



State of Wisconsin

Land and Water Conservation Board

PO Box 8911
Madison, WI 53708 - 8911
608 - 224 - 4633

Land and Water Conservation Board Agenda

August 6, 2024

The Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB) will meet on **August 6, 2024**. The board will hold its official business meeting at 9:00 am via Microsoft Teams and at 2811 Agriculture Drive, Boardroom 106, Madison, WI 53718. To attend the meeting remotely, join by telephone at +1 608-571-2209 with Conference ID 112411209# or click the following Teams [hyperlink](#). The agenda for the meeting is shown below.

AGENDA ITEMS AND TENTATIVE SCHEDULE:

1 Call the Meeting to Order – **Mark Cupp, LWCB Chair**

- a. Roll Call
- b. Pledge of allegiance
- c. Open meeting notice
- d. Introductions, Acknowledgements
- e. Approval of agenda
- f. Approval of June 4, 2024 meeting minutes

2 Public appearances*

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

3 Recommendation for approval of LWRM 5 Year Plan revision for Marquette County
Patrick Kilby, Marquette County Conservationist; Dennis Fenner, Land Conservation Committee Chair

4 State of Wisconsin Nutrient Reduction Strategy
Joe Bonnell, DNR

5 Recommendation for approval of LWRM 5 Year Plan revision for Price County
Evan Lund, Price County Conservationist; Nicholas Trimner, Price County Administrator

*Mark Cupp, Chair; Monte Osterman, Vice Chair
Brian McGraw, Secretary*

*Members: Andrew Buttlers; Ron Grasshoff; Rebecca Clarke; Yogesh Chawla; D.J. Nichols
Andrew Potts; Tim Anderson; Jill Schoen*

- 6 Presentation of 2025 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan
Susan Mockert, DATCP; Joanna Griffin, DNR

- 7 DNR Presentation of the Scores and Rankings of Targeted Runoff Management
(TRM) Projects for CY 2025
Joanna Griffin, DNR

- 8 DNR Presentation of the Scores and Rankings of Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water
Management Projects for CY 2025
Joanna Griffin, DNR

- 9 Recommendation for approval of LWRM 5 Year Plan revision for La Crosse County
**Matt Hanewall, LaCrosse County Conservaiton Director; Kevin Hoyer, Land
Conservation Committee Chair**

- 10 LWCB Advisory Committee on Research- Committee Updates
Kirsten Biefeld, DATCP; Ron Grasshoff, Committee Chair

- 11 Agency reports
- a. FSA
 - b. NRCS
 - c. UW-CALS
 - d. UW Madison - Extension
 - e. WI Land + Water
 - f. DOA
 - g. DATCP
 - h. DNR
 - i. Member Updates

- 12 Planning for October 2024 LWCB Meeting -
Mark Cupp, LWCB

- 13 Adjourn

**MINUTES
LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING**

June 4, 2024

Vernon County Erlandson Building, 1st Floor Conference Room, 318 Fairlane Dr. in Viroqua, WI

Item #1 Call to Order—pledge of allegiance, open meeting notice, approval of agenda, approval of April 2, 2024, LWCB meeting minutes.

Call to Order

The Land and Water Conservation Board (Board) met in person at Vernon County Erlandson Building, 1st Floor Conference Room, 318 Fairlane Dr. in Viroqua, WI on **June 4, 2024**. The meeting was preceded by public notice as required by Wis. Stat. § 19.84. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Cupp at **9:30 am** and the pledge of allegiance was conducted.

Members and Advisors Present

Members: Mark Cupp, Monte Osterman, Brian McGraw, Ron Grasshoff, D.J. Nichols, Tim Anderson, Andrew Potts, and for Jill Schoen. A quorum was present.

Advisors: Matt Krueger (WI Land + Water), Ryan Gerlich (NRCS)

Approval of Agenda

Motion

McGraw motioned to approve the agenda, seconded by Grasshoff, and the motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Motion

Potts motioned to approve the April 2, 2024, meeting minutes as presented, seconded by McGraw, and the motion carried unanimously. The approved minutes shall be posted as the official meeting record for publication on the LWCB website.

Item #2 Public Appearances

No public appearance cards were submitted.

Item #3 Recommendation for approval of 5-year Land and Water Resource Management Plan review for Chippewa County

Lynda Schweikert, County Conservationist, and Charles Bomar, Land Conservation and Forest Management Committee Chair, formally requested a recommendation of approval from the Board regarding the County's 5-year LWRM plan review.

The County provided written answers to the Board's standardized questions, recent work plans and accomplishments, and other materials (available on LWCB's website: lwcb.wi.gov).

Motion

After a discussion between the Board and County representatives, McGraw motioned to recommend approval of Chippewa County's 5-year LWRM plan review, seconded by Grasshoff, and the motion carried unanimously.

Item #4 Recommendation for approval of 5-year Land and Water Resource Management Plan review for Vernon County

Ben Wojahn, Vernon County Conservationist, and Will Beitlich, Mary Henry, Nathaniel Slack and David Eggen, Land Conservation Committee Chair and Members, formally requested a recommendation of approval from the Board regarding the County's 5-year LWRM plan review.

The County provided written answers to the Board's standardized questions, recent work plans and accomplishments, and other materials (available on LWCB's website: lwcb.wi.gov).

Motion

After a discussion between the Board and County representatives, McGraw motioned to recommend approval of Vernon County's 5-year LWRM plan review, seconded by Osterman, and the motion carried unanimously.

Item #5 LWCB Advisory Committee on Research

Ron Grasshoff delivered an update on the LWCB Advisory Committee on Research. The Committee will reconvene on July 2, 2024.

Item #6 Agency Reports- Written Report Only

Agency reports may be accessed in the June 4, 2024 [meeting materials](#) on the Board's website.

Item #7 Planning for the August 6, 2024 LWCB meeting

The Board should expect the following at the next LWCB meeting:

- 5-year Review La Crosse, Marquette & Price Counties
- 2025 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan
- DNR Presentation of the scores and rankings of the Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Projects for CY 25
- DNR Presentation of the scores and rankings of the Urban Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Management Projects for CY 25
- Presentation of the 2023 Annual Soil and Water Conservation Report (if available)
- LWCB Advisory Committee on Research Updates

Item #8 Adjourn

Motion

Potts motioned to adjourn, seconded by McGraw, and the motion carried unanimously. The business meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m. and the Board convened to lunch and to make planned field visits to Sidie Hollow County Park, Yttri-Primmer Dam and Steve Barr's Grad Stabilization project.

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: July 24, 2024

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: Five Year Review of the *Marquette County Land and Water Resource Management Plan*

Recommended Action: This is an action item. The LWCB should determine whether the county has met the LWCB's criteria for a five-year review of a LWRM plan approved for ten years. If the LWCB makes a formal determination that the county has failed to meet these criteria, DATCP will automatically modify its order to terminate approval of the county's plan effective December of this year.

Summary: The Marquette County land and water resource management plan has been approved through December 31, 2029, contingent on a five-year review conducted prior to December 31, 2024. In advance of the five-year review, Marquette County has completed a DATCP approved form designed to implement the LWCB's reference document dated October 27, 2021, and the criteria for conducting a five-year review. The county has provided written answers to four questions regarding past and future implementation, has provided the required work planning documents, and has appropriately involved the Land Conservation Committee.

Materials Provided:

- Completed Five Year Review Form
- 2023 Annual Workplan with Accomplishments
- 2024 Annual Workplan

Presenter: Patrick Kilbey, County Conservationist, Marquette County LWCD
Dennis Fenner, Land Conservation Committee Chair



Land and Water Conservation Board
County Land and Water Resource Management Plan
Five Year Review of LWRM Plans

County: Marquette

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 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.***

By reviewing our annual workplans on an yearly basis and setting high goals (while being realistic) have helped us reach the following accomplishments as related to our annual work plan.

Nutrient Management Planning: Since 2019; acres under plan have increased by 9,886 acres for a new total of 45,196 acres or 63% of cropland in Marquette County. Farmer Training by County Staff and the annual Nutrient Management Farmer Education Grant (NMFE) are the 2 biggest factors why we keep exceeding our annual goals. We host two Nutrient Management training classes each year; training an average of 50 farmers. We anticipate this program continuing to grow and a need to add a third training class soon.

Farmland Preservation Program: 2019 saw 72 Landowners enrolled in FPP to be eligible to claim the Tax Credit. At the end of the 2023 tax year, we increased to 112 Landowners for a total of 28,969 acres. By promoting the FPP Tax Credit we are able to get Landowners compliant with the State Runoff Standards and NR151.

Cover Crops & No-Till: Utilizing State and Federal Cost Share Programs and participating in Demo Farm Networks or Watershed based groups, we have increased the amount of acres installing Cover Crops and performing No-Till planting. Increases in and ability to utilize State Cost Sharing have allowed us to adjust this number as we set our goals in annual workplans. We also continue to host an annual Soil Health Field Day at one of our Demo Farms that is well attended.

2. ***Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in multiple 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.***

Farm Inspections & Farmland Preservation Program Status Reviews have not been able to be performed at a desirable level. This was due to lack of staff availability and simply making it a priority. As the Farmland Preservation Program continues to grow in Marquette County we needed to make a change and get caught up. Late in 2023 we set a new status review schedule and devoted more staff time to perform the reviews. It is early in the process but we are ahead of schedule with the creation of this document.

Conservation Reserve Program (CREP) continues to be a stagnant program in Marquette County but is still being offered to County Landowners. CREP buffers and other practices are a great way to protect water quality but are a difficult program to sell to Marquette County landowners.

Livestock Facility Practices have become difficult to install. An effort has been made over the past 10 years to reduce livestock/feedlot runoff and progress has been made on the easy projects seeing good progress. However, the few remaining, unknown or more difficult sites and/or Landowners have been a bit challenging to remedy. Future focus on TMDL loading watersheds will be used to make progress.

3. ***Describe how the county's work plans implement its priority farm strategy and the effectiveness of county actions implementing agricultural performance standards and conservation practices on farms. In particular, the county should describe outreach, farm inventories, and additional funds that were pursued to implement its strategy.***

Farmland Preservation Program is increasing in Marquette County. When adding in the recently increased \$10/acre Tax Credit, we predict (with high certainty) a large increase in participation. Along with the added participants, we will be expanding on farm inventories and inspections. Using this strategy, we will be adjusting future workplans to match the demand.

Traditional cost share dollars are not sufficient to allow Marquette County to reach its Nutrient Management Plan goals in our workplans. Since 2019 we have requested and received additional cost share funds from other counties through the DATCP cost share transfer portal. Even with additional funds being transferred, we typically do not have enough cost share to match demand.

Marquette County lies entirely in the Upper Fox Watershed Basin which is a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) watershed. Having this pollutant loading data, we can better concentrate in areas of need or deem high loading watersheds as priority areas. As recent as 2024, we have started to focus on the subwatersheds with excessive nutrient and sediment loading. This addition of TMDL data will be added into next five years workplans (see question 4 below).

4. ***Provide representative examples that show changes in direction for work planning in the upcoming five years, with specific examples provided showing adjustments in planned activities in the county's most recent work plan.***

Recent trends show nitrates in private wells to be increasing in Marquette County. This recently led Marquette County to use ARPA funding to embark on a private well water

sampling program. This program is in collaboration with UWSP Center for Watershed Science and Education. UWSP will be providing sampling protocols and testing. Data collected (once analyzed) will help guide the Department to target conservation practices and focus on priority areas in future workplans. One thing important to note is testing will need to be continued for trend analysis. This will be contingent on funding being available to continue testing wells in certain areas over time to see what trends are developing. This groundwater sampling program comes as a by-product of working with the 6 county consortium known as the Central Sands Groundwater County Collaborative. The Central Sands Counties involved in the Consortium all are seeing nitrate levels on the rise in their respective Counties.

Targeting high nutrient loading watersheds using TMDL data will be a goal for future workplans. As stated above under question 3, we have already started incorporating these high nutrient loading areas into our Nine Key Element Planning in certain subwatersheds will be pursued. County Staff will plan on utilizing Lake Districts who are concerned about pollutant loading from the watershed into their lake as a catalyst to promote watershed based thinking. This partnership will allow for more exposure and increasing chances for additional funding. Along with this exposure we will look at starting producer led watershed group(s) in these areas.

We have shifted staff duties internally to put more focus on Soil Health Conservation practices in the County. We will be looking to expand our Demo Farm Network and watershed based Demo Farm activities. With limited funding becoming the norm, we as a Department feel the best way to utilize funding is to concentrate on Soil Health practices using demo farms, watershed groups, cost sharing and education to help promote soil health benefits. Soil Health will also help us meet our goals in the two (above) activities (Nitrates in wells & TMDL Implementation).

Annual Work Plans

Attach both of the following:

- a. The most current annual work prepared by the county.
- b. The work plan for the previous year that includes a column that identifies the progress in implementing the planned activities for that year.

Board Review Process

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. Counties have the option to prepare a brief presentation to illustrate their successes and future priorities.

Land Conservation Committee Notification

The LCC was provided a completed copy of these questions (including attachments) on: July 3rd, 2024

Signature of Authorized Representative: Patrick Kilbey **Date:** 07/11/2024
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

Send completed questionnaire and attachments to:

Lisa.Trumble@wi.gov

MARQUETTE COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (Goals and objectives from LWRM plan)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS ACCOMPLISHMENTS
• <i>Cropland</i>		
Cropland conservation practices installed to implement state performance standards and prohibitions	<i>Install 1,400 acres of NEW Nutrient Mngmt. Plans</i> <i>Install 3,000 acres of cover crops</i> <i>Design/Install 2 Grassed Waterway Systems</i> <i>Design/Install 2 Grade Stabilizing Structure/WASCB</i> <i>Install 10 acres Critical Area Stabilization</i>	<i>1,538 new acres of Nutrient Management installed</i> <i>8,250 new acres of cover crops planted</i> <i>1 Grassed Waterway system installed</i> <i>1 Grade Stabilization structure installed</i> <i>2 acres of critical area stabilization installed</i>
Farmer Education on Developing Nutrient Management Plans	<i>Train 8 new farmers on Plan development</i> <i>Re-train 68 farmers to update existing plan</i>	<i>59 total landowners trained with 6 new</i>
• <i>Livestock</i>		
Farm Inspections to implement state performance standards and prohibitions	<i>Perform 15 FPP Status Compliance Reviews</i> <i>Perform 2 NR151 Compliance Reviews</i> <i>Issue Certificates of compliance or non-compliance</i>	<i>16 FPP Status Reviews completed</i> <i>1 NR151 Compliance Determination completed</i>
Livestock Facility conservation practices installed to meet state performance standards	<i>Design/install 1 animal waste runoff practices</i> <i>Design/install 3 clean water diversions</i> <i>Design/install 4 Animal Fencing/Exclusion Projects</i>	<i>1 runoff practice installed</i> <i>3 clean water diversion practices installed</i> <i>1 fencing project installed</i>
Promote Rotational Grazing	<i>Assist/Design/Install rotational grazing system</i>	
• <i>Water quality</i>		
Water Quality	<i>Promote Soil Health through Demo Farm Network</i> <i>Assist/Design/Install 5 lakeshore/streambank project</i> <i>Promote CREP/enroll 1 Landowner</i> <i>Approve/Inspect 20 Erosion Control Plan SWQMA's</i> <i>Monitor 2 stream sites for TP, TSS, TN</i>	<i>2 Cooperators hosted field days through Upper Fox Demo</i> <i>3 streambank projects installed</i> <i>Goal not met</i> <i>21 Erosion Control Plans inspected</i> <i>Met Goal, on-going project</i>
Water Quantity	<i>Monitor 8 Streamflow sites for baseflow</i> <i>Monitor 7 Lake Level Sites</i>	<i>Met Goal, on-going project</i> <i>Met Goal, on-going project</i>
• <i>Invasive</i>		
Aquatic Invasive Species	<i>Continue to contract with RC&D for Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator</i>	<i>Annual Program that is on-going and renewed for next 2 years</i>
• <i>Wildlife</i>		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other)	<i>Wetland restoration</i>	<i>Goal not met but assistance given to NRCS for WRP Projects</i>

MARQUETTE COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

than forestry or invasive species)	<i>Wildlife Damage Program (contract with USDA/WS)</i> <i>Annual Tree Sale- 44,000 Trees Sold Annually</i>	48,500 trees sold
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Urban</i> 		
Urban issues	<i>Stormwater control</i> <i>Construction site erosion control</i>	<i>Infiltration Plan advice provided to Zoning Department</i> <i>21 Erosion Control Plans inspected</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Watershed</i> 		
Watershed strategies	<i>Upper Fox Demo Farms Participant</i> <i>TMDL coordination with DNR</i> <i>Enroll in Multi Discharge Variance (MDV)</i>	<i>On-going program that expanded with the addition of the Fox-Wolf Alliance.</i> <i>Started using TMDL Inventory numbers to target subwatersheds.</i> <i>Did not enroll in MDV Program</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Other</i> 		
Other	<i>Non-Metallic Mining Reclamation</i>	<i>3 plans reviewed/renewed with zero inspections</i>

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	0	0
Manure storage closure		
Livestock facility siting		
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	20	20
Shoreland zoning	10	10
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)		
Other		

MARQUETTE COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	
For FPP	15
For NR 151	2
Animal waste ordinance	
Livestock facility siting	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	20
Nonmetallic mining	4

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1
Field days	3
Trainings/workshops	4
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	1 Camp, 1 Field Day, 6 in Classroom Presentations
Newsletters	
Social media posts	40
News release/story	20

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>County Conservationist</i>	1976	\$117,236
<i>Engineering Technician</i>	2080	\$60,965
<i>Agronomist/Program Coordinator</i>	1560	\$68,500
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
<i>Bonding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$90,000</i>
<i>SEG</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$90,000</i>
<i>EQIP</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$25,000</i>

MARQUETTE COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (Goals and objectives from LWRM plan)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS
• <i>Cropland</i>		
Cropland conservation practices installed to implement state performance standards and prohibitions	<i>Install 1,500 acres of NEW Nutrient Mngmt. Plans</i> <i>Install 8,000 acres of cover crops</i> <i>Install 10,000 acres of no-till</i> <i>Design/Install 2 Grassed Waterway Systems</i> <i>Design/Install 2 Grade Stabilizing Structure/WASCB</i> <i>Install 5 acres Critical Area Stabilization</i>	<i># of acres enrolled/installed under Nutrient Management Plan</i> <i>Number of practice(s) installed</i> <i>Amount of cost-share dollars spent</i>
Farmer Education on Developing Nutrient Management Plans	<i>Train 5 new farmers on Plan development</i> <i>Re-train 53 farmers to update existing plan</i>	<i>Number of farmers taking training</i> <i>#of new acres enrolled under Nutrient Management Plan</i>
• <i>Livestock</i>		
Farm Inspections to implement state performance standards and prohibitions	<i>Perform 15 FPP Status Compliance Reviews</i> <i>Perform 2 NR151 Compliance Reviews</i> <i>Issue Certificates of compliance or non-compliance</i>	<i>Number of Reviews completed</i> <i>Number of compliance certificates issued</i>
Livestock Facility conservation practices installed to meet state performance standards	<i>Design/install 3 clean water diversions</i> <i>Design/install 3 Animal Fencing/Exclusion Projects</i>	<i>Number of practices installed</i> <i>Amount of cost share dollars spent</i> <i># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method)</i> <i># lbs of P reduced (using any approved method)</i>
Promote Rotational Grazing	<i>Assist/Design/Install rotational grazing system</i>	<i>Number of plans promoted/reviewed/installed</i>
• <i>Water quality</i>		
Water Quality	<i>Promote Soil Health through Demo Farm Network</i> <i>Assist/Design/Install 5 lakeshore/streambank project</i> <i>Promote CREP/enroll 1 Landowner</i> <i>Approve/Inspect 20 Erosion Control Plan SWQMA's</i> <i>Monitor 2 stream sites for TP, TSS, TN</i>	<i>Type and units of practice(s) installed</i> <i>Amount of cost-share dollars spent & projects installed</i> <i># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method)</i> <i># lbs of P reduced (using any approved method)</i>
Water Quantity	<i>Monitor 8 Streamflow sites for baseflow</i> <i>Monitor 7 Lake Level Sites</i>	<i>Baseflow readings recorded</i> <i># of readings entered into SWIMS Database</i>
• <i>Invasive</i>		
Aquatic Invasive Species	<i>Continue to contract with RC&D for Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator</i>	<i>Number of surveys completed</i> <i>Number of control efforts implemented/sites treated</i>

MARQUETTE COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

- *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	Wetland restoration Wildlife Damage Program (contract with USDA/WS) Annual Tree Sale	Acres of wetland restored Number of trees sold
--	--	---

- *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	Upper Fox Demo Farms participant Fox/Wolf Watershed Alliance participant TMDL coordination with DNR Enroll in Multi Discharge Variance (MDV)	Number of meetings attended/presentations given Modeling completed Number of partner contacts made Information system/tracking developed Number of partnership development activities accomplished
-----------------------------	---	--

- *Other*

Other	Non-Metallic Mining Reclamation	Number of plans reviewed Number of inspections
--------------	---------------------------------	---

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	0	0
Manure storage closure		
Livestock facility siting		
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	20	20
Shoreland zoning	10	10
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	2	2
Other		

MARQUETTE COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	
For FPP	15
For NR 151	2
Animal waste ordinance	
Livestock facility siting	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	20
Nonmetallic mining	4

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1
Field days	3
Trainings/workshops	4
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	1 Camp, 1 field days, 6 in classroom
Newsletters	
Social media posts	40
News release/story	20

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>County Conservationist</i>	1976	\$123,164
<i>Engineering Technician</i>	2080	\$ 65,871
<i>Agronomist/Program Coordinator</i>	1560	\$ 72,290
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
<i>Bonding</i>	N/A	\$90,000
<i>SEG</i>	N/A	\$90,000
<i>EQIP</i>	N/A	\$25,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: July 22, 2024

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: Five Year Review of the *Price County Land and Water Resource Management Plan*

Recommended Action: This is an action item. The LWCB should determine whether the county has met the LWCB's criteria for a five-year review of a LWRM plan approved for ten years. If the LWCB makes a formal determination that the county has failed to meet these criteria, DATCP will automatically modify its order to terminate approval of the county's plan effective December of this year.

