State of Wisconsin
Land and Water Conservation Board

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

Land and Water Conservation Board
Agenda

October 1, 2019

The Land and Water Conservation Board will meet on **October 1, 2019** beginning at **9:00 a.m.** in Boardroom 106 at the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection, 2811 Agriculture Drive, Madison, WI. The agenda for the meeting is shown below. A lunch break will be observed.

AGENDA ITEMS AND TENTATIVE SCHEDULE:

9:00 am 1. Call the Meeting to Order – **Mark Cupp, LWCB Chair**
   a. Pledge of allegiance
   b. Open meeting notice
   c. Approval of agenda
   d. Approval of August 6, 2019 meeting minutes

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

9:10 am 3. Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Clark County- **Jim Arch, County Conservationist, Clark County LCD; Fritz Garbisch, Land Conservation Committee Chair**

9:55 am 4. Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Douglas County – **Ashley Vande Voort, County Conservationist, Douglas County LWCD; Sue Hendrickson, Land Conservation Committee Chair**

10:40 am 5. Recommendation for approval of the 2020 Joint DATCP and DNR Final Allocation Plan – **Jennifer Heaton-Amrhein, DATCP, and Mary Anne Lowndes, DNR**

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

11:00 am	6.	Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for La Crosse County – **Gregg Stangl, County Conservationist, La Crosse County DLC; Rick Cornforth, Planning, Resources & Development Committee Chair**
11:45 pm	7.	Lunch
12:30 pm	8.	Livestock Facility Siting Update – **Chris Clayton, DATCP**
12:45 pm	9.	Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Langlade County – **Molly McKay, County Conservationist, Langlade County LCD; Dave Solin, Land Conservation Committee Chair; Duane Haakenson, Land Records & Regulations Director; Fred Heider, North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission**
1:30 pm	10.	Report on 2018 program accomplishments- **Coreen Fallat, DATCP**
2:00 pm	11.	Discussion on Funding Sources for Programs Subject to LWCB Oversight - **Mark Cupp, LWCB**
2:20 pm	12.	Agency reports a. FSA b. NRCS c. UW-CALS d. UW-Extension e. WI Land + Water f. DOA g. DATCP h. DNR
2:45 pm	13.	Planning for December 2019 LWCB meeting **– Mark Cupp, LWCB**
2:50 pm	14.	Adjourn

MINUTES
LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING

August 6, 2019
Boardroom 106
Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
2811 Agriculture Drive, Madison, Wisconsin

Item #1 Call to Order—pledge of allegiance, open meeting notice, approval of agenda, approval of June 4, 2019 LWCB meeting minutes.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Cupp at 9:00 a.m. Members Eric Birschbach, Brad Matson, Ron Grasshoff, Dave Solin, Bobbie Webster, Monte Osterman, Brian Weigel, Sara Walling, and Andrew Potts were in attendance. A quorum was present. Advisors Eric Allness (NRCS) and Matt Krueger (WI Land + Water) also were present. Others present included Jennifer Heaton-Amrhein, Lisa Trumble, and Chris Clayton, DATCP.

Clayton confirmed that the meeting was publicly noticed.

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

Potts moved to approve the June 4th meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Webster, 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 Vernon County

Ben Wojahn, Vernon County Land and Water Conservation Department, and Will Beitlich, Land 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.

Vernon County Land 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 Vernon County representatives discussed the following: possible changes to the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) such as requiring conservation compliance for assessing agricultural lands at the current use-value rate; funding a groundwater study with Crawford and Richland Counties; utilizing FPP and the Producer Led Watershed Program as NR 151 compliance tools; the state of dairy farms in Vernon County and interest among new, younger farmers; interest in grazing; grazing as a means to greater resilience in the face of large storm events.

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

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

MaryJo Gingras, Ashland County Land and Water Conservation Department, and George Mika, Land 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.

Ashland County Land 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 Ashland County representatives discussed the following: local ordinances addressing agricultural performance standards, manure storage, and CAFOs; incorporation of climate data into the LWRM Plan; the need for further work with DNR to include additional water quality and NR 151 compliance information into the LWRM Plan; a board request to insert a narrative covering the topic of metallic mining within the county.

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

Item #5 Report on 2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan

Heaton-Amrhein, DATCP, reported on the allocation amounts to the counties, the total dollar amount in the allocation as compared to the statutory goal ($3.4 million shortage), and differences in the use of monies as compared with past allocation plans.

Lowndes, DNR, reported on bonding amounts in the allocation plan, an increase in the cap on small scale Targeted Runoff Management grants from $150,000 to $225,000, and Urban Nonpoint Source grant amounts in the allocation plan.

Item #6 Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Barron County

Tyler Gruetzmacher, Barron County Soil and Water Conservation Department, and Russ Rindsig, Land 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.

Barron County Soil 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 Barron County representatives discussed the following: the thoroughness of the county's description of NR 151 compliance in the LWRM Plan; the need for a soil health position within the conservation department; cover crop incentive payments and their value to nutrient

DRAFT

management plans; a board suggestion to implement a more robust information and education program in the county.

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

Item #8 Livestock Facility Siting Update

Clayton, DATCP, provided an update on the livestock facility siting rule (ATCP 51), including the department's schedule for holding public hearings and receiving public comments on the draft rule.

Item #9 Recommendation for approval of Land and Water Resource Management Plan revision for Oneida County

Michele Sadauskas, Oneida County Land and Water Conservation Department, Bob Mott, Oneida County Conservation and UW-Extension Education Committee Chair, Karl Jennrich, LWCD / Planning & Zoning Department Head, and Fred Heider, North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 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.

Oneida 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 Oneida County representatives discussed the following: partnerships with lake districts; good relations with local media; challenges with managing pollution from septic tanks and the county's septic maintenance program; challenges posed by forest fragmentation; the need for further work with DNR to include additional NR 151 compliance information into the LWRM Plan.

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

Item #10 Draft letter to Water Quality Task Force regarding nonpoint funding

Cupp presented a draft letter addressed to the Assembly Speaker's Water Quality Task Force to voice support for increased funding to address nonpoint source pollution statewide.

Matson moved to approve the letter with additions, seconded by Grasshoff, and the motion carried.

Item #11 Agency Reports

NRCS – Allness reported that NRCS is providing funding for floodplain easements and annual local working group meetings are occurring statewide.

DATCP – Walling announced the addition of staff within the Bureau of Land and Water Resources, funding to hire a new staff person for the Producer Led Watershed Program, and updates on the industrial hemp program.

DRAFT

DNR – Weigel reported that the CAFO permit fees will be kept within the DNR, new positions will be added to the CAFO program, and DNR will begin the rule making process for targeted performance standards for nitrates in the Central Sands.

DOA – Potts provided brief budget updates.

Item #12 Planning for October 2019 LWCB meeting

- Five LWRM plan revisions (La Crosse, Douglas, Clark, Langlade, Marquette).
- Final allocation plan.
- Brief update on the livestock facility siting rule.

Item #13 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35pm.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Eric Birschbach, Secretary Date

Recorder: CC, DATCP

DRAFT

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ State of Wisconsin

DATE: **September 17, 2019**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clark County held a public hearing on August 15, 2019, as part of its public input and review process. The Clark County Land Conservation Committee will present the LWRM plan for County Board approval after receiving a recommendation for approval from the LWCB.

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

Presenters: Jim Arch, Clark County Conservationist
Fritz Garbisch, Land Conservation Committee Chair

ARM-LWR-167 (August, 2017)

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

Land and Water Resource Management (LWRM)

LWRM Plan Review Checklist

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

County: CLARK Date Plan Submitted for Review: 7/16/2019

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county convene a local advisory committee that included a broad spectrum of public interests and perspectives (such as affected landowners, partner organizations, government officials, educational institutions)	☒	☐	7

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	3/22/18 9/6/18 7/8/19
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan[1]	8/15/19
3. Provide the date of county board approval of the plan, or the date the county board is expected to approve the plan after the LWCB makes its recommendation.[2]	November

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	☒	☐	74-76 86-87 118
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county[3], including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	☒	☐	31-33

[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	☒	☐	34-41
iii. identification of areas within the county that have water quality problems that merit action within the next 10 years.	☒	☐	60,85-86
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	☒	☐	40-49
b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available	☒	☐	41, App K
Other comments: WI River and Mead Lake TMDL			

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	☒	☐	7
Other comments: _____			

V. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan include the following implementation components: :			
a. A voluntary implementation strategy to encourage adoption of farm conservation practices	☒	☐	90
b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan	☒	☐	93-95
c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations	☒	☐	91
d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems	☒	☐	106-107
e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	☒	☐	96

[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	☒	☐	wk pl
b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	☒	☐	wk pl
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	☒	☐	90

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	☒	☐	90,98, 99
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	☒	☐	93-95 119-120

Other comments:

VII. WORK PLANNING AND PROGRESS MONITORING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the county's most recent annual work plan[5] do both of the following:			
a. Provide measurable performance benchmarks	☒	☐	NA
b. Identify priorities	☒	☐	NA
2. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy and framework for monitoring county progress implementing its plan including methodology to track and measure progress in meeting performance benchmarks and plan objectives	☒	☐	96,97

Other comments: _____

VIII. EPA SECTION 319 CONSIDERATIONS

1. IS THE COUNTY WORKING WITH DNR TO SEEK EPA APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN AS MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF A 9 KEY ELEMENT PLAN UNDER SECTION 319 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT: Currently have a portion of the county with a 9KE plan

[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: 9/16/2019

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

County: Clark

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.

   The department increased the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) participation from 26,774 acres to currently 54,143 acres. The department is currently in the process of getting two new townships, (Mead and Reseburg) certified with the state to offer FPP. County wide acres under a nutrient management plan (NMP) went from 113,811 acres to 120,296 acres in the last five years. In 2018, the Land Conservation Department was able to secure a DNR Large Scale TRM Grant to do three year cover crop demonstration plots on 20 acres starting in 2019. The Land Conservation Department was able to purchase a $24,000.00 no-till drill using county funding in order to promote and increase no-till and cover crop planting in the county. In the last five years 125 farmers have been trained mostly with the NMFE grant to write their own NMP. Abandoned well closing is a top priority in the Land Conservation Department. 193 wells have been properly closed since 2014 in Clark County. As with wells closing abandoned manure pits is another top priority for the department. 25 manure pits have been closed up in the county mostly with the help of SWRM grants. Demands for waterway cost sharing usually exceed our available funding. In 2014, 4.7 acres of waterways were installed so far in 2019, 9.5 acres of waterways have been constructed.

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.

The Clark County Land Conservation Department went through a major staff turnover in late 2015 early 2016. In late 2015, the department had only two employees, the land conservationist and land conservation agronomist. By November 2015, the land conservationist had left his position leaving only the land conservation agronomist running the department. In January 2016 the department hired a new land conservationist, land conservation engineer and land conservation program assistant. In February 2016, the land conservation agronomist left his position and the department hired a new land conservation agronomist in March 2016. These interruptions in employee turnovers had a significant impact on the services the department provides to the public during that period. It can take

months if not years for a completely new staff to develop trusting relationships with clientele and learning the county and state ordinances and programs available. The department in general attempts to follow the annual work plan but obviously, the department has no control over the weather, commodity prices or available funding. As everyone knows funding does not cover the full cost for any project. The current commodity prices for milk and grains has put severe financial stress on farmers. We are way down on our applications for manure storages for 2019. For example, while no funding was involved, there was a large CAFO that was going to construct two 30 million gallon manure pits in the county in 2019 that plan is now on hold. The weather has also made it difficult to do manure storage closures and waterway work. The severe alfalfa winterkill that occurred this past winter had a lot of farmers calling about renting the no-till drill in early May so they could interseed some grasses but because of excessive rains some interseeding could not be done when it should have been. Clark County has a high number of Amish and Mennonites. There are services and/or programs that they are not interested in such as the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) and the FPP.

The county as of today still does not have any Farmer Led Priority Watershed Groups. The department would like to put more emphasis on developing at least one watershed group in 2020.

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 Land Conservation Department routinely publishes articles in the county UW Extension newsletter on well closing, manure storage closing, wetland protection, no-till cover cropping, invasive species. The department has also updated it's county website to include timely information on the above. We use the Farmland Preservation Program and nutrient management program as a tool to get farmers/landowners to meet the performance standards. Because of the high population of Amish and Mennonites in the county the traditional ways of out reach like radio programs and the internet are not effective, so the department is looking at using more field days such as the Cover Crop Demo Project to educate farmers on soil health and soil conservation.

