)

Guidance on Board Review Process

The LWCB's review supplements, but does not replace compliance with the DATCP checklist for LWRM plan approval. This encourages and supports honest presentations from the county. The county is strongly encouraged to have the LCC chair or committee member be a part of the presentation to the Board to contribute policy and other insights to the discussion. The goal of the review is not to fail counties. The board recognizes the dynamic nature of the planning process. Board members are interested in how counties tackle priorities over time and how they respond to changing conditions in pursuing their priorities. The board will evaluate a county's planning and implementation based on how well the county balances and prioritizes the following: agricultural performance standards, other state priorities (impaired waters, FPP checks), and local priorities. When needed, the Board will provide constructive support to counties to improve the quality of their planning.

Land Conservation Committee Notification

The LCC was provided a completed copy of this form (including attachments) on: July 12, 2019

Signature of Authorized Representative: Mary Jo Gingras **Date:** 7/12/19
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

Send completed form and attachments to:
Lisa.Trumble@wi.gov

ASHLAND COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	**Nutrient Management** (County-wide) o Encourage voluntary development of nutrient management plans for all agricultural producers through cost-share incentives o Develop new nutrient management plans on 400 acres of cropland with $16,000 of cost-share **Ordinances and Zoning** (County-wide) o Implement the Ashland County Agricultural Performance Standards and Animal Waste Ordinance as adopted by the County Board o Implement the Ashland County Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations Ordinance as adopted by the County Board **No-Till** (County-wide) o Implement 300 acres of no-till seeding using the department's rental no-till planter **Practice installation:** Provide technical assistance including planning, survey, design and construction of conservation practices o 1 Nutrient Management Plan completed with cost-share assistance o 1000' livestock fencing cost-shared with 2 landowners (Lower Brunsweiler R: 040103020403) (Lower Tyler Forks: 040103020203)	**NM:** 45 staff hours expended, $14,643.20 SEG cost-share spent, and 366 acres enrolled. Of Ashland's 52,428 farmland acres (USDA 2017 Census of Agriculture), 16% are covered by a NMP and 20% are enrolled in FPP. **Ordinances:** Ashland County Board of Supervisors adopted the Ashland County Agricultural Performance Standards and Animal Waste Ordinance and the Ashland County Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations Ordinance on September 20, 2018. **No-till:** 49.5 staff hours expended, 77.3 acres planted **Practice installation:** • Livestock fencing: 60 staff hours expended, $6,591.09 SWRM cost-share spent, 2,570 linear feet installed. • Livestock watering facilities: 20 staff hours, $5,260.37 SWRM cost-share spent, 2 facilities installed.
Livestock	**Practice installation:** Provide technical assistance including planning, survey, design and construction of conservation practices o 2 livestock watering facilities o 390' stream bank and shoreline protection o 1 manure storage closure (Lower Brunsweiler R: 040103020403) (Troutmere Ck.-Marengo R.: 040103020404)	**Practice installation:** • Streambank stabilization: 100 staff hours expended, $5,131.30 SWRM cost-share spent, 390 linear feet installed.
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	**CREP** (Lake Superior Basin) o Promote participation in the Lake Superior CREP o Track existing CREP contracts/ easements and review compliance with NRCS and FSA	**CREP:** No new contracts in 2018. Ashland County has 3 contracts. Enrollment has been challenging due to: a 300' minimum buffer requires farmers to give up valuable farmland, clay soil on steep ravines make

ASHLAND COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
	Groundwater/surface water testing and protection (County-wide) ○ Coordinate with local well drillers to identify and properly abandon unused and non-compliant wells with cost-share assistance ○ Improve data sharing with the WDNR to coordinate field applications of human septage, paper mill sludge, and other wastes covered under WPDES permits. ○ Support efforts of Superior Rivers Watershed Association (formerly Bad River Watershed Association), Northland College and others to characterize surface water quality within the county **Planning** (Fish Ck.-Frontal: 040103011105) ○ Work with the City of Ashland to complete their drinking water source protection plan ○ Coordinate with the City of Ashland for remediation of the coal tar "Superfund" site **Citizen monitoring** ○ Provide technical assistance and funding to encourage citizen monitoring/reporting of groundwater and surface water conditions	grass control and tree survival nearly impossible, steep ravines require arduous hand planting, and the state's 28-step paperwork is a constraint. **Groundwater/surface water testing and protection** • Continued efforts to identify wells. No wells abandoned in 2018, however we exceeded the 1 per year 5-year goal. 12 wells were properly abandoned and cost-shared from 2014-2018. • From 1996 to 2016, a total of 4,931.5 acres were permitted for land spreading in the Primary and Secondary Source Water Protection Area (see 2020-2029 LWRM Plan). In 2016, the number of permitted sites actively utilized for land spreading was much smaller than the amount permitted over the 20-year time period from 1996-2000. In 2016, waste spreading occurred on 366.2 acres, totaling 1,975,678 gallons in the Primary and Secondary SWPP area. **Planning** • Supported planning efforts for City of Ashland drinking water source protection plan. City had staff turnover and completion was delayed. • City of Ashland Superfund Site is expected for completion in November 2019. **Citizen monitoring** • Supported Citizen Monitoring efforts on Galilee Lake including 5 staff hours. There was no further staff capacity for additional hours in 2018.
Forestry	○ Promote development of forest management plans to qualify landowners for cost-share assistance through EQIP and other forestry incentive programs(County-wide)	• No staff capacity for forest planning in 2018.
Invasive species	**Coordination and Staffing** (County-wide) ○ Apply for WDNR Surface Water Grants to reestablish a county Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator ○ Coordinate Invasive Species activities with adjacent counties, municipalities, agencies, Northland College, NGOs, and tribal organizations ○ Support efforts of the Northwoods Cooperative Weed Management Area (NCWMA)	**Coordination and Staffing** • Applied for a WDNR Surface Water Grant for AIS Education, Prevention, and Planning on December 10, 2018 and received grant in February 2019. • Supported NCWMA: attended 2 bi-monthly meetings and annual event.

ASHLAND COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
	○ Develop MOU or similar cooperative agreement to manage invasive species within the Bad River tribal reservation **Surveys** (County-wide) ○ Contribute data on the location and size of invasive species occurrences in Ashland County **Management plans** (County-wide) ○ Provide input to invasive or nuisance species management plans developed by the City of Ashland or other partners **Control** (County-wide) ○ Participate in collaborative control efforts for invasive species within Ashland County ○ Provide the "Puller Bear" tool to uproot buckthorn and honeysuckle shrubs ○ Provide storage space for herbicides and application equipment **Education**(County-wide) ○ Provide educational information and merchandise concerning invasive species at local fairs, shows, and other civic events ○ Respond to phone calls, emails, and counter requests for recommendations on invasive species identification and control **Citizen monitoring** ○ Provide technical assistance and funding to encourage citizen monitoring of invasive species	**Surveys** (County-wide) • Contributed invasive species location data to NCWMA for Japanese knotweed, Purple loosestrife, Garlic mustard, and Yellow iris. **Management plans** (County-wide) • No new invasive management plans developed by the City of Ashland or other partners. **Control** (County-wide) • Assisted Buckthorn removal at Prentice Park. • Provided storage of herbicides and equipment. **Education**(County-wide) • 25 staff hours expended providing educational information on invasive species at local events and lake programs. • Fielded 20+ phone calls, emails, and site visits on invasive species concerns. **Citizen monitoring** • Supported NCWMA efforts to train volunteers for citizen monitoring at workshop.
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	**Wetlands** (County-wide) Provide technical assistance for wetland restoration including planning, survey, design and construction ○ 3 wetland restoration cost-share projects totaling 35 acres ○ Work with Wisconsin Wetlands Association and the Ashland County Zoning Department to develop and manage wetland conservation goals through ordinance development or other means ○ Support the efforts of Wisconsin Wetlands Association to identify critical wetland restoration sites to mitigate flooding (Select catchments) **Aquatic Organism Passage** (County-wide)	**Wetlands** • Wetland restoration: 80 staff hours expended, $3,922.25 US fish & Wildlife Service cost-share spent, 10 acres restored. • Supported Wisconsin Wetlands Association in a Federal Emergency Management Agency grant application to identify critical wetland restoration sites to mitigate flooding. Grant award notification in July 2019. **Aquatic Organism Passage** • No culvert replacements in 2018.

ASHLAND COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
	○ Identify and prioritize culvert crossings to remove barriers to aquatic organism passage ○ Implement grant contract with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to remove a culvert barrier and replace with a bottomless structure. (Devils Creek – Bad River: 040103020304) **Lakes and Rivers** (County-wide) ○ Encourage development of a county-wide lakes and rivers association ○ Support the Lake Galilee Association with Citizen Lake Monitoring and applications for surface water grants (Minnow Ck.-Bad River 040103020303) **Wildlife Damage Abatement and Control** ○ Provide office space, equipment, supplies and vehicle for WDNR Wildlife Damage Program ○ Facilitate payroll, procurement, and program reimbursements through county system **Tree and plant sales** (County-wide) ○ Provide native trees and shrubs in annual sale ○ Provide education on native plant use and care ○ Fund scholarships and awards for youth and adult education opportunities from annual proceeds	• US Fish and Wildlife Service to remove a culvert barrier and replace with a bottomless structure on Devils Creek was delayed due to USFWS staff departure of personal working on engineering design. Will carry over to 2019. **Lakes and Rivers** (County-wide) • Supported Galilee Lake Association with Citizen Lake Monitoring and education and outreach efforts. 15 staff hours expended. **Wildlife Damage Abatement and Control** • Hosted office space, equipment, supplies and vehicle for WDNR Wildlife Damage Specialist. • Facilitated payroll and program reimbursements through county system. **Tree and plant sales** (County-wide) • 10,900 native trees and shrubs sold in 2018; 46,675 native plants sold from 2014-2018. • $140 in youth scholarships distributed.
Urban issues	○ Assist town and county departments with erosion and storm water control as needed (County-wide) ○ Work with the City of Ashland to complete their drinking water source protection plan ○ Coordinate with the City of Ashland for remediation of the coal tar “Superfund” site	• Supported planning efforts for City of Ashland drinking water source protection plan. City had staff turnover and completion was delayed. • City of Ashland Superfund Site is expected for completion in November 2019.

ASHLAND COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
Watershed strategies	**Landscape-scale surveys and/or inventories** (County-wide) o Use watershed modeling techniques to assess existing condition, potential threats, and impairments o Prioritize watersheds, sub-watersheds, and catchments for specific conservation activities o Use watershed model results to identify restoration activities to protect and improve the City of Ashland drinking water source o Use watershed models to describe county-wide conditions for the update of the County's LWRMP consistent with the EPA's 9-Key Element Watershed Plans **Producer-led Watershed Group** (Marengo River HUC 10: 0401030204) o Encourage grant application by producers to improve Ashland County Agricultural Ordinances	• Supported planning efforts for City of Ashland drinking water source protection plan. City had staff turnover and completion was delayed. • Identified Marengo River Watershed to develop a flood adaptation demonstration project with Wisconsin Wetlands Association (WWA). Applied for FEMA grant in collaboration with WWA to plan for conservation practices and identify landowners for water storage/ flood adaptation practices on a landscape scale. Developed draft language to propose this climate adaptation demonstration project to the Wisconsin legislature for adding funding support. • Prioritized watersheds with 9-Key Element Watershed Plan for update of the County's LWRM Plan (Marengo River). **Producer-led Watershed Group** (Marengo River) • Promoted producer-led grant application by selected farmers without success.
Other	**Farmland Preservation and Comprehensive Planning** (County-wide) o Encourage participation in the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) o Ensure consistency between County Comprehensive Plan and Farmland Preservation Plan when implementing programs and projects **Mining** o Review and comment on non-metallic mining applications and reclamation plans (County-wide) o Track developments of iron mining operations in the Penokee range (Devils Creek – Bad River: 040103020304) **Environmental Education** (County-wide) o Participate in farm and garden show, and other community events to promote conservation and provide general information to interested public o Inform the public of technical assistance and cost-share available through the LWCD and partners o Provide incentives to youth and their families to participate in conservation contests and camps **Partnerships and Collaboration** (County-wide)	**Farmland Preservation Planning** • No new FPP in 2018. Ashland County includes 4 Farmland Preservation Agreements with 765.64 acres and an additional 1386.45 acres enrolled in FPP in AEAs. Began pursuing Farmland Preservation Zoning in 2018. **Mining** • Reviewed proposed updates to the Ashland County Metallic Mining Ordinance. Attended and provided comments at the public hearing. **Environmental Education** • 25 staff hours expended providing conservation education at public events. • Informed the public of technical assistance and cost-share available through the LWCD and partners. **Partnerships and Collaboration**

ASHLAND COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
	○ Support conservation efforts of tribal government entities and non-government organizations through workshops, trainings, and presentations ○ Collaborate with partners to secure grant funds for conservation projects ○ Maintain or improve communication and coordination with Federal, State, Tribal, and local government entities ○ Maintain or improve communication and coordination with other county departments, specifically zoning, highway, forestry, agriculture extension, and land records	• 45 staff hours expended for conservation efforts with tribal government entities and non-government organizations at workshops, symposiums, trainings, and presentations. • Applied for FEMA grant in collaboration with Wisconsin Wetlands Association for flood adaptation practices on a landscape scale. Received grant notification in 2019. • Attended meetings, collaborated on 5 projects, and provided technical assistance to zoning, highway, forestry, and agriculture extension departments. 45+ staff hours expended.

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	0	
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	0	
Manure storage closure	1	
Livestock facility siting	0	
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	0	
Shoreland zoning	2	
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	2	2
Other: Ashland County Agricultural Performance Standards and Animal Waste Ordinance and Ashland County Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations Ordinance	Adopt by Land Conservation Committee and Ashland County Board.	Adopted by Land Conservation Committee on June 27, 2018 and by the Ashland County Board on September 20, 2018.

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	6
For FPP	2
For NR 151	2
Animal waste ordinance	2
Livestock facility siting	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	0
Nonmetallic mining	0

ASHLAND COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1
Field days	1
Trainings/workshops	4
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	4
Newsletters	0
Social media posts	4
News release/story	6

Table 5: Staff Hours and Expected Costs

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	1950	$78,385
Civil Engineering Technician	1950	$69,957
Program Assistant	1600	$28,419
Support Costs	N/A	$23,438
Cost Sharing	**Hours**	**Costs**
Bonding	N/A	$54,750.00
SEG NMP	N/A	$16,000.00

ASHLAND COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	**Nutrient Management** (County-wide) o Encourage development of nutrient management plans for agricultural producers through cost-share incentives o Develop new nutrient management plans on 500 acres of farmland with $20,000 SEG cost-share **Ordinances and Zoning** (County-wide) o Implement Ashland County Agricultural Performance Standards and Animal Waste Storage Ordinance o Implement Ashland County Large-Scale Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations Ordinance **No-Till** (County-wide) o Administer 200 acres of no-till seeding using the department's rental no-till planter **Practice installation:** Provide technical assistance including planning, survey, design and construction of conservation practices o 1 Nutrient Management Plan completed with cost-share o 450' livestock fencing; 1 landowner (Miller) (LS12) o 580'access road;2 landowners (Jolma/Pierce) (LS12/09) o 350'stream crossing;2 landowners (Miller/Jolma)(LS12)	Hours of staff time expended Amount of cost-share dollars spent Acres of no-till from rental planter Type and units of practice(s) installed Number and type of ordinances and permits developed Acres and percent of total cropland covered by NMPs Number of people receiving technical assistance
Livestock	**Practice installation:** Provide technical assistance including planning, survey, design and construction of conservation practices o 2 livestock watering facilities (Kysar/Oliphant) (LS12) o 1 manure storage closure (Pupp) (LS12)	Hours of staff time expended Amount of cost-share dollars spent Type and units of practice(s) installed Number of people receiving technical assistance
Water quality/quantity (activities <u>not</u> listed in other categories)	**Practice installation:** Provide technical assistance including planning, survey, design and construction of conservation practices o 182' Lined waterway; 1 landowner (Wilson) (LS10) **CREP** (Lake Superior Basin) o Promote participation in the Lake Superior CREP o Track existing CREP contracts **Groundwater/surface water testing** (County-wide) o Coordinate with local well drillers to properly abandon unused/non-compliant wells with cost-share assistance o Collaborate w/ Northland College, Superior Rivers Watershed, and others to characterize surface water quality	Hours of staff time expended Amount of cost-share dollars spent Type and units of practice(s) installed Number of CREP contracts in compliance Number of people receiving technical assistance Number of meetings attended/presentations given

ASHLAND COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
	Citizen Monitoring (County-wide) o Provide technical assistance/cost-share to encourage citizen monitoring of groundwater and surface waters o Encourage development of lake and river associations o Promote Citizen Lake Monitoring and WDNR Surface Water grant application for Lake Galilee (LS14) **Planning** (Lake Superior Basin) (LS08) o Work with the City of Ashland to complete their drinking water source protection plan o Coordinate with the City of Ashland for mitigation of city wastewater overflows	
Forestry	o Promote landowner forest management plan development with cost-share assistance through EQIP and other forestry incentive programs (County-wide)	Hours of staff time/ Cost-share dollars spent Type and units of practice(s) installed Number of people receiving technical assistance
Invasive species	**Coordination and Staffing** (County-wide) o Implement WDNR Surface Water Grant for an Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program; hire coordinator o Coordinate Invasive Species activities with adjacent counties, municipalities, agencies, Northland College, NGOs, and tribal organizations o Support efforts of the Northwoods Cooperative Weed Management Area (NCWMA) **Surveys** (County-wide) o Contribute data on the location and size of invasive species occurrences in Ashland County **Management plans** (County-wide) o Support efforts of City of Ashland with management of invasive/nuisance species **Control** (County-wide) o Participate in collaborative control efforts for invasive species within Ashland County o Share equipment for invasive species management o Galerucella beetles rearing for Purple loosestrife control **Education**(County-wide) o Provide AIS education program at local schools/events o Respond to public requests for recommendations on invasive species identification and control **Citizen monitoring** o Provide technical assistance and funding to encourage citizen monitoring/reporting of invasive species	Hours of staff time expended Amount of cost-share dollars spent Type and units of practice(s) installed Number of invasive species surveys completed Number of invasive species sites treated Number of participants at volunteer events Number of people receiving technical assistance Number of meetings attended/presentations given

ASHLAND COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	**Wetlands** (County-wide) Provide technical assistance for wetland restoration including planning, survey, design and construction o 1 wetland restoration totaling 15 acres (LS08) o Work with Wisconsin Wetlands Association to develop wetland conservation goals in Ashland County o Support Wisconsin Wetlands Association to identify critical wetland restoration sites flood adaptation **Aquatic Organism Passage** (County-wide) o Identify and prioritize culvert crossings to remove barriers to aquatic organism passage o Replace culvert barrier with a bottomless arch through US Fish and Wildlife Service grant funding (LS14) **Wildlife Damage Abatement and Control** (County-wide) o Provide office space, equipment, supplies and vehicle for WDNR Wildlife Damage Program Specialist o Facilitate payroll, procurement, and program reimbursements through county system **Tree and Plant Sales** (County-wide) o Provide native trees and shrubs through annual sale o Provide native plant recommendations & education o Fund scholarships and awards for youth and adult education opportunities from annual proceeds	Hours of staff time expended Amount of cost-share dollars spent Type and units of practice(s) installed Acres of wetland restored and upland protected Number of culvert crossings and other obstructions evaluated Amount of financial assistance obtained for AO passage and erosion control. Number of meetings attended/presentations given Number of trees and shrubs sold Number of people receiving technical assistance Amount of scholarship funding generated
Urban issues	**Stormwater Management** (LS08) o Assist municipalities w/ erosion/stormwater control o Assist Ashland w/ city wastewater overflow mitigation o Technical assistance to develop/install rain gardens o Coordinate Rain Barrel Sale	Hours of staff time expended Amount of cost-share dollars spent Type and units of practice(s) installed Number of people receiving technical assistance Number of meetings attended/presentations given
Watershed strategies	**Landscape-scale surveys & inventories** (County-wide) o Use watershed modeling techniques to assess existing condition, potential threats, and impairments o Prioritize conservation activities by watershed based on current research & flood potential o Use watershed modeling to protect and improve the City of Ashland drinking water source o Update County LWRMP based on watershed flood potential models, Marengo 9-Key Element Watershed Plan, County Comprehensive Plan, and others **Producer-led Watershed Group** (LS14) o Encourage grant application by producers to improve water quality in Agricultural Enterprise Areas	Hours of staff time expended Number of people and organizations receiving technical assistance Number of computer models tested and completed Number of partnership activities accomplished Number of meetings attended/presentations given

ASHLAND COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
Other	**Farmland Preservation and Comprehensive Planning** o Encourage Farmland Preservation Program participation o Ensure consistent implementation between the County Comprehensive Plan and Farmland Preservation Plan **Mining** o Assist Zoning Department in review of Metallic/Non-Metallic Mining Ordinance Review/applications o Track iron mining potential in Penokee range (LS14) **Environmental Education** (County-wide) o Participate in outreach & education events o Encourage technical assistance/cost-share to the public o Provide youth incentives for conservation programs **Partnerships and Collaboration** (County-wide) o Support tribal/ non-governmental conservation efforts Collaborate on regional grants for conservation efforts o Maintain coordination with Federal, State, Tribal, and local government entities and county offices including zoning, forestry, highway, and agriculture extension	Hours of staff time expended Amount of cost-share dollars spent Type and units of practice(s) installed Number of people receiving technical assistance and environmental education Number of meetings attended/presentations given

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	0	
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	0	
Manure storage closure	1	1
Livestock facility siting	0	
Nonmetallic/frac-sand mining	0	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	2	
Shoreland zoning	2	
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	2	2
Other	0	

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	10
For FPP	5
For NR 151	10
Animal waste ordinance	2
Livestock facility siting	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	2
Nonmetallic mining	0

ASHLAND COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	5
Field days	4
Trainings/workshops	3
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	25
Newsletters	0
Social media posts	5
News release/story	5

Table 5: Staff Hours and Expected Costs

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	1950	$77,916
Civil Engineering Technician	1950	$71,326
Program Assistant	962	$15,873
Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator	1200	$20,400
Support Costs	N/A	$65,094
Cost Sharing	**Hours**	**Costs**
Bonding	N/A	$59,475
SEG NMP	N/A	$20,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM_____State of Wisconsin

DATE: **July 26, 2019**

TO: **Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors**

FROM: **Jenni Heaton-Amrhein, DATCP**
Bureau of Land and Water Resources Management

Mary Anne Lowndes, DNR
Bureau of Watershed Management

SUBJECT: ***2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan* for the Soil and Water Resource Management Program and the Nonpoint Source Program**

Recommended Action: This is an informational item. However, if the LWCB wishes to do so, it may vote to "receive" the *2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan.* A vote to "receive" the preliminary allocation plan does not bind the LWCB to any position.