Summary: The Price County land and water resource management plan has been approved through December 31, 2029, contingent on a five-year review conducted prior to December 31, 2024. In advance of the five-year review, Price County has completed a DATCP approved form designed to implement the LWCB's reference document dated October 27, 2021, and the criteria for conducting a five-year review. The county has provided written answers to four questions regarding past and future implementation, has provided the required work planning documents, and has appropriately involved the Land Conservation Committee.

Materials Provided:

- Completed Five Year Review Form
- 2023 Annual Workplan with Accomplishments
- 2024 Annual Workplan

Presenter: Evan Lund, County Conservationist, Price County LCD
Nicholas Trimner, Price County Administrator



**Land and Water Conservation Board
County Land and Water Resource Management Plan
Five Year Review of LWRM Plans**

County: Price

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 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.

Over the past five years, Price County has accomplished numerous activities outlined in our annual work plans as well as the LWRM Plan. The LWRM plan helped identify priority areas and strategies to prioritize cost-share dollars and best allocate time to address resource concerns identified throughout the plan. Accomplishments are listed below from the work plan.

Examples of accomplishments identified throughout the multiple work plans include:

1. Accomplishments were made to increase producer technical and financial assistance to reduce erosion, control runoff, and achieve NR 151 compliance. The Land Conservation Department implemented 38 cost share projects through the Soil and Water Resource Management Grant program providing \$206,060 in cost share funds. The practices implemented through these projects include: Livestock fencing/Managed Grazing: 118,095 linear feet; Livestock Watering Facilities: 10; Stream Crossings: 600 linear feet; Well Decommissioning: 12; Shoreline and Streambank Protection: 500 linear feet; Milkhouse Waste Transfer System: 1; Manure Storage Closure: 1. Other projects were provided technical assistance to achieve goals outlined in the LWRM plan including livestock practices, stream crossings, local municipality aids, wetland restorations, and forestry/wildlife practices.

2. Prevent and control both aquatic and terrestrial invasive species populations throughout the county. The Land Conservation Department partnered with numerous Lake Associations throughout the County to assist in Clean Boats/Clean Waters program including AIS monitoring and AIS removal/control efforts. Price County partners with the Upper Chippewa Invasives Species Cooperative to raise public awareness and assist in the control of terrestrial invasive species. Work groups were held to educate landowners and provide assistance in the control efforts for Wild Parsnip, Japanese Knotweed, and Garlic Mustard.

3. Non-Metallic Mining Program: The Land Conservation Department has assisted the Price County Zoning Department to ensure that mine sites are developed and reclaimed to minimize impacts to groundwater, surface water, and wetlands. Over the past 5 years

the Land Conservation Department has monitored 250 acres of partially reclaimed sites and assisted in the final reclamation of 32 acres to ensure that NR 135 compliance is met.

4. Annual Cleansweep Program: Conducting an annual cleansweep program within the county is identified as a priority in the annual work plan. The Land Conservation Department partners annually with Northwest Regional Planning to hold an event for residents to safely dispose of hazardous household, agricultural, and industrial chemicals in an environmentally friendly manner.

Annual work plan revisions allow for slight adjusting on a year-to-year basis to best allocate resources based on weather conditions, landowner preferences, and funding availability to better identify and target resource concerns.

2. Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in multiple 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.

Nutrient management on smaller scale farms has been an area that the Price County Land Conservation Department has identified as an area for growth. The producers have not fully bought into the effectiveness of proper nutrient management planning. The LCD continues to do educational outreach in an attempt to gain interest. There has been a strong emphasis towards managed grazing so the Department has adjusted efforts towards practices associated with rotational grazing vs. traditional tillage agriculture.

Lack of sufficient funding to cost share projects has also been a large hurdle for Price County. Even small-scale heavy use protection areas or manure pit closures can eat up a significant portion of our annual bond allotment. Price County LCD has referred projects to the NRCS or partnered with them on projects to try to alleviate this problem. Price County has also shifted focus to smaller scale projects in targeted areas to try to achieve the greatest conservation benefit with limited dollars.

Price County Land Conservation was able to make progress in all other areas identified throughout the plan.

3. Describe how the county's work plans implement its priority farm strategy and the effectiveness of county actions implementing agricultural performance standards and conservation practices on farms. In particular, the county should describe outreach, farm inventories, and additional funds that were pursued to implement its strategy.

The Price County LCD has developed the following priority farm identification strategy:
First Priority - Farms where a valid complaint has been received regarding the violation of the agricultural performance standards or prohibitions.

Second Priority – Farms that receive cost-share assistance under the Soil and Water Resource Management grant program

Third Priority – Farms located in watersheds draining to 303(d) waters.

The above strategy for selecting priority farms has been very effective for Price

County. NR 151 implementation is typically achieved through voluntary compliance in Price County. State agricultural performance standards are used when voluntary compliance is not possible. Letters of non-compliance are issued and the County has been able to achieve compliance through continued efforts with the producer. The County has relied heavily on our partnerships with the DNR and the NRCS to identify resource concerns and achieve NR 151 compliance.

Price County continually inventories active farms within the County to look for additional ways to address resource concerns. Areas listed as 303d impaired waters due to total phosphorus are giving priority as are farms located within watersheds listed as outstanding/exceptional resource waters. 90% of SWRM grant funds over the past 5 years were implemented on active farms to address agricultural resource concerns. Price County also promotes NRCS programs and works with the NRCS to provide cost share for conservation projects.

4. Provide representative examples that show changes in direction for work planning in the upcoming five years, with specific examples provided showing adjustments in planned activities in the county's most recent work plan.

Nutrient managements has always been listed as a high priority within Price County's annual work plan. While nutrient management planning continues to be one of the top priorities, managed grazing has become much more popular and seems to be a more effective way to promote conservation efforts in Price County.

Decommissioning abandoned wells has become a large priority in Price County as well. Numerous unused wells are located in rural areas of the County and the LCD has spent a considerable amount of time educating landowners of the importance of properly decommissioning an abandoned well.

Working with local lake and river associations has also been emphasized over the previous two years. The Land Conservation Technician has been attending lake association meetings to discuss the importance of shoreline protection and discussing strategies to restore degraded shorelines.

Invasive species education and control has been a priority the past few years. Price County continues to see new terrestrial invasive species show up and a significant amount of time has been spent educating Price County residents how to identify invasive species and control methods.

Annual Work Plans

Attach both of the following:

- a. The most current annual work prepared by the county.
- b. The work plan for the previous year that includes a column that identifies the progress in implementing the planned activities for that year.

Board Review Process

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. Counties have the option to prepare a brief presentation to illustrate their successes and future priorities.

Land Conservation Committee Notification

The LCC was provided a completed copy of these questions (including attachments) on: 6/20/24

Signature of Authorized Representative:  **Date:** 6/20/24
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

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

Price County 2023 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Cropland</i> 		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	Provide technical assistance and design practices. 500 hours staff time Cost share of 6 fencing and managed grazing systems within priority watersheds listed in goal number 1. Cost share 1 waterway and provide nutrient management education to landowners. Focus will be on farms within UC03, UC04, and UC09 watersheds.	Provided cost share and technical assistance for 6 managed grazing systems and cost shared 25,000 linear feet of livestock fencing. Provided information to 5 farmers on Nutrient management planning. Provided design assistance for 1 grassed waterway.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Livestock</i> 		
Livestock	Install livestock practices. New storage facilities 1 storage facility closure 1 heavy use protection system 2 access roads/cattle crossings	Provided cost share for 1 manure storage closure and provided technical assistance for 1 new manure storage facility Provided cost share for 1 milkhouse waste transfer facility Provided cost share for 1 access road and 1 stream crossing \$28,484.72 in cost share dollars spent.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Water quality</i> 		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	Inventory and prioritize shoreline buffer zones along shorelines of lakes and rivers. Inventory shoreline for buffer compliance. Abandon non-compliant wells Install 2 stream bank protection projects. Provided 300 hours of technical assistance including design and project oversight	10 wetland restoration sites inventoried and prioritized. 2 restorations designed and installed. Inventoried 1450 linear feet of shoreland buffer for compliance Provided cost share for 5 well decommissioning Provided design assistance for 450 feet of shoreline protection.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forestry</i> 		
Forestry	Provide technical and educational assistance to foresters and loggers regarding the importance of BMPs relating to sedimentation and nutrient loading as a result of logging operations.	Provided 3 designs for stream crossings on forestry projects.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Invasive</i> 		
Invasive species	Treat 3 sites annually for control of terrestrial invasive species. (local wild parsnip and Japanese knotweed hotspots) Assist lake and river associations with grants and sponsor cooperative efforts.	Treated 7 sites for wild parsnip, 2 sites for garlic mustard, and 2 for Japanese knotweed. Attended 6 lake association meetings for AIS information.

**Price County 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	Provide information and publications to groups about identification and control.	
• <i>Wildlife</i>		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	Restore 5 acres of wetland annually. Provide information to landowners/associations about the value of wetlands Assist Taylor County in annual tree and plant sales	5 acres of wetland restored/preserved Assisted with annual tree and shrub sale.
• <i>Urban</i>		
Municipality issues	Assist town and county road departments with erosion control and storm water management along roadways.	Assisted 3 towns with culvert/bridge technical assistance.
• <i>Watershed</i>		
Watershed strategies	Attend association meetings and provide information. Provide technical assistance to 3 associations. (i.e. permitting, design work, tree drops, etc.) Assist the local municipality in adaptive management strategies for P reduction in the watershed.	Attend 6 lake association meetings Attended 2 meetings to discuss shoreline buffer initiative on local lake chains.
• <i>Other</i>		
Other	Assist in technical review of Non-metallic mining reclamation plans and project oversight in regard to runoff. Conduct a Clean Sweep Hazardous Waste Collection	Assisted in review of NMM rec plans Conducted annual cleansweep event.

**Price County 2023 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		No permitting in Price Co
Manure storage construction and transfer systems		No permitting in Price Co
Manure storage closure		No permitting in Price Co
Livestock facility siting		No permitting in Price Co
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining		Permit Issuance done by Zoning
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	Assist with 5 permits	Permits issued by WDNR
Shoreland zoning	5 restoration plans	Permits issued by Zoning
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	8	Permits issued by WDNR
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	25
For FPP	2
For NR 151	25
Animal waste ordinance	No Ordinance in Price Co
Livestock facility siting	No Ordinance in Price Co
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	20
Nonmetallic mining	10 to ensure stormwater practices are followed

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities
(numbers may vary significantly due to current shutdowns)

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

**Price County 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY-IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>County Conservationist</i>	1250	\$63,400
<i>Technician</i>	2080	\$68,500
<i>Support Costs</i>	625	\$15,000
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
<i>SWRM Bonding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$50,000</i>
<i>USFWS</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$3,000</i>
<i>WI-DNR</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$20,000</i>

**Price County 2024 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)
• <i>Cropland</i>		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	Provide technical assistance and design practices. 500 hours staff time Cost share of 6 fencing and managed grazing systems within priority watersheds listed in goal number 1. Cost share 1 waterway and provide nutrient management education to landowners. Focus will be on farms within UC03, UC04, and UC09 watersheds.	200 staff hours expended for NM training and education/cover crop education 1000 acres of cropland in compliance with a performance standard (e.g. soil erosion, tillage setback) 100 hour staff time in development/implementation of grassed waterway projects
• <i>Livestock</i>		
Livestock	Install livestock practices. New storage facilities 1 storage facility closure 1 heavy use protection system 2 access roads/cattle crossings Evaluate 5 farms for implementation of new practices	1000 of staff hours expended for design and installation 2 New storage facilities 1 storage closure 1 heavy use protection 2 access roads/cattle crossings \$30,000 in cost share dollars spent.
• <i>Water quality</i>		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	Inventory and prioritize shoreline buffer zones along shorelines of lakes and rivers. Inventory shoreline for buffer compliance. Abandon non-compliant wells Install 2 stream bank protection projects. Provided 300 hours of technical assistance including design and project oversight Assist in private groundwater testing	10 sites inventoried and prioritized. 4 restorations designed and installed. 1600 feet of shoreline At least 8 wells abandoned Test 75 private wells throughout the county
• <i>Forestry</i>		
Forestry	Provide technical and educational assistance to foresters and loggers regarding the importance of BMPs relating to sedimentation and nutrient loading as a result of logging operations.	Design and install forestry practices/stream crossings on an as needed basis
• <i>Invasive</i>		
Invasive species	Treat 3 sites annually for control of terrestrial invasive species. (local wild parsnip and	Control of invasive species on sites.

**Price County 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<p>Japanese knotweed hotspots) Assist lake and river associations with grants and sponsor cooperative efforts.</p> <p>Provide information and publications to groups about identification and control.</p>	200 hours staff time dedicated to education and control efforts with a focus on wild parsnip and Japanese knotweed locations.
--	--	---

• *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	<p>Restore 5 acres of wetland annually. Provide information to landowners/associations about the value of wetlands Assist Taylor County in annual tree and plant sales</p>	5 acres of wetland restored/preserved
--	--	---------------------------------------

• *Urban*

Urban issues	Assist town and county road departments with erosion control and storm water management along roadways.	Assists local municipalities in development, design, and installation on an as needed basis
---------------------	---	---

• *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	<p>Attend association meetings and provide information.</p> <p>Provide technical assistance to 3 associations. (i.e. permitting, design work, tree drops, etc.) Assist the local municipality in adaptive management strategies for P reduction in the watershed.</p>	<p>Attend 5 meetings annually</p> <p>Assisting in designing and installing at least 3 practices annually(tree drops, permitting, etc)</p>
-----------------------------	---	---

• *Other*

Other	<p>Assist in technical review of Non-metallic mining reclamation plans and project oversight in regard to runoff.</p> <p>Conduct a Clean Sweep Hazardous Waste Collection</p>	<p>Assist in review of NMM rec plans on an as needed basis</p> <p>Number of participants Pounds collected</p>
--------------	---	---

Price County 2024 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		No permitting in Price Co
Manure storage construction and transfer systems		No permitting in Price Co
Manure storage closure		No permitting in Price Co
Livestock facility siting		No permitting in Price Co
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining		Permit Issuance done by Zoning
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	Assist with 5 permits	Permits issued by WDNR
Shoreland zoning	5 restoration plans	Permits issued by Zoning
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	8	Permits issued by WDNR
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	25
For FPP	2
For NR 151	25
Animal waste ordinance	No Ordinance in Price Co
Livestock facility siting	No Ordinance in Price Co
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	20
Nonmetallic mining	10 to ensure stormwater practices are followed

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1
Field days	1
Trainings/workshops	5
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	3
Newsletters	
Social media posts	
News release/story	6

**Price County 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>County Conservationist</i>	1250	\$69,600
<i>Technician</i>	2080	\$78,500
<i>Support Costs</i>	625	\$18,000
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
<i>SWRM Bonding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$50,000</i>
<i>USFWS</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$3,000</i>
<i>WI-DNR</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$20,000</i>



State of Wisconsin
Governor Tony Evers

Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
Secretary Randy Romanski

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: July 25, 2024

TO: Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors

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

SUBJECT: *2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan for the Soil and Water Resource Management Program and the Nonpoint Source Program*

Recommend Action:

This is an informational item. However, if the LWCB wishes to do so, it may vote to “receive” the *2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan*. A vote to “receive” the preliminary allocation plan does not bind the LWCB to any position.

Summary:

The *2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan* provides details on how both the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) proposes to allocate \$23,421,931 of available nonpoint grant funds to county land conservation committees and other project cooperators.

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

Breakdown of the 2025 Joint Allocation

Charts 1 and 2 on Page 6 of the Joint Allocation Plan provide an overview of the grant funds DNR and DATCP propose to allocate. Specifically, Chart 1 identifies the proposed DNR and DATCP awards by program category and the dollar amounts and Chart 2 documents the grants awarded by the state appropriation or other funding source.

DATCP’s allocation awards grants in these program categories: staff and support, landowner cost-sharing, including a reserve to cost-share farm discharges and specific environmental concerns, and project grants including NMFE training and Innovation Grants. The following tables provide details regarding DATCP grants:

Wisconsin - America’s Dairyland

2811 Agriculture Drive • PO Box 8911 • Madison, WI 53708-8911 • Wisconsin.gov

An equal opportunity employer

Table A (page 20) summarizes county and cooperator awards by program category; Table A-1 (pages 21-22) shows the step-by-step process for calculating county staff and support grants; Tables A-2 (page 25) and A-3 (page 26) show county scores and rankings in the competition for structural and SEG cost-share grants.

DATCP expenditures for the 2025 allocation vary from the 2024 allocation as follows:

- An increase of \$252,100 in staffing and support grants.
- An increase of \$70,616 in SEG cost-share funds.
- A decrease of \$112,802 in Innovation Grant awards.
- An increase of \$19,848 in project cooperator grants.
- An increase of \$22,338 in NMFE grants awards.

DNR provides grants in the following funding categories: Targeted Runoff Management (TRM), Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management (UNPS) Construction, and NR 243 Notice of Discharge (NOD) programs. Table B (page 23) provides a breakdown of DNR's allocation to counties.

Table C (page 24) combines the DNR and DATCP allocations to provide a complete picture of the 2025 allocations.

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

- Possible changes in SEG-funded grants targeted to improve soil health and watershed management, specifically cover crops and reduced/no-till practices.
- Refining the SEG funding formula for awarding nutrient management cost-sharing.

Comment on Preliminary Allocation Plan

The 2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan and DATCP's Environmental Assessment were provided to all county land conservation departments and other interested parties prior to the LWCB's August 6, 2024 meeting.

Counties, project cooperators, and other interested persons may comment on the 2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan either by:

- Requesting to appear and present comments before the LWCB at its August 6, 2024 meeting. A Public Appearance Request Card must be submitted before the meeting.
- Emailing written comments no later than September 6, 2024 to datcpswrm@wisconsin.gov.