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

The last Land and Water Resource Management Plan did not have any plans for purchasing a no-till drill. Having the no-till drill has been a big accomplishment in promoting soil health and protection of the county's surface water but has also added to the departments work load. The approval of the 9 key Element Plan for the Eau Claire River Watershed in 2018 and the Mead Lake TMDL has made focusing more of the departments energy and time in that watershed (eg, Cover Crop Demo Project) possible. Because the county has been experiencing an increase in intense rain events the last several years there has been an increase in the demand for waterway construction. With more dairy farms exiting the business there has been increased demand for manure pit closures. The department has been getting more requests to close abandond wells then it had in the past.

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:

Signature of Authorized Representative: _____ **Date:** 9/17/19
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

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

Clark 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	***Practice installation*** *Waterways* *Cover Crops* *Soil Health Training* *No-Till Crops* *NM planning and training* *Transect Survey 2X for Tillage Practices*	***Type and units of practice(s) installed*** *Install 15 Acres 12* *1,200 acres 140 (Only Using Co. Drill)* *20 Farmers 15* *1000 Acres 560 (Only Using Co. Drill)* *50 New Farmers 40* *3 Townships 27*
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	***Practice installation*** *Manure Storage* *Manure Storage Closures* *Milk House Waste* *Roof Runoff Diversions* *Stream Crossing*	***Type and units of practice(s) installed*** *6 Manure Pits 6* *6 Closures 4* *6 Collected 6* *3 Diversions 0* *2 Crossings 2*
• *Water quality*		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	***Practice installation*** *Surface Water Testing*	***Type and units of practice(s) installed*** *1 Watershed 0*
• *Forestry*		
Forestry	***Practice installation***	***Type and units of practice(s) installed***
• *Invasive*		
Invasive species	***Surveys*** *Purple Loosestrife* *Curley Pond Weed* *Wild Parsnip*	***Number of surveys completed*** *3 0* *3 0* *3 0*
• *Wildlife*		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	*Wetland restoration* *Wildlife damage program*	*5 Acres of wetland restored 0* *5 Landowners 3*

Clark 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Urban*

Urban issues	*Stormwater control* *Construction site erosion control*	

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	*Large Scale TRM Grant* *Producer Led Watershed*	*Headwaters of South Fork, St. Hedwigs Cemetery, Norwegian Creek-South Fork of The Eau Claire 1* *6 Farmers 0*

- *Other*

Other	*PL 566*	*1- Sportsman Lake*

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	0	0
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	8	8
Manure storage closure	8	8
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	6	6
Shoreland zoning	0	0
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	3	3
Other		

Clark 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	*81 50*
For FPP	*81 50*
For NR 151	*81 50*
Animal waste ordinance	8 10
Livestock facility siting	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	8 0
Nonmetallic mining	0

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1 0
Field days	2 3
Trainings/workshops	8 1
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	1 1
Newsletters	4 4
Social media posts	0 0
News release/story	0 0

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	2080	
Engineer Technician	*2080*	
County Agronomist	*2080*	
Program Assistant	1040	
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Ex. Bonding	*N/A*	*$100,000*
Ex. SEG	*N/A*	$20,000
Ex. MDV	*N/A*	*$40,000*

Clark 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	***Practice installation*** *Waterways* *Cover Crops* *Soil Health Training* *No-Till Crops* *NM planning and training* *Transect Survey 2X for Tillage Practices*	***Type and units of practice(s) installed*** *Install 25 Acres* *1,200 acres* *40 Farmers* *1000 Acres* *50 New Farmers* *24 Townships*
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	***Practice installation*** *Manure Storage* *Manure Storage Closures* *Milk House Waste* *Roof Runoff Diversions* *Stream Crossing*	***Type and units of practice(s) installed*** *10 Manure Pits* *10 Closures* *10 Collected* *3 Diversions* *2 Crossings*
• *Water quality*		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	***Practice installation*** *Surface Water Testing*	***Type and units of practice(s) installed*** *2 Watershed*
• *Forestry*		
Forestry	***Practice installation***	***Type and units of practice(s) installed***
• *Invasive*		
Invasive species	***Surveys*** *Purple Loosestrife* *Curley Pond Weed* *Wild Parsnip*	***Number of surveys completed*** *3* *3* *3*
• *Wildlife*		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	*Wetland restoration* *Wildlife damage program*	*5 Acres of wetland restored* *5 Landowners*

Clark 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Urban*

Urban issues	*Stormwater control* *Construction site erosion control*	

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	*Large Scale TRM Grant*	*Headwaters of South Fork, St. Hedwigs Cemetery, Norwegian Creek-South Fork of The Eau Claire* *Demo Cover Crop Farm*

- *Other*

Other	*PL 566*	*1- Sportsman Lake*

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	0	0
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	10	10
Manure storage closure	10	10
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	6	6
Shoreland zoning	0	0
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	3	3
Other		

Clark 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	*65*
For FPP	*65*
For NR 151	*65*
Animal waste ordinance	10
Livestock facility siting	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	8
Nonmetallic mining	0

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1
Field days	3
Trainings/workshops	8
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	1
Newsletters	5
Social media posts	0
News release/story	0

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	2080	$92,608.00
Engineer Technician	*2080*	*$89,035.00*
County Agronomist	*2080*	*$71,343.00*
Program Assistant	1560	$26,119.00
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Ex. Bonding	*N/A*	*$100,000*
Ex. SEG	*N/A*	$80,000
Ex. MDV	*N/A*	*$40,000*

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ State of Wisconsin

DATE: **September 17, 2019**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Douglas County held a public hearing on June 12, 2019, as part of its public input and review process. The Douglas County Land Conservation Committee will present the LWRM plan for County Board approval after receiving a recommendation for approval from the LWCB.

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

Presenters: Ashley VandeVoort, Douglas County Conservationist
Sue Hendrickson, Land Conservation Committee Chair

ARM-LWR-167 (August, 2017)

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

Land and Water Resource Management (LWRM)

LWRM Plan Review Checklist

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

County: DOUGLAS Date Plan Submitted for Review: 7/10/2019

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county convene a local advisory committee that included a broad spectrum of public interests and perspectives (such as affected landowners, partner organizations, government officials, educational institutions)	☒	☐	ii,2

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	3/27,4/15
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan[1]	6/12/19
3. Provide the date of county board approval of the plan, or the date the county board is expected to approve the plan after the LWCB makes its recommendation.[2]	TAKE AFTER LWCB MTG

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	☒	☐	26-29
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county[3], including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	☒	☐	Fig 7
ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources	☒	☐	8-13, App.A

[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.	☒	☐	35-40 App A
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	☒	☐	AppA
b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available	☒	☐	App A
Other comments: Basin and TMDL plan info. inc.			

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	☒	☐	ii, 2

Other comments:

V. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan include the following implementation components: :			
a. A voluntary implementation strategy to encourage adoption of farm conservation practices	☒	☐	41-48
b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan	☒	☐	App A-B, 32
c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations	☒	☐	42,47, 48
d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems	☒	☐	32
e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	☒	☐	22,41, 48
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	☒	☐	w.p.

[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.

b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	☒	☐	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	☒	☐	41-45

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	☒	☐	49-50
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	☒	☐	52-55

Other comments: _____

VII. WORK PLANNING AND PROGRESS MONITORING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the county's most recent annual work plan[5] do both of the following:			
a. Provide measurable performance benchmarks	☒	☐	NA
b. Identify priorities	☒	☐	NA
2. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy and framework for monitoring county progress implementing its plan including methodology to track and measure progress in meeting performance benchmarks and plan objectives	☒	☐	53-54

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:

[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: 9/17/2019

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

County: Douglas

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.
   Eight shoreline and slope stabilization projects- A survey was performed to target shorelines with erosion issues. Contacts were established with landowners to install vegetative buffers and/or riprap. Different barriers, such as cost or changes in the landowner's desire to install practices on their shoreline, created challenges. Through education, compromise, and flexibility with the timeframe of when projects were completed, there was successful completion of projects.

   Two well abandonments- Abandonments were originally planned to be funded with DATCP cost-share funding. Discovering DNR funding could be utilized to assist in the well abandonments allowed for the county to use less of their cost-share funding on the project.

   Decision Support Tool- The creation of this tool was part of Douglas County creating an In-Lieu of Fee Wetland Mitigation Program. The process of creating this tool involved public input which resulted in a tool that represented stakeholder's needs. This tool can be used to strategically plan the placement of wetland mitigation projects in the future.

   Groundwater testing program- It was established in the 2010-2020 LWRM Plan to gain a better understanding of groundwater. By providing subsidized water testing for citizen, the county was not only able to educate landowners about their drinking water quality, but also the county was able to gain baseline information of groundwater quality. The county discovered mailings weren't very effective at recruiting people to participate in the study. It was also discovered that without an in-depth educational training on how to collect the sample, there is increased likelihood the samples will not be correctly gathered. An area of naturally-occurring arsenic contamination was also discovered. This brought attention to a need for groundwater testing in the northern part of the county which was contradictory to the notion that groundwater contamination would be more likely in the southern part of the county where there are sandy soils.

2. Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in recent work plans. For each area identified, explain

the work plan adjustments that were made to refocus planned activities. If no areas are identified, explain how the county was able to make progress in all the areas planned.

There were about seven shoreline stabilization projects which were intended to be cost-shared, but the projects weren't completed for various reasons. One of the reasons for this was a lack of contractors placing bids combined with a shortage of rock for riprap which resulted in project expenses being higher than expected. This deterred some landowners from completing projects. Other projects were delayed in hopes of acquiring less expensive project bids in future years by receiving bids from a greater number of contractors.

Another reason for fewer shoreline stabilization projects being performed than anticipated was a lack of understanding in what requirements were necessary for the project to be installed. Some projects were initiated as shoreline vegetative buffers, and riprap was later recommended to help stabilize the shoreline. Landowners then decided they only wanted to install riprap without a vegetative buffer, and the LWCD did not desire to support projects lacking the vegetative buffer. Additional education for shoreland owners will be necessary when shoreland work is being performed in the future.

Due to beginning this position in January, I am not certain how work plans were changed to refocus planned activities. In the case of last year, some projects were postponed to be completed in future years and cost-share money was shared with other counties. Instead a focus was placed on acquiring grant-funding from other sources for other conservation projects. One focus was on wetland mitigation and preservation by securing grant money to work on the Douglas County In-Lieu of Fee Program.

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?

To the best of my understanding, the utilization of the method in place to prioritize farmers for cost-share has not been necessary. Farmers desiring cost-share would contact the county on a voluntary basis, and there was not a shortage of funding for the number of requests received. Going forward, the county will continue to have a voluntary, non-regulatory approach to working with farmers. However, it is desirable to attempt to perform more outreach to farmers to make sure there is knowledge of the cost-share funding available for them.

One-on-one contact has been and will continue to be made with farmers to spread awareness of DATCP programs. This may be done by attending functions, such as Farmer's Union Meetings, or making visits to farms. Collaboration with UW-Extension will also provide opportunities to connect with farmers in need of assistance and improvements in management practices.

Collaboration with NRCS or the DNR will occur to utilize additional sources of funding and technical assistance. Douglas County is currently collaborating with NRCS for funding along with technical assistance for a couple of agricultural projects.

An inventory of farms enrolled in Farmland Preservation was lacking in the past. This has resulted in a lack of monitoring of projects installed and a lack of compliance with Farmland Preservation Plans. In the future, I intend to maintain an inventory and inspect and educate farmers to stay in compliance. A larger inventory of farms in Douglas County is also intended to be created along with identification of farms that have classified water bodies

within the property. This inventory will assist in prioritizing famers for cost-share as well as encouraging enrollment in Farmland Preservation.

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.

Being that I am a new Land Conservationist for Douglas County, there will be changes in how I prioritize and complete work. The past few years the county has focused on performing shoreline erosion control projects with the cost-share money received. In the future a greater effort will be put forth to locate projects with agricultural focus. To emphasize this point, a goal with an agricultural focus was added to the LWRM Plan. In 2019 we plan to complete two shoreline projects which were carried over from last year as well as one project which is a livestock well-installation. In future years, emphasis will be placed on reaching out to contact farmers in need of conservation practices.

Due to the limited amount of livestock and crop agriculture in Douglas County, there still will be efforts to work with waterfront and forestland property owners to implement conservation practices on their properties. Projects to reduce erosion on shorelines by installing native vegetation buffers without riprap will be prioritized. Private forest owners with intent to harvest will also be targeted for assistance with installing stream crossings where necessary.

There is also a focus on protecting wetlands and performing mitigation using the proposed In-Lieu of Fee program. Over the past 10 years three large floods have occurred, and there is a need for assistance with upgrading infrastructure to handle the intense flooding events resulting from climate change. There is also a need for wetland enhancement, restoration, and preservation performed with existing knowledge and data of the watersheds in order to lessen the impact of flooding.