Summary: The *2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan* provides details on how both the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) propose to allocate $20,716,439 (about $213,000 less than the 2019 allocation) in available nonpoint grant funds to county land conservation committees and other project cooperators. This plan does not include DNR award of grants to cities, towns, and villages for projects under ss. 281.65 or 281.66, Wis. Stats.

As part of the allocation process, DATCP prepared an environmental assessment (EA). The EA finds that DATCP's proposed allocation is not a major action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment and concludes that an environmental impact statement is not required.

Breakdown of 2020 Joint Allocation

Charts 1 and 2 on the first page of the Joint Allocation Plan provide an overview of the grant funds DNR and DATCP propose to allocate. Specifically, Chart 1 identifies the proposed DNR and DATCP awards by the program category and the dollar amounts and Chart 2 documents the grants awarded by the state appropriation or other funding source.

DATCP's allocation awards grants in these program categories: staff and support, landowner cost-sharing, including a reserve to cost-share farm discharges, and project grants including NMFE training. The following tables provide details regarding DATCP grants: Table A (page 2) summarizes county and cooperator awards by program category; Table A-1 (pages 3 and 4) shows the step-by-step process for calculating county staff and support grants; Tables A-2 and

A-3 (page 15)show county scores and rankings in the competition for bond and SEG cost-share grants.

DATCP expenditures proposed for 2020 allocation varies from the 2019 allocation as follows:

- A $475,000 increase (5 percent) increase in staff and support grants.
- A $65,000 decrease (2 percent) in bond cost-sharing. This reduction reflects a positive development: counties are spending more of their grants and there is less funding leftover to increase awards in 2020.
- A nearly $148,000 decrease (7 percent) in county grants primarily for nutrient management cost-sharing with landowners. This shift reflects an aligning of awards closer to the historical spending levels.
- A nearly $270,000 increase (30 percent) in grants for cooperators and a nearly $168,000 increase (48 percent) in grant awards for the 16 NMFE grant recipients. These increases reflects a shift in priority to outreach and technical assistance.

DNR provides grants in the following funding categories: Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) and NR 243 Notice of Discharge (NOD) programs. No funding requests for grants related to Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water (UNPS) Construction projects were received from the Counties. Table B provides a breakdown of DNR's allocations to counties (which in the case of the preliminary allocation is held in reserve to be allocated based on county rankings).

Table C combines the DATCP and DNR allocations to provide a complete picture of the 2020 allocations.

The body of the Joint Allocation Plan provides a detailed discussion regarding DATCP and DNR allocations including future directions for DATCP funding. These are highlights of DATCP's discussion regarding future directions:

- Changes in the staffing grant to create incentives to hire conservation professionals whose time is fully dedicated to conservation activities such as nutrient management or conservation engineering. This would discourage counties from assigning conservation staff work in zoning and other non-conservation areas.
- Changes in SEG-funded grants to make better use of available funds in the implementation of nutrient management plans. While continuing to provide cost-share funding above historical spending levels, more funding is made available for NMFE and outside cooperator grants to focus on NMP implementation.

Comment on Preliminary Allocation Plan

The 2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan and DATCP's Environmental Assessment were provided to all county land conservation departments and other interested parties prior to the LWCB's August 6, 2019 meeting.

Counties, project cooperators and other interested persons may comment on 2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan either by:

- Requesting to appear and present comments before the LWCB at its August 6, 2019 meeting. A Public Appearance Request Card must be submitted before the meeting.
- Emailing written comments by no later than September 4, 2019 to Kim Carlson at

Email: datcpswrm@wisconsin.gov

Materials Provided:

- *2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan*
- *Environmental Assessment*

Presenters: Jenni Heaton-Armhein (DATCP); Mary Anne Lowndes (DNR).

2020 JOINT PRELIMINARY ALLOCATION PLAN
Soil and Water Resource Management Grant Program and Nonpoint Source Program

The allocations identified in this plan provide counties and others with grant funding for conservation staff and support costs, landowner cost-sharing, and runoff management projects. The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) are making these allocations to protect Wisconsin's soil and water resources, consistent with the objectives in chs.92 and 281, Wis. Stats.

DATCP is allocating grants to county land conservation committees (counties) and other project cooperators in 2020 through the Soil and Water Resource Management Program (Table A).

DNR is allocating grants to counties through the Targeted Runoff Management (TRM), the NR 243 Notice of Discharge (NOD), and Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Planning Projects (UNPS-Planning) programs (Table B).

For 2020, a total of $20,716,439 is allocated based on the state budget for the 2019-21 biennium. Table C summarizes all allocations, by grantee. Organized by funding category, Chart 1 below summarizes grant fund requests, unmet funding requests, and allocation amounts. Chart 2 below shows the allocation categories by funding sources.

If required, these allocations may be adjusted based on reductions or lapses in appropriations or authorizations.

Preliminary

Chart 1: Grant Requests and Allocations

Funding Category	Total Requests	Unmet Requests	Allocation Amounts
DATCP ALLOCATIONS			
County Staff/Support	$17,626,768	$8,187,668	$9,439,100
County LWRM Cost-Share (B)	$7,975,750	$4,585,750	$3,390,000
Bond Cost-Share Reserve (B)	$300,000	$0	$300,000
LWRM Cost-Share (SEG)	$3,081,616	$994,884	$2,086,732
Project Contracts (SEG)	$1,046,250	$158,099	$888,151
NMFE Training Grants (SEG)	$ 350,117	$0	$350,117
SUBTOTAL	$30,380,501	$13,926,401	$16,454,100
DNR ALLOCATIONS			
UNPS Planning	$149,730	$85,000	$64,730
UNPS Construction	NA	NA	NA
TRM Construction	$ 2,697,609	$0	$2,697,609
NOD Reserve (B)			$ 1,500,000
SUBTOTAL	$ 2,847,339	$ 85,000	$ 4,262,339
TOTAL			$20,716,439

Abbreviations Used Above:

LWRM *= Land & Water Resource Management Plan Implementation*
SEG = *Segregated Revenue*
NA *= Not Applicable or Available*
TRM *= Targeted Runoff Management*
UNPS *= Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Management*
B *= Bond Revenue*
CP*= Cropping Practices*

Chart 2: Funding Sources

Staff and Support Grants	
$6,411,900	DATCP SEG from s. 20.115(7)(qe)
$3,027,200	DATCP GPR from s. 20.115(7)(c)
$9,439,100	DATCP Subtotal
$64,730	DNR SEG from s. 20.370(6)(dq)
$143,063	DNR Sec. 319 Account (Federal)
$207,793	DNR Subtotal
$9,646,893	**TOTAL Staff & Support Grants**
Cost-Share Grants	
$3,390,000	DATCP Bond from s. 20.866(2)(we)
$300,000	DATCP Bond (Reserve) from s. 20.866(2)(we)
$2,086,732	DATCP SEG from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
$5,776,732	DATCP Subtotal
$3,197,609	DNR Bond Revenue from s. 20.866(2)(tf)
$0	DNR SEG from s. 20.370(6)(aq)
$856,937	DNR Sec. 319 Account (Federal)
$4,054,546	DNR Subtotal
$9,831,278	**TOTAL Cost-Share Grants**
Nutrient Management Farmer Education (NMFE) & Other Project Cooperator (OPC) Grants	
$350,117	DATCP SEG (NMFE) from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
$888,151	DATCP SEG (OPC) from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
$1,238,268	**TOTAL NMFE & Other Grants**
$20,716,439	**GRAND TOTAL**

Table A: DATCP Allocations

County	DATCP Staffing & Support Allocation	LWRM Plan Implementation Allocation		Total DATCP Allocation	County	DATCP Staffing & Support Allocation	LWRM Plan Implementation Allocation		Total DATCP Allocation
		Bond Cost-Sharing	SEG Cost-Sharing				Bond Cost-Sharing	SEG Cost-Sharing	
Adams	117,061	33,140	20,000	170,201	Oconto	142,662	56,100	0	198,762
Ashland	112,248	52,990	20,000	185,238	Oneida	99,771	50,850	0	150,621
Barron	131,582	59,850	35,000	226,432	Outagamie	178,579	41,990	75,000	295,569
Bayfield	115,626	57,490	35,000	208,116	Ozaukee	140,281	62,990	50,400	253,671
Brown	153,004	38,330	8,000	199,334	Pepin	107,394	45,260	35,000	187,654
Buffalo	115,814	52,120	20,000	187,934	Pierce	141,006	60,600	20,000	221,606
Burnett	96,102	25,000	30,000	151,102	Polk	162,030	36,250	0	198,280
Calumet	149,871	43,260	40,000	233,131	Portage	148,425	64,350	0	212,775
Chippewa	183,659	49,750	55,000	288,409	Price	92,390	45,260	0	137,650
Clark	136,301	56,620	75,000	267,921	Racine	148,554	57,490	35,000	241,044
Columbia	121,244	64,350	65,832	251,426	Richland	98,903	48,370	28,000	175,273
Crawford	108,509	56,100	8,000	172,609	Rock	163,594	48,580	75,000	287,174
Dane	188,043	52,120	95,000	335,163	Rusk	112,153	33,140	35,000	180,293
Dodge	145,929	34,000	10,000	189,929	Saint Croix	143,558	45,000	20,000	208,558
Door	143,964	50,990	28,000	222,954	Sauk	142,660	64,350	45,000	252,010
Douglas	110,336	13,140	0	123,476	Sawyer	93,194	40,000	8,000	141,194
Dunn	179,594	40,000	28,000	247,594	Shawano	126,812	40,330	10,000	177,142
Eau Claire	141,669	57,490	45,000	244,159	Sheboygan	152,280	52,870	20,000	225,150
Florence	75,000	43,120	0	118,120	Taylor	119,171	60,600	35,000	214,771
Fond du Lac	158,787	40,000	20,000	218,787	Trempealeau	131,181	64,350	95,000	290,531
Forest	102,969	11,000	0	113,969	Vernon	129,254	64,350	45,000	238,604
Grant	104,160	56,620	0	160,780	Vilas	125,100	33,080	0	158,180
Green	143,560	64,350	20,000	227,910	Walworth	144,868	48,370	20,000	213,238
Green Lake	159,436	57,490	30,000	246,926	Washburn	106,151	45,260	6,000	157,411
Iowa	123,519	50,000	35,000	208,519	Washington	136,558	37,220	10,000	183,778
Iron	108,529	50,850	0	159,379	Waukesha	176,709	31,220	0	207,929
Jackson	131,124	66,100	20,000	217,224	Waupaca	134,962	66,100	95,000	296,062
Jefferson	179,819	30,285	20,000	230,104	Waushara	135,525	50,000	25,000	210,525
Juneau	119,441	50,000	20,000	189,441	Winnebago	159,814	31,140	35,000	225,954
Kenosha	133,255	45,260	20,000	198,515	Wood	144,034	48,370	54,000	246,404
Kewaunee	149,985	52,990	20,000	222,975	Reserve		300,000		300,000
LaCrosse	155,386	33,140	20,000	208,526	Sub-Totals	$9,439,100	$3,690,000	$2,086,732	$15,215,832
Lafayette	96,012	52,120	22,500	170,632					
Langlade	92,890	45,260	40,000	178,150	OTHER PROJECT COOPERATOR (OPC) FUNDING				
Lincoln	85,451	19,140	0	104,591	Monroe County AEA Incentive Project			41,250	
Manitowoc	158,309	60,600	55,000	273,909	UW-CALS			580,000	
Marathon	144,015	75,850	95,000	314,865	Nutrient Management Farmer Education (NMFE)			350,117	
Marinette	130,327	57,490	35,000	222,817	WI Land + Water (WLWCA)			225,401	
Marquette	133,415	37,220	70,000	240,635	Standard Oversight Council (SOC)			38,000	
Menominee	75,000	20,000	0	95,000	Conservation Observance Day			3,500	
Milwaukee	75,000	20,000	0	95,000	Sub-Totals				$1,238,268
Monroe	115,582	40,535	50,000	206,117	TOTAL	$9,439,100	$3,690,000	$3,325,000	$16,454,100

Preliminary

Table A-1: Staff and Support Tier 1, Tier 2, Rounds One, Two and Three										
County	Tier 1	Tier 2								DATCP Staffing & Support Allocation
	Base Allocation	First Position at 100% (Round 1)	Round 1 Award	Adjusted Award (Tier 1 + Round 1)	Second Position at 70% (Round 2)	Round 2 Award at (70% of 70%)	Adjusted Award (Tier 1 + Round 1 & 2)	Third Position at 50% (Round 3)	Round 3 Award No Funds Available	
Adams	75,000	83,417	8,417	83,417	47,990	33,644	117,061	26,224	0	117,061
Ashland	75,000	77,916	2,916	77,916	48,972	34,332	112,248	8,650	0	112,248
Barron	75,000	88,897	13,897	88,897	60,887	42,685	131,582	40,736	0	131,582
Bayfield	75,000	80,955	5,955	80,955	49,456	34,671	115,626	34,497	0	115,626
Brown	75,000	106,267	31,267	106,267	66,666	46,737	153,004	41,763	0	153,004
Buffalo	75,000	80,264	5,264	80,264	50,709	35,550	115,814	28,261	0	115,814
Burnett	75,000	67,819	0	75,000	37,282	21,102	96,102	24,138	0	96,102
Calumet	75,000	103,235	28,235	103,235	66,523	46,636	149,871	46,842	0	149,871
Chippewa	75,000	126,672	51,672	126,672	81,287	56,987	183,659	50,238	0	183,659
Clark	75,000	92,608	17,608	92,608	62,325	43,693	136,301	35,672	0	136,301
Columbia	75,000	81,394	6,394	81,394	56,841	39,849	121,243	55,403	0	121,244
Crawford	75,000	71,666	0	75,000	51,132	33,509	108,509	25,799	0	108,509
Dane	75,000	130,102	55,102	130,102	82,648	57,941	188,043	53,883	0	188,043
Dodge	75,000	102,530	27,530	102,530	61,905	43,399	145,929	39,082	0	145,929
Door	75,000	97,148	22,148	97,148	66,779	46,816	143,964	43,626	0	143,964
Douglas	75,000	76,142	1,142	76,142	48,775	34,194	110,336	-	0	110,336
Dunn	75,000	127,984	52,984	127,984	73,618	51,610	179,594	49,886	0	179,594
Eau Claire	75,000	98,155	23,155	98,155	62,069	43,514	141,669	40,025	0	141,669
Florence	75,000	54,725	0	75,000	11,091	0	75,000	3,773	0	75,000
Fond du Lac	75,000	110,976	35,976	110,976	68,198	47,811	158,787	46,409	0	158,787
Forest	75,000	83,052	8,052	83,052	28,410	19,917	102,969	13,778	0	102,969
Grant	75,000	69,259	0	75,000	47,335	29,160	104,160	32,562	0	104,160
Green	75,000	106,840	31,840	106,840	52,378	36,720	143,560	35,400	0	143,560
Green Lake	75,000	110,912	35,912	110,912	69,215	48,524	159,436	46,763	0	159,436
Iowa	75,000	92,441	17,441	92,441	44,330	31,078	123,519	31,664	0	123,519
Iron	75,000	72,858	0	75,000	49,968	33,529	108,529	6,418	0	108,529
Jackson	75,000	90,963	15,963	90,963	57,287	40,161	131,124	0	0	131,124
Jefferson	75,000	131,737	56,737	131,737	68,585	48,082	179,819	48,530	0	179,819
Juneau	75,000	81,794	6,794	81,794	53,701	37,647	119,441	28,284	0	119,441
Kenosha	75,000	111,806	36,806	111,806	30,596	21,449	133,255	13,600	0	133,255
Kewaunee	75,000	105,631	30,631	105,631	63,267	44,354	149,985	37,331	0	149,985
LaCrosse	75,000	109,259	34,259	109,259	65,797	46,127	155,386	46,998	0	155,386
Lafayette	75,000	66,295	0	75,000	38,677	21,012	96,012	31,503	0	96,012
Langlade	75,000	76,398	1,398	76,398	23,525	16,492	92,890	7,531	0	92,890
Lincoln	75,000	77,667	2,667	77,667	11,103	7,784	85,451	3,750	0	85,451
Manitowoc	75,000	108,454	33,454	108,454	71,114	49,855	158,309	50,723	0	158,309

