



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 4, 2020

The Land and Water Conservation Board will meet on **August 4, 2020**. The board will hold its official business meeting at **9:00 am** via Skype for Business. To attend the meeting, join by telephone at 608-316-9000 with Conference ID 65602472. The agenda for the meeting is shown below.

AGENDA ITEMS AND TENTATIVE SCHEDULE:

1. Call the Meeting to Order – **Mark Cupp, LWCB Chair**
 - a. Pledge of allegiance
 - b. Open meeting notice
 - c. Introductions
 - d. Approval of agenda
 - e. Approval of June 2, 2020 meeting minutes
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*
3. Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Winnebago County – **Chad Casper, Interim Director, Winnebago County LWCD; Chuck Farrey, Land Conservation Committee Chair**
4. Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Washington County – **Paul Sebo, County Conservationist, Washington County LWCD; Carroll Merry, Land Use and Planning Committee Chair**
5. Update on Climate Change Resiliency and LWRM Plans Discussion,
Mark Cupp
6. Update on non-point funding sources, **Mark Cupp**

Mark Cupp, Chair □ Eric Birschbach, Vice-Chair
Members: Monte Osterman □ Andrew Buttles □ Ron Grasshoff □ Mike Hofberger
Bob Mott □ Bobbie Webster □ Andrew Potts □ Sara Walling □ Brian Weigel

7. DNR Presentation of the Scores and Rankings of Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Projects for CY 2021 -- **Joanna Griffin, DNR**
8. DNR Presentation of the Scores and Rankings of Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Management Projects for CY 2021 -- **Joanna Griffin, DNR**
9. Update on the **Best Management Practice Implementation Tracking System (BITS)** – **Eric Hettler, DNR**
10. Agency reports
 - a. FSA
 - b. NRCS
 - c. UW-CALS
 - d. UW-Extension
 - e. WI Land + Water
 - f. DOA
 - g. DATCP
 - h. DNR
 - i. Member Updates
11. Planning for October 2020 LWCB meeting – **Mark Cupp, LWCB**
12. Adjourn

MINUTES
LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 2, 2020
Skype Meeting

Item #1 Call to Order—pledge of allegiance, open meeting notice, approval of agenda, approval of February 4, 2020 LWCB meeting minutes.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Cupp at 9:00 a.m. Members Eric Birschbach, Ron Grasshoff, Bobbie Webster, Mike Hofberger, Andrew Buttles, Monte Osterman, Brian Weigel, Sara Walling, and Andrew Potts were in attendance. A quorum was present. Advisors Angela Biggs, NRCS, and Matt Kreuger, WI Land+Water were also present. Others present included Lisa Trumble and Katy Smith, DATCP.

Smith confirmed that the meeting was publicly noticed.

The pledge of allegiance was conducted.

Weigel moved to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Webster, and the motion carried.

Grasshoff and Webster requested corrections to Item 8: *Recommendation regarding SWRM allocation* of the February 4, 2020 meeting minutes to correct misspellings, as well as, document that a motion was passed for Item 8. Webster requested a correction to Item 6: *Gathering input from stakeholders and public regarding nonpoint funding* to revise basic sentence structure regarding the state allocation of tax revenue into the stewardship fund. Webster requested revisions to Item 10: *Agency Reports* to correct misspellings. Hofberger made a motion to approve the February 4, 2020 meeting minutes as corrected, seconded by Osterman, 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 Columbia County

Kurt Calkins, Columbia County Land and Water Conservation Department, and Mike Weyh, Agriculture, Extension, and Land & Water Conservation Committee 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.

Columbia 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 county representatives discussed the following: nitrate susceptibility and contamination in relation to groundwater monitoring in Columbia County, coordination with county highway department on aquatic invasive species, adaptive management practices for the City of Lodi, county's harvestable buffer contract, the development of a producer led council, status of Best

Management Practice Implementation Tracking System (BITS) in the county, use of performance standards to implement TMDL reductions, and tracking permitted manure storage facilities.

Osterman moved to recommend approval of Columbia 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 Iron County

Heather Palmquist, Iron County Land and Water Conservation Department, and Ken Saari, Land Conservation Committee Member, 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.

Iron 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 county representatives discussed the following: stream restoration projects within the county, assistance with additional groundwater education in susceptible agricultural areas, expanding interest of the pollinator plantings and plant sales through volunteers, climate change impacts to the county, livestock facility siting, and grazing plans for grazing operations.

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

Item #5 Recommendation for approval of 5 year LWRM plan review for Iowa County

Katie Abbott, Iowa County Soil and Water Conservation Department, and Dave Gollon, Land and Water Conservation Committee, made a formal presentation in support of the 5-year review of the county's LWRM plan.

Iowa 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 county representatives discussed the following: manure storage ordinance requirements, county plans to cost-share cover crops and funding for cost-sharing, shifts to non-operator ownership, land lease strategies to encourage investments in conservation practices.

Birschbach moved to recommend approval of Iowa County's 5 year LWRM plan review, seconded by Hofberger, and the motion carried.

Item #6 Climate Change Resiliency and LWRM Plans Discussion

The board discussed the status of incorporating climate change into county LWRM plans. The Wisconsin Land+Water Association will take a leadership role in facilitating the discussion on how counties can incorporate climate change in county plans. In order to gather multiple different perspectives, about 8 county conservationist have been contacted to gather their input. Grasshoff stated

he has a tentative action plan and noted this as an opportunity to collaborate with the State's climate change task force. Cupp stated he will prepare an action plan memo, tentatively, for the December LWCB meeting.

Item #7 Recommendation for approval of 5 year LWRM plan review for Lafayette County

Terry Loeffelholz, Lafayette County Conservation and Zoning Manager, and Andy Schilling, Land Conservation Committee Chair, made a formal presentation in support of the 5-year review of the county's LWRM plan.

Lafayette 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 county representatives discussed the following: county participation in Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), tracking systems to record location and volume of manure storage systems, septic system permits, and county contracts to deal with invasive species.

Walling moved to recommend approval of Lafayette County's 5 year LWRM plan review, seconded by Grasshoff, and the motion carried.

Item #9 Recommendation for approval of 5 year LWRM plan review for Oconto County

Ken Dolata, Oconto County Conservationist, and Dennis Kroll, Land Conservation Committee Chair, made a formal presentation in support of the 5-year review of the county's LWRM plan.

Oconto 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 county representatives discussed the following: nutrient transport in tile drain line as well as studying nutrient transport for another year, funding county staff devoted to nutrient management, NR 151 implementation in the county and county ordinances, and waterfront flooding issues.

Osterman moved to recommend approval of Oconto County's 5 year LWRM plan review, seconded by Walling, and the motion carried.

Item #10 Gathering input from stakeholders and public regarding nonpoint funding

The agenda item was postponed.

Item #11 Lawns to Legumes

Webster, LWCB, presented on the State of Minnesota Lawns to Legumes program. Lawns to Legumes is an educational, outreach and cost-sharing program that encourages residential and rural landowners to plant pollinator-friendly native plantings, as opposed to grass lawns. The board discussed this program, the DATCP Pollinator Protection program, and non-farm contributions to pollinator habitats.

Item #12 Agency Reports

NRCS – Biggs reported that the NRCS is cautiously allowing staff to come back into the office. However, NRCS offices are not open to the public at the time of this meeting.

WI Land + Water – Kreuger reported that Dave Solin has resigned his position on the county board. Bob Mott will succeed Solin on the LWCB beginning with the August 4th meeting. The board recognized and thanked Solin for his service to the LWCB.

DOA – Potts reported that the CARES Act and coronavirus relief fund will provide \$50 million in direct aid payment to farmers. The money will be processed through the Department of Revenue with assistance from DATCP. An additional and separate \$50 million in innovation grants is available for communities in need of commodities. DOA is working on next year’s budget, which shows potential for budget shortfall.