Additional effort will also be placed on invasive species control. Douglas County currently has an Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Strategic Management Plan. It is a high priority to secure funding for an AIS coordinator, or at least be prepared for funding as the DNR changes how AIS funding is distributed. There will also be a focus to collaborate with other organizations, such as Northwoods Cooperative Weed Management Area, to perform invasive species education and management.

The structure of how education is incorporated into the LWRM Plan has also been modified. Instead of incorporating an education section into each of the goals, education has been broken out into its own goal. Within that goal are specific activities which tie back to the other plan goals. This adds emphasis on the importance of education for the LWCD.

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: May 21, 2019

Signature of Authorized Representative: Susan A. Hendrickson **Date:** 06/12/19
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

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

DOUGLAS COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
• *Livestock*		
• *Water quality*		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	Practice installations Shoreland restoration Groundwater education Groundwater testing	330 feet streambank/shoreline protection 200 feet shoreline protection 5 well abandonments 2 well abandonments All plans submitted are reviewed and all sites inspected All zoning plans reviewed and site inspected Capital funding proposal, 2 well-owner events Funding secured and 2 well-owner events occurred 100 tests, results compiled and reported, geodatabase updated 64 test, results were compiled and reported and geodatabase updated Well delegation program explored and created if applicable Explored, not created
• *Forestry*		
• *Invasive*		
Invasive species	Surveys Management plans Control	Coordination with NWCMA Unknown/No Coordination with local organizations Unknown
• *Wildlife*		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	Wetland restoration Wildlife Damage Program Habitat restoration	1 wetlands complex restoration design completed Not complete Wildlife Damage Program fully implemented Complete ILF proposal completed and submitted Complete South Shore Grade culvert removal Still in progress Surveys for USFWS priority culvert projects completed Not completed
• *Urban*		
Urban issues	Stormwater control	360 inspections 28 inspections of stormdrains formally inspected, additional casual inspections occurred All plans submitted reviewed and all sites inspected All zoning plans reviewed and sites inspected

DOUGLAS COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	Water Quality Trading Watershed Planning Data collection and processing	WQT feasibility analysis completed and submitted to Village Complete WQT plan completed Complete 2 meetings attended Complete LSB: decision support tool used to created site roster lists Complete LSB: watershed plan updated Complete LSB: nine-key element planning started Nemadji River plan in progress LSB: 2 stakeholder meetings held Complete Hydro-conditioned digital elevation model created Not created

- *Other*

Other	Non-metallic mining Metallic mining	All plans reviewed and site inspections completed Complete- 6 plans 8 reviewed and 6 renewed Regulation options reviewed and ordinance created if applicable N/A

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits		
Manure storage construction and transfer systems		
Manure storage closure		
Livestock facility siting		
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	8	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control		
Shoreland zoning	5	
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)		
Other		

DOUGLAS COUNTY 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	
For FPP	
For NR 151	
Animal waste ordinance	
Livestock facility siting	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	360 28
Nonmetallic mining	6

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1 2
Field days	2 0
Trainings/workshops	5 4
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	3 0
Newsletters	1 0
Social media posts	
News release/story	5 2

Douglas County 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	*Watering facility*	*One well, one all-season drinker, one protective pad, and pipe for water transport installed.*
• *Water quality*		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	*Groundwater testing* *Groundwater education* *Shoreline restoration*	*140 well water tests* *2 groundwater education sessions* *140 test results compiled in geodatabase* *1 well abandonment* *1 Water Quality Task Force Meeting attended* *350 feet of shoreline protected* *10 shoreline mitigation plans are reviewed and implemented* *Inspect 20% of shoreline mitigation projects*
• *Forestry*		
Forestry		
• *Invasive*		
Invasive species	*Invasive species identification and reporting education* *Invasive species control*	*1 invasive species workshop for highway crews coordinated with NCWMA* *1 invasive species workshop for Clean Boats Inspectors* *2 invasive species control field days coordinated with NCWMA*
• *Wildlife*		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	*Wildlife damage program* *Wetland restoration* *Moratorium on Cervid importation and raising*	*Wildlife Damage Program fully implemented* *1 ILF proposal edited and resubmitted* *Renew Cervid importation and raising moratorium*
• *Urban*		
Urban issues	*Stormwater education* *Stormwater drain inspection*	*14 stormwater drains with educational information added by them and inspected*
• *Watershed*		
Watershed strategies	*St. Louis River Watershed Planning* *St. Croix River Watershed Planning*	*2 St. Louis River 9 Key Element Plan meetings attended* *2 St. Louis Rive AOC meetings attended* *2 St. Croix River TMDL meetings attended*

Douglas County 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Other*

Other	*Land and Water Plan* *Non-metallic and frac sand mining* *Conservation Department promotion* *FPP inspections*	*2 CAC meetings held* *LWRM Plan approved* *1 Non-metallic mine remediation plan completed* *Attend 3 show/fairs to promote the department* *Develop system for tracking FPP* *Inspect 25% of FPP*

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits		
Manure storage construction and transfer systems		
Manure storage closure		
Livestock facility siting		
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	1	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control		
Shoreland zoning	10	
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	1	
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	*12*
For FPP	*10*
For NR 151	*2*
Animal waste ordinance	0
Livestock facility siting	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	14
Nonmetallic mining	1

Douglas County 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	0
Field days	3
Trainings/workshops	5
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	3
Newsletters	0
Social media posts	12
News release/story	3

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	1928 (Started 1/28/19)	$70,577
Technician	*2080*	*$69,678*
Support Costs	*N/A*	*$11,650*
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Ex. Bonding	*N/A*	*$20,000*
Ex. SEG	*N/A*	$0
Ex. MDV	*N/A*	*$0*

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM_____State of Wisconsin

DATE: **September 20, 2019**

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

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

Mary Anne Lowndes
Runoff Management Section, DNR

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

Recommended Action: This is an action item. Staff request that the Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB) recommend approval of the *2020 Joint Final Allocation Plan.*

Procedural Summary: On July 26, 2019, DATCP provided a link to the 2020 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan and Environmental Assessment (EA) to interested parties including county land conservation departments and current and former DATCP grant cooperators. Interested parties were advised of their opportunities to comment on the preliminary allocation including the option of submitting written comments by September 4, 2019. Two written comments were submitted regarding the DATCP or DNR allocations.

Allocation Summary: For 2020, DATCP and DNR will allocate a total of $20,716,440 for staffing, cost-sharing and cooperator grants. Table C of the joint final allocation summarizes all allocations, by grantee.

DATCP's final allocations make no changes to the allocations in the preliminary allocation. DNR's changes are documented in the two DNR scoring memoranda accompanying this cover memorandum.

Materials Provided:

- *DNR Scoring of Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2020 Funding*
- *DNR Scoring of Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2020 Funding*
- *2020 Joint Final Allocation Plan*
- *Environmental Assessment*

Presenters: Jennifer Heaton-Amrhein, DATCP; Mary Anne Lowndes, DNR

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

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

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

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

For 2020, a total of $20,716,440 is allocated based on the state budget for the 2019-21 biennium. Table C summarizes all allocations, by grantee. Organized by funding category, Chart 1 below summarizes grant fund requests, unmet funding requests, and allocation amounts. Chart 2 below shows the allocation categories by funding sources.

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

Chart 1: Grant Requests and Allocations

Funding Category	Total Requests	Unmet Requests	Allocation Amounts
DATCP ALLOCATIONS			
County Staff/Support	$17,626,768	$8,187,668	$9,439,100
County LWRM Cost-Share (B)	$7,975,750	$4,585,750	$3,390,000
Bond Cost-Share Reserve (B)	$300,000	$0	$300,000
LWRM Cost-Share (SEG)	$3,081,616	$994,884	$2,086,732
Project Contracts (SEG)	$1,046,250	$158,099	$888,151
NMFE Training Grants (SEG)	$ 350,117	$0	$350,117
SUBTOTAL	$30,380,501	$13,926,401	$16,454,100
DNR ALLOCATIONS			
UNPS Planning	$149,730	$85,000	$64,730
UNPS Construction	NA	NA	NA
TRM Construction	$ 2,697,610	$0	$2,697,610
NOD Reserve (B)			$ 1,500,000
SUBTOTAL	$ 2,847,340	$ 85,000	$ 4,262,340
TOTAL			$20,716,440

Abbreviations Used Above:

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

Chart 2: Funding Sources

Staff and Support Grants	
$6,411,900	DATCP SEG from s. 20.115(7)(qe)
$3,027,200	DATCP GPR from s. 20.115(7)(c)
$9,439,100	DATCP Subtotal
$64,730	DNR SEG from s. 20.370(6)(dq)
$143,063	DNR Sec. 319 Account (Federal)
$207,793	DNR Subtotal
$9,646,893	**TOTAL Staff & Support Grants**
Cost-Share Grants	
$3,390,000	DATCP Bond from s. 20.866(2)(we)
$300,000	DATCP Bond (Reserve) from s. 20.866(2)(we)
$2,086,732	DATCP SEG from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
$5,776,732	DATCP Subtotal
$3,139,585	DNR Bond Revenue from s. 20.866(2)(tf)
$0	DNR SEG from s. 20.370(6)(aq)
$914,962	DNR Sec. 319 Account (Federal)
$4,054,547	DNR Subtotal
$9,831,279	**TOTAL Cost-Share Grants**
Nutrient Management Farmer Education (NMFE) & Other Project Cooperator (OPC) Grants	
$350,117	DATCP SEG (NMFE) from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
$888,151	DATCP SEG (OPC) from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
$1,238,268	**TOTAL NMFE & Other Grants**
$20,716,440	**GRAND TOTAL**

Table A: DATCP Allocations

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

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

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

Table B: DNR Allocations					
County	Targeted Runoff Mgmt. BMP Construction	Local Assistance Funding for "Large Scale" TRM	Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. BMP Construction	Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. Planning	Total DNR Final Allocations
Adams	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Ashland	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Barron	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Bayfield	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Brown	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Buffalo	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Burnett	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Calumet	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Chippewa	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Clark	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Columbia	$326,789	$0	$0	$0	$326,789
Crawford	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Dane	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Dodge	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Door	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Douglas	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Dunn	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Eau Claire	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Florence	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Fond du Lac	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Forest	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Grant	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Green	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Green Lake	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Iowa	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Iron	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Jackson	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Jefferson	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Juneau	$127,500	$0	$0	$0	$127,500
Kenosha	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Kewaunee	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
LaCrosse	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Lafayette	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Langlade	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Lincoln	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Manitowoc	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

Table B: DNR Allocations					
County	Targeted Runoff Mgmt. BMP Construction	Local Assistance Funding for "Large Scale" TRM	Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. BMP Construction	Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. Planning	Total DNR Final Allocations
Marathon	$0	$0	$0	$64,730	$64,730
Marinette	$94,026	$0	$0	$0	$94,026
Marquette	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Menominee	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Milwaukee	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Monroe	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Oconto	$125,607	$0	$0	$0	$125,607
Oneida	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Outagamie	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Ozaukee	$225,000	$0	$0	$0	$225,000
Pepin	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Pierce	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Polk	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Portage	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Price	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Racine	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Richland	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Rock	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Rusk	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Saint Croix	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Sauk	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Sawyer	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Shawano	$225,000	$0	$0	$0	$225,000
Sheboygan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Taylor	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Trempealeau	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Vernon	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Vilas	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Walworth	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Washburn	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Washington	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Waukesha	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Waupaca	$884,625	$88,463	$0	$0	$973,088
Waushara	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Winnebago	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Wood	$546,000	$54,600	$0	$0	$600,600
DNR NR243 NOD Reserve					$1,500,000
Total	$2,554,547	$143,063	$0	$64,730	$4,262,340