Preliminary

Table A-1: Staff and Support Tier 1, Tier 2, Rounds One, Two and Three										
County	Tier 1	Tier 2								DATCP Staffing & Support Allocation
	Base Allocation	First Position at 100% (Round 1)	Round 1 Award	Adjusted Award (Tier 1 + Round 1)	Second Position at 70% (Round 2)	Round 2 Award at (70% of 70%)	Adjusted Award (Tier 1 + Round 1 & 2)	Third Position at 50% (Round 3)	Round 3 Award No Funds Available	
Marathon	75,000	97,004	22,004	97,004	67,058	47,011	144,015	46,992	0	144,015
Marinette	75,000	89,744	14,744	89,744	57,889	40,583	130,327	39,399	0	130,327
Marquette	75,000	101,487	26,487	101,487	45,543	31,928	133,415	17,238	0	133,415
Menominee	75,000	0	0	75,000	57,544	0	75,000	10,476	0	75,000
Milwaukee	75,000		0	75,000	42,413	0	75,000	25,833	0	75,000
Monroe	75,000	84,747	9,747	84,747	43,984	30,835	115,582	22,794	0	115,582
Oconto	75,000	99,568	24,568	99,568	61,470	43,094	142,662	33,931	0	142,662
Oneida	75,000	69,719	0	75,000	40,615	24,771	99,771	7,696	0	99,771
Outagamie	75,000	125,970	50,970	125,970	75,042	52,609	178,579	45,658	0	178,579
Ozaukee	75,000	89,639	14,639	89,639	72,237	50,642	140,281	41,537	0	140,281
Pepin	75,000	63,910	0	75,000	57,298	32,394	107,394	20,168	0	107,394
Pierce	75,000	94,558	19,558	94,558	66,254	46,448	141,006	42,501	0	141,006
Polk	75,000	114,510	39,510	114,510	67,784	47,520	162,030	44,299	0	162,030
Portage	75,000	105,830	30,830	105,830	60,759	42,595	148,425	41,502	0	148,425
Price	75,000	60,600	0	75,000	39,206	17,390	92,390	9,815	0	92,390
Racine	75,000	102,807	27,807	102,807	65,255	45,747	148,554	33,706	0	148,554
Richland	75,000	67,695	0	75,000	41,401	23,903	98,903	24,128	0	98,903
Rock	75,000	119,726	44,726	119,726	62,574	43,868	163,594	46,728	0	163,594
Rusk	75,000	83,764	8,764	83,764	40,494	28,389	112,153	7,568	0	112,153
Saint Croix	75,000	96,300	21,300	96,300	67,410	47,258	143,558	23,978	0	143,558
Sauk	75,000	99,012	24,012	99,012	62,260	43,648	142,660	43,093	0	142,660
Sawyer	75,000	62,488	0	75,000	38,465	18,194	93,194	18,441	0	93,194
Shawano	75,000	88,658	13,658	88,658	54,423	38,154	126,812	33,477	0	126,812
Sheboygan	75,000	109,449	34,449	109,449	61,095	42,831	152,280	39,570	0	152,280
Taylor	75,000	87,491	12,491	87,491	45,189	31,680	119,171	30,105	0	119,171
Trempealeau	75,000	78,450	3,450	78,450	75,216	52,731	131,181	34,358	0	131,181
Vernon	75,000	91,180	16,180	91,180	54,309	38,074	129,254	35,503	0	129,254
Vilas	75,000	88,912	13,912	88,912	51,620	36,188	125,100	33,366	0	125,100
Walworth	75,000	98,401	23,401	98,401	66,282	46,467	144,868	42,940	0	144,868
Washburn	75,000	79,885	4,885	79,885	37,467	26,266	106,151	4,084	0	106,151
Washington	75,000	97,136	22,136	97,136	56,233	39,422	136,558	34,302	0	136,558
Waukesha	75,000	124,100	49,100	124,100	75,042	52,609	176,709	44,431	0	176,709
Waupaca	75,000	91,166	16,166	91,166	62,472	43,796	134,962	42,671	0	134,962
Waushara	75,000	94,090	19,090	94,090	59,104	41,435	135,525	43,359	0	135,525
Winnebago	75,000	116,103	41,103	116,103	62,350	43,711	159,814	44,076	0	159,814
Wood	75,000	107,059	32,059	107,059	52,742	36,975	144,034	33,352	0	144,034
Totals	5,400,000	6,535,396	1,383,362	6,783,362	3,976,940	2,655,737	9,439,099	2,272,817	0	9,439,100

Preliminary

Table B: DNR Allocations					
County	Targeted Runoff Mgmt. BMP Construction	Local Assistance Funding for "Large Scale" TRM	Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. BMP Construction	Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. Planning	Total DNR Preliminary Allocations
Adams	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Ashland	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Barron	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Bayfield	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Brown	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Buffalo	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Burnett	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Calumet	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Chippewa	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Clark	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Columbia	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Crawford	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Dane	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Dodge	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Door	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Douglas	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Dunn	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Eau Claire	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Florence	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Fond du Lac	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Forest	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Grant	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Green	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Green Lake	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Iowa	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Iron	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Jackson	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Jefferson	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Juneau	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Kenosha	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Kewaunee	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
LaCrosse	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Lafayette	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Langlade	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Lincoln	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Manitowoc	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

Preliminary

Table B: DNR Allocations					
County	Targeted Runoff Mgmt. BMP Construction	Local Assistance Funding for "Large Scale" TRM	Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. BMP Construction	Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. Planning	Total DNR Preliminary Allocations
Marathon	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Marinette	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Marquette	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Menominee	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Milwaukee	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Monroe	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Oconto	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Oneida	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Outagamie	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Ozaukee	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Pepin	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Pierce	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Polk	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Portage	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Price	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Racine	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Richland	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Rock	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Rusk	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Saint Croix	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Sauk	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Sawyer	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Shawano	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Sheboygan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Taylor	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Trempealeau	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Vernon	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Vilas	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Walworth	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Washburn	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Washington	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Waukesha	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Waupaca	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Waushara	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Winnebago	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Wood	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
TRM & UNPS Reserves*	$2,554,546	$143,063	$0	$64,730	$2,762,339
DNR NR243 NOD Reserve					$1,500,000
Total	$2,554,546	$143,063	$0	$64,730	$4,262,339

*The reserve amounts for TRM and UNPS Grants are estimated because the grants have not yet been awarded.

Preliminary

Table C: Summary of DATCP and DNR Allocations

County	Staffing & Support from DATCP and DNR	Cost-Sharing from DATCP and DNR	Total Allocation of DATCP and DNR Funding
Adams	117,061	53,140	170,201
Ashland	112,248	72,990	185,238
Barron	131,582	94,850	226,432
Bayfield	115,626	92,490	208,116
Brown	153,004	46,330	199,334
Buffalo	115,814	72,120	187,934
Burnett	96,102	55,000	151,102
Calumet	149,871	83,260	233,131
Chippewa	183,659	104,750	288,409
Clark	136,301	131,620	267,921
Columbia	121,244	130,182	251,426
Crawford	108,509	64,100	172,609
Dane	188,043	147,120	335,163
Dodge	145,929	44,000	189,929
Door	143,964	78,990	222,954
Douglas	110,336	13,140	123,476
Dunn	179,594	68,000	247,594
Eau Claire	141,669	102,490	244,159
Florence	75,000	43,120	118,120
Fond du Lac	158,787	60,000	218,787
Forest	102,969	11,000	113,969
Grant	104,160	56,620	160,780
Green	143,560	84,350	227,910
Green Lake	159,436	87,490	246,926
Iowa	123,519	85,000	208,519
Iron	108,529	50,850	159,379
Jackson	131,124	86,100	217,224
Jefferson	179,819	50,285	230,104
Juneau	119,441	70,000	189,441
Kenosha	133,255	65,260	198,515
Kewaunee	149,985	72,990	222,975
LaCrosse	155,386	53,140	208,526
Lafayette	96,012	74,620	170,632
Langlade	92,890	85,260	178,150
Lincoln	85,451	19,140	104,591
Manitowoc	158,309	115,600	273,909
Marathon	144,015	170,850	314,865
Marinette	130,327	92,490	222,817
Marquette	133,415	107,220	240,635
Menominee	75,000	20,000	95,000
Milwaukee	75,000	20,000	95,000
Monroe	115,582	90,535	206,117

County	Staffing & Support from DATCP and DNR	Cost-Sharing from DATCP and DNR	Total Allocation of DATCP and DNR Funding
Oconto	142,662	56,100	198,762
Oneida	99,771	50,850	150,621
Outagamie	178,579	116,990	295,569
Ozaukee	140,281	113,390	253,671
Pepin	107,394	80,260	187,654
Pierce	141,006	80,600	221,606
Polk	162,030	36,250	198,280
Portage	148,425	64,350	212,775
Price	92,390	45,260	137,650
Racine	148,554	92,490	241,044
Richland	98,903	76,370	175,273
Rock	163,594	123,580	287,174
Rusk	112,153	68,140	180,293
Saint Croix	143,558	65,000	208,558
Sauk	142,660	109,350	252,010
Sawyer	93,194	48,000	141,194
Shawano	126,812	50,330	177,142
Sheboygan	152,280	72,870	225,150
Taylor	119,171	95,600	214,771
Trempealeau	131,181	159,350	290,531
Vernon	129,254	109,350	238,604
Vilas	125,100	33,080	158,180
Walworth	144,868	68,370	213,238
Washburn	106,151	51,260	157,411
Washington	136,558	47,220	183,778
Waukesha	176,709	31,220	207,929
Waupaca	134,962	161,100	296,062
Waushara	135,525	75,000	210,525
Winnebago	159,814	66,140	225,954
Wood	144,034	102,370	246,404
DATCP NR243 Res.	-	300,000	300,000
DNR NR243 Res.	-	1,500,000	1,500,000
UNPS & TRM Res.	207,793	2,554,546	2,762,339
Sub-Totals	$9,646,893	$9,831,278	$19,478,171
OTHER PROJECT FUNDING:			
Monroe County AEA Incentive Pilot		41,250	
UW CALS		580,000	
NMFE		350,117	
WLWCA/SOC		263,401	
Conservation Observation Day		3,500	
Sub-Totals			1,238,268
TOTAL	$9,646,893	$11,069,546	$20,716,439

Preliminary

DATCP ALLOCATIONS

1. Staff and Support

The allocation under this category provides county staff and support funding. Grants are awarded consistent with the terms of the 2020 grant application and instructions located at: https://datcp.wi.gov/Pages/Programs_Services/SWRMSect6.aspx

A. Funds Available

The allocation amount listed on page one consists of annual appropriations of $3,027,200 in GPR funds and $6,411,900 in SEG funds "for support of local land conservation personnel under the soil and water resource management program." DATCP has no underspending from prior years to increase this allocation.

B. Grant Awards

Grants are awarded using the following formula:

Tier 1

DATCP is exercising its discretion under s. ATCP 50.32(5) to award each county a $75,000 base grant.

Tier 2

DATCP will allocate the remaining $4,039,100 using a modified version of the formula designed to meet the goal in s. 92.14(6)(b), Wis. Stats., of funding 100, 70 and 50 percent of the costs of three staff positions in each county. As modified, the formula allows counties to claim department heads, technicians and engineers as their first positions (entitled to 100 percent funding) only if they work over 95% on eligible conservation activities.

DATCP makes Tier 2 awards in three rounds in an attempt to meet the statutory goal. For round one, DATCP can fully fund county requests for their first position at the 100% rate. However, for round two, DATCP can only fund about 70% of the county requests for their second position at the 70% rate. DATCP has no funding to make awards in round three to fund a county's third position at the 50% rate. Table A-1 (pages 3 and 4) provides round-by-round details of the Tier 2 allocation for each county.

Unmet Need for Staff and Support Funds

Despite an increase in appropriations, DATCP would need an additional $3.4 million in appropriations to reach the goal in s. 92.14(6)(b), Wis. Stats. Even with increases in funding, counties are anticipated to shoulder a significant part of the burden paying staff. For example, in 2018, counties provided funding to pay 211 of the 365 conservation staff employed statewide.

Reallocation and Redirection

DATCP approves Menominee County's request to reallocate up to $8,000 to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin on the condition that county provides a report on the use of the reallocated funds.

Future Funding Directions

As noted in the 2019 allocation, DATCP has initiated changes to move away from the needs-based approach that focuses on providing counties funding to cover the costs of its positions. DATCP now awards grants for a county's first position only if the staff is actively engaged in qualified conservation activities. Also, DATCP has tightened requirements for annual work planning and reporting, which are conditions for DATCP funding. These modifications were intended to stimulate counties building county conservation capacity and to better account for their performance. In light of the biennial budget's increased funding for staffing grants, DATCP has the opportunity to consider further adjustments in the grant formula to advance the goals of capacity building and accountability without compromising the basic funding for county staff.

Preliminary

In the future, DATCP could ensure that counties maintain adequate conservation delivery capacity by requiring that a county's second or third position be engaged in providing high level conservation support as a technician with conservation engineering practitioner certification or as planner qualified to write nutrient management plans. Also, DATCP could preclude a county from claiming a department head as its second or third position if the county has listed a department head in its first position. To reward county performance, the staffing grant formula could be modified to provide additional payments for counties that are making reasonable progress in implementing their annual work plans or have track records of spending high levels of cost-sharing. In moving forward, DATCP will proceed with caution, mindful of the challenges of tinkering with the staffing allocation, even with addition increases in the appropriation.

2. Bond Revenue Cost-Sharing

The allocations under this category provide cost-sharing to resolve discharges on farms (awarded to counties from a reserve), and provide counties grants for landowner cost-sharing. Unless otherwise noted below, grants are awarded consistent with the terms of the 2020 grant application and instructions (see page 8 for the link to these documents).

A. Bond Funds Available

The allocation amount listed on page one consists of $3.5 million (half of DATCP's $7.0 million authorization in the 2019-21 budget), with the following adjustment:

- Increase the amount by $190,000 using unspent bond funds previously allocated.

B. Grant Awards

Bond Reserve Projects

DATCP will allocate $300,000 to a reserve for the purpose of funding projects to address discharges on farms including regulatory animal waste response (NR 243) projects approved in cooperation with DNR. DATCP has scaled back its reserve to reflect changes in demand for the funds. These funds are awarded using separate processes: (1) selection based on a separate application, http://dnr.wi.gov/Aid/NOD.html, for farm projects issued a notice of discharge or notice of intent, (2) a recommendation from DATCP engineering staff concerning a farm discharge, especially to address increased costs for managing runoff from feedlots and feed storage.

Landowner Cost-Sharing

After setting aside a $300,000 reserve, DATCP will allocate $3,390,000 to counties for landowner cost-sharing. DATCP makes county awards by first providing base funding, and then awarding funds based on criteria related to county performance and need. This approach is designed to better meet the statewide priorities set in s. ATCP 50.30(2) including the need to address farms with water quality issues and support farmer participation in the farmland preservation program (FPP). After providing each county $10,000 in base funding, DATCP awards the remaining $2,670,000 using two performance-based criteria (a 3-year record of cumulative spending of cost-share funds, and a 3-year average of underspending of cost-share funds) and two needs-based criteria (farmland acres based on 2017 USDA Ag Census data and base adjustment to help counties receive funding closer to their requests).

Table A-2 (page 14) shows each county's total award amount and the factors that contributed to the county's award.

Unmet Need for Bond Cost-Share Funds

DATCP's allocation provided 43% of the funds requested, leaving $4,585,750 in unsatisfied county requests. This shortfall in bond funds has practical implications for our capacity to implement state and local priorities including farm runoff standards. Of particular concern, cost-share dollars are not keeping pace with increased costs for conservation practices and

Preliminary

expanded priorities reflected in new NR 151 targeted performance standards.

Future Funding Directions

DATCP discontinued including grant funds received via a notice of intent or notice of discharge project in the allocation calculations in the 2019 Allocation Plan. Having followed this request, DATCP has noted that the removal of these funds from positive spending has a detrimental impact on county allocations. Administratively, the time required to track these funds outside of the SWRM database has proven burdensome. Therefore, starting with the 2021 allocation, grant funds received via the notice of discharge and notice of intent program will be included in the allocation.

3. SEG Fund Allocation

The allocations under this category provide funding for (1) landowner cost-sharing, (2) farmer and related training involving nutrient management (NM), and (3) NM implementation support and other projects of statewide importance. Unless otherwise noted below, grants are awarded consistent with the terms of the 2020 grant application and instructions (see page 8 for the link to these documents).

A. Funds Available

The allocation amount listed on page one consists of $4,425,000 appropriation in SEG funds "for cost−sharing grants and contracts under the soil and water resource management program under s. 92.14" with the following adjustments:

- A decrease of $750,000 as a result of a redirection of funds for producer-led watershed protection grants.
- A decrease of $350,000 for a reserve to develop a database to manage SWRM grants and track the location and benefits of conservation practices.

Of the $3,325,000 available for allocation, $2,086,732 will be provided to counties for landowner cost-sharing, $350,117 will be awarded for farmer NM training, and $888,151 will be awarded to project cooperators including a $3,500 award for Conservation Observance Day. The majority of funding awarded in this category directly benefits farmers and other landowners by providing NM cost-sharing and farmer training.

Landowner Cost-Sharing

DATCP provides grants to counties primarily for cost-sharing NM plans at $10 per acre for four years, the flat rate that covers the costs to meet the 2015 Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 590 Standard. Some of these funds may be used to cost-share (a) cover crops and other cropping practices to implement a NM plan, and (b) for "hard practices" with DATCP approval if the county's grant contract authorizes such use.

Fifty-seven counties applied for $3,081,616 in grants, and DATCP will award $2,086,732 to applicants based on ranking determined by the following scoring criteria:

- Up to 20 points for having one or more Agricultural Enterprise Areas within the county.
- Up to 20 points based on the extent of impaired waters located in each county.
- Up to 30 points based on percent of acres in a county with NM plans (established by checklist submissions to DATCP in the prior year).
- Up to 30 points based on a county's total positive spending on NM cost-sharing and NMFE for the previous year.

DATCP relies on data in its possession to score county applications based on the six funding criteria. Counties are ranked according to their cumulative score (up to 100 points) and are organized into four groups for allocation purposes. Counties receive the highest maximum award for their grouping, unless a county requests a lower amount. The four award groups are as follows:

Group 1 (80-100 points)
Maximum Award: $95,000
Maximum awards in the group: 4 of 4

Preliminary

Group 2 (65-79 points)
Maximum Award: $75,000
Maximum awards in group: 2 of 8

Group 3 (50-64 points)
Maximum Award: $55,000
Maximum awards in group: 2 of 18

Group 4 (less than 50 points)
Maximum Award: $35,000
Maximum awards in group: 8 of 29

Table A-3 (page 15) enumerates each county's score, grouping, and grant award. The term "N/A" identifies the 15 counties that did not apply for funds. Table A (page 2) also reflects amounts allocated to each county under the "SEG Cost-Sharing" column. Adams, Brown, Calumet, Door, Fond du Lac, Kewaunee, and Manitowoc Counties have 75 percent or more of cropland covered by nutrient management plans and qualify to spend up to 50% of 2020 SEG funds on bondable practices. See 2018 Update, https://datcp.wi.gov/Documents/NMUpdate2018.pdf

NMFE Training Grants

For 2020, DATCP will fully fund all requests, in the amounts listed in Table A-4 below.

Table A-4: NMFE Grant Awards (in dollars)

Organization	Tier 1	Tier 2
Buffalo Co.	$12,500	
Calumet		$1,105
Columbia Co.	$12,720	
CVTC	$20,000	
Dane Co.	$12,650	$2,100
Dodge Co.	$10,000	
Eau Claire Co.	$3,009	
Juneau Co.	$10,500	
Kewaunee Co.	$19,700	
Lafayette Co.	$7,150	
Langlade Co.	$10,412	
Manitowoc Co.	$15,400	
Mid-state Technical College	$24,200	
Marquette Co.	$20,000	
NWTC	$19,881	
Ozaukee Co		$2,500
Polk Co	$17,000	
SWTC	$20,000	
Taylor(Mrthn, Clrk, Lncln, Wd)	$53,350	
Trempealeau Co./WTC	$20,000	
Vernon Co.	$20,000	
Washington Co.		$2,500
Waushara Co.	$13,440	
Total	**$341,912**	**$8,205**

All grant recipients must sign a contract with DATCP that incorporates the requirements of s. ATCP 50.35 and commits the project to developing NM plans that meet the 2015 NRCS 590 standards.