Materials Provided:

- 2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan
- Environmental Assessment

Presenter: Susan Mockert (DATCP)

2025 Joint Allocation Plan

Preliminary

August 2024

Soil and Water Resource Management Grant
Program and Nonpoint Source Program



Contents

List of Tables	iii
Summary of Changes to the 2025 Joint Allocation Plan	iv
Approval Signatures	iv
Funding Sources and Allocation Requests	6
.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
DATCP Allocations	7
Staff and Support	7
Funds Available	7
Grant Awards	7
Unmet Need for Staff and Support Funds	7
Future Funding Directions	8
Cost-Sharing, Structural Practices	8
Structural Practice Funds Available	9
Grant Awards	9
SEG Fund Allocation.....	10
Funds Available	10
Landowner Cost-Sharing	11
Innovation Grants.....	14
Unmet Need for Cost-Share Funding	15
Future Funding Directions	15
DNR Allocations.....	16
Funding Sources	16
1. TRM Preliminary Allocation.....	16
2. UNPS Preliminary Allocation	17
3. Notice of Discharge Program	17
Attachments	19

List of Tables

<u>Table A</u> : DATCP Allocations	Page 20
<u>Table A-1</u> : Staff and Support	Pages 21-22
<u>Table B</u> : Total DNR Preliminary Allocations	Page 23
<u>Table C</u> : Summary of DATCP and DNR Allocations	Page 24
<u>Table A-2</u> : County Bond Cost-Share Awards	Page 25
<u>Table A-3</u> : County SEG Cost-Share Awards	Page 26

Summary of Changes to the 2025 Joint Allocation Plan

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

Counties, project cooperators, and other interested persons may comment on the 2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan either by:

- Requesting to appear and present comments before the LWCB at a regularly scheduled meeting (a Public Appearance Request Card must be completed before the start of the meeting); or
- Emailing written comments no later than September 6, 2024 to datcpswrm@wisconsin.gov.

Approval Signatures

DATCP has determined that the action described in this allocation plan for the 2025 soil and water resource management grant program shown in Table A conforms to the applicable DATCP provisions of s. 92.14, Wis. Stats., and ch. ATCP 50, Wis. Admin. Code. DATCP reserves the right to reallocate grant funds unexpended by recipients.

Dated this ____ day of _____, 2024

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Randy Romanski, Secretary

DNR has determined that the actions described in this allocation plan for the 2025 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 _____, 2024

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Steve Little, Deputy Secretary

Introduction

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 2025 through the Soil and Water Resource Management (SWRM) Program ([Table A](#)). ATCP 50, the administrative rule that covers this grant program, was updated on June 1, 2024. The updates to ATCP 50 incorporated several new conservation practices for cost-sharing including: conservation cover, conservation crop rotation, habitat diversification, harvestable buffers, hydrologic restoration, nutrient treatment systems, stream restoration, and verification of depth to bedrock in Silurian areas. These practices require further administrative consideration by DATCP and County staff prior to contracting for cost share.

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 Management Construction Projects (UNPS Planning) Grant programs ([Table B](#)).

For 2025, a total of \$23,421,931 is allocated based on the state budget for the 2023-2025 biennium. [Table C](#) summarizes all allocations, by grantee. Organized by funding category, Chart 1 on page 6, summarizes grant fund requests, unmet funding requests, and allocation amounts. Chart 2 on page 6, shows the allocation categories by funding sources. *If required, these allocations may be adjusted based on reductions or lapses in appropriations or authorizations.*

The 2023-2025 biennium budget changed the funding source for the SWRM cost-share traditionally referred to as "bond" projects. For this biennium, these funds will be general purpose revenue (GPR) funds leading to a change in terminology within the SWRM program. Herein bond or GPR funded cost-share projects are referred to as "structural" practices.

Funding Sources and Allocation Requests

CHART 1: GRANT REQUESTS AND ALLOCATIONS			
Funding Category	Total Requests	Unmet Requests	Allocation Amounts
DATCP			
County Staff/Support	\$20,214,329	\$8,999,929	\$11,214,400
LWRM Cost-Share	\$6,493,000	\$2,993,000	\$3,500,000
Bond Reserve (B)	\$150,000	\$0	\$150,000
LWRM Cost-Share (SEG)	\$2,608,000	\$425,000	\$2,183,000
Cooperator Contracts (SEG)	\$1,144,007	\$121,246	\$1,022,761
Innovation Grants (SEG)	\$334,950	\$265,102	\$69,848
NMFE Grants (SEG)	\$399,391	\$0	\$399,391
SUBTOTAL	\$31,343,677	\$12,804,277	\$18,539,400
DNR			
UNPS Planning	NA	NA	NA
UNPS Construction	\$85,000	\$0	\$85,000
TRM	\$3,797,531	\$0	\$3,797,531
NOD Reserve (B)			\$1,000,000
SUBTOTAL	\$3,882,531	\$0	\$4,882,531
TOTAL			\$23,421,931

CHART 2: FUNDING SOURCES	
Staff and Support Grants	
\$7,437,100	DATCP SEG from s. 20.115(7)(qe)
\$3,777,300	DATCP GPR from s. 20.115(7)(c)
\$11,214,400	DATCP Subtotal
\$145,945	DNR SEG from s.20.370(6)(aq)
\$131,655	DNR GPR from s. 20.370(6)(ag)
\$210,000	DNR Sec. 319 Account (Federal)
\$487,600	DNR Subtotal
\$11,702,000	TOTAL Staff & Support Grants
Cost-Share Grants	
\$3,500,000	DATCP GPR from s. 20.115(7)(c)
\$150,000	DATCP Bond (Reserve) from s. 20.866(2)(we)
\$2,183,000	DATCP SEG from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
\$5,833,000	DATCP Subtotal
\$1,948,833	DNR Bond Revenue from s. 20.866(2)(tf)
\$85,000	DNR Bond Revenue from s. 20.866(2)(th)
\$2,068,964	DNR GPR from s. 20.370(6)(ag)
\$292,134	DNR Sec. 319 Account (Federal)
\$4,394,931	DNR Subtotal
\$10,227,931	TOTAL Cost-Share Grants
Nutrient Management Farmer Education (NMFE) & Other Project Cooperator (OPC) Grants	
\$399,391	DATCP SEG (NMFE) from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
\$1,022,761	DATCP SEG (OPC) from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
\$69,848	DATCP SEG (Innovation) from s.20.115(7)(qf)
\$1,492,000	TOTAL NMFE & Other Grants
\$23,421,931	Grand Total

DATCP Allocations

Staff and Support

The allocation under this category provides county staff and support funding. Grant awards are consistent with the terms of the 2025 grant application and instructions located at https://datcp.wi.gov/Pages/Programs_Services/SWRMSect6.aspx.

Funds Available

The allocation amount listed in [Table A-1](#) consists of annual appropriations of \$3,777,300 in GPR funds and \$7,437,100 in segregated (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.

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 \$5,814,400 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 percentage goals. For round one, DATCP will fully fund county requests for their first position at the 100% rate. Due to a decrease in the 2023-2025 biennium allocation, DATCP had a funding shortfall of 20% for the second position. DATCP is able to fund 80% of the county requests at the 70% rate for the second position. DATCP has no funding to make awards in round three to fund a county's third position at the 50% rate. [Table A-1](#) provides round-by-round details of the Tier 2 allocation for each county.

Unmet Need for Staff and Support Funds

DATCP requires an additional \$2.5 million appropriated to reach the goal of providing 50% of the third position and an additional \$1,016,931 to fully fund 70% of the second position. Third and subsequent staffing costs are also submitted with the grant application for a total of \$20,214,329. With decreases in funding, counties incur a significant part of the staffing costs.

For example, in 2023, counties obtained or provided funding to pay 212 of the 384 conservation staff employed statewide.

Future Funding Directions

DATCP awards grants for a county's first position only if the staff is actively engaged in qualified conservation activities. DATCP also requires annual work planning and reporting in order to qualify for DATCP funding. These requirements build county conservation capacity and better account for the performance of conservation activities using state funds. If sufficient additional staffing funding is made available in the future to fully fund the statutory goal in s. 92.14(6)(b), Wis. Stats., DATCP may consider further adjustments to the grant formula to advance the goals of capacity building and accountability without compromising the basic funding for county staff. If additional funding is provided moving forward, DATCP could consider the amount of DATCP programming a county supports such as nutrient management farmer education, farmland preservation, the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), or livestock siting in determining how funds are allocated.

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 a planner qualified to write nutrient management plans. In addition, 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. DATCP reserves the right to adjust awards to buffer impacts due to changing state budgets. If adjustments to the staffing formula are made in the future, DATCP will proceed with caution and only after input from counties, mindful of the challenges.

Cost-Sharing, Structural Practices

With the 2023-2025 state budget plan, the source of funding for cost-sharing "hard" or "structural" practices to resolve discharges on farms, address priority non-point runoff projects, and provide counties grants for landowner cost-sharing was changed from bond to general purpose revenue (GPR). Historically, these cost-share funds and practices have been referred to as bond or bondable. For the 2025 Joint Allocation Plan, these practices will be referred to as *structural cost-share*. Unless otherwise noted below, grant awards are consistent with the terms of the 2025 grant application and instructions (see page 7 for the link to these documents).

The 2024 ATCP 50 updates added new practices for structural funding including harvestable buffers, hydrologic restoration, nutrient management systems, and stream restoration. These practices will require further consideration for proper implementation by DATCP and County staff.

Structural Practice Funds Available

The allocation amount listed on page 6 consists of \$3.5 million (half of SWRM's \$7.0 million authorization in the 2023-2025 biennium budget) GPR funds. NOTE: Extended bond funds remain available for approved extended projects.

Grant Awards

Cost-share

DATCP will allocate \$3,500,000 for structural practices 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 accomplishments in previous grant cycles and need.

After providing each county \$10,000 in base funding, DATCP awards the remaining \$2,780,000 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 one needs-based criteria (farmland acres based on 2022 Census of Agriculture data). Minor manual adjustments are then made to the allocation, if needed.

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

Engineering Reserve Projects

DATCP will allocate \$150,000 to an engineering reserve primarily for funding projects to address discharges on farms including regulatory animal waste response (NR 151) projects in cooperation with DNR. Funds may also be used for priority projects related to extreme weather events or other non-runoff related projects. These projects are usually higher cost and funds are awarded based on a competitive application process that includes completing a form for engineering reserve projects and projects over \$50,000 as well as obtaining a recommendation from DATCP engineering staff.

Unmet Need for Structural Cost-Share Funds

DATCP's allocation provided 54% of the structural cost-share funds requested, leaving \$2,993,000 in unfunded county requests. A shortfall in structural cost-share funds has practical implications 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 the news. NR 151.075 targeted performance standard.

Future Funding Directions

Funding to install structural conservation practices has stayed the same since 2009, but costs have increased, resulting in 75% of counties having no underspending. Therefore, that criterion is less meaningful when awarding funds than in previous years. Acres of farmland per county and positive spending over a three year period are taking precedence in how funds are awarded.

DATCP may update the review of applications and awards process using a rubric to score applications and supporting information. The criteria would stay the same—underspending, acres of farmland and positive spending—but the interpretation of the data may be updated.

Finally, with the move to GPR funds, \$150,000 in unspent bond funds constitute the 2025 engineering reserve fund.

SEG Fund Allocation

The allocations under this category provide funding for (1) landowner cost-sharing for soft practices including nutrient management (NM), (2) farmer and related training involving NM, (3) NM implementation support and other projects of statewide importance and (4) innovative projects focused on creative implementation of NM projects. Unless otherwise noted below, grant awards are consistent with the terms of the 2025 grant application and instructions (see page 7 for the link to these documents). The updates to ATCP 50 approved on June 1, 2024, include new practices of conservation cover, conservation crop rotation, habitat diversification, and Silurian performance standard implementation that are to utilize SEG funding for cost-sharing. Several existing practices were revised to incorporate current standards and revise cost-share rates.

Funds Available

The total funding amount allocated for SEG programming is \$6,475,000 “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 \$1,000,000 for a redirection of funds for producer-led watershed protection grants.
- A decrease of \$1,000,000 for a redirection of funds to the Nitrogen Optimization Pilot Program.
- A decrease of \$800,000 for a redirection of funds to the Crop Insurance Rebates for Cover Crops program.

Of the \$3,675,000 available for allocation, \$2,183,000 will be provided to counties for landowner cost-sharing, \$399,391 will be awarded for farmer NM training, \$69,848 will be given to counties for innovation grants and \$1,022,761 will be awarded to project cooperators for training and support services. 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 to meet the 2015 Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 590 Standard. These funds may be used to cost-share (a) cover crops and other cropping practices to implement a NM plan and (b) for structural practices with DATCP approval if the county's grant contract authorizes such use.

Sixty-one counties applied for \$2,608,000 in grants, and DATCP will award \$2,183,000 to applicants based on ranking determined by the following scoring criteria:

- Up to 20 points based on acres covered by Farmland Preservation Zoning and Agriculture Enterprise Areas.
- Up to 20 points based on the extent of impaired waters located in each county.
- Up to 30 points based on a county's participation in NM planning and implementation as demonstrated by specific employee positions, inclusion of NM planning in 2023 work plans, providing educational opportunities related to NM planning, soil testing, or plan renewal.
- Up to 30 points based on a county's total three-year positive spending on NM cost-sharing.

DATCP relies on data in its possession to score county applications based on the four funding criteria. Counties are ranked according to their cumulative scores (up to 100 points) and are organized into five groups for allocation purposes. Counties receive the highest maximum award for their grouping unless a county requests a lower amount. The five award groups are listed in Chart 3.

Chart 3: SEG Cost-Share Awards		
Group	Maximum Award	Maximum Awards in Groups
1	\$95,000	3 of 5
2	\$75,000	6 of 20
3	\$55,000	3 of 17
4	\$45,000	1 of 13
5	\$15,000	0 of 6

Awards may be manually adjusted in a few cases to provide additional SEG funding to counties who requested larger allocations and have demonstrated an ability to spend it, or to limit funds going to counties who have a proclivity of transferring all SEG funds. In no case did the award exceed a county's request or the maximum of \$95,000. Table A-3 enumerates each county's score, grouping, and grant award. The term "N/A" identifies the eleven counties that did not apply for funds. Table A also reflects amounts allocated to each county under the "SEG Cost-Sharing" column. With prior approval from DATCP, counties may spend up to 50% of their cost-share SEG allocation on structural practices in support of nutrient management plan implementation. Counties may request additional flexibility to use the funds with DATCP approval.

NMFE Training Grants

For 2025, DATCP funded twenty-three Nutrient Management Farmer Education requests, in the amounts listed in Chart 4.

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 Standard. Four of the awards also include funds to purchase laptops for training.

Tier 1 funding provides for nutrient management training to producers and plan writers to develop 590-compliant nutrient management plans. These funds can be used for participant

payments to complete soil tests or attend training, as well as for administrative costs. Tier 2 awards offer the same training but developing a 590-compliant plan is not required.

Chart 4 2025 NMFE Awards				
Applicant Name	Tier 1	Tier 2	Laptop Request	Total Award
Buffalo Co & River Country RC&D	34,850		2,000	\$36,850
Calumet Co		1,100		\$1,100
Columbia Co		3,000		\$3,000
Douglas Co	24,042		2,000	\$26,042
Eau Claire Co	25,000			\$25,000
Glacierland RC&D	24,978	3,000		\$27,978
Green Lake Co	10,150			\$10,150
Kewaunee Co & PPF	35,000			\$35,000
Lafayette	9,750			\$9,750
Langlade Co	24,650			\$24,650
Manitowoc Co	13,300	1,550	2,000	\$16,850
Marathon et al	32,596			\$32,596
Marinette & Oconto Co	15,325			\$15,325
Marquette Co		3,000		\$3,000
Ozaukee Co		2,500		\$2,500
Rock Co		3,000		\$3,000
Sauk Co	15,200			\$15,200
SWTC	25,000			\$25,000
Trempealeau Co	20,000	2,500		\$22,500
Vernon Co	20,900			\$20,900
Washburn & Burnett Co	35,000		2,000	\$37,000
Washington Co		3,000		\$3,000
Wisconsin State Cranberry Growers Association		3,000		\$3,000
TOTALS	365,741	25,650	8,000	\$399,391
Tier 1 and Tier 2 Awards				

Statewide Projects: Project Cooperator Grants

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 and support of technical standards, and coordinated activities in AEAs and impaired waters.



In the cooperator subcategory of Nutrient Management Implementation Support, DATCP received an application from the SnapPlus program at UW-Madison that submitted a request totaling \$322,015. DATCP will provide \$306,698 for SnapPlus maintenance and development. The

increase in this award is in support of the launch of version 3 of the SnapPlus software. Funding the UW CALS Nutrient and Pest Management Program supports the maintenance and expansion of a digital, self-paced, interactive NM curriculum, including the development of new applications and resources. Funding supports statewide delivery of the NM curriculum through



virtual and in-person trainings. The UW CALS project will also support development of new training materials related to the launch of SnapPlus version 3, which is anticipated in 2024.

Also in support of Nutrient Management implementation, DATCP received an application from UW-Extension for \$331,925. DATCP will provide \$316,608 for statewide support of NM planning through education, outreach, and project implementation.

In the training and technical standard support category of project cooperators, DATCP will provide the following funding:

- Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Association (WI Land+Water) is awarded \$233,426. 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). Funding also supports activities to promote accountability and achievements among county conservation

programs. Finally, a focus on enhancing state conservation delivery will be facilitated through statewide conservation initiatives and by fostering state and local priorities. Up to \$5,000 of this award is to be dedicated to announcing and celebrating the Conservation Farmer of the Year award.

The Standards Oversight Council (SOC) is awarded the full \$44,000 requested. This award contributes support to ensure statewide capacity to develop and maintain technical standards for conservation programs.

DATCP received several other applications for cooperator funds:

- UW-SFAL – Support of Soil Lab services. This project will support the NM soil lab certification program. Request: \$26,134. Award: \$14,054.
- UW-NOP – Support of the Nitrogen Optimization Pilot Program that is a partnership between DATCP and UW. This will partially fund a position in Dr. Matt Ruark's Soil Lab focused on data management. Request: \$94,676. Award: \$60,000.
- UW-GNHS – Supporting depth to bedrock map and data incorporation. Request: \$39,850. Award: \$35,000.
- Sand County Foundation – Sharing the Story of Producer-Led Watershed Protection Grants using ESRI ArcGIS Experience Builder Web Application. Request: \$12,975. Award: \$12,975.

Innovation Grants

With the 2025 SWRM grant application, counties were invited to submit Innovation Grant requests for new ways to approach land and water conservation. Thirteen applications were received from counties with \$334,950 SEG funds requested. With the increase in NMFE awards and the divide in NM support of UW-Extension and UW CALS, less funding is available for the Innovation Awards in 2025 than previous years. A total of \$69,848 is awarded shown in Chart 5.

Chart 5: Innovation Awards			
Innovation Grant	Amount	Staffing award from EPA Hypoxia Grant	Total Award
Buffalo County	\$14,550		\$14,550
Iowa County	\$8,300	\$15,370	\$23,670
Lafayette County	\$5,000		\$5,000
Ozaukee County	\$11,998		\$11,998
Polk County	\$10,000		\$10,000
Racine County	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
St. Croix County	\$20,000		\$20,000
Wood County	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
TOTALS	\$69,848	\$35,370	\$105,218

Projects were scored by four individuals on a 20-point scale that considered alignment with the program goals, a logical plan, the proposed budget, and previous funding. Three Innovation Grant proposals are fully funded based on the level of innovation: Buffalo County, Iowa County, and St. Croix County. Three proposals are partially funded: Lafayette County, Ozaukee County and Polk County. These projects are not only innovative in the proposed county, but also could provide models for other counties and programs moving forward. Due to less available funding, lower scoring projects cannot be funded for 2025.

The 2025 cooperator awards are documented in the lower section of Table A. All award recipients are required to sign grant contracts that incorporate the requirements of s. ATCP 50.35 and include significant accountability measures.

A separate pass-through grant from the EPA's Gulf Hypoxia award to DNR has allowed staff support funding for Innovation Grants. The following counties qualified for awards from this grant: Iowa County, Racine County and Wood County.

Unmet Need for Cost-Share Funding

DATCP will provide about 84% of the SEG funding requested by counties for cost-sharing, which is \$425,000 less than the requested amount. While the cost-share funding aligns with county spending, the department hopes that the continued additional flexibility provided will increase the amount of cost-sharing utilized by counties.

Future Funding Directions

DATCP continues to consider how it can best apply its SEG funding to improve conservation and implement conservation practices. There is a growing interest to target SEG funds towards cropping practices to improve soil health and watershed management, specifically encouraging cover crops and reduced/no-till practices.