Table C: Summary of DATCP and DNR Allocations

County	Staffing & Support from DATCP and DNR	Cost-Sharing from DATCP and DNR	Total Allocation of DATCP and DNR Funding
Adams	117,061	53,140	170,201
Ashland	112,248	72,990	185,238
Barron	131,582	94,850	226,432
Bayfield	115,626	92,490	208,116
Brown	153,004	46,330	199,334
Buffalo	115,814	72,120	187,934
Burnett	96,102	55,000	151,102
Calumet	149,871	83,260	233,131
Chippewa	183,659	104,750	288,409
Clark	136,301	131,620	267,921
Columbia	121,244	456,971	578,215
Crawford	108,509	64,100	172,609
Dane	188,043	147,120	335,163
Dodge	145,929	44,000	189,929
Door	143,964	78,990	222,954
Douglas	110,336	13,140	123,476
Dunn	179,594	68,000	247,594
Eau Claire	141,669	99,990	241,659
Florence	75,000	43,120	118,120
Fond du Lac	158,787	60,000	218,787
Forest	102,969	11,000	113,969
Grant	104,160	56,620	160,780
Green	143,560	84,350	227,910
Green Lake	159,436	87,490	246,926
Iowa	123,519	92,500	216,019
Iron	108,529	50,850	159,379
Jackson	131,124	86,100	217,224
Jefferson	179,819	50,285	230,104
Juneau	119,441	197,500	316,941
Kenosha	133,255	65,260	198,515
Kewaunee	149,985	72,990	222,975
LaCrosse	155,386	53,140	208,526
Lafayette	96,012	74,620	170,632
Langlade	92,890	85,260	178,150
Lincoln	85,451	19,140	104,591
Manitowoc	158,309	115,600	273,909
Marathon	208,745	170,850	379,595
Marinette	130,327	186,516	316,843
Marquette	133,415	107,220	240,635
Menominee	75,000	20,000	95,000
Milwaukee	75,000	20,000	95,000
Monroe	115,582	90,535	206,117

County	Staffing & Support from DATCP and DNR	Cost-Sharing from DATCP and DNR	Total Allocation of DATCP and DNR Funding
Oconto	142,662	181,707	324,369
Oneida	99,771	50,850	150,621
Outagamie	178,579	116,990	295,569
Ozaukee	140,281	338,390	478,671
Pepin	107,394	80,260	187,654
Pierce	141,006	80,600	221,606
Polk	162,030	36,250	198,280
Portage	148,425	64,350	212,775
Price	92,390	45,260	137,650
Racine	148,554	92,490	241,044
Richland	98,903	76,370	175,273
Rock	163,594	123,580	287,174
Rusk	112,153	68,140	180,293
Saint Croix	143,558	65,000	208,558
Sauk	142,660	106,850	249,510
Sawyer	93,194	48,000	141,194
Shawano	126,812	275,330	402,142
Sheboygan	152,280	72,870	225,150
Taylor	119,171	95,600	214,771
Trempealeau	131,181	159,350	290,531
Vernon	129,254	106,850	236,104
Vilas	125,100	33,080	158,180
Walworth	144,868	68,370	213,238
Washburn	106,151	51,260	157,411
Washington	136,558	47,220	183,778
Waukesha	176,709	31,220	207,929
Waupaca	223,425	1,045,725	1,269,150
Waushara	135,525	75,000	210,525
Winnebago	159,814	66,140	225,954
Wood	198,634	648,370	847,004
DATCP NR243 Res.	-	300,000	300,000
DNR NR243 Res.	-	1,500,000	1,500,000
Sub-Totals	$9,646,893	$9,831,279	$19,478,172
OTHER PROJECT FUNDING:			
Monroe County AEA Incentive Pilot		41,250	
UW CALS		580,000	
NMFE		350,117	
WLWCA/SOC		263,401	
Conservation Observation Day		3,500	
Sub-Totals			$1,238,268
TOTAL	$9,646,893	$11,069,547	$20,716,440

DATCP ALLOCATIONS

1. Staff and Support

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

A. Funds Available

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

B. Grant Awards

Grants are awarded using the following formula:

Tier 1

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

Tier 2

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

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

Unmet Need for Staff and Support Funds

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

Reallocation and Redirection

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

Future Funding Directions

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

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

2. Bond Revenue Cost-Sharing

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

A. Bond Funds Available

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

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

B. Grant Awards

Bond Reserve Projects

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

Landowner Cost-Sharing

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

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

Unmet Need for Bond Cost-Share Funds

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

expanded priorities reflected in new NR 151 targeted performance standards.

Future Funding Directions

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

3. SEG Fund Allocation

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

A. Funds Available

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

- A decrease of $750,000 as a result of a redirection of funds for producer-led watershed protection grants.
- A decrease of $350,000 for a DATCP reserve to develop a SWRM grant and conservation practice database or fund priorities that may include soil testing support, harvestable buffers, or other statewide conservation support needs.

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

Landowner Cost-Sharing

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

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

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

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

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

Group 2 (65-79 points)
Maximum Award: $75,000
Maximum awards in group: 3 of 7

Group 3 (50-64 points)
Maximum Award: $55,000
Maximum awards in group: 2 of 19

Group 4 (less than 50 points)
Maximum Award: $35,000
Maximum awards in group: 8 of 27

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

NMFE Training Grants

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

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

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

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

Statewide Projects: Nutrient Management Implementation Support, Cooperators

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Unmet Need for Cost-Share Funding

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

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

Future Funding Directions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table A-2: County Bond Cost-Share Awards

County	Bond				County	Bond			
	16-18 Cumulative Average Under-Spending*	2017 Census Acres**	16-18 Cumulative Total Dollars Spent***	Award		16-18 Cumulative Average Under-Spending*	2017 Census Acres**	16-18 Cumulative Total Dollars Spent***	Award
Adams	7.6%	117,206	$113,747	$33,140	Marathon	0.0%	473,147	$388,144	$75,850
Ashland	0.0%	52,428	$126,070	$52,990	Marinette	0.0%	133,068	$161,550	$57,490
Barron	0.1%	305,604	$131,996	$59,850	*Marquette*	3.9%	113,183	$100,688	$37,220
Bayfield	0.0%	81,041	$161,714	$57,490	*Menominee*	2.7%	290	$43,474	$20,000
Brown	6.2%	192,007	$84,873	$38,330	*Milwaukee*	0.0%	6,990	$1,050	$20,000
Buffalo	3.0%	293,130	$125,883	$52,120	Monroe	18.7%	300,659	$163,254	$40,535
Burnett	1.8%	89,237	$64,673	$25,000	*Oconto*	0.0%	189,898	$148,455	$56,100
Calumet	0.7%	153,858	$88,538	$43,260	Oneida	0.0%	34,670	$112,600	$50,850
Chippewa	1.5%	356,176	$117,790	$49,750	Outagamie	9.3%	236,963	$143,754	$41,990
Clark	2.6%	451,035	$182,770	$56,620	Ozaukee	0.0%	59,299	$258,711	$62,990
Columbia	0.0%	304,058	$194,130	$64,350	Pepin	0.5%	106,881	$108,198	$45,260
Crawford	0.3%	210,550	$115,052	$56,100	Pierce	0.0%	233,188	$195,318	$60,600
Dane	0.6%	506,688	$113,462	$52,120	Polk	14.3%	256,114	$110,264	$36,250
Dodge	12.2%	405,992	$61,181	$34,000	Portage	0.0%	280,410	$171,568	$64,350
Door	0.0%	114,508	$86,631	$50,990	Price	1.7%	89,203	$114,953	$45,260
Douglas	59.8%	69,759	$25,595	$13,140	Racine	0.0%	127,496	$187,133	$57,490
Dunn	8.1%	348,301	$144,609	$40,000	Richland	0.6%	220,843	$126,309	$48,370
Eau Claire	0.0%	172,256	$164,098	$57,490	Rock	3.8%	353,505	$158,852	$48,580
Florence	0.5%	18,609	$114,175	$43,120	Rusk	8.5%	136,062	$109,999	$33,140
Fond du Lac	4.8%	317,371	$162,339	$40,000	Saint Croix	2.1%	279,191	$63,416	$45,000
Forest	25.0%	38,084	$20,348	$11,000	Sauk	0.0%	298,906	$189,638	$64,350
Grant	3.2%	600,324	$194,971	$56,620	Sawyer	1.4%	46,009	$98,016	$40,000
Green	0.0%	292,368	$190,950	$64,350	Shawano	4.7%	247,241	$114,909	$40,330
Green Lake	0.0%	126,751	$176,359	$57,490	Sheboygan	0.7%	195,938	$190,563	$52,870
Iowa	1.6%	360,134	$99,358	$50,000	Taylor	0.0%	225,856	$198,601	$60,600
Iron	0.0%	9,200	$139,000	$50,850	*Trempealeau*	0.4%	329,916	$187,953	$64,350
Jackson	0.0%	248,342	$269,087	$66,100	Vernon	0.0%	337,086	$173,937	$64,350
Jefferson	19.1%	221,355	$86,945	$30,285	Vilas	5.3%	5,652	$92,283	$33,080
Juneau	0.1%	175,417	$79,632	$50,000	*Walworth*	1.5%	192,422	$147,119	$48,370
Kenosha	3.1%	77,782	$146,896	$45,260	Washburn	2.1%	73,773	$132,448	$45,260
Kewaunee	0.4%	170,405	$118,576	$52,990	Washington	5.1%	126,146	$126,285	$37,220
LaCrosse	8.1%	144,334	$128,328	$33,140	Waukesha	5.9%	97,460	$56,715	$31,220
Lafayette	1.2%	342,518	$125,188	$52,120	Waupaca	0.0%	201,603	$207,669	$66,100
Langlade	1.0%	116,386	$106,057	$45,260	Waushara	0.0%	135,306	$162,346	$50,000
Lincoln	25.3%	78,293	$81,615	$19,140	Winnebago	8.6%	162,052	$81,218	$31,140
Manitowoc	0.0%	231,609	$152,787	$60,600	Wood	1.8%	220,891	$149,182	$48,370
					TOTAL				**$3,390,000**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table A-3: County SEG Cost-Share Awards

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

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

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

DNR ALLOCATIONS

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

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

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

FUNDING SOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

1. TRM Final Allocation

The DNR allocates up to $2,697,610 to counties for cost sharing of TRM projects during calendar year 2020. This amount is adequate to fully fund the estimated state share of all seven eligible county Small-Scale TRM applications. Additionally, this amount is adequate to fully fund the estimated state share for the two eligible county Large-Scale TRM applications. As shown in Chart 1, there are no unmet needs for county TRM projects.

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

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

2. UNPS Final Allocation

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

PLANNING. There were two county applicants for UNPS-Planning grants for the 2020 award cycle. Table B contains a lump-sum allocation of $64,730 for the higher ranked of these two applications. The DNR will not solicit UNPS-Planning grant applications in 2020. These

grants will next be available in 2021 for 2022 grant awards. The maximum cost-share amount that can be awarded for a UNPS-Planning grant is $85,000

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

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

3. Notice of Discharge Program

A. Background

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

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

B. NOD Final Allocation

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

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

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

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

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

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

The DATCP portion of the final plan made no substantive changes from the preliminary allocation plan.

The DNR's portion of the final plan includes the following changes from the preliminary allocation plan:

- Updated Charts 1 and 2 to reflect currently available funding to County projects.
- Updated Tables B and C in the final plan to reflect DNR's funding decisions for county TRM and UNPS grant applications.

FINAL ACTION

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

Dated this ____day of _____, 2019

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

_____
Bradley Pfaff, Secretary

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

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2019

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

_____
Preston D. Cole, Secretary

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

I. The Nature and Purpose of the Proposed Action

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

II. The Environment Affected by the Proposed Action

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

III. Foreseeable Environmental Effects of the Proposed Action

A. Immediate Effects

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

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

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

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

Table A: Cost-Share Expenditure Comparison

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

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

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

B. Long-Term Effects

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

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

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

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

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

C. Direct Effects

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

D. Indirect Effects

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

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

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

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

E. Cumulative Effects

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. Those Directly Affected

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

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

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

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

B. Those Significantly Affected

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

V. Significant Economic and Social Effects of the Proposed Action

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VI. Controversial Issues Associated with the Proposed Action

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII. Possible Alternatives to the Proposed Action

A. Take No Action

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

B. Delay Action

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

C. Decrease the Level of Activity

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

D. Increase the Level of Activity

Available appropriations and authorizations determine the overall level of activity.

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

E. Change the Amounts Allocated to Some or All Recipients

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

VIII. Mitigation of Adverse Environmental Effects

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

IX. Final Determination

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

Date 9/9/2019 By Susan Mockert

Susan Mockert
Land and Water Resources Bureau
Agricultural Resource Management Division

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

Date 9/6/19 By S Walling

Sara Walling, Administrator
Agricultural Resource Management Division

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 20, 2019

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

FROM: Mary Anne Lowndes
Runoff Management Section, DNR

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

Recommended Action: DNR staff request that the Land and Water Conservation Board make recommendations on the DNR proposed funding of TRM applications.

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 being considered for CY 2020 grant funding. Scoring results for projects being considered for calendar year (CY) 2020 funding are presented in the attached tables.

Chapter NR 153, Wis. Adm. Code, which governs the TRM Grant Program, became effective on January 1, 2011, and includes four separate TRM project categories as noted below. Projects are scored and ranked against other projects in the same category. Based on available appropriations, the Department has $2,697,610 to fund CY 2020 TRM grants. Funds will be allocated among the four project categories. The maximum possible awards are $225,000 for Small-Scale projects and $1,000,000 for Large-Scale projects.