Statewide Projects: Nutrient Management Implementation Support, Cooperators

In addition to supporting NMFE training, DATCP uses its SEG appropriation for projects that contribute to statewide conservation goals, meeting the following grant priorities in s. ATCP 50.30(3): fund cost−effective activities that address and resolve high priority problems; build a systematic and comprehensive approach to soil erosion and water quality problems; contribute to a coordinated soil and water resource management program and avoid duplication of effort. DATCP has targeted the following areas for funding: nutrient management implementation activities including SnapPlus, support for statewide training of conservation professionals, development of technical standards, and coordinated activities in AEAs and impaired waters.

In the cooperator subcategory of Nutrient Management Implementation Support, DATCP received one application from the UW-Madison College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (UW-CALS) with different options for funding ranging from a low of $390,000 to a high of $ 696,849. DATCP will fund the UW-CALS request as follows: (1) $280,000 for

Preliminary

maintaining and improving SnapPlus, and (2) $300,000 for outreach, education and training provided by the Nutrient and Pest Management Program. Funding this project supports tools and information needed by government agencies and farmers to implement the nutrient management standard and the Phosphorus Index. UW-CALS will need to negotiate the details of a final work plan to reflect this funding and will need to provide detailed reports of worked performed as a condition of reimbursement.

In the general category of project cooperator, DATCP will provide the following funding. Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Association (WI Land+Water) is awarded $225,401. The funds are intended to build statewide capacity to deliver and coordinate conservation training including implementation of recommendations of the statewide interagency training committee (SITCOM) and the Producer-Led Watershed Protection Grants Annual Workshop. Funding also supports activities to promote accountability among county conservation programs.

The Standards Oversight Council (SOC) is awarded $38,000 which fairly recognizes the higher costs for maintaining statewide capacity to develop and maintain technical standards for conservation programs and the specific support for DATCP standards.

Up to $3,500 is awarded to the host county for costs related to Conservation Observance Day.

DATCP will partially fund a request to increase participation in Monroe County's two Agricultural Enterprise Areas through awarding incentives to landowers who sign FPP agreements at $41,250.

The 2020 cooperator awards are documented in the lower right-hand corner of Table A (page 2). All award recipients are required to sign grant contracts that incorporate the requirements of s. ATCP 50.35, and include significant accountability measures.

Unmet Need for Cost-Share Funding

DATCP will provide about 68% of the SEG funding requested by counties for cost-sharing, which is $994,884 less than the requested amounts.

While requests for nutrient management grant funds total over $3 million most years, the average total spent is closer to $1.9 million annually. DATCP is awarding less direct cost-share to better use nutrient management funds where they are most needed.

Future Funding Directions

With additional SEG appropriations, DATCP plans to consider how it can best implement conservation practices. On a fundamental level, DATCP needs to consider whether additional SEG dollars should be set aside to cost-share conservation practices historically funded by bond dollars. DATCP has consistently fallen short of meeting the demand for cost-sharing bondable practices, and diversion of SEG dollars may help fill the gap.

To the extent that DATCP will spend additional funding to support nutrient management (NM) planning, we are at an important crossroads in terms of the manner in which we provide financial support for NM implementation. Based on feedback from counties and other stakeholders, DATCP will consider combining cost-sharing with other strategies to effectively implement nutrient management. Some of the proposals received by DATCP involve:

- Use additional funds to hire agronomists to provide education in targeted areas;
- Expand the number of agronomists available to support NM planning (especially if DATCP does not target part of staffing grants to accomplish the same goal);
- Develop partnerships to expand NM training with the goal of smaller class sizes and specialized training;
- Build outreach to the private sector to make improvements in plans;

Preliminary

- Increase capacity to monitor and review the quality of NM plans and provide feedback;
- Build a stronger connection to the co-ops, consultants and fertilizer dealers to promote nutrient management;
- Better incorporate nutrient management planning to DATCP programs such as producer led watershed protection.

Regarding the allocation of SEG funds specifically for nutrient management cost-sharing, DATCP remains interested in refining the formula for awarding county cost-sharing. For example, DATCP needs to respond to concerns about the criterion related to nutrient management plan coverage in a county. The criteria needs to better capture NM plan coverage in a county to reflect acres under plans, not just the percentage of land in a county under NM plans.

Before making major changes, DATCP will engage key stakeholders to develop a workable approach. The counties and producer led groups can share insights on approaches to effectively target cost-sharing and increase farmer participation.

Preliminary

Table A-2: County Bond Cost-Share Awards

County	Bond				County	Bond			
	16-18 Cumulative Average Under-Spending*	2017 Census Acres**	16-18 Cumulative Total Dollars Spent***	Award		16-18 Cumulative Average Under-Spending*	2017 Census Acres**	16-18 Cumulative Total Dollars Spent***	Award
Adams	7.6%	117,206	$113,747	$33,140	Marathon	0.0%	473,147	$388,144	$75,850
Ashland	0.0%	52,428	$126,070	$52,990	Marinette	0.0%	133,068	$161,550	$57,490
Barron	0.1%	305,604	$131,996	$59,850	*Marquette*	3.9%	113,183	$100,688	$37,220
Bayfield	0.0%	81,041	$161,714	$57,490	*Menominee*	2.7%	290	$43,474	$20,000
Brown	6.2%	192,007	$84,873	$38,330	*Milwaukee*	0.0%	6,990	$1,050	$20,000
Buffalo	3.0%	293,130	$125,883	$52,120	Monroe	18.7%	300,659	$163,254	$40,535
Burnett	1.8%	89,237	$64,673	$25,000	*Oconto*	0.0%	189,898	$148,455	$56,100
Calumet	0.7%	153,858	$88,538	$43,260	Oneida	0.0%	34,670	$112,600	$50,850
Chippewa	1.5%	356,176	$117,790	$49,750	Outagamie	9.3%	236,963	$143,754	$41,990
Clark	2.6%	451,035	$182,770	$56,620	Ozaukee	0.0%	59,299	$258,711	$62,990
Columbia	0.0%	304,058	$194,130	$64,350	Pepin	0.5%	106,881	$108,198	$45,260
Crawford	0.3%	210,550	$115,052	$56,100	Pierce	0.0%	233,188	$195,318	$60,600
Dane	0.6%	506,688	$113,462	$52,120	Polk	14.3%	256,114	$110,264	$36,250
Dodge	12.2%	405,992	$61,181	$34,000	Portage	0.0%	280,410	$171,568	$64,350
Door	0.0%	114,508	$86,631	$50,990	Price	1.7%	89,203	$114,953	$45,260
Douglas	51.9%	69,759	$25,595	$13,140	Racine	0.0%	127,496	$187,133	$57,490
Dunn	8.1%	348,301	$144,609	$40,000	Richland	0.6%	220,843	$126,309	$48,370
Eau Claire	0.0%	172,256	$164,098	$57,490	Rock	3.8%	353,505	$158,852	$48,580
Florence	0.5%	18,609	$114,175	$43,120	Rusk	8.5%	136,062	$109,999	$33,140
Fond du Lac	4.8%	317,371	$162,339	$40,000	Saint Croix	2.1%	279,191	$63,416	$45,000
Forest	25.0%	38,084	$20,348	$11,000	Sauk	0.0%	298,906	$189,638	$64,350
Grant	3.2%	600,324	$194,971	$56,620	Sawyer	1.4%	46,009	$98,016	$40,000
Green	0.0%	292,368	$190,950	$64,350	Shawano	4.7%	247,241	$114,909	$40,330
Green Lake	0.0%	126,751	$176,359	$57,490	Sheboygan	0.7%	195,938	$190,563	$52,870
Iowa	1.6%	360,134	$99,358	$50,000	Taylor	0.0%	225,856	$198,601	$60,600
Iron	0.0%	9,200	$139,000	$50,850	*Trempealeau*	0.4%	329,916	$187,953	$64,350
Jackson	0.0%	248,342	$269,087	$66,100	Vernon	0.0%	337,086	$173,937	$64,350
Jefferson	19.1%	221,355	$86,945	$30,285	Vilas	5.3%	5,652	$92,283	$33,080
Juneau	0.1%	175,417	$79,632	$50,000	*Walworth*	1.5%	192,422	$147,119	$48,370
Kenosha	3.1%	77,782	$146,896	$45,260	Washburn	2.1%	73,773	$132,448	$45,260
Kewaunee	0.4%	170,405	$118,576	$52,990	Washington	5.1%	126,146	$126,285	$37,220
LaCrosse	8.1%	144,334	$128,328	$33,140	Waukesha	5.9%	97,460	$56,715	$31,220
Lafayette	1.2%	342,518	$125,188	$52,120	Waupaca	0.0%	201,603	$207,669	$66,100
Langlade	1.0%	116,386	$106,057	$45,260	Waushara	0.0%	135,306	$162,346	$50,000
Lincoln	25.3%	78,293	$81,615	$19,140	Winnebago	8.6%	162,052	$81,218	$31,140
Manitowoc	0.0%	231,609	$152,787	$60,600	Wood	1.8%	220,891	$149,182	$48,370
					TOTAL				**$3,390,000**

Each County was given a base of $10,000 to help counties receive closer to their requested amount. The following criteria were also applied to finalize a county's BOND award.

***Graduated awards based on 3-yr avg underspending: 0%= $31,850, 1%-3.75%= $24,120, 3.76- 6.2%=$16,080, 6.21-14.3%=$12,000, 14.31-20%= $8,035, >20%= $0.**

****Graduated awards based on 2017 Census acres: 275,000 or more=$10,000, 175,000-274,999=$6,250, 50,000-174,999=$3,140, 1001 -49,999=$1,000, <1,000=$0.**

*****Graduated awards based on 3-yr cumulative spending: >$275K = $24,000, $200K-$275K = $18,000, $150K-$200K = $12,500, $100K-$150K = $8,000, $75K-$100K = $6,000, $30K-$75K = $2,000, <$30,000 = $0**

County Name in Italics = County transferred funds awarded in prior grant year

Shaded award amounts= County awarded the amount of its request, which was less than the maximum grant award.

Preliminary

Table A-3: County SEG Cost-Share Awards

County	Ranking and Award			County	Ranking and Award		
	Score	Grouping	Award		Score	Grouping	Award
Adams	40	4	$20,000	Marathon	90	1	$95,000
Ashland	35	4	$20,000	Marinette	45	4	$35,000
Barron	25	4	$35,000	Marquette	65	2	$70,000
Bayfield	40	4	$35,000	Menominee	0	0	NA
Brown	50	3	$8,000	Milwaukee	15	0	NA
Buffalo	30	4	$20,000	Monroe	50	3	$50,000
Burnett	15	4	$30,000	Oconto	50	0	NA
Calumet	65	2	$40,000	Onieda	35	0	NA
Chippewa	50	3	$55,000	*Outagamie*	70	2	$75,000
Clark	75	2	$75,000	Ozaukee	55	3	$50,400
Columbia	65	2	$65,832	Pepin	40	4	$35,000
Crawford	15	4	$8,000	Pierce	35	4	$20,000
Dane	85	1	$95,000	Polk	25	0	NA
Dodge	70	2	$10,000	Portage	20	0	NA
Door	45	4	$28,000	Price	10	0	NA
Douglas	10	0	NA	Racine	30	4	$35,000
Dunn	40	4	$28,000	Richland	25	4	$28,000
Eau Claire	50	3	$42,500	Rock	75	2	$75,000
Florence	0	0	NA	Rusk	30	4	$35,000
Fond du Lac	55	3	$20,000	Saint Croix	30	4	$20,000
Forest	5	0	NA	Sauk	50	3	$42,500
Grant	30	0	NA	*Sawyer*	10	4	$8,000
Green	40	4	$20,000	*Shawano*	50	3	$10,000
Green Lake	50	3	$30,000	Sheboygan	50	3	$20,000
Iowa	35	3	$42,500	Taylor	45	4	$35,000
Iron	35	0	NA	Trempealeau	80	1	$95,000
Jackson	25	4	$20,000	Vernon	50	3	$42,500
Jefferson	55	3	$20,000	Vilas	0	0	NA
Juneau	35	4	$20,000	*Walworth*	45	4	$20,000
Kenosha	10	4	$20,000	*Washburn*	10	4	$6,000
Kewaunee	45	4	$20,000	Washington	50	3	$10,000
La Crosse	50	3	$20,000	Waukesha	35	0	NA
Lafayette	55	3	$22,500	*Waupaca*	80	1	$95,000
Langlade	60	3	$40,000	Waushara	25	4	$25,000
Lincoln	20	0	NA	Winnebago	45	4	$35,000
Manitowoc	55	3	$55,000	Wood	55	3	$54,000
TOTAL							**$ 2,086,732**

County Name in Italics = County transferred funds awarded in prior grant year
NA= County did not apply for SEG funds

Shaded award amounts = County awarded the amount of its request, which was less than the maximum grant award

Preliminary

DNR ALLOCATIONS

DNR's portion of this preliminary allocation provides funding to counties through three programs:

1) Targeted Runoff Management (TRM),
2) Notice of Discharge (NOD), and
3) Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Construction (UNPS-Construction).

Table B shows the preliminary allocation to each county grantee for TRM and UNPS-Construction. Additionally, NOD reserves are established as specific county allocations are unknown at this time.

FUNDING SOURCES

Allocations for TRM projects and NOD projects are from bond revenue appropriated under s. 20.866(2)(tf), Wis. Stats., Federal Clean Water Act Section 319, and segregated funds appropriated under s. 20.370(6)(aq), Wis. Stats.

Allocations to counties for UNPS-Construction projects, when requested, are from segregated funds appropriated under s. 20.866(2)(th), Wis. Stats.

Allocations to counties for UNPS-Planning projects, when requested, are from segregated funds appropriated under s. 20.370(6)(dq), Wis. Stats.

Note: DNR will also provide TRM grants and UNPS-Construction grants to non-county grantees. Wisconsin Statutes do not require that non-county grantees be listed in this allocation plan.

- For all grant programs, funds will be considered "committed" when a grantee has returned to the DNR a signed copy of the grant agreement.
- For the TRM program, grant agreements not signed by the deadline may be rescinded by DNR, and the associated grant funds may be used to fund other eligible projects in rank order based on project scores. If, for any reason, funds committed through this allocation plan become available after March 31, 2020, these funds may be held to fund projects selected in the next grant cycle.

1. TRM Preliminary Allocation

The DNR allocates up to $2,697,609 to counties for cost sharing of TRM projects during calendar year 2020. This amount is adequate to fully fund the estimated state share of all seven eligible county Small-Scale TRM applications. Additionally, this amount is adequate to fully fund the estimated state share for the two eligible county Large-Scale TRM applications. As shown in Chart 1, there are no unmet needs for county TRM projects.

The maximum cost-share amount that can be awarded for a single Small-Scale TRM project is $225,000. The maximum cost-share amount that can be awarded for a single Large-Scale TRM project is $1,000,000.

TRM allocations made through this plan will be reimbursed to grantees during calendar years 2020 through 2021 for Small-Scale projects and through 2022 for Large-Scale projects. Project applications are screened, scored, and ranked in accordance with s. 281.65(4c), Wis. Stats. Adjustments to grant amounts may occur to account for eligibility of project components, cost-share rates, or ch. NR 151 enforcement action at the time that DNR negotiates the actual grant agreement with an applicant.

2. UNPS Preliminary Allocation

CONSTRUCTION. UNPS-Planning grant applications were not solicited in 2019 for the 2020 award cycle. DNR has implemented an alternating schedule for both UNPS-Planning and UNPS-Construction grants. The UNPS-Planning grant application will be available in early 2020 for 2021 awards.

PLANNING. There were two county applicants for UNPS-Planning grants for the 2020 award cycle. Table B contains a lump-sum allocation of $64,730 for the higher ranked of these two

Preliminary

applications. The DNR will not solicit UNPS-Planning grant applications in 2020. These will next be available in 2021 for 2022 grant awards. The maximum cost-share amount that can be awarded for a UNPS-Planning grant is $85,000

The DNR will also provide UNPS-Construction grants to non-county applicants. Wisconsin Statutes do not require that non-county grantees be listed in this allocation plan.

The UNPS-Planning awards made through this plan will be reimbursed to grantees during calendar years 2020 and 2021. Project applications have been screened, scored, and ranked in accordance with s. 281.66, Wis. Stats.

3. Notice of Discharge Program

A. Background

DNR issues notices of discharge (NOD) and notices of intent (NOI) under ch. NR 243, Wis. Adm. Code; this code regulates animal feeding operations. DNR has authority under s. 281.65(4e), Wis. Stats., to provide grant assistance for NOD and NOI projects outside the competitive TRM process. DNR is authorized to award grants to governmental units, which in turn enter into cost-share agreements with landowners that have received an NOD or NOI.

Cost-share assistance is provided to landowners to meet the regulatory requirements of an NOD issued under ch. NR 243, Wis. Adm. Code. In some cases, cost-share assistance must be offered before enforcement action can be taken. In other cases, DNR is not required to provide cost sharing but may do so at its discretion. DNR has several permitting and enforcement options available under ch. NR 243 if landowners should fail to meet the conditions of the NOD.

B. NOD Preliminary Allocation

This Preliminary Allocation Plan establishes a reserve of $1,500,000 for NOD projects during calendar year 2020. The reserve includes funds for structural practices in eligible locations. DNR may use its discretion to increase this reserve if needed. To receive a grant award, a governmental unit must submit an application to DNR that describes a specific project and includes documentation that an NOD or NOI has either already been issued or will be issued by DNR concurrent with the grant award. Once DNR issues a grant to the governmental unit to address an NOD or NOI, DNR will designate a portion of the reserve specifically for that project.

Since DATCP also administers funds to correct NODs, DNR and DATCP will consult on each NOD application to ensure that the two agencies are making the most efficient use of the available funds to address these problem sites.

DNR will require that county grantees commit funds to a cost-share agreement with the landowner within a time-frame that is consistent with the compliance schedule in the NOD. The county grantee shall use the grant award to reimburse the landowner for costs incurred during the grant period, which may extend beyond calendar year 2020. If the landowner fails to install practices listed in the cost-share agreement within the timeframe identified, DNR will terminate its grant with the county, leaving the landowner to correct the problems identified in the NOD without the benefit of state cost sharing.

Fund balances from terminated NOD grants and projects completed under budget may be returned to the reserve account and made available to other NOD applicants. Reserve funds remaining at the end of calendar year 2020 may either be carried over for the calendar year 2021 NOD reserve account or may be allocated for calendar year 2020 or 2021 TRM projects.

DNR and DATCP issue a joint report annually to the LWCB on progress in administering NOD funds.

Preliminary

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE *2020 JOINT PRELIMINARY ALLOCATION PLAN*

This section will be completed to account for any changes in the proposed allocation plan based on comments received, LWCB input, and other factors identified by DATCP or DNR.

Counties, project cooperators, and other interested persons may comment on the 2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan either by:

- Requesting to appear and present comments before the LWCB at a regularly scheduled meeting (A Public Appearance Request Card must be completed before the start of meeting).
- Emailing written comments by no later than September 4, 2019 to: Kim Carlson at datcpswrm@wisconsin.gov.

FINAL ACTION

DATCP has determined that the action described in this allocation plan for the 2020 soil and water resource management grant program shown in Table A conforms to the applicable DATCP provisions of s. 92.14, Wis. Stats, and ATCP 50, Wis. Administrative Code. DATCP reserves the right to reallocate grant funds unexpended by recipients.

Dated this ____day of _____, 2019

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

_____
Bradley Pfaff, Secretary

DNR has determined that the actions described in this allocation plan for the 2020 allocations of DNR funds shown in Table B conforms with the provisions of ss. 281.65 and 281.66, Wis. Stats.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2019

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

_____
Preston D. Cole, Secretary

Preliminary

Environmental Assessment
DATCP's Portion of the *2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan*
August 2019

I. The Nature and Purpose of the Proposed Action

Each year the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP), together with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), allocates grant funds to counties and others for the purpose of supporting county conservation staff, landowner cost-sharing and other soil and water resource management (SWRM) activities. DATCP funds are allocated in accordance with ch. 92, Stats., and ch. ATCP 50, Wis. Adm. Code. Counties are required to have DATCP-approved land and water resource management (LWRM) plans as an eligibility condition for grants. The details of DATCP's proposed action are set forth in charts and tables in the 2020 Joint Allocation Plan that accompanies this Environmental Assessment.