DATCP – Walling reported that UW Extension has finished county level agricultural impact reporting, however some counties were missing. The DNR has found funding to contribute to the AEM mapping survey, which will add Calumet County to the project area. The board discussed whether there is a way to integrate AEM findings with ground water studies.

DNR – Weigel discussed NR151 standards for nitrates and indicated that three meetings have been held to discuss new/revised standards. Announced that the DNR is working with UW-Madison on an agricultural economic study to examine the costs and benefits attributed to compliance with NR151 performance standards. Weigel informed the committee that DNR has developed a climate change team and is in the process of developing short term climate change actions, which includes program specific bounce back plans. Carl Gesch (Iowa soy bean Association) will be the agricultural non-point coordinator.

Item #13 Planning for August 2020 LWCB meeting

The board should expect two 5-year reviews, and two full plans to be presented at the August meeting.

Item #14 Adjourn

Grasshoff moved to adjourn, seconded by Walling, and the motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 1:40pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bobbie Webster, Secretary

Date

Recorder: KS, DATCP

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: July 23, 2020

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 *Winnebago County Land and Water Resource Management Plan*

Action Requested: This is an action item. The department has determined that the *Winnebago 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, 2030, and would be subject to a five year review prior to December 31, 2025.

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, Winnebago County must submit an annual work plan meeting DATCP requirements during each year of its 10 year plan approval.

Winnebago County held a public hearing on June 4, 2020, as part of its public input and review process. The Winnebago 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
- 2019 workplan with accomplishments and current 2020 workplan

Presenters: Chad Casper, Interim Director, Winnebago County LWCD
Chuck Farrey, Land Conservation Committee Chair



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: Winnebago

Date Plan Submitted for Review: 3/26/2020

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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	15-18
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	7/23/19 9/18/19		
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan ¹	6/4/2020		
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	8/18/20		
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	14,15, 65-73, 79
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county ³ , including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	41,45, 49,55

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.

- ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources 8,14, 15, APP D
- iii. identification of areas within the county that have water quality problems that merit action within the next 10 years. 63-73 App D

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 14-15 63,79, 86
- b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available 14-15 63,79, 86

Other comments: Lower Fox TMDL, Upper Fox-Wolf TMDL, Winnebago Waterways Lake management Plan and Healthy Land, healthy water 9KE plan

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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | many |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------|

Other comments: TMDL's and EVAL modeling for entire county, DNR staff on committee, DNR staff consulted

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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 22,24 |
| b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 19,21, 22,24 |
| c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 24,25 |
| d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 37,38 |

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.

e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	27,59
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	w.p.
b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	w.p.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	22-24
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	31-33
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------

2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	28-31
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA
b. Identify priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	34
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	----

Other comments: Continuing to submit the annual workplans will cover these items. County has a tracking system in place for Ag performance Stds and is working with neighboring counties and DNR on a regional GIS based system that is being field tested.

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.

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, however "Healthy Land, Healthy Water"9KE plan is being written.

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 15, 2020



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

County: Winnebago

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.

Several BMPs or efforts stand out as continuously meeting or exceeding the expectations of our work plan. Those would be FPP Annual Certifications and Monitoring, new NMP acres enrolled, well abandonments, wetland restorations and weather permitting, grassed waterways and "on-shore" shoreland protection projects.

FPP participants needing to comply with the NR 151 are our "Priority Farms" and have been our targeted group for the last 10 years. With livestock farms quickly declining in number, we have focused largely on the cropland. Which helps drive the waterways and wetland restorations. We are selling the idea of agricultural stormwater retention in the form of wetland restorations. Working with producers to recognize the environmental need and the positive economics associated with not planting low land that never generates a profit, even when they can get on it, and installing a wetland restoration to capture and clean runoff, provide wildlife habitat and in some cases income via CREP. FPP also has driven our ever increasing NMP enrollment. SEG funds play an integral part in that accomplishment along with the efforts of our in-house CCA/Agronomist.

Having 17% of Wisconsin's surface water provides ample opportunities to install on-shore and off-shore shoreline protection projects. County funding that can be carried over multiple years is a strategy we have implemented in place of SWRM grant funds. This allows us to complete the project as weather permits and not lose funds and be penalized in subsequent years because of weather related issues.

We have also begun a new approach to cost-sharing that provides additional funding to farmers willing to do additional or "second level" practices identified by staff that will increase the overall phosphorus and sediment reduction achieved by the project and help achieve compliance with the TMDL reduction goals. Cost-sharing via this program is increased to 90% on the entire project for cooperating landowners.

During the last five years we have also modified our County funded well abandonment program to be able to service more customers with the fund allocation. We revised the cost-sharing for low resource concern wells to 50% with a \$500 maximum. High resource concern wells are cost-shared at 70% with a \$1000 maximum. With many of the wells in the low resource concern category we are helping more landowners with the same or less money.

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 are several BMPs or efforts that continue to be below our workplan expectations. Those would be livestock waste storage facilities, livestock waste storage abandonment, cropland inventory acres, critical area stabilizations and barnyard runoff control practices.

The reduction of livestock waste storage facilities and barnyard runoff control practices is simply a reflection of the agricultural economy and the declining number of large and small livestock facilities in our county that would require those BMPs. Livestock waste storage abandonment projects do occur, but not as often as we anticipate due to owner reluctance or inability to pay for the cost of hauling the existing manure out of the facility and then 30% of the cost to properly close it. We have revised our Livestock Waste Management Ordinance to provide some leverage but there are still provisions for keeping the facility intact. One option going forward will be to explore including the hauling cost in the overall project cost.

We have struggled of late with weather making it impossible to physically inventory cropland so we have been using aerial photos to identify problem areas that can be ground truthed by staff once the land dries out or by drone with landowner permission. The other obstacle is the crop itself. Once the field is worked or the crop reaches any amount of height, it greatly reduces the ability to travel in the field or visualize any erosion issues. Combine that with limited staff time and fewer good weather days to be in the field and it makes getting inventories completed quite a struggle. Our next efforts will be to utilize three dimensional lidar imagery to provide more accurate pre-field visit data or utilize new funding for an LTE to conduct inventories.

Critical Area Stabilizations and some grassed waterway installations have also been delayed due to inaccessible field conditions along with landowner's refusal to leave enough area unplanted to allow completion during the growing season. Going forward serious consideration will be given to requiring landowners to provide unplanted open space for construction of the project as a condition of cost-sharing eligibility. Too many funds are left unspent that could be utilized on other practices with landowners willing to cooperate.

Another BMP that has been a challenge the last five years is "off-shore" shoreline protection. We have struggled to get sustained cold conditions to make ice so contractors can install the structures. To remove the "climate factor", some projects are now being built with barges in summer.

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 farms are our FPP participants. All participants are in compliance with NR151. Each participant or their operator is required to meet with staff and complete the annual review process. During that visit we communicate all that is required and verify rotations so we can validate their NMP. Due to a mass exodus out of FPP the last few years many landowners are certified compliant but will not be getting

tax credits after the 2020 tax year. We still require the annual submittal of their NMP. To bring producers into compliance with NR151 we are using TMDL and EVAAL data to prioritize the HUC 12s and use SWRM funds, County funds, NOI funds, TRM funds and most recently new MDV funds from the City of Fond du Lac to cost-share. Working with WDNR and the BITS program we are able to use MDV funds to help bring landowners in the Winnebago Watershed into compliance with NR151 and the TMDLs.

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.