Scoring and Ranking Summary to Date:

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

- Five (5) applications were submitted and are eligible for grant consideration.
- Funding requests for the applications total $904,289.
- Based on available funding, the Department has allocated $904,289 to fund CY 2020 Small-Scale TRM projects. This will fully fund all 5 applications.

B. Small-Scale Non-TMDL

- Two (2) applications were submitted and are eligible for grant consideration.
- Funding requests for the applications total $219,633.
- Based on available funding, the Department has allocated $219,633 to fund the CY 2020 Small-Scale Non-TMDL TRM projects. This will fully fund both projects.

C. Large-Scale TMDL

- Two (2) applications were submitted and are eligible for consideration.
- Funding request for these applications total $1,573,688.
- Based on available funding, the Department has allocated $1,573,688 to fund the CY 2020 Large-Scale TMDL TRM projects. This will fully fund both projects.

D. Large-Scale Non-TMDL

- No applications were submitted in this category.

Printed on Recycled Paper

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.

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

Materials Provided:

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

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2020

Table 1. Small-Scale TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Region Boost	Total Eligible Project Costs	State Share Requested	Cumulative Requested
1	Ozaukee Co	Roden HFR CTR, LLC Zero Phosphorous Discharge	SER	118.0	Yes	$360,848	$225,000	$225,000
2	Shawano Co	Schmidt Ag Waste	NER	113.3	Yes	$373,836	$225,000	$450,000
3	Columbia Co	Dan and Bryan Guenther	SCR	100.1	Yes	$349,405	$150,000	$600,000
4	Juneau Co	Whispering Winds Farm LLC	WCR	98.5	Yes	$424,571	$127,500	$727,500
5	Columbia Co	Duane Ciciva	SCR	83.6	No	$197,675	$176,789	$904,289

Table 2. Small-Scale TMDL Project Applications

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

Table 3. Large-Scale TMDL Project Applications

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

Fully-funded state share

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

State of Wisconsin

DATE: September 20, 2019

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

FROM: Mary Anne Lowndes
Runoff Management Section, DNR

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

Recommended Action: DNR staff request that the Land and Water Conservation Board make recommendations on the DNR funding of UNPS-Planning applications.

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

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

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

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

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

- Thirty-two (32) applications were submitted; all are eligible for funding.
- Grant requests for the 32 applications total $1,708,086.
- Based on available funding, the Department has allocated $974,122 to fund the CY 2020 UNPS Planning projects. This will fully fund seventeen (17) of the 32 projects.

The attached table shows the current rank order of UNPS-Planning applications.

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

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

Printed on Recycled Paper

UNPS-Planning Grant Application Scoring by Rank for 2020

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

DRAFT

UNPS-Planning Grant Application Scoring by Rank for 2020

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

Fully-funded state share

Funding not available

DRAFT

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM_____State of Wisconsin

DATE: September 20, 2019

TO: Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors

FROM: Katy Smith, DATCP
Bureau of Land and Water Resources

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

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

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

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

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

La Crosse County held a public hearing on September 2, 2019, as a part of its public input and review process. The La Crosse County Land Conservation Committee will present the LWRM plan for County Board approval after receiving a recommendation for approval from the LWCB.

Materials Provided:

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

Presenters: Gregg Stangl, La Crosse County Conservationist

ARM-LWR-167 (August, 2017)

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

Land and Water Resource Management (LWRM)

LWRM Plan Review Checklist

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

County: La Crosse Date Plan Submitted for Review: 7/30/2019

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county convene a local advisory committee that included a broad spectrum of public interests and perspectives (such as affected landowners, partner organizations, government officials, educational institutions)	☒	☐	Pdf Pg 2

LCD, DNR, UWEX, NRCS, Land Use & Zoning, FSA, Planning and Development Comittee

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	8/18/2018
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan[1]	9/3/2019
3. Provide the date of county board approval of the plan, or the date the county board is expected to approve the plan after the LWCB makes its recommendation.[2]	10/17/19

III. RESOURCE ASSESSMENT AND WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the plan include the following information as part of a county-wide resource assessment:			
a. Soil erosion conditions in the county[3], including:			
i. identification of areas within county that have high erosion rates or other soil erosion problems that merit action within the next 10 years	☒	☐	Ch 3, P2-P13; CH3 P 27-28
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county[3], including:			

[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.

i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries *Map on Ch3, p2*	☒	☐	Ch 3, P2-P13
ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources *Map on Ch3, P19*	☒	☐	CH 3, P2-P13, 20-21
iii. identification of areas within the county that have water quality problems that merit action within the next 10 years.	☒	☐	See Ch3, p18-19
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	☒	☐	CH 3, PAGE 20
b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available	☒	☐	Ch 3, page 20-21
Other comments:			

IV. DNR CONSULTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county consult with DNR[4] to obtain water quality assessments, if available; to identify key water quality problem areas; to determine water quality objectives; and to identify pollutant load reduction targets, if any; and to review NR 151 implementation	☒	☐	P2
Other comments: Met with nonpoint source coordinator 8/20/18, strongly recommended LCD pursue implementation of 9 Key Elements Plan			

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	☒	☐	Ch 5, Page 1
b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan	☒	☐	Ch 4, CH 5, PAGE 1

[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.

c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations	☒	☐	CH 4, PAGE 3
d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems	☒	☐	CH 5, PAGES 13 (COUNTYWIDE), 14 (BOSTWICK CREEK)
e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	☒	☐	CH 5, PAGE 2
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 b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.	☒ ☒	☐ ☐	CH 1, PAGE 7; CH 3, PAGE 19; CH 5, PAGES 6-7, 13-14 CH 5, PAGE 6
3. Does the LWRM plan describe a priority farm strategy designed to make reasonable progress in implementing state performance standards and conservation practices on farms appropriately classified as a priority	☒	☐	CH 5, PAGE 2

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	☒	☐	CH 5, PAGE 6
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	☒	☐	CH 5, PAGE 11-12

Other comments: _____

VII. WORK PLANNING AND PROGRESS MONITORING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the county's most recent annual work plan[5] do both of the following:			
a. Provide measurable performance benchmarks	☒	☐	NA
b. Identify priorities	☒	☐	NA
2. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy and framework for monitoring county progress implementing its plan including methodology to track and measure progress in meeting performance benchmarks and plan objectives	☒	☐	CH 5, PAGES 13-14, CH 6, PAGE 3, CH 7, PAGE 1

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***: 9 KEY ELEMENTS PLAN FOR BOSTWICK CREEK IS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE***

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: Katie Smith Date: Rev 9/26/19

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

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

County: La Crosse

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.
   The La Crosse County Department of Land Conservation was able to complete conservation compliance assessments for 257 farms and 54,566 acres of cropland under the Farmland Preservation Program. This was accomplished between years 2015 and 2018. The planning process for the FPP assessments kept staff on schedule even with the retirement of our conservation planner in 2016. The new employee was able to continue with the conservation assessments and completed them on time.

   Our Department made a conserted effort during the years 2010 to 2018 to have more nutrient management acres planned throughout the County. With the assistance of DATCP cost share funds, we were able to develop plans for 309 farms and add 20,801 additional cropland acres to the nutrient management program. Early in our nutrient management initiative, farm operators were unable to secure soil sampling services as there were few agrinomic businesses in the county providing the service. To overcome the lack of soil sampling services, our Department applied for a Nutrient Management Farmer Education Grant from DATCP in 2014 and 2015. The intent of the grant was to conduct 4 field work shops to educate farm operators how to properly soil sample their own cropland. There were 23 farm operators who attended the field days. Each was given a soil probe to keep and a private sector Certified Crop Advisor, along with Department staff, provided information on how, where and when to properly conduct soil sampling.

   The Bostwick Creek Watershed in central La Crosse County has been discussed as a potential priority watershed project since 2016. Based on DNR aquatic biota studies and our Department's water quality monitoring data, Bostwick Creek appeared to be best positioned to show water quality and fisheries improvements if conservation measures were applied strategically to the landscape. Originally, the Land Conservation Department planned to apply for a DNR Targeted Resources Management Grant (TRM) in 2019 for Bostwick Creek but further consultation with DNR staff recommended an EPA 9 Key Elements Plan be written instead. The Bostwick Creek Watershed 9 Key Elements Plan was approved by the EPA and DNR in November of 2018 and is now better positioned to receive funding from DNR's competitive TRM grant program as well as being eligible to participate in DNR's Multi-Discharger Variance program for point source discharges.

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.

Much of the upland consevation practice installation has been much less than we have anticipated over the last 4 years. The recent farm economic down-turn has farmers either relunctant to participate in cost share programs or are exiting livestock farming altogether. According to the National Agricultural Statistics Service, there were 121 dairy farms in La Crosse County in 2007. In 2017, that number has dropped to 76 dairy farms. Many of these vacated dairy operations have become cash grain operations. Department staff has been working with these converted operations to ensure their soil and water conservation plans are meeting the agricultural performance standards in NR 151 and to retain their eligibility for the Farmland Preservation Program. La Crosse County is also an urbanizing county. New development for subdivisions, commercial properties and industrial complexes have been gradually extending outward of the City of La Crosse metro area converting agricultural land along the way. From 2010 to 2018, 1,400 acres of cropland were converted to non-agricultural uses. This new development requires Department staff to permit and monitor erosion control and stormwater runoff management activities on these construction sites.

Flash flood events in various parts of La Crosse County during 2011, 2014, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 have resulted in significant damage to public and private infrastructure as well as soil and water conservation practices. Staff have been occupied with site assessments for damage to previously installed conservation measures as well as newly developed erosion sites. Often the storm damage is of the magnitude that traditional conservation technical standards are insufficient to correct the problem. Local contractors are assiting local units of government and private citizens with storm clean-up and repairs to roads, driveways, culverts and buildings causing them to be unavailble for conservation work. Much of the planned construction projects over the past 4 years have had to be extended into the following year.

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?

La Crosse County's priority farm strategy focuses on those farm operators who participate in the State's Farmland Preservation Program (FPP). Currently, La Crosse County has issued 257 Certificates of Compliance for FPP participating landowners. These farm operations are given top priority for planning, technical and financial assistance in the following order;

Location within a targeted watershed
Non-compliant sites
Highest to lowest animal units relative to surface waters
Non-compliant sites within Water Quality Management Areas

The priority farms are contacted each year through the Department's annual conservation compliance certification requirement as well as the annual nutrient management plan update workshop. Any changes in their farm operation is collected at the nutrient management workshop and staff review those changes with the landowner to ensure that they comply with the soil and water conservation performance standards. If changes in a farm operation are compliant with conservation standards, those changes are recorded on the Department's GIS based tracking program. For those operational changes that may not be compliant with conservation standards, Department staff will recommend optional conservation measures that meet the conservation compliance requirements. Suggested corrective measures may be accompanied with cost share funding under DATCP's Soil and Water Resources Management Program, NRCS's Environmental Quality Incetives Program, DNR's Targeted Resources Management Program and Notice of Discharge Program or La Crosse County's Environmental Fund.

The Department of Land Conservation has had a water quality monitoring program in place since 1995. The monitoring program consists of a 24/7 monitoring station that captures water temperature, dissolved oxygen, total phosphorus, coliform bacteria, total suspended soilds, rainfall events and streamflow volumes. The monitoring station is located in the Dutch Creek Watershed, is centrally located in the County and is representative of land use practices in other county watersheds. The Department also utilizes a county-wide sampling scheme where all major sub-watersheds are sampled twice a year for total phosphorus, total suspended solids and coliform bacteria. The Department also conducts weekly water quality sampling on streams within targeted watersheds such as the Bostwick Creek Watershed. The data collected through this water quality monitoring program is used to determine wether applied BMP's are effectively improving water quality or whether a watershed is experiencing degraded water quality and needs to be assessed for conservation non-compliance practices. The County's priority farms are located in all sub-watersheds were water quality samples are collected. The Department also utilizes a landowner BMP tracking program to monitor conservation practice installation for compliance purposes.

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

The Department of Land Conservation has implemented its' LWRM plan and achieved the goals and objectives while staying the course with minimum deviation. Some of the additional activities conducted that were not listed in the current LWRM plan inclued:

1. In 2018, joined with the Health and Human Services Department to form a Nitrate Well Water Task Force and developed a Public Policy Proposal as a guiding document for the County Board of Supervisors.

2. In 2019, joined with the County Planner and UW-Extension Resource Agent to develop a Nutrient Trading Program with municipal waste water treatment facilities in La Crosse County.

3. Assisted private landowners, Emergency Management Department and Zoning, Planning and Land Information Office with storm damage and flooding in 2007, '08, '11, '14, '16, '17, '18 and 2019 as well as repairs to PL 566 Flood Control Structures #33 and #35 in 2018 and 2019.