DATCP will continue to focus SEG funding to support NM planning and implementation, and will use feedback from counties and other stakeholders to determine which, if any, of the following strategies are possible and could be used:

- Create a soil health program that includes targeted funding specifically for soil health practices.
- Create a mentorship program to facilitate learning and better understanding of NM between producers and their plan writers.
- Provide funds to regional support groups to provide agronomic and conservation compliance assistance for FPP and other state priorities.
- Set aside funds to support SWRM program technology. The current SWRM database is scheduled for end of service support in October 2025 by Microsoft. Paired with ever-changing program needs, DATCP is seeking technological support and solutions more frequently with limited capacity for this in the future. Funding a modern database solution would also allow DATCP to track and target its funding more effectively, reduce administrative requirements of its awardees, and potentially allow for tracking of the conservation impacts of the programs across the state.

Regarding the allocation of SEG funds specifically for nutrient management cost-sharing, DATCP remains interested in refining the formula for awarding county cost-sharing and the policies surrounding its use.

Before making major changes to what is funded and how it is distributed, DATCP will engage stakeholders to develop a workable approach. The counties can share insights on approaches to effectively target cost-sharing and increase farmer participation.

DNR Allocations

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

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

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

Funding Sources

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

Allocations to counties for UNPS-Construction projects, when requested, are from bond revenue appropriated under s. 20.866(2)(th), Wis. Stats. or GPR funds appropriated under s. 20.370(6)(dg), Wis. Stats.

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

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

- For all grant programs, funds will be considered “committed” when a grantee has returned to the DNR a signed copy of the grant agreement.
- For the TRM program, grant agreements not signed by the deadline may be rescinded by DNR, and the associated grant funds may be used to fund other eligible projects in rank order based on project scores. If, for any reason, funds committed through this allocation plan become available after March 31, 2025, these funds may be held to fund projects selected in the next grant cycle.

1. TRM Preliminary Allocation

DNR allocates up to \$3,797,531 to counties for cost sharing of TRM projects during calendar year 2025. This amount is adequate to fully fund the estimated state share for all five eligible county Small-Scale TRM applications. Additionally, this amount is adequate to fully fund the estimated state share for all five eligible county Large-Scale TRM applications. As shown in Chart 1, there are not any 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 \$600,000.

TRM allocations made through this plan will be reimbursed to grantees during calendar years 2025 through 2026 for Small-Scale projects and through 2027 for Large-Scale projects. Project applications are screened, scored, and ranked in accordance with s. 281.65(4c), Wis. Stats. Adjustments to grant amounts may occur to account for eligibility of project components, cost-share rates, or ch. NR 151 enforcement action at the time that DNR negotiates the actual grant agreement with an applicant.

2. UNPS Preliminary Allocation

DNR has implemented an alternating schedule for both UNPS-Planning and UNPS-Construction grants. The UNPS-Planning grants are solicited in odd years, and the UNPS-Construction grants are solicited in even years. The maximum cost-share amount that can be awarded for a UNPS-Construction grant is \$150,000, with an additional \$50,000 for land acquisition. The maximum cost-share amount that can be awarded for a UNPS-Planning grant is \$85,000.

UNPS grant awards will be reimbursed to grantees during calendar years 2025 and 2026. Project applications have been screened, scored, and ranked in accordance with s. 281.66, Wis. Stats.

PLANNING. UNPS-Planning grant applications were not solicited in 2024 for the 2025 award cycle. The UNPS-Construction grant application will be available in early 2025 for 2026 awards.

CONSTRUCTION. UNPS-Construction grant applications were solicited in 2024 for the 2025 award cycle. One eligible application was received from counties. The DNR allocates up to \$85,000 to fully fund the grant application.

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 of the competitive TRM process. DNR is authorized to award grants to governmental units, which

in turn enter into cost-share agreements with landowners that have received an NOD or NOI.

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

B. NOD Preliminary Allocation

This Preliminary Allocation Plan establishes a reserve of \$1,000,000 for NOD projects during calendar year 2025. The reserve includes funds for structural practices in eligible locations. DNR may use its discretion to increase this reserve if needed. To receive a grant award, a governmental unit must submit an application to DNR that describes a specific project and includes documentation that an NOD or NOI has either already been issued or will be issued by DNR concurrent with the grant award. Once DNR issues a grant to the governmental unit to address an NOD or NOI, DNR will designate a portion of the reserve specifically for that project.

DNR will require that county grantees commit funds to a cost-share agreement with the landowner within a timeframe 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 2025. If the landowner fails to install practices listed in the cost-share agreement within the timeframe identified, DNR will terminate its grant with the county, leaving the landowner to correct the problems identified in the NOD without the benefit of state cost sharing.

Fund balances from terminated NOD grants and projects completed under budget may be returned to the reserve account and made available to other NOD applicants. Reserve funds remaining at the end of calendar year 2025 may either be carried over for the calendar year 2026 NOD reserve account or may be allocated for calendar year 2026 TRM projects.

Attachments

Table A: DATCP Allocations
STAFFING AND COST-SHARE 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
		Structural Cost-Sharing	SEG Cost-Sharing					Structural Cost-Sharing	SEG Cost-Sharing	
Adams	132,650	40,700	45,000	218,350		Marathon	158,979	73,454	95,000	327,433
Ashland	154,918	50,000	30,000	234,918		Marinette	164,105	54,500	75,000	293,605
Barron	163,876	51,000	10,000	224,876		Marquette	150,748	45,700	55,000	251,448
Bayfield	168,196	50,700	8,000	226,896		Menominee	96,280	20,000	0	116,280
Brown	180,384	50,000	50,000	280,384		Milwaukee	75,000	10,000	5,000	85,000
Buffalo	141,172	50,000	20,000	211,172		Monroe	161,754	55,000	50,000	216,754
Burnett	118,105	40,000	8,000	166,105		Oconto	169,055	54,500	0	223,555
Calumet	204,651	39,800	40,000	284,451		Oneida	139,723	40,700	0	180,423
Chippewa	178,285	73,454	75,000	326,739		Outagamie	210,536	55,000	75,000	340,536
Clark	169,697	65,000	65,000	299,697		Ozaukee	157,222	56,200	25,000	238,422
Columbia	148,836	59,138	75,000	282,974		Pepin	122,281	36,000	30,000	188,281
Crawford	137,923	51,000	8,000	196,923		Pierce	162,609	61,000	15,000	238,609
Dane	257,860	65,700	95,000	418,560		Polk	162,564	49,500	0	212,064
Dodge	157,234	51,000	20,000	228,234		Portage	178,001	65,000	0	243,001
Door	183,630	50,000	10,000	243,630		Price	116,036	45,700	0	161,736
Douglas	131,167	30,000	5,000	166,167		Racine	185,302	65,000	85,000	335,302
Dunn	208,581	60,700	20,000	289,281		Richland	119,351	38,800	20,000	178,151
Eau Claire	169,360	44,500	65,000	278,860		Rock	124,645	65,700	95,000	285,345
Florence	118,219	35,700	0	153,919		Rusk	112,068	50,700	25,000	187,768
Fond du Lac	161,492	40,000	6,000	207,492		Saint Croix	158,567	50,000	45,000	253,567
Forest	116,941	15,000	10,000	141,941		Sauk	181,493	60,700	60,000	302,193
Grant	134,033	73,454	0	207,487		Sawyer	111,000	35,700	8,000	154,700
Green	170,008	65,700	20,000	255,708		Shawano	160,497	44,500	20,000	224,997
Green Lake	179,457	45,700	30,000	255,157		Sheboygan	167,718	55,000	15,000	237,718
Iowa	156,271	45,000	45,000	246,271		Taylor	155,052	50,000	65,000	270,052
Iron	126,856	40,700	2,000	169,556		Trempealeau	147,031	65,700	30,000	242,731
Jackson	149,049	61,000	0	210,049		Vernon	151,336	60,700	75,000	287,036
Jefferson	198,798	29,500	12,000	240,298		Vilas	154,897	35,700	0	190,597
Juneau	163,398	44,500	20,000	227,898		Walworth	203,251	54,500	20,000	277,751
Kenosha	150,021	36,000	5,000	191,021		Washburn	130,646	45,700	6,000	182,346
Kewaunee	167,731	39,800	15,000	222,531		Washington	164,004	25,700	10,000	199,704
LaCrosse	180,346	49,500	20,000	249,846		Waukesha	210,038	40,700	10,000	260,738
Lafayette	111,733	60,000	0	171,733		Waupaca	161,879	60,000	75,000	296,879
Langlade	127,333	35,000	55,000	217,333		Wausara	160,475	43,500	25,000	228,975
Lincoln	88,635	40,700	1,000	130,335		Winnebago	191,542	44,500	50,000	286,042
Manitowoc	164,139	55,000	75,000	294,139		Wood	167,730	50,000	54,000	271,730
						Reserve		150,000		150,000
						Sub-Totals	\$11,214,400	\$3,650,000	\$2,183,000	\$17,047,400
PROJECT COOPERATOR ALLOCATIONS										
UW Madison CALS SnapPlus				306,698		WLWCA SOC				44,000
UW Extension NPM				316,608		Sand County Foundation				12,975
UW-SFAL				14,054		Nutrient Management Farmer Education				399,391
UW-GNHS				35,000		Innovation Grants				69,848
UW NOP Support				60,000		Sub-Total Cooperator Allocation				\$1,492,000
WLWCA				233,426						
ALLOCATION TOTALS						TOTAL	\$11,214,400	\$3,650,000	\$2,183,000	\$18,539,400

Table A-1

County	Tier 1	Tier 2												2025 DATCP Staffing and 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)		Eligible Round 2 Award		Round 2 Award at 80% of 70%	Adjusted Award (Tier 1 + Round 1&2)	Third Position at 50%(Round 3)	Round 3 Award No Funds Available	
Adams	\$75,000	\$89,731.00	-\$14,731.00	\$14,731.00	\$89,731.00	\$53,872.00	-\$53,872.00	\$53,872.00	\$42,919.00	\$42,919.00	\$132,650.00	\$24,067.00		\$132,650.00
Ashland	\$75,000	\$101,271.00	-\$26,271.00	\$26,271.00	\$101,271.00	\$67,338.00	-\$67,338.00	\$67,338.00	\$53,647.00	\$53,647.00	\$154,918.00	\$31,792.00		\$154,918.00
Barron	\$75,000	\$105,711.00	-\$30,711.00	\$30,711.00	\$105,711.00	\$73,009.00	-\$73,009.00	\$73,009.00	\$58,165.00	\$58,165.00	\$163,876.00	\$50,552.00		\$163,876.00
Bayfield	\$75,000	\$114,511.00	-\$39,511.00	\$39,511.00	\$114,511.00	\$67,386.00	-\$67,386.00	\$67,386.00	\$53,685.00	\$53,685.00	\$168,196.00	\$40,203.00		\$168,196.00
Brown	\$75,000	\$120,649.00	-\$45,649.00	\$45,649.00	\$120,649.00	\$74,979.00	-\$74,979.00	\$74,979.00	\$59,735.00	\$59,735.00	\$180,384.00	\$46,177.00		\$180,384.00
Buffalo	\$75,000	\$100,480.00	-\$25,480.00	\$25,480.00	\$100,480.00	\$51,076.00	-\$51,076.00	\$51,076.00	\$40,692.00	\$40,692.00	\$141,172.00	\$22,738.00		\$141,172.00
Burnett	\$75,000	\$81,696.00	-\$6,696.00	\$6,696.00	\$81,696.00	\$45,701.00	-\$45,701.00	\$45,701.00	\$36,409.00	\$36,409.00	\$118,105.00	\$30,497.00		\$118,105.00
Calumet	\$75,000	\$138,167.00	-\$63,167.00	\$63,167.00	\$138,167.00	\$83,451.00	-\$83,451.00	\$83,451.00	\$66,484.00	\$66,484.00	\$204,651.00	\$59,543.00		\$204,651.00
Chippewa	\$75,000	\$119,912.00	-\$44,912.00	\$44,912.00	\$119,912.00	\$73,270.00	-\$73,270.00	\$73,270.00	\$58,373.00	\$58,373.00	\$178,285.00	\$50,666.00		\$178,285.00
Clark	\$75,000	\$117,848.00	-\$42,848.00	\$42,848.00	\$117,848.00	\$65,081.00	-\$65,081.00	\$65,081.00	\$51,849.00	\$51,849.00	\$169,697.00	\$31,533.00		\$169,697.00
Columbia	\$75,000	\$97,828.00	-\$22,828.00	\$22,828.00	\$97,828.00	\$64,025.00	-\$64,025.00	\$64,025.00	\$51,008.00	\$51,008.00	\$148,836.00	\$45,675.00		\$148,836.00
Crawford	\$75,000	\$88,356.00	-\$13,356.00	\$13,356.00	\$88,356.00	\$62,217.00	-\$62,217.00	\$62,217.00	\$49,567.00	\$49,567.00	\$137,923.00	\$24,802.00		\$137,923.00
Dane	\$75,000	\$167,197.00	-\$92,197.00	\$92,197.00	\$167,197.00	\$113,800.00	-\$113,800.00	\$113,800.00	\$90,663.00	\$90,663.00	\$257,860.00	\$70,473.00		\$257,860.00
Dodge	\$75,000	\$101,162.00	-\$26,162.00	\$26,162.00	\$101,162.00	\$70,382.00	-\$70,382.00	\$70,382.00	\$56,072.00	\$56,072.00	\$157,234.00	\$44,358.00		\$157,234.00
Door	\$75,000	\$129,315.00	-\$54,315.00	\$54,315.00	\$129,315.00	\$68,176.00	-\$68,176.00	\$68,176.00	\$54,315.00	\$54,315.00	\$183,630.00	\$48,058.00		\$183,630.00
Douglas	\$75,000	\$88,814.00	-\$13,814.00	\$13,814.00	\$88,814.00	\$53,162.00	-\$53,162.00	\$53,162.00	\$42,353.00	\$42,353.00	\$131,167.00	\$33,687.00		\$131,167.00
Dunn	\$75,000	\$140,790.00	-\$65,790.00	\$65,790.00	\$140,790.00	\$85,091.00	-\$85,091.00	\$85,091.00	\$67,791.00	\$67,791.00	\$208,581.00	\$60,439.00		\$208,581.00
Eau Claire	\$75,000	\$116,315.00	-\$41,315.00	\$41,315.00	\$116,315.00	\$66,582.00	-\$66,582.00	\$66,582.00	\$53,045.00	\$53,045.00	\$169,360.00	\$40,991.00		\$169,360.00
Florence	\$75,000	\$81,720.00	-\$6,720.00	\$6,720.00	\$81,720.00	\$45,813.00	-\$45,813.00	\$45,813.00	\$36,499.00	\$36,499.00	\$118,219.00			\$118,219.00
Fond du Lac	\$75,000	\$105,083.00	-\$30,083.00	\$30,083.00	\$105,083.00	\$70,805.00	-\$70,805.00	\$70,805.00	\$56,409.00	\$56,409.00	\$161,492.00	\$40,477.00		\$161,492.00
Forest	\$75,000	\$92,734.00	-\$17,734.00	\$17,734.00	\$92,734.00	\$30,384.00	-\$30,384.00	\$30,384.00	\$24,207.00	\$24,207.00	\$116,941.00	\$14,014.00		\$116,941.00
Grant	\$75,000	\$86,471.00	-\$11,471.00	\$11,471.00	\$86,471.00	\$59,700.00	-\$59,700.00	\$59,700.00	\$47,562.00	\$47,562.00	\$134,033.00	\$41,816.00		\$134,033.00
Green	\$75,000	\$119,334.00	-\$44,334.00	\$44,334.00	\$119,334.00	\$63,606.00	-\$63,606.00	\$63,606.00	\$50,674.00	\$50,674.00	\$170,008.00	\$29,634.00		\$170,008.00
Green Lake	\$75,000	\$119,553.00	-\$44,553.00	\$44,553.00	\$119,553.00	\$75,191.00	-\$75,191.00	\$75,191.00	\$59,904.00	\$59,904.00	\$179,457.00	\$47,359.00		\$179,457.00
Iowa	\$75,000	\$116,374.00	-\$41,374.00	\$41,374.00	\$116,374.00	\$50,079.00	-\$50,079.00	\$50,079.00	\$39,897.00	\$39,897.00	\$156,271.00	\$31,917.00		\$156,271.00
Iron	\$75,000	\$82,562.00	-\$7,562.00	\$7,562.00	\$82,562.00	\$55,598.00	-\$55,598.00	\$55,598.00	\$44,294.00	\$44,294.00	\$126,856.00	\$13,548.00		\$126,856.00
Jackson	\$75,000	\$96,197.00	-\$21,197.00	\$21,197.00	\$96,197.00	\$66,340.00	-\$66,340.00	\$66,340.00	\$52,852.00	\$52,852.00	\$149,049.00			\$149,049.00
Jefferson	\$75,000	\$135,366.00	-\$60,366.00	\$60,366.00	\$135,366.00	\$79,915.00	-\$79,915.00	\$79,915.00	\$63,667.00	\$63,667.00	\$199,033.00	\$39,886.00		\$198,798.00
Juneau	\$75,000	\$111,312.00	-\$36,312.00	\$36,312.00	\$111,312.00	\$65,378.00	-\$65,378.00	\$65,378.00	\$52,086.00	\$52,086.00	\$163,398.00	\$32,501.00		\$163,398.00
Kenosha	\$75,000	\$121,118.00	-\$46,118.00	\$46,118.00	\$121,118.00	\$36,279.00	-\$36,279.00	\$36,279.00	\$28,903.00	\$28,903.00	\$150,021.00	\$14,332.00		\$150,021.00
Kewaunee	\$75,000	\$122,377.00	-\$47,377.00	\$47,377.00	\$122,377.00	\$56,928.00	-\$56,928.00	\$56,928.00	\$45,354.00	\$45,354.00	\$167,731.00	\$40,311.00		\$167,731.00
LaCrosse	\$75,000	\$120,237.00	-\$45,237.00	\$45,237.00	\$120,237.00	\$75,449.00	-\$75,449.00	\$75,449.00	\$60,109.00	\$60,109.00	\$180,346.00	\$50,416.00		\$180,346.00
Lafayette	\$75,000	\$73,868.00	\$1,132.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00	\$47,239.00	-\$46,107.00	\$46,107.00	\$36,733.00	\$36,733.00	\$111,733.00	\$29,931.00		\$111,733.00
Langlade	\$75,000	\$89,967.00	-\$14,967.00	\$14,967.00	\$89,967.00	\$46,902.00	-\$46,902.00	\$46,902.00	\$37,366.00	\$37,366.00	\$127,333.00	\$23,506.00		\$127,333.00
Lincoln	\$75,000	\$77,457.00	-\$2,457.00	\$2,457.00	\$77,457.00	\$14,031.00	-\$14,031.00	\$14,031.00	\$11,178.00	\$11,178.00	\$88,635.00	\$8,259.00		\$88,635.00
Manitowoc	\$75,000	\$120,068.00	-\$45,068.00	\$45,068.00	\$120,068.00	\$55,318.00	-\$55,318.00	\$55,318.00	\$44,071.00	\$44,071.00	\$164,139.00	\$38,192.00		\$164,139.00