Several changes that truly stand out are the substantial increases in efforts to promote and cost-share Soil Health via no-till and cover crops, Managed Grazing, Buffers and Rain Gardens. We now list soil health (no-till and cover crop) acres enrolled as an objective. The county has developed a Soil Health Challenge Program that enrolls landowners in a six year contract to demonstrate the benefits of no-till and cover crops. Participants are paid on an increasing sliding scale for each year of the contract and are required to practice no-till and plant cover crops. They also agree to provide data and allow us to put up signs and hold field days at the site. We have held multiple field days with soil pits over last few years which have been very educational for our farmers. We have also invested in the Upper Fox-Wolf Demonstration Farm Network that has multiple producers in multiple counties that utilize innovative practices to reduce resource concerns.

We have also started listing Managed Grazing BMPs like cattle crossings, waterers, fencing and cattle access roads as objectives. We have held field days on rotational grazing and demonstrations on proper fence installation. We have one technician that is now the designated lead on grazing practices. This is a major change that helps us reduce loading on smaller farms with susceptible fields while building soil structure.

The Buffers are two-fold, one is a shoreline buffer on a residential site and the other is a rural or ag setting normally along a stream or river. The residential buffer has specific requirements on fertilizer usage on the property and the size of the buffer in order to receive cost-sharing. We have recently revised the rural buffer program to provide a much larger payment on a 10- or 15-year contract with the possibility of renewal if funding is available and the LWCD and LCC sees the value in continuing the contract.

We have also started cost-sharing rain gardens and are currently working with a local organization that is partnering on the cost-sharing.

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: 5/7/2020

Signature of Authorized Representative: Thomas E. David **Date:** 5/7/2020
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

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

WINNEBAGO 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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cropland</i> 		
<p>Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs Install: 7 waterway systems & 2 critical area stabs. Conduct one NMP Farmer Cert. Training-Review submitted NMPs for compliance Conduct the annual Soil Health Field Day Training Enroll another producer in the County funded “Soil Health Challenge Program”. Enroll 1000-1100 new acres into NMP CSAs Support the installation of 200 acres of no-till & cover crops Inventory the cropland on a total of 10-20 farms for NR151/TMDL/FPP compliance in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 in Winn Co. and County Wide for FPP Participants Run EVAAL for all HUC 12s in the Upper Fox and Winnebago HUC 8s in Winn. Co. Complete FPP monitoring requirements Contact specific landowners to promote buffers and wetland restorations in MDV/TMDL targeted/funded HUC 12s listed above and to achieve NR 151 compliance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45 lbs of sediment reduced • 68 lbs of P reduced • Inventoried the cropland on 15 farms for NR151/TMDL/FPP compliance in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 • A total of 17,569 acres of cropland are currently in compliance with a performance standard, FPP and/or the TMDL • 941 acres of new NMP enrollment • 2 acres of waterway systems • 209 acres of no-till and cover crops planted • 19 attendees at training sessions • 4 Soil Health and Demo Field Days with Demo Farm Network • Ran EVAAL for 18 HUC 12s in the Upper Fox, Wolf and Winnebago HUC 8s in Winnebago County.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Livestock</i> 		
<p>Livestock</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs Inventory the livestock facilities on a total of 10-20 farms in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 for NR151/TMDL compliance in Winn Co. and County wide for FPP Participants Install: 2 livestock crossings, 2 cattle waterers, 2 cattle access road, 1 barnyard runoff controls & 1 manure storage closure. Contact specific landowners to promote rotational grazing in MDV/TMDL targeted/funded HUC 12s listed above and to achieve NR 151 compliance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 625 lbs of sediment reduced • 937 lbs of P reduced • Inventoried the livestock facilities on 4 farms for NR151/TMDL/FPP compliance in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401. • A total of 71 livestock facilities are in compliance with ag performance standard, FPP and/or the TMDL. • 112 feet of livestock crossings and cattle access roads • 3 livestock watering facilities • 34,550 linear feet of livestock fencing

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Water quality*

<p>Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs CREP Install: 4 shoreline protection projects, 2 buffers, 10 well abandonments/closures and 4 rain gardens. Engage with Winnebago Waterways Program, & Winnebago Lake Management Planning to complete a regional 9 key element plan. Complete planning and design for the Poygan Break Wall Project- Phase II. Address shoreline and streambank issues identified in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 to achieve NR151 compliance and TMDL reductions in sediment and phosphorus.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 lbs of sediment reduced • 7 lbs of P reduced • 1 acre of buffers • 104 feet of shoreline protection • 16 well abandonments • Design is complete for the Poygan Breakwall Project (phase2) • Continue to be a partner with the Winnebago Waterways Program and plan to have an approved Lake Management Plan and regional 9 key element plan complete in 2020.
---	--	---

- *Forestry*

<p>Forestry</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs</p>	
------------------------	---	--

- *Invasive*

<p>Invasive species</p>	<p>Support AIS boat inspections, surveys/inventories via Fox Wolf Watershed Alliance (FWWA) Engage with Clean Boats, Clean Waters boat launch educational program Continue AIS planning for the Winnebago Lakes Management Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3,722 boats inspected • 6,431 people contacted • 1,236 hours at boat launches • Attended 15 events and spoke to 755 attendees • Completed AIS planning in the Winnebago Lakes Management Plan
--------------------------------	--	---

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wildlife</i> 		
<p>Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs Install 1-3 wetland restorations, 1-2 wetland scrapes, 2-4 buffers in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 to achieve NR151 compliance and TMDL reductions in sediment and phosphorus. Administer Wildlife Damage Abatement and Claims Program Conduct annual tree and supply sale; sell 20,000 trees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 82 lbs of sediment reduced • 63 lbs of P reduced • 20 acres of wetland restored • 21,900 trees sold • WDACP totaled \$13,174 in program implementation costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Urban</i> 		
<p>Urban issues</p>	<p>Contractor EC Training Sessions See Table 2 & 3 for Stormwater and Construction Site EC Permit and Inspection info Attain MS4 Stormwater Management Plan approval from WDNR. MS4 Permit requirements submitted by 3-31-2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 512 EC inspections were completed • 16 Stormwater Management facilities were approved • 16 Stormwater and 152 EC permits issued • 137 shoreland zoning permits issued • MS4 Stormwater Management Plan approved by WDNR as part of our Permit requirements. • Ordinances in compliance with State Code and MS4 requirements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Watershed</i> 		
<p>Watershed strategies</p>	<p>Run EVAAL for all HUC 12s in the Upper Fox and Lake Winnebago HUC 8s in Winn. Co. Continue participation in the LFR Ag Implementation Group Complete MDV watershed plan for the Lake Winnebago HUC 8. Begin communication and implementation with targeted landowners in the Lake Winnebago HUC 8 to utilize MDV funds to achieve NR151 compliance and TMDL goals. Pursue grants and grant administration options with</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ran EVAAL for 18 HUC 12s in the Upper Fox, Wolf and Lake Winnebago HUC 8s in Winnebago Co. • Contacted several landowners in the Lake Winnebago HUC 8 and are starting to plan for BMP installation to allocate MDV funds. • Completed and received approval from WDNR on the MDV watershed plan for the Lake Winnebago HUC 8. • Partnered with the WDNR and FWWA and secured two NRDA grants for a large breakwall project on Lake Butte des Morts and a study with UWO on evaluating the effectiveness of breakwall projects on the Winnebago System.

