SECTION 2

2.4 OVER \$50,000 DATCP COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS

The following describes key steps that counties must follow to obtain DATCP approval of conservation projects that involve \$50,000 or more in DATCP cost-sharing. A county should seek DATCP approval as soon as the county is aware that the cost-share portion of the project will exceed \$50,000 as a result of an initial project estimate, or cost overruns or the addition of practices (a change order would be required in both cases). To obtain approval, a county should submit (a) a completed form number ARM-LWR-385 (the latest version of which is downloadable from the SWRM Working Manual, http://datcp.wi.gov/Environment/Land and Water Conservation/SWRM Grant Program Working Manual/index.aspx), (b) the cost-share contract along with any applicable change orders, and (c) answers to the questions listed below along with evidence of LCC concurrence in the project. The county should wait for DATCP approval before proceeding further on the construction of the project.

Counties that receive a DATCP reallocation for NOD/NOI projects do not need separate DATCP approval under s. ATCP 50.40 (8) when they receive an award of \$50,000 or more in DATCP cost-sharing. DATCP's selection of the county's project functions as an approval. However, DATCP typically requires independent engineering review for NOD/NOI projects (see last section, "DATCP Review," below).

Key Questions

- 1A. Identify the water quality problem(s) addressed by each project. In answering this question, please explain how the current site conditions contribute to specific water quality problems. This issue should be analyzed by addressing each of the following scenarios as long as these scenarios are reasonably likely to occur:
 - i) The extent to which there will be a continuing discharge of manure or wastewater into a waterway at a significant level.
 - ii) The extent to which there will be spreading of manure at times and places inconsistent with sound manure management, and these spreading activities will result in risks to surface water.
- 1B. Explain how the proposed design will reduce the risk of these water quality problems? For example, how will a proposed design address a feedlot discharge and resolve related water quality concerns?
 - i) The discussion should touch on the role of any supporting practices such access road, cattle crossing, riparian buffer, and critical area stabilization in resolving water quality concerns.

June 2014 2.4 - 1

- 2. Demonstrate that the project is a cost-effective response to the water quality problem(s). Indicate that the options evaluated, and discuss why the other options were not selected based on cost, effectiveness, or a combination of both.
- 3. Provide evidence showing that a site investigation was performed and it was determined that the landowner will not have a more critical compliance concern after the installation of the cost-shared practices associated with this project.

LCC Concurrence

The county must indicate the following regarding LCC involvement and approval of this project:

- Specific approval by the LCC for the project as reflected in LCC minutes or other documentation, or
- Evidence of LCC delegation of authority to approve projects of this type and the LCD's commitment to continue to involve the LCC in the project including reports on key developments and project status.

DATCP Review

Before DATCP signs an approval, it will rely on a DATCP, NRCS or other independent engineer to review the project to confirm that the proposed practices can be expected to effectively address the water quality problems at the site, that no alternative approaches would better address the concerns at the site, and that site will not have any significant water quality problems after the project is completed. If a county is selected to receive an NOI award over \$50,000 or anticipates that cost-sharing for a project will exceed \$50,000, the county should engage the assistance of an independent engineer early in the project planning process to facilitate this process.

June 2014 2.4 - 2