Table A-1

County	Tier 1	Tier 2												2025 DATCP Staffing and 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)		Eligible Round 2 Award		Round 2 Award at 80% of 70%	Adjusted Award (Tier 1 + Round 1&2)	Third Position at 50%(Round 3)	Round 3 Award No Funds Available	
Marathon	\$75,000	\$103,401.00	-\$28,401.00	\$28,401.00	\$103,401.00	\$69,761.00	-\$69,761.00	\$69,761.00	\$55,578.00	\$55,578.00	\$158,979.00	\$49,113.00		\$158,979.00
Marinette	\$75,000	\$112,167.00	-\$37,167.00	\$37,167.00	\$112,167.00	\$65,193.00	-\$65,193.00	\$65,193.00	\$51,938.00	\$51,938.00	\$164,105.00	\$36,285.00		\$164,105.00
Marquette	\$75,000	\$116,890.00	-\$41,890.00	\$41,890.00	\$116,890.00	\$42,498.00	-\$42,498.00	\$42,498.00	\$33,858.00	\$33,858.00	\$150,748.00	\$29,379.00		\$150,748.00
Menominee	\$75,000	\$43,640.00	\$31,360.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00	\$58,071.00	-\$26,711.00	\$26,711.00	\$21,280.00	\$21,280.00	\$96,280.00			\$96,280.00
Milwaukee	\$75,000		\$75,000.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00	\$65,580.00	\$9,420.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00	\$36,032.00		\$75,000.00
Monroe	\$75,000	\$121,507.00	-\$46,507.00	\$46,507.00	\$121,507.00	\$50,518.00	-\$50,518.00	\$50,518.00	\$40,247.00	\$40,247.00	\$161,754.00	\$31,368.00		\$161,754.00
Oconto	\$75,000	\$113,802.00	-\$38,802.00	\$38,802.00	\$113,802.00	\$69,353.00	-\$69,353.00	\$69,353.00	\$55,253.00	\$55,253.00	\$169,055.00	\$40,930.00		\$169,055.00
Oneida	\$75,000	\$95,654.00	-\$20,654.00	\$20,654.00	\$95,654.00	\$55,315.00	-\$55,315.00	\$55,315.00	\$44,069.00	\$44,069.00	\$139,723.00	\$10,272.00		\$139,723.00
Outagamie	\$75,000	\$138,833.00	-\$63,833.00	\$63,833.00	\$138,833.00	\$90,002.00	-\$90,002.00	\$90,002.00	\$71,703.00	\$71,703.00	\$210,536.00	\$51,407.00		\$210,536.00
Ozaukee	\$75,000	\$108,355.00	-\$33,355.00	\$33,355.00	\$108,355.00	\$61,338.00	-\$61,338.00	\$61,338.00	\$48,867.00	\$48,867.00	\$157,222.00	\$42,932.00		\$157,222.00
Pepin	\$75,000	\$57,856.00	\$17,144.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00	\$76,491.00	-\$59,347.00	\$59,347.00	\$47,281.00	\$47,281.00	\$122,281.00	\$26,536.00		\$122,281.00
Pierce	\$75,000	\$105,631.00	-\$30,631.00	\$30,631.00	\$105,631.00	\$71,519.00	-\$71,519.00	\$71,519.00	\$56,978.00	\$56,978.00	\$162,609.00	\$48,420.00		\$162,609.00
Polk	\$75,000	\$116,078.00	-\$41,078.00	\$41,078.00	\$116,078.00	\$58,349.00	-\$58,349.00	\$58,349.00	\$46,486.00	\$46,486.00	\$162,564.00	\$41,256.00		\$162,564.00
Portage	\$75,000	\$119,346.00	-\$44,346.00	\$44,346.00	\$119,346.00	\$73,624.00	-\$73,624.00	\$73,624.00	\$58,655.00	\$58,655.00	\$178,001.00	\$48,833.00		\$178,001.00
Price	\$75,000	\$76,400.00	-\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	\$76,400.00	\$49,751.00	-\$49,751.00	\$49,751.00	\$39,636.00	\$39,636.00	\$116,036.00	\$5,383.00		\$116,036.00
Racine	\$75,000	\$122,945.00	-\$47,945.00	\$47,945.00	\$122,945.00	\$78,270.00	-\$78,270.00	\$78,270.00	\$62,357.00	\$62,357.00	\$185,302.00	\$34,245.00		\$185,302.00
Richland	\$75,000	\$83,952.00	-\$8,952.00	\$8,952.00	\$83,952.00	\$44,433.00	-\$44,433.00	\$44,433.00	\$35,399.00	\$35,399.00	\$119,351.00	\$27,604.00		\$119,351.00
Rock	\$75,000	\$81,608.00	-\$6,608.00	\$6,608.00	\$81,608.00	\$53,724.00	-\$53,724.00	\$53,724.00	\$42,801.00	\$42,801.00	\$124,409.00	\$37,220.00		\$124,645.00
Rusk	\$75,000	\$65,310.00	\$9,690.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00	\$56,218.00	-\$46,528.00	\$46,528.00	\$37,068.00	\$37,068.00	\$112,068.00	\$12,595.00		\$112,068.00
Saint Croix	\$75,000	\$108,306.00	-\$33,306.00	\$33,306.00	\$108,306.00	\$63,088.00	-\$63,088.00	\$63,088.00	\$50,261.00	\$50,261.00	\$158,567.00	\$42,567.00		\$158,567.00
Sauk	\$75,000	\$121,132.00	-\$46,132.00	\$46,132.00	\$121,132.00	\$75,765.00	-\$75,765.00	\$75,765.00	\$60,361.00	\$60,361.00	\$181,493.00	\$53,047.00		\$181,493.00
Sawyer	\$75,000	\$73,168.00	\$1,832.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00	\$47,019.00	-\$45,187.00	\$45,187.00	\$36,000.00	\$36,000.00	\$111,000.00	\$21,227.00		\$111,000.00
Shawano	\$75,000	\$112,802.00	-\$37,802.00	\$37,802.00	\$112,802.00	\$59,867.00	-\$59,867.00	\$59,867.00	\$47,695.00	\$47,695.00	\$160,497.00	\$25,623.00		\$160,497.00
Sheboygan	\$75,000	\$112,249.00	-\$37,249.00	\$37,249.00	\$112,249.00	\$69,625.00	-\$69,625.00	\$69,625.00	\$55,469.00	\$55,469.00	\$167,718.00	\$47,548.00		\$167,718.00
Taylor	\$75,000	\$110,076.00	-\$35,076.00	\$35,076.00	\$110,076.00	\$56,454.00	-\$56,454.00	\$56,454.00	\$44,976.00	\$44,976.00	\$155,052.00	\$27,278.00		\$155,052.00
Trempealeau	\$75,000	\$108,132.00	-\$33,132.00	\$33,132.00	\$108,132.00	\$48,826.00	-\$48,826.00	\$48,826.00	\$38,899.00	\$38,899.00	\$147,031.00	\$24,044.00		\$147,031.00
Vernon	\$75,000	\$107,916.00	-\$32,916.00	\$32,916.00	\$107,916.00	\$54,501.00	-\$54,501.00	\$54,501.00	\$43,420.00	\$43,420.00	\$151,336.00	\$37,356.00		\$151,336.00
Vilas	\$75,000	\$111,251.00	-\$36,251.00	\$36,251.00	\$111,251.00	\$54,784.00	-\$54,784.00	\$54,784.00	\$43,646.00	\$43,646.00	\$154,897.00	\$34,844.00		\$154,897.00
Walworth	\$75,000	\$125,632.00	-\$50,632.00	\$50,632.00	\$125,632.00	\$97,427.00	-\$97,427.00	\$97,427.00	\$77,619.00	\$77,619.00	\$203,251.00	\$59,340.00		\$203,251.00
Washburn	\$75,000	\$92,115.00	-\$17,115.00	\$17,115.00	\$92,115.00	\$48,364.00	-\$48,364.00	\$48,364.00	\$38,531.00	\$38,531.00	\$130,646.00	\$7,792.00		\$130,646.00
Washington	\$75,000	\$111,518.00	-\$36,518.00	\$36,518.00	\$111,518.00	\$65,880.00	-\$65,880.00	\$65,880.00	\$52,486.00	\$52,486.00	\$164,004.00	\$38,245.00		\$164,004.00
Waukesha	\$75,000	\$147,509.00	-\$72,509.00	\$72,509.00	\$147,509.00	\$78,486.00	-\$78,486.00	\$78,486.00	\$62,529.00	\$62,529.00	\$210,038.00	\$48,415.00		\$210,038.00
Waupaca	\$75,000	\$104,634.00	-\$29,634.00	\$29,634.00	\$104,634.00	\$71,854.00	-\$71,854.00	\$71,854.00	\$57,245.00	\$57,245.00	\$161,879.00	\$50,798.00		\$161,879.00
Waushara	\$75,000	\$103,397.00	-\$28,397.00	\$28,397.00	\$103,397.00	\$71,644.00	-\$71,644.00	\$71,644.00	\$57,078.00	\$57,078.00	\$160,475.00	\$42,778.00		\$160,475.00
Winnebago	\$75,000	\$133,542.00	-\$58,542.00	\$58,542.00	\$133,542.00	\$72,801.00	-\$72,801.00	\$72,801.00	\$58,000.00	\$58,000.00	\$191,542.00	\$49,281.00		\$191,542.00
Wood	\$75,000	\$131,717.00	-\$56,717.00	\$56,717.00	\$131,717.00	\$45,204.00	-\$45,204.00	\$45,204.00	\$36,013.00	\$36,013.00	\$167,730.00	\$21,981.00		\$167,730.00
Totals	5,400,000	7,590,022	(2,190,022)	2,326,180	7,726,180	4,505,150	(4,368,992)	4,378,412	3,488,219	3,488,219	11,214,399	2,494,324	-	11,214,400

Table B: Total DNR Preliminary 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
Chippewa	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$600,000.00
La Crosse	\$430,000	\$170,000	\$0	\$0	\$600,000.00
Kewaunee	\$178,427	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,427.00
Marinette	\$225,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$225,000.00
Oconto	\$188,785	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$188,785.00
Outagamie	\$209,899	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$209,899.00
St. Croix	\$375,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$525,000.00
Washington	\$560,000	\$40,000	\$85,000	\$0	\$685,000.00
Waupaca	\$472,400	\$127,600	\$0	\$0	\$600,000.00
Wood	\$70,420	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,420.00
DNR NR243 NOD Reserve					\$1,000,000
Total	\$3,309,931	\$487,600	\$85,000	\$0	\$4,882,531

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	County	Staffing & Support from DATCP and DNR	Cost-Sharing from DATCP and DNR	Total Allocation of DATCP and DNR Funding
Adams	132,650	85,700	218,350	Marinette	164,105	354,500	518,605
Ashland	154,918	80,000	234,918	Marquette	150,748	100,700	251,448
Barron	163,876	61,000	224,876	Menominee	96,280	20,000	116,280
Bayfield	168,196	58,700	226,896	Milwaukee	75,000	15,000	90,000
Brown	180,384	100,000	280,384	Monroe	161,754	105,000	266,754
Buffalo	141,172	70,000	211,172	Oconto	169,055	243,285	412,340
Burnett	118,105	48,000	166,105	Oneida	139,723	40,700	180,423
Calumet	204,651	79,800	284,451	Outagamie	210,536	339,899	550,435
Chippewa	178,285	748,454	926,739	Ozaukee	157,222	81,200	238,422
Clark	169,697	130,000	299,697	Pepin	122,281	66,000	188,281
Columbia	148,836	134,138	282,974	Pierce	162,609	76,000	238,609
Crawford	137,923	59,000	196,923	Polk	162,564	49,500	212,064
Dane	257,860	160,700	418,560	Portage	178,001	65,000	243,001
Dodge	157,234	71,000	228,234	Price	116,036	45,700	161,736
Door	183,630	60,000	243,630	Racine	185,302	150,000	335,302
Douglas	131,167	35,000	166,167	Richland	119,351	58,800	178,151
Dunn	208,581	80,700	289,281	Rock	124,645	160,700	285,345
Eau Claire	169,360	109,500	278,860	Rusk	112,068	75,700	187,768
Florence	118,219	35,700	153,919	Saint Croix	308,567	470,000	778,567
Fond du Lac	161,492	46,000	207,492	Sauk	181,493	120,700	302,193
Forest	116,941	25,000	141,941	Sawyer	111,000	43,700	154,700
Grant	134,033	73,454	207,487	Shawano	160,497	64,500	224,997
Green	170,008	85,700	255,708	Sheboygan	167,718	70,000	237,718
Green Lake	179,457	75,700	255,157	Taylor	155,052	115,000	270,052
Iowa	156,271	90,000	246,271	Trempealeau	147,031	95,700	242,731
Iron	126,856	42,700	169,556	Vernon	151,336	135,700	287,036
Jackson	149,049	61,000	210,049	Vilas	154,897	35,700	190,597
Jefferson	198,798	41,500	240,298	Walworth	203,251	74,500	277,751
Juneau	163,398	64,500	227,898	Washburn	130,646	51,700	182,346
Kenosha	150,021	41,000	191,021	Washington	204,004	680,700	884,704
Kewaunee	167,731	233,227	400,958	Waukesha	210,038	50,700	260,738
LaCrosse	350,346	499,500	849,846	Waupaca	289,479	607,400	896,879
Lafayette	111,733	60,000	171,733	Waushara	160,475	68,500	228,975
Langlade	127,333	90,000	217,333	Winnebago	191,542	94,500	286,042
Lincoln	88,635	41,700	130,335	Wood	167,730	174,420	342,150
Manitowoc	164,139	130,000	294,139	DATCP NR243 Res.		150,000	150,000
Marathon	158,979	168,454	327,433	DNR NR243 Res.		1,000,000	1,000,000
				Sub-Totals	11,702,000	10,227,931	21,929,931
PROJECT COOPERATOR ALLOCATIONS							
UW Madison CALS SnapPlus			306,698	WLWCA SOC			44,000
UW Extension NPM			316,608	Sand County Foundation			12,975
UW-SFAL			14,054	Nutrient Management Farmer Education			399,391
UW-GNHS			35,000	Innovation Grants			69,848
UW NOP Support			60,000	Sub-Total Cooperator Allocation			1,492,000
WLWCA			233,426				
PROGRAM ALLOCATION TOTALS					\$ 11,702,000	\$ 10,227,931	\$ 23,421,931

Table A-2: County Structural Practices Cost-Share Awards

County	Structural Practice Awards				County	Structural Practice Awards			
	21-23 Cumulative Average Under- Spending*	2022 Census Acres**	21-23 Cumulative Total Dollars Spent***	Award		21-23 Cumulative Average Under- Spending*	2022 Census Acres**	21-23 Cumulative Total Dollars Spent***	Award
Adams	0.0000%	114,792	\$78,150	\$40,700	Marathon	0.4411%	477,577	\$260,623	\$73,454
Ashland	0.0001%	68,629	\$148,867	\$50,000	Marinette	0.0000%	132,155	\$176,204	\$54,500
<i>Barron</i>	9.1929%	282,265	\$87,844	\$51,000	Marquette	0.4925%	104,952	\$148,422	\$45,700
Bayfield	0.0000%	93,254	\$151,798	\$50,700	Menominee	0.0000%	290	\$49,981	\$20,000
Brown	0.0000%	181,018	\$108,551	\$50,000	<i>Milwaukee</i>	0.0000%	98	\$0	\$10,000
Buffalo	18.0972%	309,976	\$68,955	\$50,000	Monroe	0.0000%	263,476	\$134,640	\$55,000
Burnett	0.2351%	77,858	\$256,431	\$40,000	Oconto	0.0000%	194,482	\$150,092	\$54,500
Calumet	8.1680%	143,801	\$99,827	\$39,800	Oneida	0.0000%	42,083	\$121,962	\$40,700
Chippewa	0.0000%	338,969	\$386,087	\$73,454	Outagamie	0.0000%	241,653	\$117,310	\$55,000
Clark	0.0000%	409,582	\$165,581	\$65,000	Ozaukee	0.0115%	49,769	\$152,758	\$56,200
Columbia	2.0027%	290,003	\$112,941	\$59,138	Pepin	1.1129%	111,859	\$91,377	\$36,000
Crawford	0.0000%	194,544	\$124,226	\$51,000	Pierce	0.0000%	229,659	\$175,355	\$61,000
Dane	0.0000%	449,464	\$160,871	\$65,700	Polk	0.0000%	239,493	\$130,849	\$49,500
<i>Dodge</i>	4.5880%	374,456	\$94,210	\$51,000	Portage	0.0005%	273,256	\$197,428	\$65,000
<i>Door</i>	0.0001%	108,658	\$87,805	\$50,000	Price	0.0000%	84,387	\$120,531	\$45,700
Douglas	0.0000%	67,866	\$32,161	\$30,000	Racine	0.0000%	99,108	\$220,954	\$65,000
Dunn	0.0000%	372,774	\$141,071	\$60,700	Richland	40.6822%	244,767	\$79,648	\$38,800
<i>Eau Claire</i>	0.0000%	168,016	\$59,432	\$44,500	Rock	0.0000%	296,636	\$178,817	\$65,700
Florence	0.0000%	17,926	\$81,800	\$35,700	Rusk	0.0000%	118,421	\$170,821	\$50,700
Fond du Lac	1.5685%	308,888	\$66,332	\$40,000	Saint Croix	0.0000%	254,630	\$108,677	\$50,000
Forest	16.4098%	27,368	\$5,789	\$15,000	Sauk	0.0000%	298,103	\$128,441	\$60,700
Grant	0.0000%	586,453	\$211,487	\$73,454	Sawyer	0.0000%	40,786	\$66,801	\$35,700
Green	0.0000%	282,888	\$161,547	\$65,700	Shawano	0.7100%	253,092	\$64,959	\$44,500
Green Lake	0.0000%	122,086	\$119,650	\$45,700	Sheboygan	0.0211%	198,776	\$175,192	\$55,000
<i>Iowa</i>	0.0000%	374,179	\$265,895	\$45,000	Taylor	0.0000%	216,009	\$106,184	\$50,000
Iron	0.0000%	8,578	\$121,769	\$40,700	Trempealeau	0.0003%	296,684	\$159,586	\$65,700
Jackson	0.0000%	228,011	\$189,836	\$61,000	Vernon	0.0000%	354,885	\$104,196	\$60,700
<i>Jefferson</i>	0.0239%	191,783	\$836	\$29,500	Vilas	0.0000%	5,847	\$76,205	\$35,700
<i>Juneau</i>	0.0493%	167,871	\$99,206	\$44,500	Walworth	0.0000%	179,902	\$155,378	\$54,500
<i>Kenosha</i>	6.5059%	67,322	\$98,593	\$36,000	Washburn	0.0000%	70,390	\$103,519	\$45,700
Kewaunee	5.1721%	168,893	\$73,945	\$39,800	Washington	0.0000%	118,210	\$33,133	\$25,700
LaCrosse	0.0000%	138,200	\$127,396	\$49,500	Waukesha	0.0000%	70,268	\$55,979	\$40,700
Lafayette	1.0829%	316,462	\$218,102	\$60,000	Waupaca	0.3577%	230,412	\$182,596	\$60,000
<i>Langlade</i>	0.0014%	109,487	\$72,702	\$35,000	<i>Waushara</i>	0.0000%	149,098	\$135,876	\$43,500
Lincoln	0.0000%	79,496	\$55,677	\$40,700	Winnebago	0.0000%	145,208	\$91,271	\$44,500
Manitowoc	0.0000%	236,367	\$140,068	\$55,000	Wood	0.0000%	216,635	\$99,532	\$50,000
					TOTAL				\$3,500,000

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 Structural Practice award.

*Graduated awards based on 3-yr avg underspending, excluding extended underspending: less than 1% = \$5,700, 1-9.99% = \$1,000, >10% = \$0.

**Graduated awards based on 2022 Census acres: 275,000 or more=\$25,000; 125,000-274,999=\$13,800; 50,000-124,999=\$10,000, <50,000=\$5,000.

***Graduated awards based on 3-yr cumulative spending: \$200K+ = \$32,754, \$150K-199,999=\$25,000, \$100K-\$149,999 = \$20,000, \$50K-\$99,999 = \$15,000, <\$50,000 = \$0

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

County Name Shaded: 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	45	4	\$45,000		<i>Marathon</i>	95	1	\$95,000
Ashland	60	3	\$30,000		Marinette	70	2	\$75,000
Barron	50	3	\$10,000		Marquette	65	3	\$55,000
Bayfield	40	4	\$8,000		Menominee			NA
Brown	75	2	\$50,000		Milwaukee	25	4	\$5,000
<i>Buffalo</i>	65	3	\$20,000		Monroe	65	3	\$50,000
Burnett	65	3	\$8,000		Oconto			NA
Calumet	70	2	\$40,000		Oneida			NA
Chippewa	80	2	\$75,000		Outagamie	80	2	\$75,000
<i>Clark</i>	85	2	\$65,000		<i>Ozaukee</i>	55	3	\$25,000
Columbia	80	2	\$75,000		<i>Pepin</i>	50	3	\$30,000
Crawford	25	4	\$8,000		Pierce	45	4	\$15,000
Dane	100	1	\$95,000		Polk			NA
Dodge	80	2	\$20,000		Portage			NA
<i>Door</i>	75	2	\$10,000		Price			NA
Douglas	35	4	\$5,000		<i>Racine</i>	60	3	\$85,000
Dunn	80	2	\$20,000		Richland	30	4	\$20,000
Eau Claire	80	2	\$65,000		Rock	95	1	\$95,000
Florence			NA		<i>Rusk</i>	35	4	\$25,000
Fond du Lac	85	2	\$6,000		Saint Croix	55	3	\$45,000
<i>Forest</i>	15	5	\$10,000		<i>Sauk</i>	70	2	\$60,000
Grant			NA		<i>Sawyer</i>	10	5	\$8,000
Green	55	3	\$20,000		<i>Shawano</i>	35	4	\$20,000
Green Lake	80	2	\$30,000		<i>Sheboygan</i>	55	3	\$15,000
Iowa	90	1	\$45,000		Taylor	75	2	\$65,000
Iron	20	5	\$2,000		Trempealeau	75	2	\$30,000
Jackson			NA		Vernon	75	2	\$75,000
<i>Jefferson</i>	55	3	\$12,000		Vilas			NA
Juneau	30	4	\$20,000		Walworth	40	4	\$20,000
Kenosha	20	5	\$5,000		Washburn	20	5	\$6,000
Kewaunee	40	4	\$15,000		Washington	60	3	\$10,000
La Crosse	75	2	\$20,000		Waukesha	35	4	\$10,000
Lafayette			NA		Waupaca	85	2	\$75,000
Langlade	55	3	\$55,000		<i>Waushara</i>	55	3	\$25,000
Lincoln	20	5	\$1,000		Winnebago	65	3	\$50,000
Manitowoc	95	1	\$75,000		Wood	75	2	\$54,000
TOTAL							\$2,183,000	
County Name in Italics = County transferred funds awarded in prior grant year NA= County did not apply for SEG funds				County NameShaded = County awarded the amount of its request, which was less than the maximum grant award				

Allocation Plan Dictionary

Chapter 92: Wisconsin statute establishing soil and water conservation and animal waste management.