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	FWWA or other partners.	
--	-------------------------	--

- *Other*

Other	na	na
--------------	----	----

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	15	12
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	1	1
Manure storage closure	1	1
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	190	170
Shoreland zoning	120	100
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	2	2
Other	0	0

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	24
For FPP	14
For NR 151	10
Animal waste ordinance	12
Livestock facility siting	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	340 (Minimum of 2 per permit)
Nonmetallic mining	0

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	3
Field days	2
Trainings/workshops	2
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	3
Newsletters	1
Social media posts	40
News release/story	1

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
LWCD Staff	14,300	\$609,685
Support Costs	NA	\$6,000
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
SWRM Bonding w/ Extensions	N/A	\$81,753
SWRM SEG w/ Extensions	N/A	\$115,000
Winnebago County Funding w/Extensions	N/A	\$200,247

WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2020 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

<p style="text-align: center;">CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of “planned activities” in italics)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)</p>
<p>• <i>Cropland</i></p>		
<p>Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs Install: 8.5 acres of waterway systems, 1 water & sediment control basin. Conduct one NMP Farmer Cert. Training-Review submitted NMPs for compliance Conduct the annual Soil Health Field Day Training Enroll another producer in the County funded “Soil Health Challenge Program”. Enroll 875 new acres into NMP CSAs Support the installation of 200 acres of no-till & cover crops Inventory the cropland on a total of 10-20 farms for NR151/TMDL/FPP compliance in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 in Winn Co. and County Wide for FPP Participants Complete FPP monitoring requirements Contact specific landowners to promote buffers and wetland restorations in MDV/TMDL targeted/funded HUC 12s listed above and to achieve NR 151 compliance.</p>	<p># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method) # lbs of P reduced (using any approved method) # acres of cropland in compliance with a performance standard # acres of new NMP enrollment # acres of no-till and cover crops planted # of attendees at training sessions</p>
<p>• <i>Livestock</i></p>		
<p>Livestock</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs Inventory the livestock facilities on a total of 10-20 farms in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 for NR151/TMDL compliance in Winn Co. and County wide for FPP Participants Install: 2 livestock crossings, 2 cattle waterers, 1 barnyard runoff controls & 2 manure storage closures. Contact specific landowners to promote rotational grazing in MDV/TMDL targeted/funded HUC 12s listed above and to achieve NR 151 compliance.</p>	<p># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method) # lbs of P reduced (using any approved method) # of livestock facilities in compliance with a performance standard, FPP and/or the TMDL feet of livestock crossings and cattle access roads # facility structures installed</p>

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2020 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Water quality*

<p>Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs CREP Install: 3,000 ft of shoreline/streambank protection projects, 1 buffer, 10 well abandonments/closures and 2 rain gardens. Engage with Winnebago Waterways Program, & Winnebago Lake Management implementation to complete a regional 9 key element plan. Complete installation of the Poygan Break Wall Project- Phase II. Address shoreline and streambank issues identified in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 to achieve NR151 compliance and TMDL reductions in sediment and phosphorus.</p>	<p># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method) # lbs of P reduced (using any approved method) # acres of buffers # feet of shoreline protection # of events and attendees Complete Winnebago Lakes Management 9 key element plan</p>
---	--	--

- *Forestry*

<p>Forestry</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs</p>	<p># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method) # lbs of P reduced (using any approved method)</p>
------------------------	---	---

- *Invasive*

<p>Invasive species</p>	<p>Support AIS boat inspections, surveys/inventories via Fox Wolf Watershed Alliance (FWWA) Engage with Clean Boats, Clean Waters boat launch educational program Participate in the WDNR AIS Demo Project with FWWA as coordinator.</p>	<p>Number of surveys completed Number of control efforts implemented/sites treated Number of events held and attendees Complete AIS planning in the Winnebago Lakes Management Plan</p>
--------------------------------	--	---

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2020 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wildlife</i> 		
<p>Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)</p>	<p>Complete and provide needed BMP Survey, Design and Cost Projections Sign CSAs to provide funding for eligible BMPs Install 10 acres of wetland restorations, 2 buffers in HUC 12s 40302030102 & 40302030401 to achieve NR151 compliance and TMDL reductions in sediment and phosphorus. Administer Wildlife Damage Abatement and Claims Program Conduct annual tree and supply sale; sell 10,000 trees</p>	<p># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method) # lbs of P reduced (using any approved method) # acres of wetland restored Number of trees sold</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Urban</i> 		
<p>Urban issues</p>	<p>Contractor EC Training Sessions See Table 2 & 3 for Stormwater and Construction Site EC Permit and Inspection info Implement MS4 Stormwater Management Plan. MS4 Permit requirements submitted by 3-31-2020</p>	<p>Number of site visits Number of plans reviews Number of permits issued Number of compliance issues resolved Ordinances in compliance with State Code and MS4 requirements MS4 Permit in compliance</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Watershed</i> 		
<p>Watershed strategies</p>	<p>Utilize EVAAL for all HUC 12s in the Upper Fox and Lake Winnebago HUC 8s in Winn. Co. Continue participation in the LFR Ag Implementation Group Complete MDV watershed plan (phase 2) for the Lake Winnebago HUC 8. Begin communication and implementation with targeted landowners in the Lake Winnebago HUC 8 to utilize MDV funds to achieve NR151 compliance and TMDL goals. Pursue grants and grant administration options with FWWA or other partners.</p>	<p>Number of meetings attended/presentations given Modeling progress Number of partner contacts made Information system/tracking developed Number of partnership development activities accomplished</p>

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2020 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Other*

Other	na	na
--------------	----	----

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	6	6
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	1	1
Manure storage closure	2	1
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	120	115
Shoreland zoning	130	125
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	7	7
Other	0	0

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	20
For FPP	12
For NR 151	8
Animal waste ordinance	6
Livestock facility siting	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	230 (Minimum of 2 per permit)
Nonmetallic mining	0

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY 2020 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	2
Field days	2
Trainings/workshops	2
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	1
Newsletters	1
Social media posts	40
News release/story	3

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
LWCD Staff	14,300	\$624,271
Support Costs	NA	\$0
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
SWRM Bonding w/ Extensions	N/A	\$76,991
SWRM SEG w/ Extensions	N/A	\$72,622
Winnebago County Funding w/Extensions	N/A	\$254,313
Multi-Discharge Variance	N/A	\$35,257
NRDA Grant	N/A	\$130,379
NAWCA	N/A	\$20,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: July 15, 2020

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 *Washington County Land and Water Resource Management Plan*

Action Requested: This is an action item. The department has determined that the *Washington 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, 2030, and would be subject to a five year review prior to December 31, 2025.

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, Washington County must submit an annual work plan meeting DATCP requirements during each year of its 10 year plan approval.

Washington County held a public hearing on June 25, 2020, as part of its public input and review process. The Washington 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
- 2019 workplan with accomplishments and current 2020 workplan

Presenters: Paul Sebo, Washington County Conservationist
Carroll Merry, Land Use and Planning Committee Chair



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: WASHINGTON

Date Plan Submitted for Review: 5/12/2020

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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	II
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	2/4, 4/28		
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan ¹	6/25/20		
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	OCTOBER		
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	47-50 APP E
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county ³ , including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	29,30
ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	55-57 37-40

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. Chap 4

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 Chap 4
- b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available Chap 4

Other comments: _____

IV. DNR CONSULTATION

Yes No Page

- 1. Did the county consult with DNR⁴ 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 N/A

Other comments: Washington County has been working with DNR throughout the planning process

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 Chap 4
 - b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan 79-90
 - c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations 71, 73
 - d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems 69
 - e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program N/A

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100-102
b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100-102
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	71-72

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	91-94
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chap 5

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA
b. Identify priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	103-106

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

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 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 15, 2020



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

County: Washington

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.