II. The Environment Affected by the Proposed Action

As further explained in Section III.A., the DATCP grant program operates in every county, potentially covering all of Wisconsin's 34.8 million acres. While the program can fund a range of activities that protect surface and ground waters throughout the state, grant funds are primarily used to protect rural areas and install conservation practices on farms, which now account for less than 50% of Wisconsin's land base (14.3 million acres). Ultimately each county's LWRM plan determines the nature and scope of conservation activities in the area and the natural resources affected by DATCP funds.

Preliminary

III. Foreseeable Environmental Effects of the Proposed Action

A. Immediate Effects

The environmental effects of the proposed allocation plan are positive. Through support for conservation staff and landowner cost-sharing, the proposed allocation plan will result in actions on farms and other areas that reduce soil erosion, prevent farm runoff, improve management of manure and other nutrients, and minimize pollution of surface and ground water.

By providing annual funding for conservation staff and other conservation cooperators, DATCP secures statewide capacity to deliver a wide range of conservation and water quality programs. DATCP staffing grants enable counties to hire and retain conservation staff who have the experience and technical skills required to implement county resource management plans, including the state agricultural performance standards; facilitate landowner participation in state and federal cost-share programs; and ensure cross-compliance of farmers in the farmland preservation program (FPP). By funding special projects that support conservation implementation, DATCP is filling critical needs in areas such as technical standards development, nutrient management support, training, and coordination between the public and private sector. As discussed later, funding for county conservation staff has not kept up with the demand which is fueled by new programs such as producer-led watershed councils and phosphorus management, and the persistence of intractable ground and surface water issues throughout the state.

Each year, counties use cost-share funds to address state and local priorities identified in their local plans. New work plan and reporting requirements discussed on page six will provide a clearer picture of county efforts and facilitate reporting of county accomplishments.

Cost-share funds translate into tangible conservation practices that produce documentable results in controlling runoff pollution and improving water quality. In 2018, counties spent about $5.3 million in DATCP funds to install cost-shared practices, compared to 2017 expenditure of about $5.2 million. Table A highlights the top conservation practices DATCP cost-share spent by counties in 2017 and 2018.

Table A: Cost-Share Expenditure Comparison

Conservation Practice	2017 Cost-Share Dollars Spent (in millions)	2017 Units of Practice Installed	2018 Cost-Share Dollars Spent (in millions)	2018 Units of Practice Installed
Nutrient Management Plans	1.6	66,038 acres	1.8	53,414 acres
Waterway Systems	0.40	1,343 acres	0.47	1,730 acres
Manure Storage	0.39	20 systems	0.44	14 systems
Barnyard Runoff Control	0.18	16 systems	0.05	5 systems
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	0.38	24,469 feet	0.48	22,267 feet
Grade Stabilization	0.25	40 structures	0.29	34 structures
Closure of Manure Storage System	0.30	40 closed	0.23	29 closed
Feed Storage Runoff Control Systems			0.25	2 systems

Preliminary

The following developments are worth mentioning with respect to expenditures of cost-share funds in 2018 compared 2017 expenditures:

- A reduction in acres cost-shared for nutrient management even with higher expenditures based on implementation of a higher cost share rate.
- A slight increase in spending for erosion control practices such as waterway systems and grade stabilization structures.
- A continuing decline in the number of manure management structures such as manure storage and barnyard runoff control systems, in part attributable to increased costs for installation.
- The emergence of feed storage runoff control systems as top expenditure, with two projects totaling nearly ¼ million dollars.

B. Long-Term Effects

Over time, DATCP's annual financial support of county staff and other project cooperators has built and sustained a statewide conservation infrastructure that delivers the following reinforcing benefits:

- Outreach and education that results in positive behavioral changes;
- Development of conservation technologies such as SNAP Plus and the Manure Advisory System, and the training systems to effectively use these technologies;
- Technical assistance that ensures proper design and installation of conservation practices;
- Resource management planning that tackles local and state priorities, with an improved emphasis on annual work planning and reporting;
- Permitting and other regulation of livestock farms that requires properly designed manure storage and nutrient management plans; and

- FPP administration that protects valuable resources and promotes conservation compliance.

DATCP cost-share grants are critical in helping landowners meet their individual needs and fundamental to overall efforts to make progress in achieving broader water quality goals. Most farmers are not required to meet state runoff control standards without cost-sharing. Long-term state commitment to farmer cost-sharing determines the extent to which conservation practices are installed, and ultimately the degree to which water quality is improved. When multiple conservation practices are installed in a watershed or other area over time, the combined effect of these practices can result in marked water quality improvements.

Fully assessing the long-term benefits, however, is complicated for a number of reasons including the fact that DATCP's grant program operates within a collection of conservation and natural resource programs. See Section III.E. for more a detailed discussion.

C. Direct Effects

DATCP cost-share grants result in the installation of conservation practices and capital improvements on rural and agricultural lands for the purpose of protecting water quality and reducing soil erosion. Grants to counties and others also secure access to technical or other assistance that supports conservation efforts, including conservation and nutrient management planning.

D. Indirect Effects

Installed conservation practices not only improve resources in the immediate area, but benefit surrounding areas, including resources located "downstream" from the installed practice. For example, nutrient management practices implemented on fields upstream from a lake reduce sediment and nutrients that would otherwise be deposited in surface waters, and can provide additional protection for groundwater. Installed practices may have secondary benefits at a site, such as shoreline buffers, which not only serve to control runoff, but may increase wildlife habitat.

DATCP policies and rules mitigate secondary impacts from the installation and maintenance of conservation practices. DATCP policies ensure that counties evaluate cultural resource impacts of a project before any land-disturbing activities are initiated. To minimize erosion from excavation and construction projects, such as a manure storage facility or barnyard runoff control system, DATCP rules require landowners to implement measures to manage sediment runoff from construction sites involving DATCP cost-shared practices. Adverse environmental impacts may result from improper design and installation of practices. DATCP rules avoid this outcome by requiring the design and construction of cost-shared projects according to established technical standards. Improper maintenance can undermine the benefits of a long-term conservation practice. By requiring that landowners maintain conservation projects installed with DATCP cost-share dollars, DATCP ensures that practices perform in the long-term as intended.

In rare cases, certain negative impacts are unavoidable. For example, unusual storm events can cause manure runoff from the best-designed barnyard. Unavoidable impacts may also arise if a cost-shared practice is not maintained or is improperly abandoned. Manure storage facilities that are not properly abandoned or emptied may present a water quality threat, unless they are closed in accordance with technical standards.

Preliminary

Overall, the positive benefits of reducing nonpoint runoff through conservation measures significantly outweigh the slight risks associated with the installation and maintenance of conservation practices.

E. Cumulative Effects

While it is difficult to accurately gauge the cumulative effects of this action, it is clear that SWRM grant funds play an integral part in supporting a comprehensive framework of federal, state, and local resource management programs. By supporting 114 of the 365 conservation employees in the state's 72 counties, DATCP grant funds secure the foundation necessary to deliver a myriad of conservation programs, which among other accomplishments, achieved the following:

In 2018, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provided $62 million for conservation programs including $37.2 million in Environmental Quality Incentives (EQIP) payments to install conservation practices with the top six expenditures related to cover crops ($10.8 million), waste storage facility ($3.0 million), streambank and shoreline protection ($2.7 million), pond sealing or lining ($2.0 million), roofs and covers ($1.7 million), and heavy use protection ($1.4 million). In 2018, Wisconsin NRCS invested 12 active Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) projects with outlays of $1.48 million, including support for Lafayette County Agricultural Enterprise Area Water Quality Project, a project with DATCP as the lead partner designed to mobilize an existing informal network of landowners to address water quality concerns in the Pecatonica River Watershed through the widespread adoption and installation of conservation practices. In addition NRCS made $4.4 million in conservation stewardship payments covering 280,156 acres of privately owned farms and forestland.

The conservation reserve enhancement program (CREP) protects important soil and water resources while allowing landowners to make use of valuable adjacent working lands. As of the beginning of 2019, about 62,459 acres were enrolled under CREP agreements and easements: with approximately 7,100 acres under CREP easements and the remainder under CREP 15-year agreements. Of those enrollments 38,153 acres are currently under active agreements. The conservation benefits of the practices installed on the active agreements (e.g. riparian buffers and filter strips) are as follows: 1,007 miles of streams buffered with an estimated phosphorus annual removal of 103,968 pounds, nitrogen annual removal of 55,918 pounds and sediment removal of 51,684 tons.

DNR continued annual funding in 2019 for Targeted Runoff Management Projects, providing nearly $3.7 million to counties for cost-sharing 8 small scale and 7 large scale projects. DNR set aside $1.5 million for farms issued a notice of discharge.

Through its Producer-Led Watershed Protection Grants, DATCP awarded 14 producer-led groups $242,550 in 2016, 11 groups $197,065 in 2017, and 19 groups $558,246 in 2018, and 28 groups $750,000 in 2019.

Assessing the full extent of the effects of grant funding is complicated by a number of factors including complex interactions and far-reaching impacts of grant funding. For example, conservation activities funded by DATCP can dampen the potential negative environmental impacts of actions driven by farm policies and economics. In particular, the risks of cropland soil

Preliminary

erosion have increased as a result of conditions that favor increased cash grain/row cropping, and the increased market incentives to grow these crops.

IV. Persons, Groups, and Agencies Affected by the Activity

A. Those Directly Affected

County Conservation Programs and Cooperators: The proposed allocation plan provides funding to support 72 county conservation programs. Even with increased appropriations for the staffing grant, DATCP awards still fall short of funding three staff per county at the prescribed rates in s. 92.14(6)(b), Stats, providing less than one third of the costs to support county conservation staff, who number 365 according to most recent data. DATCP grants are one of several sources for cost-share funds that include county levies, DNR grants and NRCS funding. DATCP grants also fund private and public entities to provide statewide support for implementing conservation programs or provide special services to promote conservation statewide. DATCP funding for training and professional development is critical to maintaining county capacity to deliver high quality technical services, and reflects a state commitment to build the capacity of conservation staff statewide.

Landowners who are direct beneficiaries: Farmers and other landowners rely on many services, such as technical assistance, provided by conservation staff funded with DATCP grants. They also benefit from cost-share dollars to install conservation practices.

Other county residents: County residents benefit from resource management planning, permitting and other services provided by county conservation staff funded through DATCP grants. Through information and education efforts, for example, a county can help non-farm residents better manage lawn fertilizers, improve backyard wildlife habitat, control invasive species and minimize construction site erosion.

Farm-related businesses: Farm supply organizations, nutrient management planners, soil testing laboratories, agricultural engineers, and construction contractors benefit from state grants to counties. Landowners who receive cost-sharing purchase goods and services from these entities.

B. Those Significantly Affected

The allocation benefits those landowners whose soil and water resources are improved or protected as a consequence of the activities funded by DATCP. The benefits may include protection of drinking water. Landowners with properties located "downstream" of lands with nutrient and sediment delivery runoff problems also benefit from conservation practices that reduced these problems. Certain measures, such as nutrient management plans, can help protect drinking water wells that serve neighboring landowners and communities. The general public benefits from conservation practices that protect water resources, and promote natural resources.

V. Significant Economic and Social Effects of the Proposed Action

On balance, DATCP's proposed action will have positive economic and social effects.

DATCP grants support cost-sharing and technical assistance that enable farmers and other landowners to meet their conservation responsibilities and maintain eligibility for state and federal program benefits. By providing financial support to meet state runoff standards for farms, DATCP

Preliminary

cost-sharing helps farmers avoid the costs related to government enforcement actions and other liability risks. For example, farmers who develop and follow nutrient management plans gain liability protection in the case of a manure spill or groundwater contamination.

The economic impacts of installing conservation practices vary with each individual farmer and the type of practices involved. To receive cost-sharing, landowners often pay 30% of the costs (10% in the case of economic hardship) to install a practice. DATCP adjustments in the cost-sharing will enable farmers to keep pace with increasing responsibilities and costs associated with meeting conservation requirements. For example, the new maximum rate of $10 per acre for nutrient management plans represents a needed adjustment to help farmers complete more extensive planning requirements. DATCP's efforts to expand its cost-share reserve offers limited options to install more costly practices to control feed storage or barnyard runoff, in response to the uncertainties surrounding the installation of vegetated treatment areas to effectively manage discharges.

In addition to incurring costs, landowners also must adjust their management routines to accommodate new conservation practices and meet government cost-share requirements. With these changes, farmers face new risks including potential for reduced productivity and reduced profits. Farmers implementing these practices, however, may also see long-term benefits including savings on the cost of fertilizer, sustaining soil at productive levels, and reduced liability for environmental problems.

From the standpoint of local economies, grant funds will generate demand for the purchase of goods and services to design, install and maintain conservation practices. The farm-related businesses listed in IV.A. will directly profit from this increased demand.

Socially, DATCP allocations provide needed support for the farming community and others to take a more active role in the protection and preservation of natural and agricultural resources. Through the increased adoption of conservation measures, farmers can ensure continued acceptance by rural communities as responsible and conscientious neighbors. Improved water quality both enhances recreational opportunities and protects the scenic rural landscape, both of which are features essential to tourism.

Preliminary

VI. Controversial Issues Associated with the Proposed Action

For the 2019-2021 biennium, SWRM grants program benefited from funding increases in key areas. DATCP's annual appropriation for staffing grants was raised to its highest level since 2001, when DATCP awarded $9.4 million in staffing grants, an increase of approximately $475,000. This increase, however, did not help DATCP close the gap in meeting the statutory goal of funding an average of three county staff at the rate of 100, 70 and 50 percent. In fact, in 2020, DATCP will fall $3.4 million short of meeting the goal, which is about the same as the 2019 shortfall. As noted below, increased county staff may be key ingredient in making important gains in nutrient management implementation. It may necessary to look at ways to pay for field staff to support farmers with management intensive practices such as nutrient management.

Funding for nutrient management (NM) grants and related expenditures increased to levels not seen since the 2008 allocation, and we have responsibility to consider how best to spend this funding to promote NM implementation. While the flat rate payments for a nutrient management plan have increased from $7.00 to $10.00 per acre to account for increased planning obligations, counties have had adequate funds to meet their needs for cost-sharing. A narrow focus on NM

cost-sharing overlooks other opportunities that may be more effecting in promoting NM. There has been increased interest in farmer training. For example, NMFE grant applications nearly doubled for 2020. Counties are expressing interest in having access to resources other than cost-sharing to further implementation. These resources may include more county and University staff who can support farmers in the writing and implementation of NM plans.

While understandable from the standpoint of concerns about increased debt service, the decision to retain the same funding for bond cost-sharing fails to meet current program needs. While the $7.0 authorization for bond cost-sharing has not increased since 2002, the farmer costs for practices have increased for number of reasons:

- A significant jump in costs of material for construction of engineered practices in the last 5-10 years (e.g. a 60 percent increase in both excavation costs to $3.50 per cubic yard and concrete costs to $125 per cubic yard).
- Greater conservation responsibilities requiring farmers to install more conservation practices. For example, DNR adopted new performance standards in 2011 and 2018 and DATCP tightened manure spreading restrictions which increases the need for storage.

The unmet needs for cost-sharing engineered practices may call for creative solutions including the expanded use of SEG funds to pay for these practices.

Farm conservation practices have taken on renewed importance with the Governor's declaration that 2019 is the year of clean drinking water and the activities of the legislative task force on water quality. Increases in conservation spending are much needed and long overdue; however, the main source of funding for these conservation activities is inadequate to support more spending. A better supported and more sustainable source of funding is necessary to tackling our conservation challenges.

Preliminary

VII. Possible Alternatives to the Proposed Action

A. Take No Action

Taking no action on the proposed allocations is inconsistent with legal requirements. DATCP and DNR are statutorily mandated to provide grant assistance for their respective programs through an annual allocation as long as the state appropriates the necessary funds.

B. Delay Action

DATCP is under legal obligation to make an annual allocation within a specific timetable. Furthermore, there is no financial justification for a delay since the funding is available. Delaying the grant allocation runs the risk of hampering counties in meeting their legal responsibilities, including their contractual responsibilities to landowners, and undermines the significant environmental, economic, and social benefits of the program.

C. Decrease the Level of Activity

Decreasing the allocations would reduce environmental benefits, impede local program delivery, is not warranted based on the available funding for DATCP programs and would be inconsistent with legislative intent to implement the nonpoint pollution control program. Therefore, this is an undesirable choice.

D. Increase the Level of Activity

Available appropriations and authorizations determine the overall level of activity.

However, subject to the factors discussed in E. below, DATCP may increase the allocation in a given project category to better target spending to achieve desired conservation benefits and further legislative objectives.

E. Change the Amounts Allocated to Some or All Recipients

The awards made in the allocation plan are based on specific grant criteria that reflect a weighing and balancing of competing priorities and demands. The allocation plan is intended to implement ch. ATCP 50 and legislative directives regarding allocation of grant funds. It also reflects the input and consensus of the counties on funding issues. Changes in individual awards cannot be made without upsetting the weighing and balancing used to develop the overall allocation plan, and would unfairly deviate from grant criteria announced as part of the grant application.

VIII. Mitigation of Adverse Environmental Effects

Overall, the allocations are anticipated to have positive environmental effects. Any adverse environmental effects will be of a secondary and minor nature, and can be mitigated. DATCP minimizes adverse impacts through construction runoff control requirements, outreach and training, and improvements in the technical standards.

IX. Final Determination

This assessment finds that the *2020 Preliminary Allocation Plan* will have no significant negative environmental impact and is not a major state action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. No environmental impact statement is necessary under s. 1.11(2), Stats.

Date_____ By_____

Susan Mockert
Land and Water Resources Bureau
Agricultural Resource Management Division

The decision indicating that this document is in compliance with s. 1.11, Stats., is not final until certified by the Administrator of the Agricultural Resource Management Division.

Date_____ By_____

Sara Walling, Administrator
Agricultural Resource Management Division

Preliminary

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 16, 2019

TO: Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB) and Advisors

FROM: Mary Anne Lowndes
Runoff Management Section, DNR

SUBJECT: **DNR Proposed Scoring of Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2020 Funding**

Recommended Action: This is an informational item.

Summary: The DNR, pursuant to s. 281.65(4c)(b), Wis. Stats., is informing the LWCB through this memo of the Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) grant application scores for projects to be considered for CY 2020 grant funding. Scoring results for projects being considered for calendar year (CY) 2020 funding are presented in the attached tables.

Chapter NR 153, Wis. Adm. Code, which governs the TRM Grant Program, became effective on January 1, 2011, and includes four separate TRM project categories as noted below. Projects are scored and ranked against other projects in the same category. Once total available funding is determined, funds will be allocated among the four project categories. The maximum possible awards are $225,000 for Small-Scale projects and $1,000,000 for Large-Scale projects.

Scoring and Ranking Summary to Date:

A. Small-Scale Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

- Five (5) applications were submitted and are eligible for grant consideration.
- Funding requests for the applications total $904,288.

B. Small-Scale Non-TMDL

- Two (2) applications were submitted and are eligible for grant consideration.
- Funding requests for the applications total $219,633.

C. Large-Scale TMDL

- Two (2) applications were submitted and are eligible for consideration.
- Funding request for these applications total $1,381,473.

D. Large-Scale Non-TMDL

- No applications were submitted in this category.

The following process was used to score and rank projects and make funding decisions:

1. All projects were scored and then ranked by score for each project category.
2. For Small-Scale TMDL and Small-Scale Non-TMDL applications only, the highest scoring application from each DNR region that is above the median score in each of the two project categories was identified and moved (“region boost”) to the top of the ranked list.

The attached tables show the final rank order of applications.

Printed on Recycled Paper

The Department will include allocations to counties for TRM projects in the *CY 2020 Joint Final Allocation Plan*. Once the *2020 Joint Final Allocation Plan* is signed, DNR will develop grant agreements for successful applications. During the grant agreement development process, funding amounts may be adjusted as necessary to reflect final cost-share rates and eligible project components.