ATCP 50: State administrative rule (updated June 1, 2024) that provides the framework to cost-share conservation practices including nutrient management plans. It describes the parameters for grants for conservation practices; identifies the costs to be included in cost-share grants to landowners; identifies conservation practice standards available for cost-sharing; defines the requirements for a land and water resource management plan; establishes the process and priorities for allocating grants to support county conservation efforts; describes conservation compliance requirements for the farmland preservation program; describes the process to certify conservation engineering practitioners; establishes qualifications for nutrient management planners; allows for certification of soil and manure testing laboratories and ensures access to education and training opportunities.

Agricultural Enterprise Areas: A locally identified area of contiguous agricultural lands that has received designation from the state (DATCP), at the joint request of landowners and local governments through a petition, to qualify it as important to preserve and invest in. As a part of the state's Farmland Preservation Program, AEAs strive to support local farmland protection goals and enable landowners to sign voluntary 15-year farmland preservation agreements.

Bond: Bond authority was appropriated to the department through state's biennial budget

process prior to the 2023-2025 cycle. Bonds can only be used to fund projects with a minimum of a 10-year life span. County LCDs have used bonding for cost-sharing of hard practices. As of the 2024 Allocation Plan, the only bond funds are approved extension funds and the engineering reserve fund.

DATCP: Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection. Administers many conservation programs that are implemented by counties including the soil and water resource management grant program, producer-led watershed program, farmland preservation program, agricultural enterprise areas, nutrient management farmer education program, conservation reserve enhancement program, land and water resource management planning program, livestock siting program, drainage program, and conservation engineering support.

DNR: Department of Natural Resources. Administers the TRM and UNPS grant programs. Responsible for agricultural and nonagricultural performance standards and manages the WPDES permit program for concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs).

Farmland Preservation Program (FPP): Program through which counties are encouraged to plan for agricultural and agricultural-related uses; local governments may adopt zoning ordinances that restrict lands to agricultural or agricultural-related uses; landowners and local governments may jointly petition for an agricultural enterprise area (AEA) to qualify local areas important to Wisconsin's agricultural and economic future; landowners may enter into a farmland preservation agreement with the state for farms within an AEA to commit to keeping all or a part of their farm in agricultural

use and to implement farm conservation practices for 15 years. Participating landowners must implement applicable soil and water conservation standards (see ATCP 50.04)* to qualify for an income tax credit. ***Note:** *Landowners of farmland subject to a farmland preservation agreement must meet the soil and water conservation standards in place at the time the agreement was signed. Contact the department for assistance in determining which standards apply to a specific agreement.*

GPR: General Purpose Revenue. GPR is funding that comes from the state's income and sales tax revenues. These dollars are very flexible and can be used for most purposes. In relation to the joint allocation plan, DATCP has a small GPR appropriation that helps fund the staffing grants. Additionally, the 2023-2025 biennium budget approves \$7 million in GPR to fund structural practices associated with SWRM, at \$3.5 million a year over the two years. When the Governor calls for budget cuts from agencies, GPR is usually the money that is targeted for reductions. GPR is allocated on an annual basis.

LCC: Land Conservation Committee. Committee of county-board elected officials that oversee the LCDs.

LCD: Land Conservation Department. County government department that receives staffing and cost-share grants from DATCP and DNR to implement soil and water conservation programs at the local level. In some counties, the department may go by a slightly different name such as soil and water conservation department, planning and land conservation department, etc.

LWRM: Land and Water Resource Management Plan. Each county must have an approved LWRM plan in order to receive funding from DATCP and DNR as part of the joint allocation plan. An approved LWRM plan ensures a county is eligible for staffing grants and a base amount of structural practice funding. DATCP coordinates the LWRM planning program. LWRM plans are approved by the LWCB for 10 years, with a progress check-in after 5 years.

NMFE: Nutrient Management Farmer Education. NMFE is a grant program funded through SWRM's SEG appropriation. The NMFE program provides grants to counties and technical colleges to deliver training for farmers to write their own NM plans. Funding from the NMFE program can go to farmer incentives, soil tests and training materials.

OPC: Other Project Cooperators. OPCs include non-county entities such as the University of Wisconsin and Wisconsin Land+Water that receive SEG grants from the SWRM program in order to advance the SWRM programs. OPC grants are often used for training and infrastructure services. The OPC recipients and the size of the grants have changed over time as needs have changed.

PL or PLWPG: Producer Led Watershed Program. The PL watershed grant program funds farmer-led projects intended to reduce nonpoint source pollution and improve water quality. By statute, the PL watershed grant program is funded via the SWRM SEG account and is capped at \$1,000,000 annually.

SEG: Segregated Funds. Segregated funds are collected from fees and held in designated funds for specific purposes under state law. In relation to the joint allocation plan, the

Environmental Fund is the source of the segregated funds. The joint allocation plan has two uses for segregated funds. One appropriation designates some segregated funds to the staffing allocation. The second appropriation of segregated funds is for “aids” that explicitly excludes county conservation staffing and is used for nutrient management and other soft practice cost-sharing, training and other related purposes. Three programs are funded via these funds outside of the Allocation Plan:

\$1,000,000 is directed to Producer-Led Watershed Grants.

\$1,000,000 is directed to Nitrogen Optimization Pilot Program

\$800,000 is directed to crop insurance rebates for cover crops.

SEG funds are allocated on an annual basis and if not used they lapse back to the Environmental Fund and are not available to the program to use.

SnapPlus: Soil Nutrient Application Planner is the computer program Wisconsin landowners and agronomists use to develop a compliant NM plan. The UW SnapPlus team developed, maintains, and offers technical assistance on SnapPlus.

Soft Practices: Soft practices are those conservation practices that are implemented on an annual or short-term basis. Soft practices include nutrient management planning, cover crops, residue management, contour farming, and strip-cropping, among others. Soft practices can only be cost-shared with SEG funding.

Structural Practices: Structural Practices are conservation practices that have a lifespan of at least 10 years, such as streambank stabilization, manure storage, well abandonment, managed

grazing systems and others. In past allocations, bond funding was only used to cost-share structural, or hard, practices. SEG funding can also be used to fund hard practices with permission from DATCP. SEG funding is not the preferred funding source for hard practices since that money is the only available funding for soft practices and OPCs.

SWRM: Soil and Water Resource Management Program. The SWRM program is DATCP’s signature grant program that provides staffing and cost-share grants to county LCDs. The SWRM funding is distributed through the annual joint allocation plan process.

TRM: Targeted Runoff Management. The TRM program is a DNR competitive grant program for targeted nonpoint source pollution projects. TRM grants use bond funds allocated through the joint allocation plan

UNPS & SW: Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Management: The UNPS & SW program is a DNR competitive grant program for urban nonpoint source pollution projects. UNPS grants use bond funds allocated through the joint allocation plan.

DATCP's Environmental Assessment

for the 2025 Joint Allocation Plan

Preliminary

August 2024

Soil and Water Resource Management Grant
Program and Nonpoint Source Program



Contents

Signature Page and Final Determination	3
I. The Nature and Purpose of the Proposed Action.....	4
II. The Environment Affected by the Proposed Action	4
III. Foreseeable Environmental Effects of the Proposed Action.....	4
A. Immediate Effects	4
B. Long-Term Effects	6
C. Direct Effects	6
D. Indirect Effects	7
E. Cumulative Effects	7
IV. Persons, Groups, and Agencies Affected by the Activity.....	8
V. Significant Economic and Social Effects of the Proposed Action	9
VI. Controversial Issues Associated with the Proposed Action	10
VII. Possible Alternatives to the Proposed Action	10
A. No Action.....	10
B. Delay Action	10
C. Decrease the Level of Activity.....	11
D. Increase the Level of Activity	11
E. Change the Amounts Allocated to Some or All Recipients	11
VIII. Mitigation of Adverse Environmental Effects.....	11

Signature Page and Final Determination

This assessment finds that the *2025 Preliminary Allocation Plan* will have no significant negative environmental impact and is not a major state action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. No environmental impact statement is necessary under s. 1.11(2), Stats.

Date _____ By _____
Susan Mockert
Land and Water Resources Bureau
Agricultural Resource Management Division

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

Date _____ By _____
Brian Kuhn, Acting Administrator
Agricultural Resource Management Division

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 2025 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 42% 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 impacted 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 soil health, increase nutrient management planning, and minimize pollution of surface and ground water.

County Staffing: For the 2023-2025 biennium, the annual funding for conservation staff decreases from a high in 2023 of \$11.28 million to \$11.2 million in 2025. 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

- Compliance with the state agricultural performance standards
- Facilitate landowner participation in state and federal cost-share programs
- Ensure cross-compliance of farmers in the farmland preservation program (FPP)
- Support for the development of technical standards development, nutrient management training, and coordination between the public and private sector.

As discussed later, funding for county conservation staff has not kept up with a demand fueled by expanding programs such as producer-led watershed councils and phosphorus and nitrate management, and the persistence of intractable ground and surface water issues throughout the state.

Cost-sharing for conservation practices: Each year, counties use cost-share funds to address state and local priorities identified in their local plans. Cumulatively in 2022 and 2023, counties spent about \$5.2 million in DATCP funds to install cost-shared practices. Table A highlights the top conservation practices funded by DATCP cost-share and spent by counties in 2022 and 2023.

Table A: Cost-Share Expenditure Comparison				
Conservation Practice	2022 Cost-Share Dollars Spent (in millions)	2022 Units of Practice Installed	2023 Cost-Share Dollars Spent (in millions)	2023 Units of Practice Installed
Barnyard Runoff Control	0.42	12 systems	0.3	7 systems
Manure Storage System	0.32	3 systems	0.13	8 systems
Manure storage Closure	0.30	38 systems	0.43	49 systems
Cover and Green Manure	0.34	13,267 acres	0.46	17,381 acres
Grade Stabilization	0.31	36 structures	0.32	33 structures
Livestock Fencing	0.12	101,125 feet	0.15	113,073 feet
Livestock Watering Facilities	0.13	31 systems	0.12	22 systems
Nutrient Management Planning	1.2	33,559 acres	1.0	25,902 acres
Prescribed Grazing /Permanent Fencing	0.14	105,105 feet	0.09	84,583 feet
Streambank Crossing	0.10	1,844 feet	0.19	5,233 feet
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	0.41	10,482 feet	0.37	10,735 feet
Waterway Systems	0.36	455 acres	0.47	167 acres

The following developments are worth mentioning with respect to expenditures of cost-share funds in 2023 compared to 2022 expenditures:

- An increase in manure storage systems, and closure of systems as well.
- An increase in livestock fencing as regenerative grazing becomes more of a conservation focus.
- Continued significant grant funds to support nutrient management planning

B. Long-Term Effects

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

- Conservation outreach and education
- Development of conservation technologies such as SNAP Plus and the Manure Advisory System, and the training systems to effectively use these technologies;
- Technical and engineering assistance that ensures proper design and installation of conservation practices;
- Resource management planning that addresses local and state priorities, with an emphasis on annual work planning and reporting;
- Permitting and other regulation of livestock farms that requires properly designed manure storage and nutrient management plans;
- Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) administration that protects valuable resources and promotes conservation compliance;
- Producer-Led watershed administration and technical assistance.

With the decrease to the staffing allocation for fiscal biennium 2023-2025, the amount of funding DATCP is able to give to support county conservation decreased by \$65,600 from the 2023 allocation. This level of funding disallows the program to meet statutory goals under s. 92.14(6)(b), Stats for funding conservation staff. The total staffing allocation required to meet the statutory goals for the program is \$20,214,329.

DATCP cost-share grants are critical in helping landowners meet their individual needs and essential to overall efforts to make progress in achieving broader water quality goals. Most farmers are not required to meet state runoff 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. Installing conservation practices in a watershed or other area over time results in water quality improvement.

Fully assessing the long-term benefits, however, is complicated. The DATCP grant program operates within a collection of conservation and natural resource programs, and as such, other program priorities will affect DATCP funds. See Section III.E. for a more 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 improving soil health. Grants to counties and others also secure access to technical or other assistance that supports conservation efforts, including conservation education and nutrient management planning.

D. Indirect Effects

Installed conservation practices not only improve resources in the immediate area, but also benefit surrounding areas, including resources located downstream from the installed practice. For example, nutrient management and cropping 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 and impede erosion, but also may increase wildlife habitat.

DATCP policies and rules mitigate secondary impacts from the installation and maintenance of conservation practices. DATCP policies require counties evaluate impacts to cultural resources prior to any land-disturbing activity. 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 help prevent 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. Requiring landowners to maintain conservation projects installed with DATCP cost-share dollars ensures DATCP 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 delivery of this allocation plan, it is clear that SWRM grant funds play an integral part in supporting a comprehensive framework of federal, state, and local resource management programs. With the decrease to the staffing allocation for the 2023-2025 biennium, DATCP is able to support for 122 of the 384 conservation employees in the state's 72 counties, enabling DATCP grant funds to secure the foundation necessary to deliver a myriad of conservation programs, which among other accomplishments, achieved the following:

- In 2023, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provided \$87.6 million for conservation programs including \$37.4 million in Environmental Quality Incentives (EQIP) payments to install conservation practices with the top five expenditures related

to cover crops (\$6.9 million), residue and no-till (\$1.4 million), tree/shrub establishment (\$1.3 million), fence (\$1.1 million) and water transfers (\$1.3 million).

- The conservation reserve enhancement program (CREP) protects important soil and water resources while allowing landowners to make use of valuable adjacent agricultural lands. As of the beginning of 2023, about 74,000 acres were enrolled under CREP agreements and easements: with 6,884 acres under CREP easements and the remainder under CREP 15-year agreements. Of those enrollments, 41,224 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: 678 miles of streams buffered with an estimated phosphorus annual removal of 77,887 pounds, nitrogen annual removal of 41,921 pounds and sediment removal of 38,521 tons.
- DNR continued annual funding in 2023 for Targeted Runoff Management Projects (TRM), providing over \$2.6 million to counties for cost-sharing five small-scale and four large-scale projects. DNR set aside \$1.0 million for farms issued a notice of discharge. DNR did not receive any applications from counties for cost-sharing of Urban Nonpoint source and Storm Water Construction Projects in 2023.

Table B: DNR Funding 2023		
Program	Number of Projects	Sum of Total Amount Awarded
Large-scale TRM	4	\$1,752,877
Small-scale TRM	5	\$923,925
Urban NPS & Storm Water Mgmt. Planning	0	\$0

- In 2023, through the Producer-Led Watershed Protection grant program, DATCP offered support to forty-three producer-led groups around the State, encompassing 2,016 farmers managing 782,674 farmland acres. DATCP has awarded over \$5.2 million since the program's inception in 2016.

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. The decrease to the staffing grant allocation for the 2023-2025 biennium will enable DATCP to only completely support one employee per program, as well as 80% of the requests for the second position (funded at 70%). The DATCP awards fall short of funding three staff per county at the prescribed rates in s. 92.14(6)(b), Stats, providing 32% of county conservation staff.

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. Long-term use of some conservation practices, such as nutrient management planning and cover crops, may have a

positive impact on the finances of a landowner by helping plan needed purchases to maximize the yield of a field while minimizing additional fertilizers and pesticides required.

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, encourage diversity in lawns, improve backyard wildlife habitat, control invasive species and minimize construction site erosion.

Farm-related businesses: Farm supply organizations, private agronomists, 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 because of the activities funded by DATCP. The benefits may include protection of drinking water and improved soil health and stability. Landowners with properties located downstream of lands with nutrient and sediment delivery runoff problems benefit from conservation practices that reduce these problems. Certain measures, such as nutrient management plans and protective cropping practices, can help protect drinking water wells that serve neighboring landowners and communities. The 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 economic and social benefits. DATCP grants support cost-sharing and technical assistance that enable farmers and other landowners to meet their conservation goals and maintain eligibility for state program benefits. By providing financial support to meet state runoff standards for farms, DATCP cost-sharing helps farmers with the cost of compliance.

The economic impacts of installing conservation practices vary with each farmer and the type of practices involved. To receive cost-sharing, farmers usually pay 30% of the costs (10% in the case of economic hardship) to install a practice. Non-agricultural practices are capped at 50% cost-share.

Producers often must adjust their management routines associated with the adoption of conservation practices. With these changes, farmers face new risks including potential for reduced productivity. However, farmers implementing these practices may also see long-term benefits including savings on labor and fertilizer and improved soil health that may lead to yield gains, 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 as they take an active role in the protection and preservation of natural and agricultural resources. Through the increased adoption of conservation measures, farmers and other landowners 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 2023-2025 biennium, the SWRM grant program will monitor impacts of the decrease in staffing funds. Additionally, a switch from bond funding to general purpose revenue funding to support the structural practice cost-share leaves that program with heavy administrative load as well as a more susceptible funding source if the state were to require funding returned.

The level of funding for the structural practices (formerly bond) cost-sharing fails to meet current program needs. While the \$7.0 million authorization for structural cost-sharing has not increased since 2002, landowner costs for practices have increased for a number of reasons:

- An increase in labor costs are driving up construction costs. Paired with increased material costs over the last decade, construction of engineered practices in the last 5-10 years have increased significantly. ([United States Construction Market Trends | CBRE](#)).
- 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. The Silurian bedrock standard will also influence the need for conservation practices in specific areas of the state.

The unmet needs for cost-sharing structural practices may call for creative solutions including the expanded use of SEG funds to pay for these practices. 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 tackle our conservation challenges.

VII. Possible Alternatives to the Proposed Action

A. 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.

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 and reflect the input and consensus of the counties on funding issues. The allocation plan implements ch. ATCP 50, Wis. Adm. Code and legislative directives regarding allocation of grant funds. It also reflects the input and consensus of the counties on funding issues.

VIII. Mitigation of Adverse Environmental Effects

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

DATE: July 10, 2024

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

FROM: Joanna Griffin
Watershed Management Bureau, DNR

SUBJECT: **DNR Proposed Scoring and Ranking of Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2024 Funding**

Recommended Action: This is an informational item.

Summary: Through this memo, the DNR is informing the LWCB of the preliminary ranked list. Scoring results for projects being considered for calendar year (CY) 2025 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 individually and ranked against other projects in the same category. Once total available funding is determined, funds are allocated among the four project categories. The maximum possible awards are \$225,000 for Small-Scale projects and \$600,000 for Large-Scale projects.

Scoring and Ranking Summary to Date:

A. Small-Scale Non-TMDL

- Two (2) applications were submitted and are eligible for grant consideration.
- Funding requests for the applications total \$413,785.
- Based on available funding, the Department proposes to allocate \$413,785 to fully fund grant requests from both projects.

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

- Thirteen (13) applications were submitted and twelve (12) are eligible for grant consideration.
- Funding requests for the applications total \$2,221,344.
- Based on available funding, the Department proposes to allocate \$2,221,344 to fully fund grant requests for twelve (12) eligible projects.