Washington County's Five Year Update was approved on April 30, 2015, since then a number of accomplishments have been achieved as well as the continuation of many other programs and initiatives. By far, the Soil Health movement has become the dominate program for many counties across the state in the last 5-years; Washington County is no different. However, this program has been more of an evolution for us; stemming off of a very successful Nutrient Management Farmer Certification Program where we continue to hold classes annually and have since 2003 with over 145 participants. The transition to Soil Health has been occurring since 2007 as we pushed producers to attend Nutrient Management refresher courses; a requirement from their original certification. These refresher courses incorporated a variety of topics that often tied back to soil health. With each course evaluation we have seen the interest and desire for similar topics that tie back to the Soil Health Principals. Then hearing about the success of Producer-Led Watershed Protection Group across the state we approached a few farmers in the Cedar Creek Watershed; their excitement to form as a group and apply for grants really catapulted the Soil Health initiatives and educational field day events in the county. Since 2017, the Land and Water Conservation (LWC) has helped organize five (5) field day style events that have had over 560 participants.

As is the case with many conservation initiatives and successes, the goals and programs are often intertwined. The last five-year work plan identified the assistance with TMDL Development and explore opportunities to partner in Adaptive Management or Trading. While the last two items have not become reality, the Milwaukee River TMDL was approved in March 2018. This TMDL has brought many organizations together with the LWC involved in the discussions and exploring opportunities to help meet the TMDL water quality requirements. The most successful partnership was created with the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District in 2016 and a \$1.5 million grant awarded for a Regional Conservation Partnership Program for the Cedar Creek Watershed area. The project goals and accomplishments are summarized in Table 20 of the draft Washington County LWRM Plan (2021-2030).

Building off the above partnership and focus area of the Cedar Creek, another work plan goal was to identify a targeted area to promote and install riparian buffers. The Stewardship Incentive Program was created in 2002 and utilizes proceeds from the

County Tree and Prairie Seed program. From 2002 thru 2010 the funding went primarily offered to help farmer develop Nutrient Management Plans through our Farmer Certification Program. In 2012, the program was modified to allow payments for installing and maintaining harvestable riparian buffers. This was added in response to the inclusion of the 5-Foot Tillage Setback in the State's Performance Standard. Then, with the focus area of the Cedar Creek Watershed, overlapping with the Producer Group and the RCPP program the buffer program was modified slightly to include a wider buffer, up to 100 foot in this region. To date, farmers have established over 18 acres of riparian buffers, protecting over 2 miles of streams with incentive payments provided totaling over \$38,000. Several of these buffers have been registered (DNR Form 3400-207) with a local municipality as a possible Water Quality Trading Credit if the municipality decides to pursue Trading as their point source compliance option.

Seeking compliance with the Agricultural Performance Standards continues to be a priority for LWC. Unfortunately, since Washington County does not have a Farmland Preservation Program that is tied to the Ag Performance Standards we lost a compliance tool. Instead we use the programs identified above that helps conservation staff get on the farms to make compliance determinations. The combined initiatives identified above helped LWC complete determinations on 35% of agricultural lands in the County, see Figure 18 on page 70 of the draft Washington County LWRM Plan (2021-2030).

Lastly, another major accomplishment that was identified in previous work plans relates to the implementation of the County's Erosion Control and Stormwater Management Ordinance. This included updating the code to incorporate new state and federal standards as well as to align the code with the State's "Uniform Statewide Standards". This update was completed and adopted by the County Board in 2016. The next process following a code update is to meet with and encourage all local municipalities to update their codes in order to maintain consistent language between jurisdictions. These discussions spurred questions related to the administration of the code, which resulted in two (2) new intergovernmental agreements identifying the LWC as their administering authority; where now the County administers the ECSM ordinance in 8 of our 11 townships.

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.

Looking back on the last 5 years I would identify two primary areas where LWC was unable to make the desired progress, these 183 would be in the Information and Education (I & E) area under several programs and the implementation of the Agricultural Performance Standards.

A primary area where we had hoped to provide greater outreach and information is with the quality of the County's groundwater. For the most part Washington County has an ample supply of groundwater in relatively good quality, however we do have areas of concern. These areas coincide where we have bedrock close to the soil surface. In 2012, we had six wells contaminated as a result of land spread manure on shallow soils. As we further investigated the cause it became apparent we needed better data on bedrock depth. Ultimately this led to the creation of a new bedrock layer based on the well construction

log information. There was more outreach planned in this area along with additional stormwater management education as part of our ECSM ordinance discussed above and related to the County's WPDES Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) Permit. However, at the end of 2016 budget cuts resulted in the reduction of one staff person, leaving a total of three (3) staff dedicated to Land Conservation. Fortunately, with the RCPP program a grant funded position was offered to the County, but typical with grant positions job security is not provided and staff turnover in that position has been occurring. With each replacement, training starts over, slowing progress resulting in less accomplishments. Likewise, with fewer and new staff member the added programs and initiatives mentioned above has pulled staff to focus more in the RCPP / Producer-led project area.

Money drives most of what we do; whether the money comes in the form of available grants, like the RCPP / Producer-led project area or the lack of money as a result of the downturn in the agricultural economy. The last several years has put high economic strains on the farming industry and has not provided many farmers the ability to invest in conservation improvements. This is a main reasons why we have had less progress in planned goals relating to Ag Performance Standards implementation. conversely, the producer-led group and the promotion of soil health has seen an increase in activity and interest as a way to improve their bottom line that can also improve water quality.

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?

The Washington County's Priority Farm Strategy primarily works off of environmental incidences, complaints and landowner requests for conservation assistance. Environmental incidences have been rare in Washington County with the last know issue being the well contamination incident in 2012 mentioned above. Complaints have also been few and are typically generated from unconfined manure stacks or land spreading concerns. These have been addressed through basic conversations with the farmer/operator to either move manure piles or conduct tillage practices to incorporate manure. The third priority farm strategy comes from requests for conservation assistance. As mentioned in question #1 above, we utilize a whole host of programs that provide an opportunity for conservation staff to get on an operation. The discussion lead to informing the landowner/farmer about the Ag Performance Standards, conducting an evaluation and presenting the results. Achieving compliance has been challenging the last couple years with the downturn in the farm economy, however prior to 2018 we have had some large animal waste control projects get completed through combined funding sources that include TRM, SWRM and USDA-NRCS-EQIP grants.

As for evaluating the effectiveness of our Priority Farm Strategy, we oftentimes do not rely on any of the above three listed. Washington County has been fortunate in being able to acquire ortho/aerial photo coverage every 2-3 years. These updated flights have provided staff the ability to evaluate operations, especially where livestock operations exist that appear to have a significant discharge. We then follow-up with a site inspection to determine compliance with the performance standards. We have had a MOU with the

DNR since 2006 and it is in our future work plan to update and revise this document which will probably lead to changing our current Priority Farm Strategy.

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.

Some of our largest changes that were incorporated onto the previous Five-Year Update and Annual Work Plans included: an Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Education, Prevention and Planning Program; the County's WPDES MS4 Permit (issued 2015); and the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) mentioned above. The County has been awarded an AIS Education/Prevention Grant in 2010, 2013, 2017, and 2020. The first several grant involved the hiring of a 3/4-time AIS Coordinator; then in 2016 we signed an IGA with Waukesha County moving the position to full-time and sharing the position 50/50 between counties. Next, Washington County was required to obtain a MS4 permit and much of the program responsibilities were taken on by LWC. This program continues to take significant resources especially with the incorporation of TMDL limits in our new permit. The RCPP program along with the Producer-led group has provided a bright spot in our work; joining forces with passionate individuals that are willing to share their knowledge and experience has brought a renewed spirit to the office. Additionally, the existing RCPP program for the Cedar Creek Watershed is set to end in 2020 but continuing with the momentum from that program, MMSD again led the charge by applying for and has recently been awarded \$7.5 million RCPP grant for the remaining upper portion of the Milwaukee River Watershed that includes approximately 50% of the County.