Materials Provided:

CY 2020 Small-Scale TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank
CY 2020 Large-Scale TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2020

Table 1. Small-Scale TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Region Boost	Total Eligible Project Costs	State Share Requested	Cumulative Requested
1	Ozaukee Co	Roden HFR CTR, LLC Zero Phosphorous Discharge	SER	118.0	Yes	$360,848	$225,000	$225,000
2	Shawano Co	Schmidt Ag Waste	NER	113.3	Yes	$373,836	$225,000	$450,000
3	Columbia Co	Dan and Bryan Guenther	SCR	100.1	Yes	$349,405	$150,000	$600,000
4	Juneau Co	Whispering Winds Farm LLC	WCR	98.5	Yes	$424,571	$127,500	$727,500
5	Columbia Co	Duane Ciciva	SCR	83.6	No	$197,675	$176,788	$904,288

Table 2. Small-Scale TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Region Boost	Total Eligible Project Costs	State Share Requested	Cumulative Requested
1	Oconto Co	Gabe Hintz Roofed Barnyard	NER	117.7	Yes	$179,439	$125,607	$125,607
2	Marinette Co	Bushmaker Roofed Barnyard and Manure Storage	NER	111.1	No	$104,473	$ 94,026	$219,633

Table 3. Large-Scale TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Total Eligible Project Costs	State Share Requested	Cumulative Requested
1	Waupaca Co	Bear Lake - Lower Little Wolf River Watershed	NER	185.2	$1,390,125	$973,088	$973,088
2	Wood Co	Mill Creek Watershed 9 Key TMDL Project	WCR	65.1	$996,000	$600,600	$1,573,688

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

State of Wisconsin

DATE: July 16, 2019

TO: Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB) and Advisors

FROM: Mary Anne Lowndes
Runoff Management Section, DNR

SUBJECT: DNR Proposed Scoring of Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2020 Funding

Recommended Action: This is an informational item.

Summary: Through this memo, the DNR is informing the LWCB of Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management (UNPS) grant application scores for projects to be considered for CY 2020 grant funding. Scoring results for projects being considered for calendar year (CY) 2020 funding are presented in the attached table.

The DNR funds UNPS projects under authority of s. 281.66, Wis. Stats. The purpose of this program is to control polluted runoff from urban project areas. Funds may be used for two types of projects:
1. Construction projects (may also include land acquisition) and 2. Planning projects. Each project type has its own application process and funding source. Consequently, construction projects and planning projects do not compete against each other for funding.

Beginning in January 2016, the DNR began implementing an alternating schedule for UNPS Planning and UNPS Construction grants. UNPS Planning grant applications were solicited in 2019 for the CY 2020 award cycle. The UNPS Construction grant application will be available in 2020 for CY 2021 awards. Due to the alternating schedule for the UNPS grants, only the scoring and ranking summary for UNPS Planning projects is provided here.

Scoring and Ranking Summary to Date for UNPS – Planning Projects:

The maximum state cost share per successful application is $85,000.

- Thirty-two (32) applications were submitted; all are eligible for funding.
- Grant requests for the 32 applications total $1,708,086.

The attached table shows the current rank order of applications. However, a requirement in s. NR 155.20(2)(b), Wis. Adm. Code, states that no one applicant may receive multiple grants that exceed 20% of the total available funding in a given project category. Applicants on the ranked list whose total funding requests exceed 20% of the total available funding may be awarded funds for the projects that do not exceed 20%; the balance of the applicant's requests are moved to the bottom of the ranked list. Additional funding is provided to those projects moved to the bottom of the ranked list only after all other eligible projects have been funded. Therefore, adjustments to the rank order may be made once total available funding is determined.

Once the *2020 Joint Final Allocation Plan* is signed, the DNR will develop grant agreements for successful applications. During the grant agreement development process, funding amounts may be adjusted as necessary to reflect final cost-share rates and eligible project components.

Materials Provided: *UNPS-Planning Scoring and Rank for CY 2020*

Printed on Recycled Paper

UNPS- Planning Grant Application Scoring by Rank for 2020

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Total Eligible Costs	Requested State Share	Cumulative Request
1	North Fond du Lac, Village	Stormwater Quality Master Plan	NER	110.0	$ 73,900	$ 29,560	$ 29,560
2	Schofield, City	Stormwater Quality Management Plan Update	WCR	108.9	$ 123,540	$ 61,770	$ 91,330
3	Grand Chute, Town	MS4 & TMDL Planning	NER	108.5	$ 181,400	$ 61,200	$ 152,530
4	Thiensville, Village	Storm Water Management Plan and TMDL Update	SER	108.0	$ 154,185	$ 77,093	$ 229,623
5	Appleton, City	Citywide Stormwater Management Plan	NER	105.8	$ 181,745	$ 75,000	$ 304,623
6	Rice Lake, City	Municipal Storm Sewer (MS4) GIS System	NOR	104.0	$ 82,000	$ 41,000	$ 345,623
7	Baraboo, City	Update 2007 Storm Water Quality Management Plan	SCR	103.5	$ 88,578	$ 31,000	$ 376,623
8	Kronenwetter, Village	Stormwater Quality Management Plan Update	WCR	101.0	$ 134,460	$ 67,230	$ 443,853
9	Marathon, County	Stormwater Quality Plan Update	WCR	101.0	$ 129,460	$ 64,730	$ 508,583
10	Mosinee, City	Stormwater Management Plan - TMDL Analysis & Recommendations	WCR	101.0	$ 84,020	$ 42,010	$ 550,593
11	Merrill, City	Stormwater Quality Management Plan Update	NOR	101.0	$ 137,710	$ 68,855	$ 619,448
12	Weston, Village	Stormwater Quality Management Plan Update	WCR	100.0	$ 144,560	$ 72,280	$ 691,728
13	Glendale, City	TMDL Stormwater Plan	SER	97.1	$ 92,200	$ 46,000	$ 737,728
14	Greenville, Town	Wolf River Basin Planning Grant	NER	96.5	$ 100,000	$ 50,000	$ 787,728
15	Oshkosh, City	Citywide Stormwater Management Plan	NER	96.5	$ 155,327	$ 77,664	$ 865,392
16	West Allis, City	Storm Water Management Plan Update	SER	96.2	$ 117,520	$ 58,760	$ 924,152
17	Marshfield, City	Stormwater Management Plan - TMDL Analysis & Recommendations	WCR	96.0	$ 99,940	$ 49,970	$ 974,122
18	West Central WI Regional Planning Commission	Rain to Rivers of Western Wisconsin: Public Education & Outreach Program	WCR	95.4	$ 100,000	$ 50,000	$ 1,024,122

DRAFT

UNPS- Planning Grant Application Scoring by Rank for 2020

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Total Eligible Costs	Requested State Share	Cumulative Request
19	Wauwatosa, City	Storm Water Management Plan Update	SER	94.0	$ 175,020	$ 84,900	$ 1,109,022
20	Fitchburg, City	TMDL Analysis and Recommendations	SCR	93.0	$ 118,720	$ 59,360	$ 1,168,382
21	Bellevue, Village	TMDL Implementation Planning Grant	NER	92.0	$ 100,000	$ 50,000	$ 1,218,382
22	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District	Respect Our Waters Storm Water Education Program – Milwaukee River Basin	SER	92.0	$ 210,000	$ 85,000	$ 1,303,382
23	River Falls, City	Collins Outfall Reconstruction Planning	WCR	91.8	$ 31,000	$ 15,500	$ 1,318,882
24	La Crosse, City	MS4 Compliance Implementation Plan	WCR	87.4	$ 135,000	$ 67,500	$ 1,386,382
25	Watertown, City	Conservation Subdivision	SCR	84.0	$ 22,308	$ 11,154	$ 1,397,536
26	Kenosha , City	Water Quality Master Plan and MS4 Permit Compliance Activities	SER	83.8	$ 243,376	$ 85,000	$ 1,482,536
27	Menomonie, City	2020 TMDL Addendum to Urban Stormwater Plan	WCR	83.2	$ 39,132	$ 19,400	$ 1,501,936
28	West Salem, Village	MS4 Storm Water Management Plan	WCR	80.2	$ 86,775	$ 43,000	$ 1,544,936
29	Richfield, Village	TMDL Storm Water Management Plan	SER	79.6	$ 37,008	$ 18,150	$ 1,563,086
30	Racine, City	Stormwater Quality Improvement Planning	SER	74.7	$ 55,000	$ 27,500	$ 1,590,586
31	Racine, County	Respect Our Waters Public Education and Outreach – Root Pike Watershed	SER	72.5	$ 180,375	$ 85,000	$ 1,675,586
32	Kewaunee, City	Storm Water Utility	NER	65.9	$ 65,000	$ 32,500	$ 1,708,086

DRAFT

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ State of Wisconsin

DATE: **July 25, 2019**

TO: **Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors**

FROM: **Lisa Trumble, DATCP** Lisa K. Trumble
Resource Management Section,
Bureau of Land and Water Resources

SUBJECT: **Recommendation for Approval of the *Barron County Land and Water Resource Management Plan***

Action Requested: This is an action item. The department has determined that the Barron *County Land and Water Resource Management Plan* meets applicable statutory and rule requirements and requests that the LWCB make a recommendation regarding approval of the plan consistent with the Board's guidance.

Summary: The plan is written as a 10 year plan, and if approved, the plan would remain in effect through December 31, 2029, and would be subject to a five year review prior to December 31, 2024.

DATCP staff reviewed the plan using the checklist and finds that the plan complies with all the requirements of section 92.10, Wisconsin Statutes, and Chapter ATCP 50, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

To qualify for 10 year approval of its plan, Barron County must submit an annual work plan meeting DATCP requirements during each year of its 10 year plan approval.

Barron County held a public hearing on July 11, 2019, as part of its public input and review process. The Barron County Land and Water Conservation Committee will present the LWRM plan for County Board approval after receiving a recommendation for approval from the LWCB.

Materials Provided:
- LWRM Plan Review Checklist
- Completed LWRM Plan Review form
- 2018 workplan with accomplishments and current 2019 workplan

Presenters: Tyler Gruetzmacher, Barron County Conservationist
Russ Rindsig, Barron County Land Conservation Committee Member

ARM-LWR-167 (August, 2017)

Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
Agricultural Resource Management Division
2811 Agriculture Drive, PO Box 8911
Madison WI 53708-8911
Phone: (608) 224-4608

Land and Water Resource Management (LWRM)

LWRM Plan Review Checklist

Wis. Stats. § 92.10 & Wis. Adm. Code § ATCP 50.12.

County: BARRON Date Plan Submitted for Review: 5/23/2019

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county convene a local advisory committee that included a broad spectrum of public interests and perspectives (such as affected landowners, partner organizations, government officials, educational institutions)	☒	☐	5

II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND COUNTY BOARD APPROVAL	Date(s)
1. Provide the dates that the local advisory committee met to discuss the development of the LWRM plan and the county plan of work	10/18/18 11/1/18 5/2/19
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan[1]	July 2019
3. Provide the date of county board approval of the plan, or the date the county board is expected to approve the plan after the LWCB makes its recommendation.[2]	08/19/19

III. RESOURCE ASSESSMENT AND WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the plan include the following information as part of a county-wide resource assessment:			
a. Soil erosion conditions in the county[3], including:			
i. identification of areas within county that have high erosion rates or other soil erosion problems that merit action within the next 10 years	☒	☐	10,51-57
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county[3], including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	☒	☐	16
ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources	☒	☐	13,16, 18-40

[1] Appropriate notice must be provided for the required public hearing. The public hearing notice serves to notify landowners and land users of the results of any determinations concerning soil erosion rates and nonpoint source water pollution, and provides an opportunity for landowners and land users input on the county's plan. Individual notice to landowners is required if the landowners are referenced directly in the LWRM plan. DATCP may request verification that appropriate notice was provided.

[2] The county board may approve the county LWRM plan after the department approves the plan. The plan approved by the county board must be the same plan approved by the department. If the department requires changes to a plan previously approved by the county board, the department's approval does not take effect until the county board approves the modified plan.

[3] Counties should support their analysis of soil and water conditions by referencing relevant land use and natural resource information, including the distribution of major soil types and surface topographic features, and land use categories and their distribution. Sec. ATCP 50.12(3)(b) requires that a county assemble relevant data, including relevant land use, natural resource, water quality and soil data.

iii. identification of areas within the county that have water quality problems that merit action within the next 10 years.	☒	☐	17,51-57
2. Does the LWRM plan address objectives by including the following:			
a. specific water quality objectives identified for each watershed based upon the resource assessment, if available	☒	☐	53-56
b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available	☒	☐	51-56
Other comments: _____			

IV. DNR CONSULTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county consult with DNR[4] to obtain water quality assessments, if available; to identify key water quality problem areas; to determine water quality objectives; and to identify pollutant load reduction targets, if any; and to review NR 151 implementation	☒	☐	2
Other comments: _____			

V. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan include the following implementation components: :			
a. A voluntary implementation strategy to encourage adoption of farm conservation practices	☒	☐	71
b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan	☒	☐	90
c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations	☒	☐	71
d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems	☒	☐	86
e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	☒	☐	58,67-68
2. Does the LWRM plan (or accompanying work plan) estimate:			
a. expected costs of implementing the plan including cost-sharing for conservation practices needed to achieve plan objectives	☒	☐	wrk pl
b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	☒	☐	wrk pl

[4] While requirements for DNR consultation may be satisfied by including relevant DNR representatives on the advisory committee, counties may also need to interact with DNR staff in central or regional offices to meet all of the consultation requirements. DNR may point counties to other resources to obtain information including consultants who can calculate pollutant load reduction targets.

3. Does the LWRM plan describe a priority farm strategy designed to make reasonable progress in implementing state performance standards and conservation practices on farms appropriately classified as a priority	☒	☐	57,69-72

Other comments:

VI. OUTREACH AND PARTNERING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy to provide information and education on soil and water resource management, conservation practices and available cost-share funding	☒	☐	88
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	☒	☐	88-89

Other comments: _____

VII. WORK PLANNING AND PROGRESS MONITORING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the county's most recent annual work plan[5] do both of the following:			
a. Provide measurable performance benchmarks	☒	☐	NA
b. Identify priorities	☒	☐	NA
2. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy and framework for monitoring county progress implementing its plan including methodology to track and measure progress in meeting performance benchmarks and plan objectives	☒	☐	90

Other comments: _____

VIII. EPA SECTION 319 CONSIDERATIONS

1. IS THE COUNTY WORKING WITH DNR TO SEEK EPA APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN AS MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF A 9 KEY ELEMENT PLAN UNDER SECTION 319 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has reviewed the above-referenced county LWRM plan based on the criteria required in s. ATCP 50.12, Wis. Admin. Code, and s. 92.10, Stats., and has determined that the plan meets the criteria for DATCP approval of this plan. This checklist review is prepared to enable the LWCB to make recommendations regarding plan approval, and for DATCP to make its final decision regarding plan approval.

Staff Signature: Lisa K. Trumble _____ Date: 07/17/2019

[5] Counties must submit annual work plan by no later than April 15th of every year to meet the requirement in s. ATCP 50.12(2)(i) for counties to have multi-year work plans.

Land and Water Conservation Board
County Land and Water Resource Management Plan
Review of LWRM Plan Revisions

County: Barron

Implementation Covering Past Five Years and Future Directions

Answer these four questions in writing (not to exceed 4 pages)

1. Provide a representative number of accomplishments within the last five years that can be directly traced to activities identified in multiple work plans. For each accomplishment, explain how the planning process helped the county achieve its outcome, including planning adjustments that helped better target county activities.

Many of our accomplishments go back further than the last 5 years or previous Land & Water Plans. Conservation has been important in Barron County for decades. We worked on one of the first Priority Watershed Projects with a focus of barnyard runoff systems and concurrently the SCS was constructing a considerable number of manure storage facilities. Barron County first began implementing Farmland Preservation in 1979.

This has followed with our work plans. Farm inspections to implement the State Performance Standards and Prohibitions have been, and will continue to be, our priority activity.

Since 2013, 208 Certificates of Compliance for a total of 44,115 acres have been issued. Our single Conservation Planner works through the entire process of inspecting the farms, developing a conservation plan, and in many cases assisting farmers in writing their own nutrient management plan. Also, we have noticed that when a farmer hires someone to write the plan for them, they receive a completed plan but have missed the planning process, so they fail to realize the worth of a nutrient mngt. plan. When the farmer is not present during the planning, the plan is not present during the farming.

Our farmer written nutrient management plan acreage has increased from 2,030 acres in 2013 to 15,850 acres for this current 2019 crop season. This is done without cost sharing. The majority of the farmers are writing their own plans in order to achieve compliance with the requirement to be eligible for the Farmland Preservation Tax Credit.

It was a goal of the last plan to update our Farmland Preservation Plan, and this was accomplished in 2013.

We have been using county cost-share funds of $20,000 annually to promote the use of cover crops with $25/ac incentives. This is one of the reasons that there have been 8000 acres of cover crops annually in Barron County.

Five Barnyard Runoff Systems have been constructed to eliminate significant discharges from feeding areas. While the BARNY model tells us how many pounds of phosphorus are leaving the barnyard, my favorite question is "how many manure spreader loads do you collect from the new barnyard?" Two of them are collecting two spreader loads a week that used to flow downstream.

There were 24 manure storage closures in the last five years, which brings our total to 105. With a considerable number of them built in an era of less stringent liner requirements, and an increasing number of farms no longer having cattle, this has been and will continue to be a priority. We partner with NRCS for many of these, the county providing the technical assistance and NRCS, the funding.

In 2011, at the time of our last plan, the world of industrial (frac) sand mining was just appearing on the horizon in Barron County. We had an NR 135 program dealing with sand and gravel operations and one quartzite quarry. We had 61 permits totalling 750 acres of which 670 were active. Today we have 79 permitted operations totalling 7727 acres of which 2289 are active. There has been reclamation of 65 acres in the last 5 years, and 135 are scheduled to be reclaimed and evaluated for completion this year. Currently, the industry is contracting and reclamation will be a focus of many operations. This is reflected in our proposed plan.

2. **Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in recent work plans. For each area identified, explain the work plan adjustments that were made to refocus planned activities. If no areas are identified, explain how the county was able to make progress in all the areas planned.**

We set a goal to have a GIS tracking system for compliance monitoring of Farmland Preservation. We have not accomplished this although we do have a plan going forward. Department staff has explored several avenues to track participants of the Farmland Preservation Program. This information is currently maintained within a simple Excel spreadsheet. Any new tracking system to be implemented should allow for linking of tabular data with the county GIS data. A module of the county's Property & Assessment software was considered, but it did not provide for a straightforward GIS link nor did it automatically alert staff of ownership changes on FPP parcels. We also looked at software used by other counties and found it to be too expensive and/or beyond the scope of what staff had time to maintain. Therefore, we are in the process of designing an FPP module within a departmental tracking system using an existing organizational software called Laserfiche. IT and Land Services staff will be involved in the design. This system will store Certificate of Compliance tax parcel information and monitor changes in ownership via a link to the Property & Assessment software. Any ownership or acreage changes will automatically be emailed to key staff for review. The system will also allow for retrieval of parcel information for mailings and extracts for GIS mapping as well as maintenance of Certificate parcels. We are hopeful that the system will be in place during 2019.

Using SEG funding to increase our NMP acres in the County was an identified goal. The permanent continuing compliance obligation has created hesitancy in individuals applying for the funds.

Also identified was outreach to lakeshore organizations and other groups. Outreach has taken a back seat to priority projects described above. At a time when the conservation staff in the county was larger than it is now, and without having to deal with Industrial Sand, more things

like newsletters and presentations were done. It is in our plan to reverse the trend to add both a lakeshore specialist and a soil health specialist to increase our efforts in this area. This will, of course, be dependent on funding.

We have had a goal of investigating groundwater issues for the past 2 years and have had discussions with our Public Health Department and UWSP regarding approaches to begin this project. Related to groundwater, and due to them being of a lower priority with lack of fund availability, no well abandonments have been accomplished in the last 8 years. We have increased the priority of these.