In the two small-scale categories, adjustments to the ranked list may be made once the total available funding is determined. The attached tables show the preliminary rank order of applications. A requirement in s. NR 153.20(2)(d)3.b., Wis. Adm. Code, states that no one applicant may receive multiple grants that exceed 20% of the total available funding in a given project category. Applicants on the ranked list whose total funding requests exceed 20% of the total available funding will be awarded funds for the projects that do not exceed 20% and the balance of the applicant's requests will be moved to the bottom of the ranked list; additional funding is provided only after all other eligible projects have first been funded.

C. Large-Scale Non-TMDL

- No applications were submitted in this project category.

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2025

D. Large-Scale TMDL

- Five (5) applications were submitted and are eligible for consideration.
- Funding requests for these applications total \$2,925,000.
- Based on available funding, the Department proposes to allocate \$2,925,000 to fully fund grant requests for all five (5) projects.

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 Department will include final allocations to counties for TRM projects in the *CY 2025 Joint Final Allocation Plan*. Once the *2025 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.

All Large-Scale and Small-Scale TRM Applications

	Preliminary Allocation			
	Bond Revenue	GPR	319	Seg
Structural BMPs (including force account and engineering)	\$2,406,431	\$1,595,464	\$230,134	\$0
Non-Structural Practices (e.g., cropping)	\$0	\$473,500	\$367,000	\$0
Local Assistance	\$0	\$131,655	\$210,000	\$145,945
Total TRM	\$2,406,431	\$2,200,619	\$807,134	\$145,945

Large-Scale and Small-Scale TRM Applications from Counties

	Preliminary Allocation - Counties			
	Bond Revenue	GPR	319	Seg
Structural BMPs (including force account and engineering)	\$948,833	\$1,595,464	\$150,134	\$0
Non-Structural Practices (e.g., cropping)	\$0	\$473,500	\$142,000	\$0
Local Assistance	\$0	\$131,655	\$210,000	\$145,945
Total TRM	\$948,333	\$2,200,619	\$502,134	\$145,945

Materials Provided:

CY 2025 Small-Scale Non-TMDL TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank
CY 2025 Small-Scale TMDL TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank
CY 2025 Large-Scale TMDL TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2025

Table 1. Small-Scale Non-TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Region Boost	Total State Share Request	Cumulative Requested
1	Oconto County	Cowtown Acres LLC Storage	NER	129	No	\$188,785	\$188,785
2	Marinette County	Myles Zeitler Barnyard Manure Management	NER	120	No	\$225,000	\$413,785

Black font = proposed to be fully funded

Red font = funding not available

Table 2. Small-Scale TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Region Boost	Total State Share Request	Cumulative Requested
1	Thiensville Village	Stabilization of the Pigeon Creek Streambank, A Tributary to the Milwaukee River	SER	167	No	\$200,000	\$200,000
2	Big Round Lake Rehabilitation District	Big Round Lake Water Quality Goal Plan Implementation / Lake St. Croix TMDL Implementation-Alum 3	NOR	152	Yes	\$225,000	\$425,000
3	Deforest Village	Yahara River Streambank Stabilization - Phase 2	SCR	146	Yes	\$371,900	\$796,900
3	Kewaunee County	Kirchman Project	NER	146	Yes	\$178,427	\$975,327
4	Racine City	Uptown Green Infrastructure	SER	161	No	\$225,000	\$1,200,327
5	Manitowoc City	Shoreline Restoration in Silver Creek	NER	129	No	\$205,000	\$1,405,327
6	Saukville Town	Milwaukee River Wetland Restoration	SER	127	No	\$80,000	\$1,485,327
7	Outagamie County	Susan Schaumberg	NER	120	No	\$209,899	\$1,695,226
8	Oconomowoc City	Cottonwood Creek Restoration	SER	114	No	\$205,500	\$1,900,726
9	Wood County	Wood County LWCD & Kerry Lewis	WCR	103	No	\$70,420	\$1,971,146
10	Watertown City	Fannie Lewis Park Shoreline Stabilization	SCR	98	No	\$113,943	\$2,085,089
11	Sheboygan City	Pigeon River Water Quality Improvement at Maywood Nature Park and Evergreen Park	SER	91	No	\$136,255	\$2,221,344

*Region Boost with score equal to or greater than median of 128

Black font = proposed to be fully funded

Red font = funding not available

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2025

Table 3. Large-Scale TMDL Project Applications

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Region	Score	Total State Share Request	Cumulative Requested
1	Waupaca County	Pigeon River	NER	180.6	\$600,000	\$600,000
2	La Crosse County	Bostwick Creek Phase II	WCR	178.2	\$600,000	\$1,200,000
3	St. Croix County	Kinnickinnic River TMDL TRM	WCR	163.9	\$525,000	\$1,725,000
4	Washington County	Jackson Marsh Watershed - Manure Management Initiative	SER	152	\$600,000	\$2,325,000
5	Chippewa County	Lower Yellow River Watershed	WCR	149.5	\$600,000	\$2,925,000

Black font = proposed to be fully funded

Red font = funding not available

DATE: July 10, 2024

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

FROM: Joanna Griffin
Watershed Management Bureau, DNR

SUBJECT: **DNR Proposed Scoring and Ranking of Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management (UNPS) Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2025 Funding**

Recommended Action: This is an informational item.

Summary: Through this memo, the DNR is informing the LWCB of the preliminary ranked list for calendar year (CY) 2025 grant funding. Scoring results for projects being considered CY 2025 are presented in the attached tables.

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.

The DNR has been implementing an alternating schedule for UNPS Planning and UNPS Construction grants since 2016. UNPS Construction grant applications were solicited in 2024 for the CY 2025 award cycle. The UNPS Planning grant application will be available in 2025 for CY 2026 awards. Due to the alternating schedule for the UNPS grants, only the scoring and ranking summary for UNPS Construction projects is provided here.

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

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

- Twenty-four (24) applications were submitted; all are eligible for funding.
- Grant requests for the 24 eligible applications total \$3,181,370
- Based on available funding, the Department proposes to allocate \$2,713,870 to fully fund grant requests from twenty (20) of the twenty-four (24) projects.
- Additionally, DNR's Clean Water Fund Loan Program received funding from the USEPA Sewer Overflow and Storm Water Reuse Municipal Grants Program. DNR plans to award these funds to eligible UNPS grant applicants (<http://www.epa.gov/cwsrf/sewer-overflow-and-stormwater-reuse-municipal-grants-program>). The amount of funding and eligible projects will be identified in the next few months.

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

eligible projects have been funded. Therefore, adjustments to the rank order may be made once total available funding is determined.

Once the *2025 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.

Preliminary Allocation Bond Revenue & GPR				
	City	Village	Sewerage District	County
Total BMP Allocation	\$1,698,970	\$779,900	\$150,000	\$85,000

UNPS Construction Scoring by Rank for 2025

Rank	Applicant	Region	Project Name	Score	State Share Requested
1	Bellevue Village	NER	Schmitt Industrial Park Storm Water Pond	121	\$199,900
2	Sheboygan Falls City	SER	5th St Det Basin	111.6	\$150,000
2	Whitewater City	SER	Starin Park Underground Wet Detention Basin	111.6	\$150,000
3	Waupun City	SCR	Gateway Drive Pond	109.4	\$150,000
4	Howard Village	NER	Valley Brooke Park Pond	108.6	\$80,000
5	Kimberly Village	NER	Papermaker Pond	107.7	\$150,000
6	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District	SER	30th Street Corridor Wet Weather Relief Phase 2 Stormwater Basin	105.6	\$150,000
7	Marshfield City	WCR	Braem Park Wet Detention Basin	103.2	\$150,000
8	Milwaukee Public Schools	SER	Greener Schools, Stronger Communities - Humboldt Park School	102.3	\$125,000
8	Milwaukee Public Schools	SER	Greener Schools, Stronger Communities - Samuel Clemens School	102.3	\$125,000
8	Milwaukee Public Schools	SER	Green Schools, Stronger Communities - Walt Whitman School	102.3	\$125,000
9	Weston Village	WCR	WisDOT Right-of-Way Wet Detention Basin	102.1	\$150,000
10	Monona City	SCR	Reach 64 Stormwater Project	101.9	\$150,000
11	Schofield City	WCR	Kort Street Wet Detention Basin	98.8	\$150,000
12	Fond du Lac City	NER	Arndt Street Wet Detention Basin	94	\$150,000
13	Washington County	SER	Washington County Campus Stormwater Improvements	93	\$85,000
14	Elkhorn City	SER	Elkhorn Lake Bioretention	91.3	\$111,000
15	Ashwaubenon Village	NER	Willard Pond	89.8	\$200,000
16	Sheboygan City	SER	North Point Bluff Water Quality Improvement Project	84.2	\$90,000
17	De Pere City	NER	26-09 Honey Court Pond Construction	80.3	\$72,970
18	Racine City	SER	Uptown Green Infrastructure	79.2	\$150,000
19	Platteville City	SCR	2024 Rountree Branch Streambank Protection	77	\$100,000
20	Kenosha City	SER	South Creek Restoration & 89th and 39th Basin Green Infrastructure	74.7	\$110,000
21	Brookfield City	SER	Rolling Meadows Park Pond Conversion	55	\$107,500

Black font = proposed to be fully funded

Red font = funding not available

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: July 23, 2024

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: Five Year Review of the *La Crosse County Land and Water Resource Management Plan*

Recommended Action: This is an action item. The LWCB should determine whether the county has met the LWCB's criteria for a five-year review of a LWRM plan approved for ten years. If the LWCB makes a formal determination that the county has failed to meet these criteria, DATCP will automatically modify its order to terminate approval of the county's plan effective December of this year.

Summary: The La Crosse County land and water resource management plan has been approved through December 31, 2029, contingent on a five-year review conducted prior to December 31, 2024. In advance of the five-year review, La Crosse County has completed a DATCP approved form designed to implement the LWCB's reference document dated October 27, 2021, and the criteria for conducting a five-year review. The county has provided written answers to four questions regarding past and future implementation, has provided the required work planning documents, and has appropriately involved the Land Conservation Committee.

Materials Provided:

- Completed Five Year Review Form
- 2023 Annual Workplan with Accomplishments
- 2024 Annual Workplan

Presenter: Matt Hanewall, Conservation Director, La Crosse County DLC
Kevin Hoyer, Land Conservation Committee Chair



Land and Water Conservation Board
County Land and Water Resource Management Plan
Five Year Review of LWRM Plans

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 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.**

La Crosse County DLC is thriving! We have achieved new heights over the last 5 years in funding levels, staffing and conservation accomplishments. I will compare some of our accomplishments as they were defined in our latest Land & Water Plan and will also identify some of the new initiatives we have undertaken.

First, we continue to implement our Erosion Control Land Disturbance Ordinance (Chapter 21) and our Post Construction Storm Water Management Ordinance (Chapter 29). The number of annual permits, inspections and notices of non-compliance have been steady within our urban erosion control program, but have been increasing within our stormwater program. The increase in stormwater workload is due to more residential and commercial development, and better awareness and compliance of stormwater rules.

This urban work, in combination with local stormwater partnerships, keeps La Crosse County in compliance with our MS4 permit. We partner with 7 other municipalities and contract with Habitat for Humanity to help bring awareness to stormwater issues. Our stormwater website (www.lacrosseareawaters.org), among other things, aids in stormwater education and outreach. Last year we were audited by the DNR for compliance with NR216. The La Crosse County MS4 program has been recognized as a model for other municipalities to follow.

In addition to our MS4 compliance and erosion control/stormwater permitting (Land & Water Plan objectives), we have created a competitive stormwater grant program to “retrofit” stormwater BMPs. This new program was funded with \$2

million dollars of ARPA funds. The mission of this program is to partner with local municipalities and public agencies to mitigate flooding, improve infrastructure resiliency and protect water quality. This new grant program has been highly successful!

Second, over the past 5 years we have ramped up our rural watershed efforts and conservation practice implementation. Aside from continued implementation of our Animal Waste Management Ordinance (Chapter 23), Farmland Preservation Program and Nutrient Management Program, we were awarded a Large-Scale TRM grant (\$600,000) in 2021 for our 9-Key plan (Bostwick Creek Watershed). By piggybacking TRM funds with EQIP, RCPP and our County Environmental Fund (which has increased from \$40K to \$100K) we have been able to install conservation practices at a record pace. We have already exceeded 10-yr Land & Water Plan installation estimates for grade stables, cover crops and streambank stabilization. As we near completion of phase I of Bostwick Creek TRM, we have applied for another (phase II) Large-Scale TRM Bostwick grant.

Similarly, we are now working with the Coon Creek Community Watershed Council ([Home - Coon Creek Community Watershed Council, Inc \(cooncreekwatershed.org\)](http://cooncreekwatershed.org)). This new producer-led group has been instrumental in bringing awareness to soil health, flood prevention and water quality within the historic Coon Creek Watershed. While not in our current Land & Water Plan, we have made it a priority to target the Coon Creek Watershed with increased conservation planning and technical assistance.

Likewise, we are also working with NRCS and neighboring counties to decommission the remaining PL566 dams within the Coon Creek and West Fork Kickapoo Watersheds. A comprehensive planning process has determined that the costs to fix or rebuild failed PL566 dams in these watersheds do not outweigh the benefits. We are wrapping up an extensive Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and then will begin decommissioning design work.

Lastly, we continue to work with our non-metallic mine owners, collect water quality data and implement water quality trades. Since 2007 we have reviewed and approved annual reclamation plans for new and existing non-metallic mines (Chapter 27). Further, since the late 90's we have collected county-wide and watershed specific water quality data. And finally, within the last 5 years we have helped to offset P and TSS loadings through MDV program practice installations.

The La Crosse County DLC has been busy! We have been fortunate to have secured new funding sources from all levels of government and some nonprofit groups. We have increased our number of technical staff and are designing and overseeing higher rates of conservation (both urban and rural) than we have in

several decades. Thank you for your support and assistance!

- 2. Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in multiple 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.**

Some conservation standards have become overly complex and cost prohibitive. For example, the 580 standard (Streambank and Shoreline Protection) may now require a Hydrologic and Hydraulic (H&H) study. An H&H study ensures that structures placed within the floodplain do not increase flooding upstream or downstream. These are expensive! Time and money simply prevent us from fixing sites we would have fixed in the past. We have been re-allocating some of those conservation dollars to upland practices like grade staves and waterways.

Further, staffing departures have left our LCD with more young professionals. While this is good, the loss of experienced staff limit our ability to design and oversee some of the more complex or unique conservation practices. Examples include roofed barnyards and rotationally grazed systems. With a long list of conservation requests to pick from, we typically select another practice off our list, rather than work with a regional specialist. Time, training and experience will eventually allow us to design and install some of these more complex practices.

- 3. Describe how the county's work plans implement its priority farm strategy and the effectiveness of county actions implementing agricultural performance standards and conservation practices on farms. In particular, the county should describe outreach, farm inventories, and additional funds that were pursued to implement its strategy.**

All of our FPP farms have a nutrient management plan. And, most of our nutrient management plans have been written by producers at our nutrient management workshops (Land & Water Plan objective). We have been holding these workshops since the late 90's and they also serve as our agricultural performance standards outreach platform. Further, they provide a place where we update producers on changes to performance standards and sign up landowners for FPP compliance checks or other conservation practices. Over the last 5 years we have been promoting the installation of cover crops and other soil health principles.

In addition to our county-wide workshops, we have been targeting Bostwick Creek (9-Key) and Coon Creek (producer-led) watersheds for implementation of the agricultural performance standards. Both watersheds have additional funding

sources that have allowed us to install more conservation practices than non-targeted areas.

Lastly, we continue to use our Animal Waste Management Ordinance (Chapter 23) to bring non-compliant sites or other negligent sites into compliance with the agricultural performance standards.

4. Provide representative examples that show changes in direction for work planning in the upcoming five years, with specific examples provided showing adjustments in planned activities in the county's most recent work plan.

While we do not intend to substantially change our direction of work planning in the next 5 years, we do intend to continue implementing several new initiatives that began in last 5 years. Much of our existing work is driven by our 4 ordinances (referenced above), our FPP and Nutrient Management programs, and our watershed planning. These ordinances and programs have been our mainstay for many years and will serve as the foundation of our work for years to come.

However, as mentioned above, there is additional work we have taken on in the last 5 years that was not included in our last Land & Water Plan update. These items include the creation of our stormwater grant program, our involvement with the Coon Creek Community Producer-Led group and our participation in the decommissioning of the PL566 dams (all mentioned above). In addition, we have recently taken on projects such as a new land records tracking system and the creation of a county-wide navigability layer. These initiatives are both critical to the continued implementation of our urban and agricultural programs.

Annual Work Plans

Attach both of the following:

- a. The most current annual work prepared by the county.
- b. The work plan for the previous year that includes a column that identifies the progress in implementing the planned activities for that year.

Board Review Process

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. Counties have the option to prepare a brief presentation to illustrate their successes and future priorities.

Land Conservation Committee Notification

PR&D was provided a completed copy of these questions (including attachments) on: 06/20/24

Signature of Authorized Representative:
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)



Date: 06/20/24

Send completed questionnaire and attachments to:

Lisa.Trumble@wi.gov

La Crosse County 2023 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	Current Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Cropland</i> 			
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	<i>Nutrient Management/Soil Health Farmer Trainings</i> <i>Soil and Water Conservation Planning (FPP)</i> <i>Cover Crop Promotion</i> <i>Gully Erosion Control</i> <i>Streambank Stabilization</i>	<i>10 Nutrient Management/Soil Health Farmer Training Days</i> <i>2 New Nutrient Management Plans</i> <i>130 Updated Nutrient Management Plans</i> <i>200 acres of new soil and water conservation plans</i> <i>800 acres of cover crops</i> <i>Install 6 Grade Stabilization Structures</i> <i>Install 3 acres of Grassed Waterways</i> <i>Install 1,200 feet of rock rip rap</i>	<i>Complete</i> <i>Completed 3</i> <i>Completed 111</i> <i>Completed 164 ac</i> <i>Completed 1657 ac</i> <i>Completed 14</i> <i>Completed 6 ac</i> <i>Completed 745’</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Livestock</i> 			
Livestock	<i>Promote Clean Water Practices</i> <i>FPP Compliance Inventories</i>	<i>Install 100 feet of Roof Gutter</i> <i>Install 1 Roofed Barnyard</i> <i>Complete 1 Manure Storage Facility Closure</i> <i>Install 2 Livestock Crossings</i> <i>Monitor 130 FPP farms for compliance</i> <i>135 farming operations assessed for compliance with NR 151</i>	<i>Completed 0</i> <i>Completed 0</i> <i>Completed 1</i> <i>Completed 1 (26 ac)</i> <i>Completed 116</i> <i>Completed 119</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Water quality</i> 			
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	<i>Maintain Water Quality Station</i> <i>Continue Monitoring Program</i>	<i>Maintain Bostwick Creek monitoring station</i> <i>Design deployable TSS and TP samplers</i> <i>Conduct Countywide water quality grab sampling (35 sites) twice</i> <i>Conduct Bostwick Creek water quality grab sampling (9 sites) at least 20 times</i> <i>Add water quality monitoring data to website</i>	<i>Completed</i> <i>Not Yet Completed</i> <i>Completed</i> <i>Completed</i> <i>Partially Completed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forestry</i> 			
Forestry	<i>Maintain County Forest Diversity</i> <i>Maintain Woodland Recreational Opportunities</i>	<i>Maintain 5 miles of trails/access roads for cross country skiing or other recreational opportunities in Bice Forest</i>	<i>Completed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Invasive</i> 			
Invasive species	<i>Continue to manage for aquatic invasive species on the Mississippi River and tributaries</i>	<i>Continue to support the efforts of the Wisconsin River Alliance Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator</i> <i>Monitor for invasive species in the Bostwick Creek Watershed</i>	<i>.Completed</i> <i>& New Agreement with UWL</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wildlife</i> 			
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (Non forestry or AIS)	<i>Continue Participation in CDAC</i>	<i>Survey 20 landowners about crop deer damage</i> <i>Promote the enlargement of the metro deer hunting zone</i>	<i>Completed</i> <i>Not Yet Completed</i>

La Crosse County 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

• *Urban*

Urban issues	<i>Stormwater control Construction site erosion control Public Outreach and Information</i>	<i>Number of site visits – 25 stormwater; 300 erosion control Number of plans reviewed – 10 SW, 170 erosion control Number of permits issued – 8 stormwater, 130 erosion control Number of compliance issues resolved – 2 SW; 10 erosion control Implement ARPA stormwater grant program</i>	<i>Completed 330 Completed 200 Completed 123 Completed 20 Completed</i>
---------------------	---	--	--