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: 7/23/2020

Signature of Authorized Representative: Paul B. Selvo **Date:** 6-30-2020
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

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

WASHINGTON 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)	ACTIVITIES AND REDUCTIONS ACHIEVED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cropland</i> 		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	8 Producer whole farm conservation plans developed or revised that meet LWRM priorities. 30 Nutrient Management plans updated or developed. 3 grassed waterway practices installed to control gully erosion. HUC 12 Focus: 040400030301, 040400030303, 040400030207	4 Plans Developed 16 Plans Developed/Revised 4 Waterways Installed (2,734 Lin. Ft) (63.7 tons saved)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Livestock</i> 		
Livestock	2 feed storage runoff control practices installed. HUC 12 Focus: 040400030106	1 Practice Installed (6 lbs. Phosphorus reduced) Provided Karst Bedrock Maps to 34 Livestock Operations impacted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Water quality</i> 		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	Assist the DNR and non-profit group with the development of a 9-Key Element Plans for the North Branch, Milwaukee River TMDL. 2 Acres of Riparian Buffers Installed. HUC 12 Focus: 040400030303 1,740 Feet Streambank Stabilization Installed. HUC 12 Focus: 040400030207	Participated development of: - Fredonia-Newburg Area Watershed-Based Plan - Cedar Creek, Pigeon, Ulaio, and Mole Creek Watershed Restoration Plan none none

**WASHINGTON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Forestry*

Forestry N/A	<i>Practice installation</i>	N/A
---------------------	------------------------------	------------

- *Invasive*

Invasive species	3 Meander Plant Surveys 1 Point Intercept Survey 200 Hours of Watercraft Inspections	5 Surveys Completed Watercraft Inspections: (1,026 hours, 1,899 boats, 4,077 people reached)
-------------------------	--	---

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	Wildlife Damage and Abatement Program Native Tree and Plant Sale <i>Tree and plant sales</i>	3 Claimant (\$8,753.73) 361 Participants (27,525 trees, 11 lbs. prairie seed)
--	---	---

- *Urban*

Urban issues	Maintain compliance with MS4 Permit. Ensure developments adhere to ECSM requirements 20 compliance inspections with existing stormwater facilities	Completed 12 Permits (34 site inspections) 36 Facilities inspected
---------------------	--	--

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	Upon Request – Assist with the City of Oconomowoc’s RCPP and Adaptive Management Goals. HUC 12 Focus: 070900010501, 070900010502 Assist with the Cedar Creek RCPP and MMSD with program goals. HUC 12 Focus: 040400030301, 040400030302, 040400030303 Assist the Producer-led Group in the Cedar Creek RCPP Area to meet program goals. HUC 12 Focus: 040400030301, 040400030302, 040400030303	No requests made Programs combined: 1 Outreach Day (250 attendees) (388 acres No-till) (280 acres Cover Crops)
-----------------------------	---	--

- *Other*

Non-Metallic Mining Reclamation	Maintain 12 permits on active mining sites	12 Active Mining Sites
--	--	------------------------

**WASHINGTON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

<p>Transect Survey</p>	<p>Conduct Annual Transect Survey</p>	<p>(1 mine in full reclamation mode) 2 Transect Conducted (Soil Health – Cedar Creek) (County-Wide Transect)</p>
<p>Hazardous Waste Clean Sweep</p>	<p>Offer Collection service to County Residents</p>	<p>Converted to Continuous Collection Site (233 Households Participated)</p>

**WASHINGTON COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued	Permits Issued
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	2	2	None – 1 Closed Out from 2018
Manure storage closure	0	0	None
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	Maintain 12 Active	Maintain 12 Active	12
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	15	15	12
Other			

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned	No. Inspections Performed
Total Farm Inspections		
For NR 151	10	5
Animal waste ordinance	4	6
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	30	34
Nonmetallic mining	12	14

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number	Activities Hosted
Tours	1	None
Field days	1	1
Trainings/workshops	3	2
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	5	5
Newsletters	2	2
Social media posts	6	unsure
News release/story	2	4

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs	Actual Costs
County Conservationist	2080	\$89,200	\$105,282
Conservation Technician	6240	\$168,300	\$209,950
AIS Coordinator	1560	\$23,920	\$31,775
Support Staff	1040	\$29,000	\$30,710
Cost Sharing (can be combined)			
Bonding	N/A	\$48,000	\$34,365
SEG	N/A	\$10,000	\$9,280
Producer-Led Grant	N/A	\$20,000	\$17,495
County / Local Funding	N/A	\$6,000	\$4,574

**WASHINGTON COUNTY 2020 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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cropland</i> 		
<p>Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management</p>	<p>Develop and revise 15 producer whole farm resource conservation and nutrient management plans.</p> <p>Directly assist with 30 Nutrient Management plan updates.</p> <p>3 grassed waterway practices installed to control gully erosion.</p> <p>100 Acres Cover Crops thru PLWPG</p> <p>100 Acres No-Till thru PLWRPG</p> <p>HUC 12 Focus: 040400030301, 040400030303, 040400030207</p>	<p># acres of cropland in compliance with performance standard</p> <p># units of practice(s) installed</p> <p># lbs of P reduced using SnapPlus</p> <p># Tons of soil saved (using approved method)</p> <p># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method)</p> <p>\$ Amount of cost-share funds provide</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Livestock</i> 		
<p>Livestock</p>	<p>2 - Feed Storage Runoff Control Practices installed HUC 12 Focus: 040400030106</p> <p>1 Roofed Manure Storage installed HUC 12 Focus: 040400030303</p> <p>1 – Waste Transfer System installed - Barnyard HUC 12 Focus: 070900010105</p>	<p># units of practice(s) installed</p> <p># of livestock facilities in compliance with a performance standard</p> <p># lbs of P reduced using Barny Model</p> <p>\$ Amount of cost-share funds provide</p>

**WASHINGTON COUNTY 2020 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Water quality*

Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	3430 Feet Streambank Stabilization Installed HUC 12 Focus: 040400030302	# units of practice(s) installed
	3 acres Wetland Restoration HUC 12 Focus: 040400030301	# lbs of P reduced using appropriate method # tons of sediment reduced using appropriate method \$ Amount of cost-share funds provide

- *Forestry*

Forestry N/A	<i>Practice installation</i>	<i>Type and units of practice(s) installed Amount of cost-share dollars spent # lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method) # lbs of P reduced (using any approved method)</i>
---------------------	------------------------------	--

- *Invasive*

Invasive species	7 Early Detection Surveys	# and Type of surveys completed
	3 Meander Plant Surveys	# of Boats inspected and People reached
	2 Point Intercept Survey	# of Educational Events and People Attended
	200 Hours of Watercraft Inspections	
	Provide Outreach and Education about AIS	

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	Wildlife Damage and Abatement Program	Number of Landowners Assisted
	Native Tree and Prairie Seed Sale	Number of trees and pounds of seed sold

- *Urban*

Urban issues	Update County Storm Water Management Plan to maintain compliance with new MS4 Permit.	Plan Developed and Annual Report on MS4 permit activities
	12 Permits issued to development projects	# of permits issued per ECSM Ordinance
	20 Inspections of existing stormwater facilities	# of facilities inspected for long-term maintenance
	Work with 8 local municipalities to implement process for long-term maintenance of storm water facilities	Number of practices identified that need maintenance and schedule sets for maintenance activities

**WASHINGTON COUNTY 2020 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	Assist the planning and implementation of the Milwaukee River TMDL & two 9-Key Element Plans: Cedar-Ulao and Fredonia-Newburg HUC 12 Focus: 040400030301, 040400030302, 040400030303, 040400030107, 040400030209	# of Project identified and future implementation scheduled
	Partnering with MMSD & NRCS to implement program goals of the Cedar Creek RCPP HUC 12 Focus: 040400030301, 040400030302, 040400030303	# of landowner contacts # and type of practices installed
	Assist the Cedar Creek Farmers Producer-led Group to meet program and grant goals HUC 12 Focus: 040400030301, 040400030302, 040400030303	# lbs of sediment or # lbs of P reduced using SnapPlus # of sponsored Outreach events # of Producers contracted # and type of practices installed
	Develop a MDV Watershed Plan based upon priorities identified in the LWRM Plan. HUC 12 Focus: 070900010102, 070900010105	Plan successfully developed and entered into MDV database (BITS)