We have not worked on Clean Boats, Clean Waters projects and many other lakes projects, again due to staffing constraints. Fortunately, Washburn County has provided training to many of our lake groups. We have set a goal of developing a County Lakes Specialist position which would work on this and other projects on our nearly 400 lakes of which the properties adjoining them account for 30% of the valuation of the county.

3. **Describe the county's approach to implementation of its priority farm strategy including outreach, farm inventories and making use of multiple funding sources. How has the county evaluated the effectiveness of its priority farm strategy and used this information to improve implementation of the agricultural performance standards and conservation practices on farms?**

Through previous manure storage permits and aerial photos, we have documented all of the manure storages and areas of significant discharge from feeding areas. This database is used to track these practices, which is easier than the aforementioned Farmland Preservation Tracking. Based on this list, and our priority farm strategy, contacts are made with farms to develop plans for them to achieve compliance with the Performance Standards. With the costs of these practices being higher than traditional soil conservation practices they have taken a considerable portion of our SWRM funds from DATCP. We have taken somewhat of a pause from them, and are working on grassed waterways. We have partnered with NRCS on several AWSF closures in the past and will continue to in the future in an effort to get as much conservation accomplished as possible.

4. **Provide representative examples that show changes in direction in the county's LWRM plan and annual work plans, with specific examples provided showing adjustments in goals, objectives or planned activities.**

The increasing discussion in Soil Health has been entered into nearly every discussion we have, whether it be with a farmer or a lakeshore resident. It especially ties into our work with the local farmer led council, Farmers of Barron County Watersheds, which is also something that wasn't mentioned in our 2011 plan. Due to the importance of soil health, we are proposing to develop a Soil Health Specialist position in the county.

Annual Work Plans

Attach both of the following:

a. The most current annual work plan (2019), prepared in the current format from DATCP, and addresses all required items such as needed funding and staff hours.

b. The work plan for the previous year (2018) that includes a column that identifies the progress in implementing the planned activities for that year.

Presentation Regarding County Resource Concerns

Prepare and present an 8-10 minute snapshot to the board regarding county resources and management issues. The county must prepare one of following as part of this brief presentation:

a. **A PowerPoint (showing what your county looks like, can include maps), or**
b. A hand out (2 page max)

Guidance on Board Review Process

The LWCB's review supplements, but does not replace compliance with the DATCP checklist for LWRM plan approval. This encourages and supports honest presentations from the county. The county is strongly encouraged to have the LCC chair or committee member be a part of the presentation to the Board to contribute policy and other insights to the discussion. The goal of the review is not to fail counties. The board recognizes the dynamic nature of the planning process. Board members are interested in how counties tackle priorities over time and how they respond to changing conditions in pursuing their priorities. The board will evaluate a county's planning and implementation based on how well the county balances and prioritizes the following: agricultural performance standards, other state priorities (impaired waters, FPP checks), and local priorities. When needed, the Board will provide constructive support to counties to improve the quality of their planning.

Land Conservation Committee Notification

The LCC was provided a completed copy of this form (including attachments) on:

Signature of Authorized Representative: Don Hoaston **Date:** 6-21-19
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

Send completed form and attachments to:
Lisa.Trumble@wi.gov

BARRON COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	*Using Barron County funds ($20,000), cost share 800 acres of cover crops, targeting individuals with limited experience and new techniques *Administer the Farmland Preservation Program, conducting **50 Status Reviews** on current participants and **15 Conservation Compliance** Certificates (FPP and NR151) for new locations. *For Nutrient Management Planning, using the SEG funds for 1000 acres of new plans. *Work one on one and in small groups of farmers to assist them in writing their own nutrient management plans. *We will begin using SNAP Plus to run the Soil Erosion Transect Survey. We are also investigating running it an additional time to determine cover crop implementation. *Install 17,000 feet (16 acres) of grassed waterway	Acres of Cover Crop cost shared Goal of 800 **700 acres cost shared** Number of Status Reviews completed Goal of 50 **72 Status Reviews Completed** Number of Certificates of Compliance issued Goal of 15 Acres on these farms **30 COCs for 8058 acres** Nutrient Management Planning acres cost shared Goal of 4 **1** Nutrient Management Planning acres assisted **220** Goal of 45 individual training sessions **57 individual sessions** **713 new acres planned** **15800 acres updated** Feet and Acres of Grassed Waterways installed. **8 acres of waterway installed**
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	Work with **4 landowners** to correct livestock runoff prohibitions using Clean Water Diversions, fencing and roof runoff outlets. Review waste storage designs for permitting under the Barron County Manure Storage Ordinance. Inspections of existing manure storage facilities (5) Inspections of barnyard areas for compliance with NR151 (5)	# lbs of P reduced (BARNY) **1 project completed 30 lbs P reduced** # of livestock facilities in compliance with a performance standard

BARRON COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Water quality*

Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	Investigate groundwater contamination of Nitrates primarily in the sandy outwash areas of the county. Developing a partnership with the Wis DNR and Wis Land+Water for this.	**We did not develop a program. We are discussing this with our Public Health Dept and UWSP**

- *Forestry*

Forestry	*None*	

- *Invasive*

Invasive species	Continue program of cutting and spraying, purple loosestrife, Japanese Knotweed, garlic mustard, and other invasive species, focusing on early infestations. Partner with Invasive Plants Association of Wisconsin on a field day Raising bio-control beetles for Purple Loosestrife and assisting Lake Associations in their efforts.	Number of control efforts implemented/sites treated **We worked on 20 sites for Japanese Knotweed and Purple Loosestrife** Number of field days Goal of 1 - **We hosted a field day with IPAW** Number of beetle release sit*es* - **Unable to obtain beetles in 2018**

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	Conduct our annual tree sale Rent out our tree planters	Number of trees sold – Goal of 15,000 **15,000 sold** Trees planted by our planters - **unknown**

- *Urban*

Urban issues	None	

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	Work with the Farmers of Barron County Watersheds on Soil Health issues including demos and field days.	**Worked with the FLC on a variety of issues**

BARRON COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Other*

Other	Sand & Gravel and Industrial Sand mines · Review of Reclamation Plans · Issue reclamation permits · Monitor active mining operations · Survey active mining areas · Evaluate reclaimed sites Erosion Control work with straw mulcher	Number of plans reviewed 5 planned **5 done** Number of inspections 115 **115 done** Certification of Reclamation Sites 1 **1 site 1 acre done** Number of Sites Mulched 2 **2 sites done**

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	NA	
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	1	1 **1**
Manure storage closure	2	2 **2 permits and closures**
Livestock facility siting	4	4 **2 issued**
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	5	5 **3 reviewed and issued**
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	NA	
Shoreland zoning	NA	
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	NA	
Other		

BARRON COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	60 **72**
For FPP	60 **72**
For NR 151	60 **72**
Animal waste ordinance	10 **5**
Livestock facility siting	4 **1**
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	NA
Nonmetallic mining	

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	
Field days - Invasive Plants	1
NMP 1 on 1 trainings	45
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	Poster, Speaking 6th Grade
Newsletters	
Social media posts	
News release/story	5

Table 5: Staff Hours and Expected Costs (staff can be combined or listed individually)

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist/Technician (95%)	1976	$84,526
Conservation Planner	*2080*	*$86,005*
County Technician/Specialist	*2080*	$77,965
Administrative Assistant (50%)	1040	$31,231
Department Head	686	$39,929
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Barron County - Cover Crops	*N/A*	*$20,000*
DATCP SWRM Bonding	*N/A*	$65,250
DATCP SEG funding for NMP	*N/A*	*$40,000*

BARRON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	*Using Barron County funds ($20,000), cost share 800 acres of cover crops, targeting individuals with limited experience and new techniques *Administer the Farmland Preservation Program, conducting **50 Status Reviews** on current participants and **15 Conservation Compliance** Certificates (FPP and NR151) for new locations. *For Nutrient Management Planning, using the SEG funds for 1000 acres of new plans. *Work one on one and in small groups of farmers to assist them in writing their own nutrient management plans. *We will begin using SNAP Plus to run the Soil Erosion Transect Survey. We are also investigating running it an additional time to determine cover crop implementation. *Install 15,000 feet (12 acres) of grassed waterway	Acres of Cover Crop cost shared Goal of 800 Number of Status Reviews completed Goal of 50 Acres on these farms Number of Certificates of Compliance issued Goal of 15 Acres on these farms Nutrient Management Planning acres cost shared Goal of 4 Nutrient Management Planning acres assisted Goal of 45 individual training sessions Feet and Acres of Grassed Waterways installed.
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	Work with **4 landowners** to correct livestock runoff prohibitions using Clean Water Diversions, fencing and roof runoff outlets. Review waste storage designs for permitting under the Barron County Manure Storage Ordinance. Inspections of existing manure storage facilities (5) Inspections of barnyard areas for compliance with NR151 (5)	# lbs of P reduced (BARNY) # of livestock facilities in compliance with a performance standard

BARRON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Water quality*

Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	Investigate groundwater contamination of Nitrates primarily in the sandy outwash areas of the county. Developing a partnership our Public Health Department for this.	Program developed

- *Forestry*

Forestry	Conduct our annual tree sale Rental of our tree planters	Number of trees sold – Goal 15,000 Number of trees planted

- *Invasive*

Invasive species	Continue program of cutting and spraying, purple loosestrife, Japanese Knotweed, garlic mustard, and other invasive species, focusing on early infestations. Use the GLEDN App for mapping of sites in the county. Raising bio-control beetles for Purple Loosestrife and assisting Lake Associations in their efforts	Number of control efforts implemented/sites treated Sites recorded by staff Number of beetle release sites

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)		

- *Urban*

Urban issues	None	

Watershed

Watershed strategies	Participate in the Red Cedar Basin Partnership Assist the Farmers of Barron County Watersheds with their soil probe project	6 meetings per year

- *Other*

Other	Sand & Gravel and Industrial Sand mines · Review of Reclamation Plans · Issue reclamation permits · Monitor active mining operations · Survey active mining areas · Evaluate reclaimed sites	Number of plans reviewed 5 planned Number of inspections 115 Certification of Reclamation Sites 2

	Erosion Control work with straw mulcher	Number of Sites Mulched 2

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	NA	
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	1	1
Manure storage closure	5	5
Livestock facility siting	1	1
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	5	5
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	NA	
Shoreland zoning	NA	
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	NA	
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	60
For FPP	60
For NR 151	60
Animal waste ordinance	10
Livestock facility siting	1
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	NA
Nonmetallic mining	115

BARRON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	
Field days	1
Trainings/workshops NMP 1 on 1	45
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	Poster contest 1 Speaking contest 1 6th Grade Tour 1
Newsletters	
Social media posts - Email list	20
News release/story	5

Table 5: Staff Hours and Expected Costs (staff can be combined or listed individually)

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist/Technician (95%)	1976	$86,981
Conservation Planner	2080	$88,897
County Technician/Specialist	2080	$81,472
Administrative Assistant (50%)	1040	$32,081
Department head	520	$28,895
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
DATCP SWRM Bonding	N/A	$66,750
DATCP SEG for NMP	N/A	$40,000
Barron County – Cover crops	N/A	$20,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ State of Wisconsin

DATE: **July 25, 2019**

TO: **Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors**

FROM: **Lisa K. Trumble, DATCP** Lisa K. Trumble
Resource Management Section,
Bureau of Land and Water Resources

SUBJECT: **Recommendation for Approval of the *Oneida County Land and Water Resource Management Plan***

Action Requested: This is an action item. The department has determined that the Oneida *County Land and Water Resource Management Plan* meets applicable statutory and rule requirements and requests that the LWCB make a recommendation regarding approval of the plan consistent with the Board's guidance.

Summary: The plan is written as a 10 year plan, and if approved, the plan would remain in effect through December 31, 2029, and would be subject to a five year review prior to December 31, 2024.

DATCP staff reviewed the plan using the checklist and finds that the plan complies with all the requirements of section 92.10, Wisconsin Statutes, and Chapter ATCP 50, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

To qualify for 10 year approval of its plan, Oneida County must submit an annual work plan meeting DATCP requirements during each year of its 10 year plan approval.

Oneida County held a public hearing on June 5, 2019, as part of its public input and review process. The Oneida County Conservation and UW-EX Committee will present the LWRM plan for County Board approval after receiving a recommendation for approval from the LWCB.

Materials Provided:
- LWRM Plan Review Checklist
- Completed LWRM Plan Review form
- 2018 workplan with accomplishments and current 2019 workplan

Presenters: Michele Sadauskas, Oneida County Conservationist
Bob Mott, Conservation & UW-EX Committee Chair
Karl Jennrich, LWCD/P&Z Department Head
Fred Heider, North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

ARM-LWR-167 (August, 2017)

Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
Agricultural Resource Management Division
2811 Agriculture Drive, PO Box 8911
Madison WI 53708-8911
Phone: (608) 224-4608

Land and Water Resource Management (LWRM)

LWRM Plan Review Checklist

Wis. Stats. § 92.10 & Wis. Adm. Code § ATCP 50.12.

County: ONEIDA Date Plan Submitted for Review: 5/28/2019

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county convene a local advisory committee that included a broad spectrum of public interests and perspectives (such as affected landowners, partner organizations, government officials, educational institutions)	☒	☐	1

II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND COUNTY BOARD APPROVAL	Date(s)
1. Provide the dates that the local advisory committee met to discuss the development of the LWRM plan and the county plan of work	10/30/18
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan[1]	6/5/19
3. Provide the date of county board approval of the plan, or the date the county board is expected to approve the plan after the LWCB makes its recommendation.[2]	AUGUST

III. RESOURCE ASSESSMENT AND WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the plan include the following information as part of a county-wide resource assessment:			
a. Soil erosion conditions in the county[3], including:			
i. identification of areas within county that have high erosion rates or other soil erosion problems that merit action within the next 10 years	☒	☐	30-31
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county[3], including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	☒	☐	22
ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources	☒	☐	20-26 att C,G

[1] Appropriate notice must be provided for the required public hearing. The public hearing notice serves to notify landowners and land users of the results of any determinations concerning soil erosion rates and nonpoint source water pollution, and provides an opportunity for landowners and land users input on the county's plan. Individual notice to landowners is required if the landowners are referenced directly in the LWRM plan. DATCP may request verification that appropriate notice was provided.

[2] The county board may approve the county LWRM plan after the department approves the plan. The plan approved by the county board must be the same plan approved by the department. If the department requires changes to a plan previously approved by the county board, the department's approval does not take effect until the county board approves the modified plan.

[3] Counties should support their analysis of soil and water conditions by referencing relevant land use and natural resource information, including the distribution of major soil types and surface topographic features, and land use categories and their distribution. Sec. ATCP 50.12(3)(b) requires that a county assemble relevant data, including relevant land use, natural resource, water quality and soil data.

iii. identification of areas within the county that have water quality problems that merit action within the next 10 years.	☒	☐	21-27
2. Does the LWRM plan address objectives by including the following:			
a. specific water quality objectives identified for each watershed based upon the resource assessment, if available	☒	☐	21-27
b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available	☒	☐	23, G
Other comments:			

IV. DNR CONSULTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county consult with DNR[4] to obtain water quality assessments, if available; to identify key water quality problem areas; to determine water quality objectives; and to identify pollutant load reduction targets, if any; and to review NR 151 implementation	☒	☐	1,7
Other comments: _____			

V. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan include the following implementation components: :			
a. A voluntary implementation strategy to encourage adoption of farm conservation practices	☒	☐	31
b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan	☒	☐	60-61
c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations	☒	☐	61
d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems	☒	☐	Att E
e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	☐	☐	N/A
2. Does the LWRM plan (or accompanying work plan) estimate:			
a. expected costs of implementing the plan including cost-sharing for conservation practices needed to achieve plan objectives	☒	☐	46
b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	☒	☐	46

[4] While requirements for DNR consultation may be satisfied by including relevant DNR representatives on the advisory committee, counties may also need to interact with DNR staff in central or regional offices to meet all of the consultation requirements. DNR may point counties to other resources to obtain information including consultants who can calculate pollutant load reduction targets.

3. Does the LWRM plan describe a priority farm strategy designed to make reasonable progress in implementing state performance standards and conservation practices on farms appropriately classified as a priority	☒	☐	4,40

Other comments: _____

VI. OUTREACH AND PARTNERING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy to provide information and education on soil and water resource management, conservation practices and available cost-share funding	☒	☐	64
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	☒	☐	65

Other comments: _____

VII. WORK PLANNING AND PROGRESS MONITORING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the county's most recent annual work plan[5] do both of the following:			
a. Provide measurable performance benchmarks	☒	☐	NA
b. Identify priorities	☒	☐	NA
2. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy and framework for monitoring county progress implementing its plan including methodology to track and measure progress in meeting performance benchmarks and plan objectives	☒	☐	62-63

Other comments:

VIII. EPA SECTION 319 CONSIDERATIONS

1. IS THE COUNTY WORKING WITH DNR TO SEEK EPA APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN AS MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF A 9 KEY ELEMENT PLAN UNDER SECTION 319 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT: NO

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has reviewed the above-referenced county LWRM plan based on the criteria required in s. ATCP 50.12, Wis. Admin. Code, and s. 92.10, Stats., and has determined that the plan meets the criteria for DATCP approval of this plan. This checklist review is prepared to enable the LWCB to make recommendations regarding plan approval, and for DATCP to make its final decision regarding plan approval.

Staff Signature: Lisa K. Trumble Date: 07/17/2019

[5] Counties must submit annual work plan by no later than April 15th of every year to meet the requirement in s. ATCP 50.12(2)(i) for counties to have multi-year work plans.

Land and Water Conservation Board
County Land and Water Resource Management Plan
Review of LWRM Plan Revisions

County: oneida

Implementation Covering Past Five Years and Future Directions

Answer these four questions in writing (not to exceed 4 pages)

1. *Provide a representative number of accomplishments within the last five years that can be directly traced to activities identified in multiple work plans. For each accomplishment, explain how the planning process helped the county achieve its outcome, including planning adjustments that helped better target county activities.*

   Invasive Species: The planning process allows us to work activities into grant applications, and performance measurements are incorporated into grant reporting and reimbursement requests. Additionally, we use the workplan to develop "working" spreadsheets that identify when staff are reaching goals. Staff can easily see what areas or activities need more focus.

   - $176,043 in grant money obtained in the last 5 years
   - 10 sites restored
   - 4,000+ hours of boat inspections
   - 35+ workshops held
   - Continued leadership in WHIP (WI Headwaters Invasive Partnership) since its inception
   - Creation and coordination of the 'Northwoods Invasive Species Poster Contest' which spans 18 Northern counties and receives close to 600 entries each year.

   Water Quality: This is our #1 goal in Oneida County. The planning process helps guide the number and type of projects we desire. We have capped cost share amounts to landowners so that more projects can be put on the landscape each year (this adjustment allows LWCD to reach measurement marks). We have also had to make planning adjustments when needing to carry over cost share funding due to contractor availability, weather constraints, and/or the economy.

   - $192,000 in cost share monies distributed to landowners to increase water quality
   - 12,627 square feet of habitat improvements
   - 1,786 feet of shoreline restored/protected
   - LWCD is starting to take a larger role in providing technical assistance to landowners with mitigation requirements. Changes in State legislation has seen an increase in violations, and LWCD will, for the first, time develop a 2019/2020 fee schedule for technical assistance on lakeshore violations.

On-line Resource Distribution: In our 2012-2016 LWRM plan, establishing an LWCD website and updating *one* webpage was an objective in a low-ranking goal (#8 out of 10 goals). Today, this goal does not register as an activity anywhere on our workplan. But, that isn't because it isn't important, it is because it is *critical*. The website is now an integral part of each and every goal we have. When we list "work with lake groups to develop and provide educational material", it is a given that we are coordinating educational material between the lake group's website and the LWCD website. Here are some examples of how we use our webpage:

- A QR code is displayed on our interpretative pollinator garden signage. The QR code brings the viewer to 'The Perfect Pollinator Garden" and gives the visitor instant access to the type of native plants in the garden.
- Current and past cost share projects are featured under our 'Protecting Your Shoreline' tab. This give the reader an idea of what type of projects LWCD can help with, shows project costs, and most importantly, shows before and after pictures.
- A resource for teachers. When the Northwoods Invasive Species Poster Contest is in full swing, teachers and students regularly check into our website to find resources about invasive species, view last year's winning posters, see who is competing this year, and view judging videos that help students create a winning poster.
- Our website is one of our most important tools in our toolbox!