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: 9/3/19

Signature of Authorized Representative: _____ **Date:** 9.3.17
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

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

La Crosse County 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	*Nutrient Management Farmer Training Workshop* Soil and Water Conservation Planning Conservation Plan Monitoring Sediment Delivery Modeling for Bostwick Creek (HUC 12)	*1 NM Farmer Training Workshop Conducted* *4 New Nutrient Management Plans Developed (399 acres)* *146 Nutrient Management Plans Revised (35,249 acres)* *24 Conservation Plans Monitored (FPP)* *Waterway Installation (3.7 acres)* *Grade Stabilization Structures Installed (2 units)* *1 Nine Key Elements Plan Approved (Bostwick Creek Watershed)*
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	*Conservation Practice Installation* *Phosphorus Runoff modeling in Bostwick Creek (HUC 12)* *ATCP 51 Application Review*	*Provided Technical Assistance for 10 Farms* *Manure Storage Structure Installation (1 unit)* *Animal Manure Management Ordinance Permits Issued (8)* *1 Nine Key Elements Plan Approved (Bostwick Creek Watershed)* *Reviewed 1 ATCP 51 Application (Morning Star Dairy)*
• *Water quality*		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	*Water Quality Monitoring Program Maintenance* *Water Quality Modeling for Bostwick Creek (HUC 12)* *Stormwater Management Demonstration Sites*	*Collected water samples for 37 watersheds in La Crosse County* *Replaced Water Quality Monitoring Station Flowmeter* *1 Nine Key Elements Plan (Bostwick Creek Watershed)* *Streambank Protection Installation (1,570 lineal feet rock rip rap)* *Installed 1 storm water demonstration project.*
• *Forestry*		
Forestry	*Manage Timber Harvest Cuts*	*No Harvest occurred in 2018*
• *Invasive*		
Invasive species	*Support Control Efforts on Mississippi River*	*Provide 6 hours of assistance to Wis. River Alliance*
• *Wildlife*		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	*N/A*	*0 Acres of wetland restored* *0 Number of trees sold*
• *Urban*		
Urban issues	*Stormwater control* *Construction site erosion control* *Public Information and Education*	*Reviewed 1 subdivision plat for Compliance w/ NR 151 & NR 216* *Reviewed Stormwater Plans for Commercial Sites (4 sites)* *Developed 112 Erosion Control Plans* *Issued 126 Erosion Control Permits* *Inspected 84 Construction Sites for Compliance* *Signed Information and Education contract with* ***New Ground***

La Crosse County 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	*Sediment Modeling (HUC 12)* *Maintain and Expand Water Quality Monitoring Program*	*Developed 1 Nine Key Elements Plan (Bostwick Creek Watershed)* *Added 1 water quality monitoring sonde* *Initiated Weekly Water Sampling in Bostwick Creek Watershed* *Updated Watershed Water Quality Ranking Table*

- *Other*

Other	*PL 566* *Non-metallic mining* *Groundwater Task Force – Attend 4 meetings*	*Inspected and mowed 2 PL 566 structures* *Replaced Internal Band on Structure #33 and Repaired Plunge Pool* *Inspected 14 active quarries (230 active acres)* *Attended 4 meetings of La Crosse County Groundwater Task Force* *Developed Groundwater Public Policy Recommendations Paper*

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	6	4
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	1	1
Manure storage closure	0	0
Livestock facility siting	1	1
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	150	150
Shoreland zoning	0	0
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	0	0
Other	0	0

La Crosse County 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	*50*
For FPP	*40*
For NR 151	*10*
Animal waste ordinance	6
Livestock facility siting	1
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	150
Nonmetallic mining	18

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

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

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
Department of Land Conservation Staff	14,430	$610,653.00
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Bonding	*N/A*	*$100,000*
SEG	*N/A*	*$20,000*
319	*N/A*	*$20,000*
County	*N/A*	*$40,000*

La Crosse County 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	*Nutrient Management Farmer Training* Soil and Water Conservation Planning (FPP) Gully Erosion Control Streambank Stabilization	*1 Nutrient Management Farmer Workshop* *4 New Nutrient Management Plans* *146 Updated Nutrient Management Plans* *600 acres of new soil and water conservation plans* *Monitor 62 FPP farms for compliance* *Install 4 Grade Stabilization Structures* *Install 2.5 acres of Grassed Waterways* *Install 1,200 feet of rock rip rap*
• *Livestock*		
Livestock	*Manure Management Practice Installation* *Monitor Livestock Compliance for FPP participants*	*Install 500 feet of Roof Gutters* *Install 1 Roofed Barnyard* *Install 1 Manure Storage Facility* *28 Livestock operations assessed for compliance*
• *Water quality*		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	*Maintain Water Quality Monitoring Program* *Groundwater Quality Planning*	*Repair and have operational Dutch Creek Monitoring Station* *Replace 1 Sonde lost in 2018 flooding* *Continue County-Wide surface water monitoring program* *Assist HHS with groundwater management plan*
• *Forestry*		
Forestry	*Maintain County Forest Diversity* *Maintain Woodland Recreational Opportunities*	*Schedule 1 timber harvest for Hoeth Forest* *Clear trails and maintain ski track in Bice Forest*
• *Invasive*		
Invasive species	*Continue to manage for aquatic invasive species on the Mississippi River and tributaries*	*Continue support to the Wisconsin River Alliance for an Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator*
• *Wildlife*		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	*Wetland restoration* *Wildlife damage program* *Tree and plant sales*	*Acres of wetland restored* *Number of trees sold*

La Crosse County 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Urban*

Urban issues	*Stormwater control* *Construction site erosion control* *Public Outreach and Information*	*Number of site visits – 15 stormwater 240 erosion control* *Number of plans reviews – 5 stormwater, 150 erosion control* *Number of permits issued – 5 stormwater, 130 erosion control* *Number of compliance issues resolved – 3 erosion control*

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	*Implement approved 9 Key Elements Plan for Bostwick Creek*	*Contact 120 landowners to begin Public Outreach Program* *Work with 3 key partners to assist with I & E development*

- *Other*

Other	*PL 566* *Non-metallic*	*Repair Emergency Spillway on CC# 35, Maintain CC# 33* *Inspect 18 active quarries for reclamation compliance*

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	5	5
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	1	1
Manure storage closure	0	0
Livestock facility siting	1	1
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	155	135
Shoreland zoning	0	0
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	0	0
Other	0	0

La Crosse County 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	*66*
For FPP	*62*
For NR 151	*4*
Animal waste ordinance	6
Livestock facility siting	1
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	255
Nonmetallic mining	18

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	0
Field days	1
Trainings/workshops	1
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	0
Newsletters	0
Social media posts	5
News release/story	3

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
Department of Land Conservation Staff	14,430	$609,543.00
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
DATCP Bond	*N/A*	*$48,400*
DATCP SEG	*N/A*	$20,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____State of Wisconsin

DATE: **September 17, 2019**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Langlade County held a public hearing on July 1, 2019, as part of its public input and review process. The Langlade County Land Conservation Committee presented the LWRM plan for County Board approval on July 30, 2019. The plan was approved.

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

Presenters: Molly McKay, Langlade County Conservationist
Dave Solin, Land Conservation Committee Chair

ARM-LWR-167 (August, 2017)

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

Land and Water Resource Management (LWRM)

LWRM Plan Review Checklist

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

County: Langlade Date Plan Submitted for Review: 6/13/2019

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Yes	No	Page
1. Did the county convene a local advisory committee that included a broad spectrum of public interests and perspectives (such as affected landowners, partner organizations, government officials, educational institutions)	☒	☐	9

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	1-22-19; & 3-11-19
2. Provide the date the county held a public hearing on the LWRM plan[1]	July 1, 2019
3. Provide the date of county board approval of the plan, or the date the county board is expected to approve the plan after the LWCB makes its recommendation.[2]	July or Oct 2019

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	☒	☐	16,18-19
b. Water quality conditions of watersheds in the county[3], including:			
i. location of watershed areas, showing their geographic boundaries	☒	☐	Map 5, p.56
ii. identification of the causes and sources of the water quality impairments and pollutant sources	☒	☐	19-20

[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.	☒	☐	19,20, 27,28
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	☒	☐	19-21
b. pollutant load reduction targets for the watersheds, if available	☒	☐	Att E
Other comments:			

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

V. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan include the following implementation components: :			
a. A voluntary implementation strategy to encourage adoption of farm conservation practices	☒	☐	31
b. State and local regulations used to implement the plan	☒	☐	31-33, 40
c. Compliance procedures that apply for failure to implement the conservation practices in ATCP 50, ch. NR 151 and related local regulations	☒	☐	40
d. Relevant conservation practices to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions and to address identified water quality and erosion problems	☒	☐	Att D
e. A system for meeting county responsibilities to monitor the compliance of participants in the farmland preservation program	☒	☐	32, 40
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	☒	☐	39
	☒	☐	39

[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.

b. the staff time needed to provide technical assistance and education and outreach to implement the plan.			
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	☒	☐	31

Other comments:

VI. OUTREACH AND PARTNERING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy to provide information and education on soil and water resource management, conservation practices and available cost-share funding	☒	☐	43
2. Does the LWRM plan describe coordination activities with local, state and federal agencies?	☒	☐	44

Other comments: __

___

VII. WORK PLANNING AND PROGRESS MONITORING	Yes	No	Page
1. Does the county's most recent annual work plan[5] do both of the following:			
a. Provide measurable performance benchmarks	☒	☐	NA
b. Identify priorities	☒	☐	NA
2. Does the LWRM plan describe a strategy and framework for monitoring county progress implementing its plan including methodology to track and measure progress in meeting performance benchmarks and plan objectives	☒	☐	41-42

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 8, 2019

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

County: Langlade

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.

   Goal 1: Protect and improve surface and groundwater quality.
   Formed Grazing Network to promote managed grazing to local farmers. (2018)
   Provided free, annual nutrient management training for farmers and landowners to develop their own nutrient management plans. (Annually)
   Revised Manure Storage Ordinance. (2018)
   Obtained DNR Lake Protection Grants to fund shoreland work throughout the county. (2015 – 2019)
   Planning Process: The LWRM plan helped us to identify actions to take and gave us a springboard for new ideas to implement those objectives. The grazing network was not a specific activity in the Plan but was grown out of the objective to provide information about grazing. The LWRM was also used as a tool to justify applications for grant funds from DNR and improved our ranking on those applications.

   Goal 2: Promote Working Forests and Farms
   Assisted with the establishment of a new Agricultural Enterprise Area in Langlade County, the Evergreen/Wolf River Agricultural Enterprise Area. (2016)
   Added a new Farmland Preservation Overlay zoning district to make 1,000s of acres of new farmland and forestland available for the Farmland Preservation Tax Credit. (2015)
   Spot checked active participants in the Farmland Preservation Program. (~67 Annually)
   Planning Process: The LWRM provided specific actions for us to bring about these accomplishments. The Plan activity C.1 led to the identification of the ability to create the Overlay district, a great success for increasing enrollment. The Plan also guided our actions.

   Goal 3: Control Invasive Species
   Employed seasonal staff to work on invasive species work. (2015, 2016, 2018)
   Inventoried roadways for invasive species populations. (2015 & 2016)
   Installed boot brushes and wader cleaners at water body access points. (2018)
   Planning Process: All of the above activities were achieved using grant funds. The LWRM plan gave us justification for our applications for grants to fund these activities. It also enhanced partnerships that led to actions.

Goal 4: Protect public health from unwanted chemical waste
Hosted Clean Sweep Hazardous Household Waste Collection event. (2016 & 2018)
Partnered with the Health Department to hold prescription drug collection event. (2016 & 2018)
Planning Process: The LWRM planning process set the goals of hosting the events and was used to justify applications for funding the projects as well as the use of county funds to cover a portion of the expenses.

Goal 5: Develop online presence for public education
Established new Land Conservation Department website with ability to update to reflect current information. (2017)
Planning Process: The process identified this as a goal that could be presented when making decisions about the set-up for a new webpage. It allowed us to have more control over the page and made it more useful.

Goal 6: Improve forest silviculture for multiple uses
Worked with DNR to make county owned tree planter available to landowners. (2017)
Planning Process: Review of the plan after change of staff helped us to identify this as partnership to revitalize. The planters had been lost track of but are now in use.

Goal 7: Manage wildlife conflicts
Participated in County Deer Advisory Committee to provide input on deer harvest objectives. (Annually)
Planning Process: While this was not an identified action in the LWRM, the Plan identifies providing input to the DNR on wildlife harvest objectives. Because of the Objective in the plan we were able to see how participation fit into our work when the opportunity arose.