- *Other*

Other	Maintain 12 permits for active mining sites	# of annual inspections and compliance determinations
	Conduct Annual Transect Survey	Report successful completion of survey
	Offer Hazardous Waste Collection to residents	Types and amounts of material collected

- Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	2	2
Manure storage closure	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	Maintain 11 Active Plans and 1 Plan Amendment	Maintain 12 Active NMM Sites
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	15	15
Other		

**WASHINGTON COUNTY 2020 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	
For NR 151	10
Animal waste ordinance	4
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	70
Nonmetallic mining	12

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	0
Field days	1
Trainings/workshops	3
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	4
Newsletters	2
Social media posts	6
News release/story	2

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	2080	\$107,200
Conservation Technician	6240	\$260,400
AIS Coordinator	1040	\$37,500
Support Staff	1040	\$29,000
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Bonding	N/A	\$48,000
SEG	N/A	\$10,000
Producer-Led Grant	N/A	\$45,000
County / Local Funding	N/A	\$6,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: July 15, 2020

TO: Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors

FROM: Susan Mockert, DATCP
Bureau of Land and Water Resources

SUBJECT: Innovative Conservation Funding Discussion: State of Iowa Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund

Action Requested: This is not an action item.

Summary: After providing a general overview of innovative conservation funding across numerous states, Staff were asked to provide more information on the State of Iowa Revolving Loan Fund

Basics:

- Originally similar to Wisconsin's Clean Water Fund Program and Safe Drinking Water Loan Program
- Expanded in 2003 to include nonpoint source water quality projects including agricultural BMPs. As of 2019, \$290 million have gone to NPS projects.
- Four subcategories of loans within the NPS loan program:
 - Local water protection program (buffer strips, field borders and constructed wetlands)
 - Livestock water quality program (manure storage)
 - Domestic septic repair and replacement
 - Storm water management practices

Borrowers:

- Communities with no bond rating
- Savings estimated at approximately \$250,000 for each million dollars borrowed

Linked Deposit Approach:

- works with 400 approved financial partners
- loan provided at or below 3% interest
- borrower pays back the loan, state withdraws the funds from the lender
- Lender underwrites and loan and receives the interest payments.

2009 Program Evaluation:

- smaller than average farms but they spent at least as much on conservation practices as the larger farms.
- Relied less on cost-share programs and farm operating budgets than farms that did not participate in the program.
- Three reasons farmers did not participate in the program: 1. Prefer to cover conservation costs through use of farm operating expenses; 2. Able to fund needs through cost-share programs; 3. waiting for cost-share support.

Sponsorship Lending

Pairs a traditional publically-owned treatment work project with a nontraditional one. A municipality receives a loan with a reduced interest rate as compensation for also sponsoring a nontraditional project. \$10 million a year is set aside for sponsored projects.

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 21, 2020

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

FROM: Joanna Griffin
Watershed Management Bureau, DNR

SUBJECT: DNR Proposed Scoring of Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2021 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 2021 grant funding. Scoring results for projects being considered for calendar year (CY) 2021 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 \$600,000 for Large-Scale projects.

Scoring and Ranking Summary to Date:

A. Small-Scale Non-TMDL

- Seven (7) applications were submitted and are eligible for grant consideration.
- Funding requests for the applications total \$1,510,307.

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

- Sixteen (16) applications were submitted and are eligible for grant consideration.
- Funding requests for the applications total \$2,863,825.

C. Large-Scale Non-TMDL

- Three (3) applications were submitted and are eligible for consideration.
- Funding request for these applications total \$449,513.

D. Large-Scale TMDL

- Eleven (11) applications were submitted and are eligible for consideration.
- Funding request for these applications total \$5,044,697

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. However, a requirement in s. NR 153.20(2)(d)3.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 will be awarded funds for the projects that do not exceed 20% and the balance of the applicant’s requests will be moved to the bottom of the ranked list; additional funding is provided only after all other eligible projects have first been funded. Therefore, adjustments to the rank order may be made once total available funding is determined.

The Department will include allocations to counties for TRM projects in the *CY 2021 Joint Final Allocation Plan*. Once the *2021 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 2021 Small-Scale Non-TMDL TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank
CY 2021 Small-Scale TMDL TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank
CY 2021 Large-Scale Non-TMDL TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank
CY 2021 Large-Scale TMDL TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2021

Table 1. Small-Scale Non-TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Region Boost	Total Eligible Project Costs	Total State Share Request	Cumulative Requested
1	Oconto County*	Alsteen Farms LLC	NER	112.7	Yes	\$1,082,835	\$225,000	\$225,000
2	Door County	Twin Harbor Creek Headwater Protection	NER	104.4	No	\$480,608	\$220,000	\$445,000
3	Oconto County	Fischer Manure and Waste Management	NER	92	No	\$236,153	\$165,307	\$610,307
4	Marinette County	Schwittay Farm Barnyard Runoff Management	NER	84.7	No	\$486,140	\$225,000	\$835,307
5	Marinette County	Drees Farm Feed Leachate Management	NER	78	No	\$777,495	\$225,000	\$1,060,307
6	Marinette County	Declark Farm Manure Management	NER	75.9	No	\$268,234	\$225,000	\$1,285,307
7	Marinette County	Zeitler Farm Manure Management	NER	75.9	No	\$1,112,420	\$225,000	\$1,510,307

*Region Boost with score equal to or greater than median of 84.7.

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2021

Table 2. Small-Scale TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Region Boost	Total Eligible Project Costs	Total State Share Request	Cumulative Requested
1	Village of Elm Grove*	Underwood Creek Streambank Stabilization	SER	156.3	Yes	\$421,608	\$225,000	\$225,000
2	Shawano County*	Shawland Ag Waste	NER	112.7	Yes	\$261,987	\$178,544	\$403,544
3	Wood County*	Wood County LWCD & Serenity River, LLC	WCR	107.6	Yes	\$57,750	\$40,425	\$443,969
4	Dane County*	Gilles, Eugene	SCR	100.6	Yes	\$337,064	\$225,000	\$668,969
5	Village of Mount Pleasant	Lamparek Ditch - Phase 3	SER	113.2	No	\$793,044	\$198,261	\$867,230
6	Village of Lac La Belle	Golf Course Stream Streambank Restoration	SER	107.4	No	\$348,180	\$209,454	\$1,076,684
7	Marathon County	Matt Hartwig Manure Storage Project	WCR	105.1	No	\$623,850	\$225,000	\$1,301,684
8	Shawano County	Mastey Ag Waste Project	NER	101.2	No	\$204,058	\$142,841	\$1,444,525
9	Burnett County	Goetz/Mogren Erosion Control	NOR	92	No	\$19,990	\$13,993	\$1,458,518
10	Waupaca County	Whitetail Valley Dairy - Manure Management	NER	87.4	No	\$316,558	\$221,591	\$1,680,109
11	Columbia County	Rock Garden Farm LLC/Hahn	SCR	81.4	No	\$325,111	\$225,000	\$1,905,109
12	Columbia County	Oliver Leachate Project	SCR	74.5	No	\$153,616	\$136,791	\$2,041,900
13	Rusk County	Austin Giles Feedlot	NOR	72	No	\$209,893	\$146,925	\$2,188,825
14	Dodge County	Carl Reible	SCR	66.7	No	\$350,000	\$225,000	\$2,413,825
15	Portage County	Jeff Lutz Manure Storage and Feed Storage Runoff Control	WCR	40	No	\$700,000	\$225,000	\$2,638,825
16	Portage County	Gerben Westra Manure Storage	WCR	39	No	\$500,000	\$225,000	\$2,863,825

*Region Boost with score equal to or greater than median of 96.3.