2. *Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in recent work plans. For each area identified, explain the work plan adjustments that were made to refocus planned activities. If no areas are identified, explain how the county was able to make progress in all the areas planned.*

There were three areas where Oneida County LWCD was unable to make desired progress.

Livestock: In the past, there have been minimal opportunities to install livestock conservation practices in Oneida County, due to limited number of livestock farmers and staff resources. Recently, LWCD began to obtain grant funding for pollinator outreach and habitat. This has led to an increase in staff, which in turn has led to a larger Agricultural Producers list, increased educational outreach to farmers, and increased coordination with NRCS. These changes have allowed LWCD to be in a better position to make contact with small-scale farmers, and provide both technical and financial assistance to them. In 2019, we are coordinating a rotational grazing plan with NRCS, and will be providing financial assistance to the farmer. A change in direction in another part of the plan (see #4 below), will allow this area (Livestock) to make desired progress in 2019 and beyond.

Forestry: For a multitude of years, LWCD has struggled to fulfill its Forestry Goal. LWCD was to "improve forest silviculture and manage trail use", but both of these objectives reside firmly in the Oneida County Forestry Department. The 2020-2029 LWRM plan re-write allowed LWCD to replace its forestry *goal* with a forestry *educational outreach objective* and added *activities* that centered around protecting

surface water quality and exceptional resources in Oneida County forests. With these changes, LWCD will be able to successfully fulfill locally identified priorities.

Cropland/Nutrient Management: Farmland preservation zoning does not exist in Oneida County, therefore we see very few Farmland Preservation Program claims (we have one old agreement) and cannot use FPP as an educational tool to reach out to farmers. Additionally, due to the small amount of agricultural land (2.3%), LWCD has not prioritized staff resources to this area. With that said, we have been able to increase our agricultural producers list because of increased pollinator habitat awareness. In addition, we have included activities in the 2020-2024 Work Plan that will prioritize the development of a priority watershed list, identify soil erosion at the watershed level, and consider establishing farmland preservation zoning. All of these actions will hopefully allow LWCD to perform increased outreach to priority farms.

3. *Describe the county's approach to implementation of its priority farm strategy including outreach, farm inventories and making use of multiple funding sources. How has the county evaluated the effectiveness of its priority farm strategy and used this information to improve implementation of the agricultural performance standards and conservation practices on farms?*

With a small department and small agricultural land base, Oneida County relies heavily on NRCS to provide first contact with producers. NRCS advises farmers of our Cost Share Program, and most of our installed agricultural conservation practices have been due to this partnership. With the new 2020-2024 Work Plan, LWCD has prioritized the development of a priority watershed list and the identification of soil erosion at the watershed level. Additionally, LWCD has identified water quality management areas and, with the help of the Oneida County Land Information Office, will be able to identify priority farms. Once identified, LWCD will work with NRCS to contact landowners and offer technical and financial assistance.

4. *Provide representative examples that show changes in direction in the county's LWRM plan and annual work plans, with specific examples provided showing adjustments in goals, objectives or planned activities.*

Pollinator Habitat/Awareness: This area was not even a blip on the radar in our 2012-2016 LWRM plan, but LWCD knew the critical nature of pollinator decline and wanted to be a leader in increasing pollinator habitat and awareness. Since 2016, LWCD has received over $25,000 in grant money to support pollinator habitat and awareness, initiated the North Central Regional Pollinator Partnership (an 8-county partnership), and created eight demonstration plots, four of those hosting 'Perfect Pollinator Garden' interpretative signage. A slight change was made to our 2017 Work Plan to "promote native species", but with the creation of the 2020-2024 Work Plan, pollinator activities are listed in three goals, and will be promoted in buffer strips, along lake shores, at invasive species controlled sites, and within our cost share program.

Revision of Mining Goal: In our 2012-2016 LWRM plan, Goal #9 focused on the reclamation of non-metallic mines. LWCD played a minor role in providing technical assistance to Planning & Zoning. Additionally, inspections were performed by Planning & Zoning and vegetating reclaimed mines with a diverse mixture of native plants was atypical. Due to recent changes in State regulations, metallic mining has become a larger resource concern in Oneida County, and Goal #9 seemed insufficient to protect our land

and water resources. The Oneida County Conservation & UWEX Education Committee, the LWRM Plan Resource Advisory Group, LWCD staff, and public comment suggested updating mining objectives and activities. Two new objectives were added to the 2020-2024 Work Plan, with a total of 9 activities. These activities are focused on protecting surface water, wetlands, and groundwater from the effects of mining. As a note, the objective to reclaim abandoned mining sites still exists.

Annual Work Plans

Attach both of the following:

a. The most current annual work plan, prepared in the current format from DATCP, and addresses all required items such as needed funding and staff hours.

b. The work plan for the previous year that includes a column that identifies the progress in implementing the planned activities for that year.

Presentation Regarding County Resource Concerns

Prepare and present an 8-10 minute snapshot to the board regarding county resources and management issues. The county must prepare one of following as part of this brief presentation:

a. A PowerPoint (showing what your county looks like, can include maps), or
b. A hand out (2 page max)

Guidance on Board Review Process

The LWCB's review supplements, but does not replace compliance with the DATCP checklist for LWRM plan approval. This encourages and supports honest presentations from the county. The county is strongly encouraged to have the LCC chair or committee member be a part of the presentation to the Board to contribute policy and other insights to the discussion. The goal of the review is not to fail counties. The board recognizes the dynamic nature of the planning process. Board members are interested in how counties tackle priorities over time and how they respond to changing conditions in pursuing their priorities. The board will evaluate a county's planning and implementation based on how well the county balances and prioritizes the following: agricultural performance standards, other state priorities (impaired waters, FPP checks), and local priorities. When needed, the Board will provide constructive support to counties to improve the quality of their planning.

Land Conservation Committee Notification

The LCC was provided a completed copy of this form (including attachments) on: July 15, 2019

Signature of Authorized Representative: M Sadauskas **Date:** 7-8-19
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

Send completed form and attachments to:
Lisa.Trumble@wi.gov

ONEIDA COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management Goal 4, objective B	-Install 1 cropland practice. -Update list of agricultural producers. -Implement agricultural BMP's on voluntary producers (2). -Provide technical assistance, including training and plan reviews (1 nutrient management plans and 1 pest management plans). -Identify and contact priority farms within HUC 0707001. -Identify highly erodible lands draining to ORW & ERW waterways.	Updated Ag producers list. ** This area is further addressed in Question #2 of the "Review of LWRM Plan Revisions" **
• *Livestock*		
Livestock Goal 4, objective C **Livestock facility conservation practices installed to implement state performance standards and prohibitions.**	-Install livestock practices. • 1 rotational grazing plan -Provide technical assistance including design prep. and construction, oversight, and educational support. This may include livestock fencing, watering facility.	** This area is addressed in Question #2 of the "Review of LWRM Plan Revisions" **
• *Water quality*		
Water quality/quantity Goal 5, objective A & B **Educate public about groundwater quality.** Goal 2, objective B **Protect shorelands.** Goal 3, objective A, B, & C **Restore shorelands.** Goal 6, objective A, B, & C **Protect damage to sensitive lake ecosystems.**	-Work with 2 lake associations to replace failing septic systems. -Assist in inventory of septic systems. -Outreach to landowners & septic service companies. -Educate 20 landowners about proper well monitoring. -Offer technical and financial assistance to properly abandon 3 wells. -Install 6 conservation practices, and restore at least 1000' of shoreline. -Work with 1 landowner to utilize easements, land trusts, and incentive payments to protect critical areas.	- 4 lakeshore/streambank restoration projects. - $36,500 of BOND Funding used. - 6 hours of maintenance plan assistance. - Maintenance list available to septic service companies upon request. - 1,180 feet of shoreline restored/protected. - Financial assistance was available for proper abandonment of wells. - "Well Abandonment" Page created at www.oclw.org.

	-Assist in development of 1 demonstration site on lakeshore. -Work with P & Z to develop & distribute 2 shoreland zoning fact sheets. -Attend 2 professional development workshops/classes to maintain or improve knowledge base. -Work with OCLRA and 3 lake groups to develop and provide educational information. -Develop information for landowners that are required to create mitigation plans. -Work with 3 organizations to identify and protect sensitive areas on lakes.	- 1 Rain Garden booklet developed (Assisted P&Z). - 3 conferences attended. - 1 workshop attended. - 2 professional development meetings attended.

- *Forestry*

Forestry Goal 7, objective A & B **Improve forest silviculture and manage trail use to control sediment, erosion, and to protect habitat cover types.**	-Encourage 10 private landowners to use professional forestry assistance. -Promote use of WI Forestry BMP's. -Promote teacher use of EEK program. -Assist clubs by providing educational material. -Provide technical assistance for erosion problems.	** This area is addressed in Question #2 of the "Review of LWRM Plan Revisions" **

- *Invasive*

Invasive species Goal 1, objective A & B **Slow the spread of invasive species: control non-native aquatic and terrestrial invasive species.**	-Encourage volunteers to participate in CBCW & CLMN programs. -Hold 3 workshops -Seek grants to fund the prevention, education, and control of AIS/TIS. -Distribute educational material on AIS/TIS. -Encourage volunteers to monitor for TIS. -Provide info via presentations and media. -Encourage use of invasive species BMP's. -Monitor for invasive species. -Restore AIS/TIS-affected landscapes. -Manage AIS/TIS sites. ----- Promote native species ----- →→→→	- 3,375 pieces of outreach material. - 806 CBCW hours. - $25,615.00 DNR Grant Funding - $6,500.00 Pollinator Habitat Grant Funding - 14 workshops. - 19 outreach events. - 3,238 contacts. - 2 control efforts implemented. - 7 surveys performed. - 34 press releases. - 83,400 Website/facebook contacts. - 4 pollinator habitat sites restored. ** This activity is additionally addressed in Question #4 of the "Review of LWRM Plan Revisions" **

ONEIDA COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat Goal 5, objective C Goal 10, objective A **Encourage landowners to enhance or restore degraded wetlands.** **Reduce wildlife damage to crops.** Goal 2, objective A **Assist P&Z to protect shorelands**	-Educate local units of government on the importance of protecting wetlands -Restore wetlands. -Utilize grant programs to provide cost-sharing for restoration practices. -Provide technical assistance to 4 landowners on abatement measures to reduce or prevent wildlife damage to crops. -Participation in DNR deer donation program. -Promote and educate the public on Wildlife Damage Program. -Provide technical assistance to at least 6 landowners with mitigation requirements.	- Participated in Deer and Turkey donation Programs. - 2 deer processors. - 12 deer donated. - $25,735.83 monies used for wildlife damage abatement. - 2 sites restored. - 12 landowners participated in WDP. - 8 to10 others received technical assistance.

- *Urban*

Urban issues Goal 4, objective A, D, & E **Reduce nonpoint source water pollution:** • **construction site erosion control** • **stormwater runoff in developed areas** • **educate public on sources of urban pollution**	-Distribute fact sheet regarding construction site erosion control to at least 35 contractors or landscapers. -Hold workshop for contractors on proper techniques & practices for shoreline buffers -Provide guidance and/or technical assistance for 2 local units of government on storm water management. -Encourage landowners to use rain gardens and rain barrels. Provide info and technical assistance. -Distribute existing publications & provide information for 2 local media outlets & at 3 public locations. -Assist local governments by helping distribute fact sheets to public.	- 1 workshop. - 20 workshop attendees. - Assisted P&Z in the creation of a booklet: "Building a Raingarden to Reduce Stormwater Runoff." - 4 site visits completed.

ONEIDA COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies		

- *Other*

Other Goal 9, objective A **Reclaim abandoned mining sites for wildlife habitat, improved aesthetics, and other post-mining uses.**	-Provide technical assistance to restore abandoned mining sites. -Encourage the use of native plant species for soil stabilization & re-vegetation. -Encourage use of WI Forestry BMP's for invasive species.	- 54 inspections. - 2 times coordinated with Zoning. ** This area is further addressed in Question #4 of the "Review of LWRM Plan Revisions" **

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews		Permits anticipated to be issued	
	Anticipated	Completed	Anticipated	Completed
Feedlot permits	0		0	
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	0		0	
Manure storage closure	0		0	
Livestock facility siting	0		0	
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	2	?	0	**2**
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	2	?	0	**51**
Shoreland zoning	5	?	5	**587**
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	5	?	2	**0** (Have done on-sites for wetland determination-but no permits issued)
Other	0		0	

ONEIDA COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned	
	Planned	Completed
Total Farm Inspections	4	0
For FPP	1	0
For NR 151	3	0
Animal waste ordinance	0	0
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	2	**51**
Nonmetallic mining	2	**54**

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number	Done
Tours	1	0
Field days	2	17
Trainings/workshops	8	15
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	20	30
Newsletters	20	25
Social media posts	120	104
News release/story	20	16

Table 5: Staff Hours and Expected Costs (staff can be combined or listed individually)

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	1950	$68,480
Technician	1950	$57,130
Support Costs	1200	$12,546
LTE's	2200	$35,000
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Bonding	150	$40,000

ONEIDA COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management Goal 4, objective B	-Install 1 cropland practice. -Update list of agricultural producers. -Implement agricultural BMP's on voluntary producers (2). -Provide technical assistance, including training and plan reviews (1 nutrient management plans and 1 pest management plans). -Identify and contact priority farms within HUC 0707001. -Identify highly erodible lands draining to ORW & ERW waterways.	Amount of cost share dollars spent Type and units or practice(s) installed # of staff hours expended for training, design, and installation # lbs. of sediment reduced (STEPL) # lbs. of P reduced (STEPL) # acres of cropland in compliance with a performance standard # of inspections performed # of contacts # of highly erodible lands identified
• *Livestock*		
Livestock Goal 4, objective C **Livestock facility conservation practices installed to implement state performance standards and prohibitions.**	-Install livestock practices. • 1 rotational grazing plan -Provide technical assistance including design prep. and construction, oversight, and educational support. This may include livestock fencing, watering facility.	Type and units of practice(s) installed Amount of cost-share dollars spent # of staff hours expended for design and installation # of grazing plan acres # of livestock fencing (feet) # of farmers contacted
• *Water quality*		
Water quality/quantity Goal 5, objective A & B **Educate public about groundwater quality.** Goal 2, objective B **Protect shorelands.** Goal 3, objective A, B, & C **Restore shorelands.** Goal 6, objective A, B, & C **Protect damage to sensitive lake ecosystems.**	-Work with 2 lake associations to replace failing septic systems. -Assist in inventory of septic systems. -Outreach to landowners & septic service companies. -Educate 20 landowners about proper well monitoring. -Offer technical and financial assistance to properly abandon 3 wells. -Install 6 conservation practices, and restore at least 1000' of shoreline.	Amount of cost share dollars spent # of organizations worked with # of press releases & website updates # of times met with P&Z # of septic inventory assists # of landowner contacts # of staff hours expended for technical assistance # lbs. of sediment reduced (STEPL) # lbs. of P reduced (STEPL) # of feet of practices installed # of critical areas protected # of demonstration sites developed # of fact sheets created

ONEIDA COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

	-Work with 1 landowner to utilize easements, land trusts, and incentive payments to protect critical areas. -Assist in development of 1 demonstration site on lakeshore. -Work with P & Z to develop & distribute 1 shoreland zoning fact sheets. -Attend 2 professional development workshops/classes to maintain or improve knowledge base. -Work with lake groups to develop and provide educational information. -Develop information for landowners that are required to create mitigation plans. -Work with 3 organizations to identify and protect sensitive areas on lakes.	# of fact sheets distributed # of workshops/classes attended # of L & W meetings attended # of educational materials developed # of sensitive areas protected

- *Forestry*

Forestry Goal 7, objective A & B **Improve forest silviculture and manage trail use to control sediment, erosion, and to protect habitat cover types.**	-Encourage 3 private landowners to use professional forestry assistance. -Promote use of WI Forestry BMP's. -Provide technical assistance for erosion problems.	# of fact sheets created # of trail assessments performed # of contacts made

- *Invasive*

Invasive species Goal 1, objective A & B **Slow the spread of invasive species: control non-native aquatic and terrestrial invasive species.**	-Encourage volunteers to participate in CBCW & CLMN programs. -Hold 3 workshops -Seek grants to fund the prevention, education, and control of AIS/TIS. -Distribute educational material on AIS/TIS. -Encourage volunteers to monitor for TIS. -Provide info via presentations and media. -Encourage use of invasive species BMP's. -Promote native species. -Monitor for invasive species. -Restore AIS/TIS-affected landscapes. -Manage AIS/TIS sites.	Amount of funding received # of workshops held # of volunteers recruited # of press releases, website updates, articles published # of outreach events attended # of contacts reached # of control efforts implemented # of acres managed # of acres restored # of surveys performed

ONEIDA COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat Goal 5, objective C Goal 10, objective A **Encourage landowners to enhance or restore degraded wetlands.** **Reduce wildlife damage to crops.** Goal 2, objective A **Assist P&Z to protect shorelands**	-Educate local units of government on the importance of protecting wetlands -Restore wetlands. -Utilize grant programs to provide cost-sharing for restoration practices. -Provide technical assistance to 4 landowners on abatement measures to reduce or prevent wildlife damage to crops. -Participation in DNR deer & turkey donation program. -Promote and educate the public on Wildlife Damage Program. -Provide technical assistance to at least 6 landowners with mitigation requirements.	Type and units of practice(s) installed Amount of cost share dollars spent # of acres of wetland restored # of grants applied for/received # of landowners contacted # of times met with APHIS # of updates to LWCD website and social media sites # of meat processors recruited # of deer and/or turkey donations # of mitigation contacts

- *Urban*

Urban issues Goal 4, objective A, D, & E **Reduce nonpoint source water pollution:** • **construction site erosion control** • **stormwater runoff in developed areas** • **educate public on sources of urban pollution**	-Update website on construction site erosion control -Provide guidance and/or technical assistance for 2 local units of government on storm water management. -Encourage landowners to use rain gardens and rain barrels. Provide info and technical assistance. -Distribute existing publications & provide information for 2 local media outlets & at 3 public locations. -Assist local governments by helping distribute fact sheets to public.	Amount of cost share dollars spent # of landowners contacted # of staff hours expended for training, design, and installation # of local governments assisted # of site visits # of plans reviewed

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies		

- *Other*

Other Goal 9, objective A	-Provide technical assistance to restore abandoned mining sites.	# of inspections # of times met with Planning & Zoning # of mine owners/operators provided with BMP's

ONEIDA COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Reclaim abandoned mining sites for wildlife habitat, improved aesthetics, and other post-mining uses.	-Encourage the use of native plant species for soil stabilization & re-vegetation. -Encourage use of WI Forestry BMP's for invasive species.	# of mine owners/operators provided with native plant list

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	0	0
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	0	0
Manure storage closure	0	0
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	2	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	2	0
Shoreland zoning	n/a	n/a
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	n/a	n/a
Other	0	0

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	2
For FPP	0
For NR 151	2
Animal waste ordinance	0
Livestock facility siting	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	1
Nonmetallic mining	2

ONEIDA COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1
Field days	3
Trainings/workshops	8
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	20
Newsletters (Website/Listserv)	30
Social media posts	0
News release/story	20

Table 5: Staff Hours and Expected Costs (staff can be combined or listed individually)

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	1950	$71,027
Technician	1950	$59,273
Support Costs	1200	$12,892
LTE's	2363	$34,675
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Bonding		$46,475