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.

   One area of work plan activities that we often see "less than anticipated" results in the annual report is regarding specific conservation practice installation. Because our department's technical assistance has been growing over the past years – having a technician after not having one in the past – we have had to work on developing relationships to grow that area of our work. Instead of refocusing planned activities we are setting the goals and then trying to reach out to more landowners in the hopes of improving participation. We also know that once our staff has been working in the current roles for more years we will better be able to plan for activities. Experience will help us know what to anticipate.

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 highest priority farms are those with valid citizen complaints against them. When we have a complaint we contact the farmer and identify actions that can be taken to resolve the issue. When a farm has been identified as a priority we are more likely to be able to use multiple funding sources. We always try to identify what grants are available in addition to our department grants (i.e. SWRM). This often means TRM or NOD funds. We also partner with EQIP funds whenever possible. Another farm that is high on the list of priorities is a farm in the FP program that is not in compliance. It is easy to identify these farms as they are spot checked every four years. Because practices are often required to keep them in compliance with FP it is important that we fund them and therefore important that we have them high on the priority farms list. We can see the effectiveness of this strategy because as we improve our spot checks system and meet with more farmers more implementation of practices is getting done.

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

   The changes in the LWRM plan can be seen in the changing of the prioritization of goals. These shifts are representative of the committees changing awareness of issues. Staff were surprised to see that many people ranked the invasive species goal highly, bumping it up to #2. "Promote stewardship of the land and water through public education" moved up on the list of priorities as well, from #5 to #4. There seems to be greater acknowledgement that education is vital to our work.

   The invasive species goal was changed from "Control Invasive Species" in the previous work plan to "Mitigate invasive species impacts". This is representative of how the fight against invasive species has changed and the realistic view that not all invasive species can be controlled. A big part of invasive species work is now mitigation. As you work through the plan you may notice that there are many places where there are slight changes in languages that we hope will better express the work that is being done or we hope to do.

   Another adjustment to objectives and activities was the addition under "Promote working forests and farms" of "Develop a plan to improve pollinator health countywide." Pollinator health has been an issue that has been coming to the attention of the public and the connection to our work to preserve farmland is clarified with this item.

   Overall, we believe that the work put into this revision makes the plan more relevant, specific to county issues, and strategic in its wording. We hope to continue to move in this direction.

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:

Signature of Authorized Representative: David J. Solin **Date:** 8-5-19
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

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

LANGLADE 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)	PROGRESS
• *Cropland*			
Assist farmers with managed grazing planning and education for soil health Goal 2, Objective K	• Partner with NRCS and UWEX to host pasture walk in the area (4 expected) • Provide grazing literature for farmers in the office • Produce grazing plan for farmers (1 expected) • Install practices to implement grazing plan (2 expected)	# of pasture walks held in county # of plans developed # of practices installed to implement plan	4 pasture walks held 1 grazing plan installed 5 practices installed
Farm inspections to implement state performance standards Goal 1, Objective A, B	Control of soil erosion on agricultural lands: FPP Spot checks are the main tool to monitor soil erosion in agricultural field's county wide. • FPP Spot check approximately ¼ of all participants in the program (about 65) • New FPP program participants (expect 10+ new participants) • New compliance certificates issues (expect 10+ new participants) • Annual self-certification for conservation compliance (approximately 260 certificates)	Spot checks are the main tool to monitor soil erosion in agricultural fields. # of inspections performed # of compliance certificates, compliance schedules, or letters issued # of compliance certificate ID #s issued	64 inspections completed 7 new FPP participants 44 updated, corrected, or newly issued COCs 207 Self Certifications completed and returned to office
Maintain tracking system for Certificate of Compliance and FPP landowners Goal 2, Objective B	Maintain database to track certificates of compliance. Update tracking system to include farm inspection history (264 records updated for past five years)	Database kept current. # of records updated	271 records maintained
Cropland conservation practices installed to implement state performance standards and prohibitions Goal 1, Objective A, E	• Training for conservation technician to gain knowledge to implement state performance standards and prohibitions • Cropland practices installed: i.e. Grassed waterways, critical area stabilization, NMPs (2 expected) • Technical assistance for NMP Farmer Training	# of acres of practices installed # of units of practices installed # lbs of P reduced # of sediment reduced # acres of cropland in compliance with performance standards	2 technical training attended 3 NMPs cost shared 1 NMP Farmer Training held 6 Farmers attended

LANGLADE 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Certificates of Compliance for the Farmland Preservation Program Goal 2, Objective B, C	• All new Certificates of Compliance (COC) will be issued a unique ID number (10 new expected) • COCs will be mailed to landowners for use when filing for FP tax credits (20 expected) • DATCP will be updated as acreage changes and new numbers are issued	# of certificates issued and updated as reported to DATCP	7 new FPP participants received certificates 44 updated corrected or newly issued COCs Updates sent to DATCP
FPP: AEA agreements and applications Goal 2 Objective B, C	• Assist landowners with applications for new agreements within the two AEAs (3 expected) • Assist DATCP with descriptions and exceptions for new AEA agreements (3 expected)	# of new applications submitted for the AEAs	2 new applications submitted for AEAs 2 agreements assisted with
Nutrient Management Goal 1 Objective B, D, E, J	• Farmer training session for Nutrient Management (1 expected) • Farmer training session for SnapPlus2 (1 expected) • Apply for NMFE Grant (1 application submitted) • Use of SEG funds for Nutrient Management (1,000 acres funded) • Submit NMP Checklists (140 checklists submitted) • Review Nutrient Management plans submitted to LCD • Record NMP and acres planned	# of acres receiving SEG funds for NMPs # of farmers attending training sessions # of NMP acres reported to LCD # of NMP checklists submitted to DATCP	1 Farmer Training held for Nutrient Management 1 SnapPlus session held 1 NMFE Grant application submitted and received 65 NMPs checklists 956 Acres NMP funded through SEG

- *Livestock*

Livestock facility conservation practices installed to implement state performance standards and prohibitions Goal 1 Objective D, E, J, K	• Provide technical assistance in design and/or preparation/oversight of project that will implement state performance standards & prohibitions (3 expected) • Create grazing plan for livestock facility (1 expected)	# of staff hours expended for design and installation Type and units of practices installed Amount of cost-share dollars spent # lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method) # of livestock facilities in compliance with a performance standard	8 practices designed and/or installed to implement performance standards and prohibitions 1 grazing plan created
Permits issued or obtained in connection with practices installed Goal 1, Objective D	• CAFO County manure storage permit(s) issued (1 expected) • Non-CAFO County manure storage permit(s) issued (2 expected)	# of staff hours # of permits issued or obtained	1 CAFO Permit for Manure Storage issued 0 non-CAFO permits
Connect landowners with state and federal funds for livestock facility performance standards Goal 1, Objective C, D, E	• Encourage landowner participation in EQIP programs • Provide assistance to eligible landowners in need of TRM or NOD funding from the State	# of landowners working with NRCS as a result of connection # of TRM or NOD grants submitted with County assistance Types and units of practices installed as a result of grant/EQIP funding	2 landowners partnering on EQIP/County projects 0 TRM or NOD requests

LANGLADE 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Water quality*

Groundwater protection through education and promotion of best management practices Goal 1, Objective C, K	• Provide literature about ground water protection to landowners (5 pieces available in office) • Meet with landowners on-site to discuss possible options for practices and protection activities • Distribute newsletter to landowners (4 expected)	# of pieces of literature made available # of practices installed to address groundwater protection # of newsletters distributed	5 pieces of literature available 12 landowner site visits 6 newsletters/email blasts sent out
Groundwater protection practices installed to meet BMPs and performance standards Goal 1, Objective C, E, F	• Provide cost-sharing for groundwater protection through well decommissioning and other practices which may be addressed in other categories (2 expected) • Provide technical assistance for design of practices (2 expected)	# of practices installed Type and units of practices installed	0 Wells decommissioned (no requests for funding)
Groundwater tests for landowners with private wells Goal 1, Objective C, F	• Make available well water test kits for landowners • Connect landowners to additional groundwater testing resources	# of test kits distributed	20 water test kits distributed
Promotion of shoreland buffer zone practices to protect surface water resources Goal 1, Objective G	• Work with local lake districts/associations on promotion of practices (6 meetings/events expected) • Assist in maintaining buffer demonstration sites (4 demo sites worked on) • Promotion of Lake Protection Grant shoreland plant sale (20 orders expected) • Technical assistance and cost-share for shoreland restoration activities (2 expected) • Provide native planting lists and resources	# of lake district/association events attended # of demo sites worked on # of orders through plant sale # of restoration completed Type of shoreland practices and units installed # of resources distributed to landowners	6 Lake Association meetings attended 4 demo sites worked on 16 plant orders 2 shoreland restorations cost shared & designed
Reduce pollution from stormwater runoff on developed sites Goal 1, Objective L	• Provide information on rain gardens and rain barrels • Work with local governments on stormwater management (2 local governments expected)	# of local units of government contacted/worked with # of rain gardens designed or installed Types and numbers of educational materials provided	Rain garden brochures made available 0 requests from local government to assist with stormwater management
Support Producer-led Watershed Protection group(s) Goal 1, Objective A, B, C	• Work with local producer-led group on implementation of their watershed protection goals • Work with any new groups interested in forming a producer led group within the County (1 group expected) • Work with producer group on grant submittal (1 grant expected)	# of practices installed by producer-led groups Types and units of practices installed # of lbs of P reduced by installation of practices # of lbs of sediment reduced by installed practices # of new grants submitted/obtained	1 Farmer led group assisted with events 0 grants submitted by group

LANGLADE 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Forestry*

Promote economically viable forest lands Goal 2, Objective A	• Provide technical assistance to local governments to help implement comprehensive plans • Promote involvement in Managed Forest Law program • Promote preservation of large tracts of forest land through farmland preservation zoning overlay (1,000 acres preserved expected)	# of landowners assisted with MFL # of units of government assisted # of acres preserved	2 meetings attended to develop new comprehensive plan 250 acres of forest land in FP overlay added
Promote BMPs for forest practices to address resource concerns on forested land Goal 2, Objective A	• Provide technical assistance for forestry related practices (i.e. access roads and stream crossings) (1 expected) • Provide cost-share assistance for forest practices that address resource concerns (1 expected)	# of practices installed Amount of cost-share dollars spent on forest related practices # of lbs of sediment reduction (using any approved method)	0 forestry related practices installed/designed
Improve forest management to control sediment, erosion and protect habitat cover types Goal 6, Objective A	• Promote use of county owned tree planters • Encourage teacher use of K-12 Forestry Education (LEAF) educational programs • Promote reforestation of open lands	# of rentals of tree planter # of teachers contacted about forestry programs Acres of open lands reforested	Worked with DNR to streamline tree planter rental 3 rentals of tree planter 1 school forest day attended

- *Invasive*

Control/manage spread of aquatic and terrestrial invasive species Goal 3, Objective A, B	• Survey locations with invasive species reports (4 expected) • Work with forestry and highway department to continue surveys of public lands and right-of-ways • Provide support to local CISMA for control of invasive species • Connect landowners with invasive species control and site treatments • Keep record of invasive species reports • Work with local lakes groups to raise gallarucella beetles for purple loosestrife control • Employ seasonal employee funded through Lumberjack grant to work with lakes groups on beetle raising and other invasive species projects.	# of surveys completed Acres of county forest land and right-of-ways treated # of sites on private land treated # of landowners contacted # of new invasive species records/reports # of pots of beetles raised and released	6 reports surveyed 8 CISMA meetings attended 6 landowners worked with on control options 6 new reports logged on IS map 48 pots of Galerucella beetles released 1 seasonal employee hired through Lumberjack 1 DNR Rapid Response grant applied for and received
Invasive species information and education programming Goal 3, Objective A, B	• Conduct educational programming for local schools, youth groups, 4H groups, and community groups (10 programs expected) • Make educational materials available in the office • Provide invasive species resources to check-out	# of programs conducted # of educational materials distributed # of times resources are used in the classroom	8 public programs conducted 1 invasive species education kit created

LANGLADE 2018 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Wildlife*

Mitigate wildlife conflicts with producers Goal 7, Objective A	• Provide technical assistance to agricultural producers (10 expected) • Contract with USDA-APHIS for wildlife control and abatement (6 wildlife damage claims expected) • Participate in venison donation program (3 deer donations expected)	# of producers assisted # of wildlife damage claims # of deer donated to venison donation program Approval of wildlife damage crop prices and claims	9 wildlife damage claims submitted 8 deer donations received