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2021

Table 3. Large-Scale Non-TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Total Eligible Project Costs	State Share Requested	Cumulative Requested
1	Calumet County	Calumet County Spring Creek Implementation	NER	171.9	\$245,658	\$171,960	\$171,960
2	Iowa County	Knight Hollow-Mill Creek 9KE Plan Impl. Ph. 1	SCR	147.4	\$210,360	\$137,553	\$309,513
3	Chippewa County	Lake Wissota Stewardship Project	WCR	95	\$200,000	\$140,000	\$449,513

Table 4. Large-Scale TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Total Eligible Project Costs	State Share Requested	Cumulative Requested
1	St. Croix County	South Fork Willow River TMDL TRM	NOR	179.4	\$830,194	\$496,075	\$496,075
2	Fond du Lac County	Pipe Creek Streambank Restoration Project & Ancillary Best Management Practices	NER	171.5	\$520,000	\$364,000	\$860,075
3	Waupaca County	Weyauwega Lake - Waupaca River Watershed	NER	170.2	\$1,018,400	\$600,000	\$1,460,075
4	Outagamie County	Upper Duck Creek II TMDL Implementation	NER	167.2	\$890,000	\$600,000	\$2,060,075
5	La Crosse County	Bostwick Creek	WCR	166.1	\$864,561	\$600,000	\$2,660,075
6	Waupaca County	Shaw Creek - Lower Little Wolf River Watershed	NER	164.5	\$1,222,000	\$600,000	\$3,260,075
7	Marathon County	Fenwood Creek Watershed Project Phase II	WCR	160.6	\$583,749	\$408,624	\$3,668,699
8	Brown County	Upper/Lower East River TRM	NER	146.1	\$420,000	\$294,000	\$3,962,699
9	Outagamie County	Apple Creek CAFO Special Project Cropping System	NER	114	\$759,997	\$531,998	\$4,494,697
10	Dodge County	Wildcat Creek Watershed	SCR	93.5	\$460,000	\$322,000	\$4,816,697
11	Dodge County	Lake Sinissippi-Rock River NPS Watershed Implementation Plan	SCR	91.4	\$340,000	\$228,000	\$5,044,697

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 21, 2020

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

FROM: Joanna Griffin
Watershed Management Bureau, DNR

SUBJECT: DNR Proposed Scoring of Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2021 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 2021 grant funding. Scoring results for projects being considered for calendar year (CY) 2021 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 Construction grant applications were solicited in 2020 for the CY 2021 award cycle. The UNPS Planning grant application will be available in 2021 for CY 2022 awards. Due to the alternating schedule for the UNPS grants, only the scoring and ranking summary for UNPS Construction projects is provided here.

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

The maximum state cost share per successful application is \$150,000 plus an additional \$50,000 for land acquisition.

- Thirty-one (31) applications were submitted; all are eligible for funding.
- Grant requests for the 31 applications total \$3,491,928

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 *2021 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-Construction Scoring and Rank for CY 2021*

UNPS-Construction Grant Application Scoring by Rank for 2021

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Total Eligible Project Cost	State Share Requested	Cumulative Requested
1	Redevelopment Authority, Milwaukee, City	Century City Triangle Neighborhood Park Development	SER	122.8	\$260,000	\$105,000	\$105,000
2	Little Chute, Village	Vandenbroek Pond	NER	121	\$294,467	\$117,800	\$222,800
3	Monona, City	Underground Wet Detention Basin	SCR	116.6	\$412,300	\$150,000	\$372,800
4	Milwaukee Board of School Directors	Greener, Healthier Schoolyards - Academy of Accelerated Learning	SER	116.3	\$230,000	\$100,000	\$472,800
5	Rothschild, Village	High Efficiency Street Sweeper	WCR	114.4	\$67,459	\$33,730	\$506,530
6	Whitewater, City	High Efficiency Street Sweeper	SER	114.4	\$99,600	\$49,800	\$556,330
7	Ashwaubenon, Village	Plymrock Pond	NER	113.3	\$299,850	\$120,000	\$676,330
8	Buchanan, Town	N130 CTH N Storm Water Management Facility Construction	NER	108.9	\$883,960	\$200,000	\$876,330
9	Buchanan, Town	Schmalz Storm Water Management Facility Construction	NER	108.9	\$694,018	\$200,000	\$1,076,330
10	Two Rivers, City	Eggers Pond	NER	106	\$516,095	\$154,600	\$1,230,930
11	Sheboygan, City	2nd Creek Dry to Wet Pond Conversion	SER	103.4	\$917,000	\$150,000	\$1,380,930
12	Calumet County	Calumet County Iron Enhanced Sand Filter	NER	102.3	\$46,500	\$23,250	\$1,404,180
13	De Pere, City	22-09 Pond and Drainage System Construction Franklin Street Pond	NER	97.9	\$210,600	\$105,300	\$1,509,480
14	De Pere, City	21-09 Pond and Drainage System Construction Matthew Drive Ponds	NER	97.9	\$274,300	\$137,150	\$1,646,630
15	Menomonie, City	Regional Pond #2	WCR	97.9	\$314,570	\$150,000	\$1,796,630
16	Saukville, Village	Saukville Storm Water Improvements	SER	96	\$220,140	\$100,000	\$1,896,630
17	Wauwatosa, City	2021-2022-Replacement of Stormwater Inlets with Catch Basins	SER	94.6	\$300,000	\$149,900	\$2,046,530
18	Ozaukee County	Mee-Kwon County Park Green Infrastructure and Stormwater Management	SER	93.3	\$95,000	\$45,000	\$2,091,530
19	Combined Locks, Village	Memorial Park Streambank Restoration Projects	NER	93	\$132,000	\$52,800	\$2,144,330
20	Kaukauna, City	Grignon Stream Restoration	NER	91.8	\$344,560	\$135,000	\$2,279,330

UNPS-Construction Grant Application Scoring by Rank for 2021

21	Beaver Dam, City	Meadow Park Pond	SCR	91.3	\$317,951	\$150,000	\$2,429,330
22	Menomonee Falls, Village	Menomonee Falls High Efficiency Street Sweeper	SER	89.1	\$92,697	\$46,348	\$2,475,678
23	Fox Point, Village	Greenvale Storm Water Improvement Project	SER	88	\$192,019	\$57,700	\$2,533,378
24	Platteville, City	Platteville 2021-22 Streambank Repair	SCR	76	\$300,000	\$150,000	\$2,683,378
25	Beloit, City	Turtle Creek Streambank Stabilization	SCR	73	\$220,000	\$110,000	\$2,793,378
26	Watertown, City	Watertown Town Square and Riverwalk	SCR	73	\$286,125	\$143,000	\$2,936,378
27	Howard, Village	Valley Brooke Pond	NER	70.8	\$153,000	\$65,000	\$3,001,378
28	Antigo, City	Saratoga Business Park Stormwater Management	NOR	69	\$379,063	\$150,000	\$3,151,378
29	Bloomfield, Village	Village of Bloomfield - Nippersink Gardens Water Quality Improvements	SER	60	\$319,050	\$150,000	\$3,301,378
30	Belmont, Village	Belmont 2021 Streambank Repair	SCR	58.5	\$413,100	\$145,000	\$3,446,378
31	Monroe, City	Golf Course Stormwater Improvements (Streambank)	SCR	39	\$91,100	\$45,550	\$3,491,928