- *Watershed*

Participate in TMDL development for Wolf River and Wisconsin River Watersheds Goal 1, Objective A, B	Work with TMDL development and implementation in both watersheds within the county (2 meetings attended)	# of meetings attended # of contacts made and partnerships developed Amount of data contributed to TMDL modeling	2 TMDL meetings attended

- *Other*

Organize Hazardous Waste Clean Sweep: agricultural and household waste Goal 4, Objective A	• Hold Clean Sweep event (1 event held) • Promote 2018 Clean Sweep event (200 post cards sent) • Provide educational materials about proper disposal of hazardous waste (4 handouts developed)	Amount of grant funds secured # of educational materials distributed # of landowners informed of upcoming event # of events held	$14,985 grant funds secured 1 Clean Sweep event held 3 new handouts created 13,646 pounds hazardous waste collected
Update online presence for Land Conservation Department and develop online education presence Goal 5, Objective A	• Continue to update new website • Provide information about LWRM plan on website • Provide links to other organizational resources • Provide list of contacts for resource professionals	Website developed LWRM plan provided # of links to resources # of contacts provided	1 new website created 1 page dedicated to LWRM info and access 1 page dedicated to "resources"

LANGLADE 2018 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	Actuals
Feedlot permits	NA	NA	NA
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	3	2	1
Manure storage closure	1	1	0
Livestock facility siting	NA	NA	NA
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	NA	NA	NA
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	1	NA	NA
Shoreland zoning	NA	NA	NA
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	3	NA	2
Other			

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned	
Total Farm Inspections	*70*	*67*
For FPP	*65*	*64*
For NR 151	*5*	*3*
Animal waste ordinance	4	1
Livestock facility siting	NA	NA
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	NA	NA
Nonmetallic mining	NA	NA

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number	
Tours	2	1
Field days	4	6
Trainings/workshops	3	9
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	10	4
Newsletters	4	2
Social media posts	0	NA
News release/story	4	11

LANGLADE COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of "planned activities" in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
• *Cropland*		
Assist farmers with managed grazing planning and education for soil health Goal 2, Objective K	• Partner with NRCS and UWEX to host pasture walk in the area (4 expected) • Provide grazing literature for farmers in the office • Produce grazing plan for farmers (2 expected) • Install practices to implement grazing plan (3 expected)	# of pasture walks held in county # of plans developed # of practices installed to implement plan
Farm inspections to implement state performance standards Goal 1, Objective A, B	Control of soil erosion on agricultural lands: FPP Spot checks are the main tool to monitor soil erosion in agricultural field's county wide. • FPP Spot check approximately ¼ of all participants in the program (about 67) • New FPP program participants (expect 10+ new participants) • New compliance certificates issues (expect 10+ new participants) • Annual self-certification for conservation compliance (approximately 270 certificates)	Spot checks are the main tool to monitor soil erosion in agricultural fields. # of inspections performed # of compliance certificates, compliance schedules, or letters issued # of compliance certificate ID #s issued
Maintain tracking system for Certificate of Compliance and FPP landowners Goal 2, Objective B	Maintain database to track certificates of compliance. • Update tracking system to include farm inspection history (67 records updates will be made post-farm inspection)	Database kept current. # of records updated
Cropland conservation practices installed to implement state performance standards and prohibitions Goal 1, Objective A, E	• Training for conservation technician to gain knowledge to implement state performance standards and prohibitions • Cropland practices installed: i.e. Grassed waterways, critical area stabilization, NMPs (2 practices, 2000 acres expected) • Technical assistance for NMP Farmer Training and plan updating (10 farmers/landowners expected)	# of acres of practices installed # of units of practices installed # of farmers/landowners assisted
Certificates of Compliance for the Farmland Preservation Program Goal 2, Objective B, C	• New Certificates of Compliance (COC) will be issued a unique ID number (10 new expected) • COCs will be mailed to landowners for use when filing for FP tax credits (20 expected)	# of certificates issued and updated as reported to DATCP

LANGLADE COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

	• Updates to COCs as properties change hands or ownership entities change (15 updates as ownership changes) • DATCP will be updated as acreage changes and new numbers are issued	
FPP: AEA agreements and applications	• Assist landowners with applications for new agreements within the two AEAs (3 expected)	# of new applications submitted for the AEAs
Nutrient Management Goal 1 Objective B, D, E, J	• Farmer training session for Nutrient Management Education (1 expected) • Farmer training session for SnapPlus2 (1 expected) • Apply for NMFE Grant (1 application submitted) • Use of SEG funds for Nutrient Management (1,000 acres funded) • Submit NMP Checklists (140 checklists submitted) • Review Nutrient Management plans submitted to LCD (140 NMPS reviewed) • Record NMP and acres planned	# of acres receiving SEG funds for NMPs # of farmers attending training sessions # of NMP acres reported to LCD # of NMP acres reviewed # of NMP checklists submitted to DATCP

- *Livestock*

Livestock facility conservation practices installed to implement state performance standards and prohibitions Goal 1 Objective D, E, J, K	• Provide technical assistance in design and/or preparation/oversight of project that will implement state performance standards & prohibitions (3 projects expected) • Create grazing plan for livestock facility (1 expected)	# of staff hours expended for design and installation Type and units of practices installed # lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method) # of livestock facilities in compliance with a performance standard
Permits issued or obtained in connection with practices installed Goal 1, Objective D	• CAFO County manure storage permit(s) issued (1 expected) • Non-CAFO County manure storage permit(s) issued (2 expected)	# of staff hours # of permits issued or obtained
Connect landowners with state and federal funds for livestock facility performance standards Goal 1, Objective C, D, E	• Encourage landowner participation in EQIP programs (4 landowners expected) • Provide assistance to eligible landowners in need of TRM or NOD funding from the State (as needed)	# of landowners working with NRCS as a result of connection # of TRM or NOD grants submitted with County assistance Types and units of practices installed as a result of grant/EQIP funding

- *Water quality*

Groundwater protection through education and promotion of best management practices Goal 1, Objective C, K	• Provide literature about ground water protection to landowners (5 pieces available in office) • Meet with landowners on-site to discuss possible options for practices and protection activities (1 expected) • Distribute newsletter to landowners (4 expected)	# of pieces of literature made available # of practices installed to address groundwater protection # of newsletters distributed

LANGLADE COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Groundwater protection practices installed to meet BMPs and performance standards Goal 1, Objective C, E, F	• Provide cost-sharing for groundwater protection through well decommissioning and other practices which may be addressed in other categories (2 expected) • Provide technical assistance for design of practices (2 expected)	# of practices installed Type and units of practices installed
Groundwater tests for landowners with private wells Goal 1, Objective C, F	• Make available well water test kits for landowners (10 kits expected) • Connect landowners to additional groundwater testing resources • Develop plan for extensive, County-wide, groundwater testing program (1 plan developed) • Identify funding sources for program	# of test kits distributed Plan developed
Promotion of shoreland buffer zone practices to protect surface water resources Goal 1, Objective G	• Work with local lake districts/associations on promotion of practices (6 meetings/events expected) • Assist in maintaining buffer demonstration sites (4 demo sites worked on) • Technical assistance and cost-share for shoreland restoration activities (2 expected) • Provide native planting lists and resources • Implement Shoreland Habitat Monitoring Protocol (4 lakes surveyed) • Promote Healthy Lakes grants to lakes groups (4 presentations on grant program)	# of lake district/association events attended # of demo sites worked on # of restoration completed Type of shoreland practices and units installed # of resources distributed to landowners # of lakes surveyed # of presentations given
Reduce pollution from stormwater runoff on developed sites Goal 1, Objective L	• Provide information on rain gardens and rain barrels (10 pieces of literature distributed) • Work with local governments on stormwater management (1 local governments expected)	# of local units of government contacted/worked with # of rain gardens designed or installed Types and numbers of educational materials provided
Support Producer-led Watershed Protection group(s) Goal 1, Objective A, B, C	• Work with local producer-led group on implementation of their watershed protection goals (12-digit HUC Code: 070700021102) • Work with producer-led group on establishment of cover-crop research trial (1 trial plot planted) • Work with producer-led group to host field days (2 field days expected) • Collaborate with UW Discovery Farms and Producer-led group on trial stations in Langlade Co. (2 monitoring stations established)	# of practices installed by producer-led groups # of research plots established # of field days held # of monitoring stations

- *Forestry*

Promote economically viable	Provide technical assistance to local governments to help implement comprehensive plans (1 assisted)	# of units of government assisted # of acres preserved

forest lands Goal 2, Objective A	Promote involvement in sustainable forest management plans Promote preservation of large tracts of forest land through farmland preservation zoning overlay (1,000 acres preserved expected)	
Promote BMPs for forest practices to address resource concerns on forested land Goal 2, Objective A	Provide technical assistance for forestry related practices (i.e. access roads and stream crossings) (3 expected) Provide cost-share assistance for forest practices that address resource concerns (2 expected)	# of practices installed Amount of cost-share dollars spent on forest related practices # of lbs of sediment reduction (using any approved method)
Improve forest management to control sediment, erosion and protect habitat cover types Goal 6, Objective A	Promote use of county owned tree planters (3 rentals expected) Encourage teacher use of K-12 Forestry Education (LEAF) educational programs (3 teachers contacted) Promote reforestation of open lands	# of rentals of tree planter # of teachers contacted about forestry programs Acres of open lands reforested

- *Invasive*

Control/manage spread of aquatic and terrestrial invasive species Goal 3, Objective A, B	• Survey locations with invasive species reports (10 expected) • Work with forestry and highway department to continue surveys of public lands and right-of-ways (40 acres treated) • Provide support to local CISMA for control of invasive species (6 meetings attended) • Connect landowners with invasive species control and site treatments (6 landowners assisted) • Keep record of invasive species reports (10 expected) • Work with local lakes groups to raise *gallarucella* beetles for purple loosestrife control (40 pots raised and released)	# of surveys completed # Acres of county forest land and right-of-ways treated # of sites on private land treated # of landowners contacted # of new invasive species records/reports # of pots of beetles raised and released
Invasive species information and education programming Goal 3, Objective A, B	• Conduct educational programming for local schools, youth groups, 4H groups, and community groups (10 programs expected) • Make educational materials available in the office (60 pamplets distributed) • Provide invasive species resources to check-out	# of programs conducted # of educational materials distributed # of times resources are used in the classroom

- *Wildlife*

Mitigate wildlife conflicts with producers Goal 7, Objective A	• Provide technical assistance to agricultural producers (10 expected) • Contract with USDA-APHIS for wildlife control and abatement (10 wildlife damage claims expected)	# of producers assisted # of wildlife damage claims # of deer donated to venison donation program Approval of wildlife damage crop prices and claims # Quota setting activities engaged in

	• Participate in venison donation program (8 deer donations expected) • Participate in deer quota setting through CDAC (2 meetings attended)	

- *Watershed*

Participate in TMDL development for Wolf River and Wisconsin River Watersheds Goal 1, Objective A, B	• Work with TMDL development and implementation in both watersheds within the county (2 meetings attended) • Connect with DNR staff to begin utilizing phosphorous reduction goals (2 contacts made)	# of meetings attended # of contacts made and partnerships developed Amount of data contributed to TMDL modeling

- *Other*

Organize Hazardous Waste Clean Sweep: agricultural and household waste Goal 4, Objective A	• Submit grant request for 2020 Clean Sweep Event (1 grant submitted) • Plan for 2020 Clean Sweep event (1 event planned) • Provide educational materials about proper disposal of hazardous waste (4 handouts developed) • Provide educational opportunities for household waste reduction strategies (1 event held)	Amount of grant funds secured # of educational materials distributed # of landowners informed of upcoming event # of events held
Update online presence for Land Conservation Department and develop online education presence Goal 5, Objective A	• Continue to update new website • Provide information about LWRM plan on website • Provide links to other organizational resources (3 new links identified and provided) • Provide list of contacts for resource professionals (1 new list added to webpage)	Website developed LWRM plan provided # of links to resources # of contacts provided

LANGLADE 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
Feedlot permits	NA	NA
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	2	2
Manure storage closure	1	1
Livestock facility siting	NA	NA
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	NA	NA
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	1	NA
Shoreland zoning	2	NA
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	3	NA
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	*72*
For FPP	*67*
For NR 151	*5*
Animal waste ordinance	4
Livestock facility siting	NA
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	1
Nonmetallic mining	NA

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	2
Field days	6
Trainings/workshops	4
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	10
Newsletters	4
Social media posts	0
News release/story	6

LANGLADE COUNTY 2019 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

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

Staff/Support	**Hours**	**Costs**
County Conservationist	1820	$75,455
Technician	910	$33,726
Administrative Support	273	$15,121
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
Bonding	N/A	$64,759
SEG	N/A	$40,000