• *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	<i>Update workplan and annual report for Bostwick Creek Targeted Runoff Management grant Support Coon Creek producer-led group Review Coon Creek Plan-EIS final recommendations</i>	<i>Update 100 landowners on conservation project status within the Bostwick Creek watershed. Install 3 new grade staves, 1,200' of rip rap and 200 acres of cover crops in the Bostwick Creek watershed Submit Bostwick Creek annual report to DNR Work with partner sponsor counties on evaluation of Coon Creek engineering and conservation planning proposal Promote soil health/CCs on 10 farms in Coon Creek watershed</i>	<i>Completed Completed 8, 745' & 285 Completed Completed Partially Completed</i>
-----------------------------	---	--	--

• *Other*

Other	<i>PL 566 Non-metallic and frac sand mining</i>	<i>Monitor PL 566 water levels and trash racks using “real-time” deployable cellular camera technology Inspect 15 active quarries for reclamation compliance</i>	<i>Completed Completed</i>
--------------	---	--	-------------------------------------

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued	Current Progress
Feedlot permits	5	5	3
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	0	0	0
Manure storage closure	1	1	1
Livestock facility siting	1	1	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	15	15	15
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	180	130	123
Shoreland zoning	0	0	
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	0	0	
Other	0	0	

La Crosse County 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned	Current Progress
Total Farm Inspections	<i>130</i>	<i>116</i>
For FPP	<i>130</i>	<i>116</i>
For NR 151	<i>135</i>	<i>119</i>
Animal waste ordinance	5	6
Livestock facility siting	1	1
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	325	330
Nonmetallic mining	20	15

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number	Current Progress
Tours		2
Field days	2	2
Trainings/workshops	10	10
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	2	3
Newsletters	10	29 videos
Social media posts	50	About 40,000
News release/story	4	4

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs	Dollars Spent
<i>Department of Land Conservation Staff</i>	16160	\$728,504	<i>\$717,726</i>
Cost Sharing (can be combined)			
<i>Bonding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$50,000</i>	<i>\$41,492</i>
<i>SEG</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$20,000</i>	<i>\$20,000</i>
<i>TRM</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$178,000</i>	<i>\$234,492</i>
<i>Environmental Fund</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$120,000</i>	<i>\$95,000</i>
<i>ARPA Stormwater Funding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$500,000</i>	<i>\$420,000</i>

La Crosse Co 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)	PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of “planned activities” in italics)	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Cropland</i> 		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	<i>Nutrient Management/Soil Health Farmer Trainings</i> <i>Soil and Water Conservation Planning & Design</i> <i>Cover Crop Promotion</i> <i>Gully Erosion Control</i> <i>Streambank Stabilization</i> <i>Critical area stabilization</i>	<i>10 nutrient management/soil health farmer training days</i> <i>2 new nutrient management plans</i> <i>100 updated nutrient management plans</i> <i>200 feet of clean water diversions</i> <i>800 acres of cover crops</i> <i>Install 6 grade stabilization structures</i> <i>Install 3 acres of grassed waterways</i> <i>Install 600 feet of streambank protection</i> <i>Stabilize 10 acres of critical areas</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Livestock</i> 		
Livestock	<i>Promote Clean Water Practices</i> <i>FPP Compliance Inventories</i>	<i>Install 100 feet of roof gutter</i> <i>Install 1 roofed barnyard</i> <i>Complete 1 manure storage facility closure</i> <i>Install 2 livestock crossings</i> <i>Assess compliance on 100 FPP farms</i> <i>Assess 105 farming operations for compliance with NR 151</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Water quality</i> 		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	<i>Maintain Water Quality Station</i> <i>Continue Monitoring Program</i>	<i>Maintain Bostwick Creek monitoring station</i> <i>Design deployable TSS and TP samplers</i> <i>Conduct Countywide water quality grab sampling (35 sites) twice</i> <i>Sample Bostwick Creek sites (9) at least 20 times</i> <i>Add water quality monitoring data to website</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forestry</i> 		
Forestry	<i>Maintain County Forest Diversity</i> <i>Maintain Woodland Recreational Opportunities</i>	<i>Maintain 5 miles of trails/access roads for cross country skiing or other recreational opportunities in Bice Forest</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Invasive</i> 		
Invasive species	<i>Continue to work with UW – La Crosse on the prevention, monitoring, containment and control of AIS.</i>	<i>Review quarterly and annual reports for agent duties</i> <i>Revise cooperative agreement as needed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wildlife</i> 		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	<i>Continue Participation in CDAC</i>	<i>Survey 20 landowners about crop deer damage</i> <i>Promote the enlargement of the La Crosse County metro zone</i>

La Crosse Co 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

• *Urban*

Urban issues	<i>Stormwater control Construction site erosion control Public Outreach and Information</i>	<i>Number of site visits – 25 stormwater; 300 erosion control Number of plans reviewed – 10 stormwater, 170 erosion control Number of permits issued – 8 stormwater, 130 erosion control Number of compliance issues resolved – 2 SW; 10 erosion control Implement ARPA stormwater grant program – oversee 3 project installations; reimburse grant recipients</i>
---------------------	---	--

• *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	<i>Submit TMDL report for Bostwick Creek TRM Apply for new Bostwick Creek TRM grant Coon Creek (CC) producer-led group NRCS dam decommissioning</i>	<i>Update 100 landowners on conservation project status within the Bostwick Creek watershed. Install 3 new grade staves, 600' of rip rap and 200 acres of cover crops in the Bostwick Creek Watershed Submit Bostwick Creek annual report to DNR Assist NRCS with dam decommissioning on 2 dams Promote soil health/CCs on 10 farms in Coon Creek Watershed</i>
-----------------------------	---	---

• *Other*

Other	<i>PL 566 Dams Non-metallic mining</i>	<i>Monitor PL 566 water levels and trash racks using “real-time” deployable cellular camera technology Inspect 15 active quarries for reclamation compliance</i>
--------------	--	--

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	1	1
Livestock facility siting	1	1
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	15	15
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	180	130
Shoreland zoning		
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)		
Other		

La Crosse Co 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	105
For FPP	100
For NR 151	105
Animal waste ordinance	5
Livestock facility siting	1
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	325
Nonmetallic mining	20

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1
Field days	2
Trainings/workshops	10
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	2
Newsletters	10
Social media posts	100
News release/story	4

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>Department of Land Conservation Staff</i>	16640	\$774,405
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
<i>Bonding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$45,000</i>
<i>SEG</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$20,000</i>
<i>TRM</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$112,000</i>
<i>EQIP</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$300,000</i>
<i>Environmental Fund</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$105,000</i>
<i>ARPA Stormwater Funding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$500,000</i>

NRCS Wisconsin

Programs Update - August 2024



Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)

EQIP is the primary program available to farmers for farm and woodland conservation work, offering payments for over 90 basic conservation practices. Applications are accepted on a continuous, year-round basis. Application batching dates are announced on [our website](#). All applications received by announced batching dates are being evaluated and considered for potential funding in FY24. Contact Melissa Bartz, melissa.bartz@usda.gov, for more information.

Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)

CSP assists landowners who practice good stewardship on their land and are willing to take additional steps over the next five years to further enhance their stewardship efforts. Applications are accepted on a continuous year-round basis. Application batching dates are announced on [our website](#). All applications received by announced batching dates are being evaluated and considered for potential funding in FY24. Contact Melissa Bartz, melissa.bartz@usda.gov, for more information.

Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)

RCPP promotes coordination between NRCS and its partners to deliver conservation assistance to producers and landowners. NRCS assists producers through partnership agreements and through program contracts or easement agreements. Current active projects for water quality improvement are located within the Oconomowoc River, Milwaukee River, and Yahara River watersheds, Driftless Area to improve fish and wildlife habitat, stream, and riparian habitat, and select counties in Northern Wisconsin to improve Golden-winged and Kirtland's warblers' habitats and select areas of Southern Wisconsin to improve soil health and protect agriculturally productive farmland. Contact Melissa Bartz, melissa.bartz@usda.gov, for more information.

Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP)

ACEP focuses on restoring and protecting wetlands, conserving productive agricultural lands, and conserving grasslands. Landowners are compensated for enrolling their land in easements. Applications for the ACEP are taken on a continuous basis but ranked and considered for funding one time per year. For FY24, WI NRCS funded two Agricultural Land Easement applications through the Inflation Reduction Act and a third using General Farm Bill funds. Wisconsin NRCS will be offering enrollment to 20 Wetland Reserve Easement applications, including 12 under the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) in

NRCS Programs Quarterly Fiscal Update

Program		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)	Financial Assistance	\$0	\$10.6M ^{ac}	\$43M ^{ac}	\$49M ^{ac}
	Contracts	0	265 ^{ac}	1,224 ^{ac}	1,334 ^{ac}
Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)	Financial Assistance	\$6.7M	\$6.7M ^{ac}	\$6.7M	\$24M ^c
	New Contracts	0	0 ^c	0 ^c	433 ^c
	Renewal Contracts	266	266	266	266
Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)	Financial Assistance	0	\$0 ^c	\$667,045 ^c	\$1,644,572 ^c
	Contracts	0	0	29 ^c	95 ^c
	Easement Parcels	0	0	2 ^c	4 ^c
	Easement Financial	0	\$0	\$689,356 ^c	\$1,993,920 ^c
Agricultural Conservation Easement Program- Agricultural Land Easements (ACEP-ALE)	Financial Assistance	0 ^c	0 ^c	\$967,500 ^c	\$967,500
	Parcels	0 ^c	0 ^c	3 ^c	3
	Acres	0 ^c	0 ^c	391 ^c	391
Agricultural Conservation Easement Program- Wetland Reserve Easements (ACEP-WRE)	Financial Assistance	0 ^c	0 ^c	\$1.2M ^c	\$7,874,825
	Easements	0 ^c	0 ^c	1 ^c	20
	Acres	0 ^c	0 ^c	188 ^c	1556
Emergency Watershed Protection Program- Floodplain Easements (EWPP-FPE)	Financial Assistance	0 ^b	0 ^b	0 ^b	0 ^d
	Proposed Easements	0 ^b	0 ^b	0 ^b	0 ^d
	Proposed Acres	0 ^b	0 ^b	0 ^b	0 ^d

^aIncludes initiatives and special funding.

^bInitiatives and special funding allocations have not been determined yet.

^cFunding decisions not yet complete for the fiscal year; not all apps have been fully obligated yet

^dNot available in FY24

(ACEP, continued)

addition to 4 applications selected for Inflation Reduction Act funding this fiscal year. The application deadline for FY25 will be November 1, 2024. Contact Dave Gundlach, ASTC-Easements, david.gundlach@usda.gov for more information.



USDA Offers Disaster Assistance to Agricultural Producers in Wisconsin Impacted by Tornadoes and Flooding

Agricultural operations in Wisconsin have been significantly impacted by recent tornadoes and flooding. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has technical and financial assistance available to help farmers and livestock producers recover from these adverse weather events. Impacted producers should contact their local [USDA Service Center](#) to report losses and learn more about program options available to assist in their recovery from crop, land, infrastructure, and livestock losses and damages.

[Click here to read more.](#)

Survey Aims to Help USDA Understand Landowner Conservation Choices: Data Will Guide the Future of NRCS Conservation Programs

Grazing or forest landowners or managers are asked to participate in a survey designed to help the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) improve the financial and technical services it offers grazing and forest landowners. A joint project between NRCS and the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), the [Conservation Practice Adoption Motivations Survey \(CPAMS\)](#) is aimed at understanding why people choose to use or not use different conservation practices. "By responding to this survey, you also help document the ongoing stewardship of America's agricultural producers and forest land managers," said NRCS Chief Terry Cosby.

Respondents are encouraged to participate online but may also respond through the mail or by sending a fax. You can learn more about CPAMS by watching [this short video](#).

[Click here to read more.](#)

Conservation at Work Video Series Continues to Grow: Real Stories. Real Successes. Real Quick.

USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service's highly popular *Conservation at Work* video series continues to grow its content. The series consists of more than 75 short videos that highlight common conservation practices being implemented around the country.

Housed on [YouTube](#) and featured on [farmers.gov](#), the series was designed with the concept of "show, don't tell." The videos shine the spotlight on farmers, ranchers, and forest landowners from across the U.S. Their first-person testimonials tell their conservation stories, and how conservation practices are helping them protect and improve natural resources while saving time and money.

[Click here to read more.](#)

Wisconsin NRCS Success Story: Do-IT-Yourself: IT Professional Turns to Innovative Farming

Before purchasing farmland in 2017, Information Technology (IT) professional, Chor Lee, had never farmed. The property included several acres of forest and cropland and a plethora of weeds growing out of control, but did not include electricity, running water, or any agricultural equipment. What Chor had in spades, however, was family members supportive of his new endeavor into farming and a passion for utilizing innovative technologies and techniques.

Learn more about how Chor cultivated his skills and knowledge for growing culturally significant produce and helps educate and inspire other farmers interested in adopting an "off-grid" solar energy system to power their small-scale growing operations.

[Click here to read more.](#)



August 2024

Soil and Water Resources Management (SWRM) Grants

- The 2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan will be presented to the Land and Water Conservation Board at the August 6, 2024 meeting. The Allocation Plan will be open for a 30-day comment period, ending September 6, 2024. Email any comments to DATCPSWRM@wisconsin.gov.
- The new practices included in ATPC 50 are available for contracting as of June 1, 2024. For questions about the practices, review Table 2.2 in the [SWRM Resources on our webpage](#). As always, reach out if you have further questions and we can help you find answers.
- DATCP staff is actively working on guidance documents for the new practice options to help you implement and offer cost sharing in accordance with the new rule standards. We look forward to having them available soon and highlighting a practice each month in this report.

ATCP 50 Update

- ATPC 50 was published on May 28, 2024, with an effective date of June 1, 2024. Final rule language can be reviewed on the Wisconsin Legislature's [website](#). The Bureau has information on our [website](#) and will be hosting events in the coming months. If you have any questions, email datcplandwater@wisconsin.gov.

Nutrient Management News

- **NEW! - We have restocked Runoff Risk Advisory Keychains and Magnets!**
Please reach out to datcpsoilandwatershedmanagement@wisconsin.gov to request magnets and or keychains. When reaching out, please include how many of each you would like, as well as an address to mail them to.
- **Second Annual Nutrient Management Regional Meetings are Back!**
Join us at one of our five meeting locations across the state to hear about new and upcoming information related to nutrient management planning and the SnapPlus software! New this year is a virtual meeting option. All events are free and will run from 9 a.m.-1 p.m. except for the Eau Claire meeting, which will be from 9:30 a.m.-1:30 p.m. In-person events will offer light lunch and refreshments sponsored by the Wisconsin CCA Board and Wisconsin Land + Water! CEUs will be available for each event! Find your meeting location registration information here: [Nutrient Management Trainings](#).
- The **2023 Annual Nutrient Management Report** is now live on the [Nutrient Management homepage](#). Cody Calkins will send out the 2024 Annual NM Survey and Calculator later this summer.

- Counties that would like some assistance on Nutrient Management Quality Assurance Reviews should email Cody Calkins at cody.calkins@wisconsin.gov. We are looking at providing assistance this year to at least three counties.
- Previous SnapPlus Trainings can be found here: [Nutrient Management Trainings](#).

Land and Water Conservation Board-LWRM Plans

- At the August 6, 2024, LWCB meeting La Crosse, Marquette, and Price counties will be presenting five-year LWRM plan reviews.
- The next meeting of the LWCB Advisory Committee on Research will be September 3, 2024.

Conservation Engineering

- For those in the DATCP Engineering Practitioner Certification and/or NRCS Job Approval Authority programs, we are passing along a reminder that this is the final year of the three-year cycle for obtaining your 30 professional development hours (PDHs). The deadline for completing the 30 PDHs is December 31, 2024. Reach out to your area engineering contact if you have questions.

DATCP Drainage Program

- The Wisconsin Association of Drainage Boards (WADB) will be holding their annual meeting in October. Final logistics will be available in early September. Stay tuned for further updates.
- All activities within drainage districts are managed and administered by a County Drainage Board. Contact information can be found on the Drainage Program website [here](#) or by contacting Barton T. Chapman, Drainage Program Manager, at Barton.Chapman@Wisconsin.gov.

Agricultural Impact Statements (AIS) Program

- The AIS program published [AIS 4574](#) for the Paris RICE 138-kV Generation Tie-in Line in Kenosha County, Wisconsin.
- You can find more information about the AIS program at agimpact.wi.gov. You can also contact DATCPAgImpactStatements@wi.gov with questions regarding any active AIS statement or the AIS program.

Farmland Preservation (FP) Program and Agricultural Enterprise Areas (AEA)

- Any new farmland preservation agreement applications must be turned in by November 15, 2024 to be guaranteed to be processed for tax year 2024. FP Staff will continue to process all applications submitted after that date, but we cannot guarantee that it will be processed and eligible for tax year 2024. The application can be found at the following webpage: [Farmland Preservation Agreement Application](#). Completed application packets can be sent to datcpworkinglands@wisconsin.gov.
- The 2024 Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA) petition cycle closed August 2, 2024. The petition evaluation committee will review the submitted petitions on August 14. Committee recommendations will be shared to the petitioners following that meeting. For information about the petition process, including application materials, visit the [Petitioning for AEA Designation webpage](#). Please contact Wednesday Coye at wednesday.coye@wisconsin.gov with any questions you have about the AEA program.
- The [DATCP Home Farmland Preservation Tax Credits](#) webpage has been updated with additional information to help landowners and tax preparers choose the correct tax schedule when filing for an FP tax credit. If you receive any questions from landowners or tax preparers regarding questions related to tax credit claims or tax credit denials, please contact Wednesday Coye at wednesday.coye@wisconsin.gov. Landowners who have received a denial letter have a limited amount of time to file an appeal with

Department of Revenue; timely action is critical.

- The Farmland Preservation Program Soil and Water Conservation Frequently Asked Questions document has been updated to reflect changes made to the program from 2023 Act 42 and changes made to soil and water conservation compliance in ATP 50. The new FAQ can be accessed at [Farmland Preservation: Conservation Compliance Factsheets and Guidance](#).
- Counties that update or issue new CoCs for Tax Year 2023 should submit updates for their DOR Spreadsheet to DATCPWorkingLands@wisconsin.gov. Updates may be submitted as needed throughout the tax season.
 - NOTE: Please make sure you are *only* reporting changes for TY 2023. If you are using a third-party contractor, please be aware of the limitations of your data reporting.

Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)

CREP FFY2024 Enrollment Deadlines under SU61

- Given how wet it has been this year, there are landowners looking for options on flood damaged crops fields. CREP may be an option for these landowners and we encourage LCDs to talk with these landowners about CREP and direct them to contact their local FSA as soon as possible, if they are interested. FSA will continue to accept new CREP enrollment offers as they come in up through September 30, 2024. However, there is no indication yet from FSA on the Farm Bill and what will happen going into the next federal fiscal year. See below for upcoming deadlines for the remainder of this federal fiscal year (Sign up 61).
 - July 31, 2024 – Deadline for producers to submit an offer for re-enrolled land. Offers on new enrollments will be accepted and processed by FSA/NRCS after this date.
 - September 30, 2024 – Deadline for COC or CED to approve FSA CRP/CREP contracts (CRP-1s). End of current Farm Bill extension authorizing CRP/CREP.
 - November 8, 2024 – Deadline to submit completed CREP State/County agreement to DATCP in order to ensure payment by December 31, 2024 for the 2024 tax year.

Producer-Led Watershed Protection Grant (PLWPG) Program

- The 2025 application period for Producer-Led Watershed Protection Grants is now open. The Request for Proposals and the Application Form can be found on our webpage: [Producer-Led Watershed Protection Grants](#). Applications will be due by 5:00 p.m. on September 13, 2024. Please reach out to Dani Heisler at dani.heisler@wisconsin.gov if you have questions about the application.

Soil Health Program

- The new online Soil Health curriculum is now live and available on our soilhealthtraining.wi.gov website. The purpose of this curriculum is to develop a common definition and understanding of Soil Health and develop some guideposts of how to implement soil health systems on Wisconsin Farms. The curriculum will assist in developing a common language of Soil Health in Wisconsin agriculture in modules 1-3. Module 4 will focus on applying soil health in Wisconsin cropping systems. The curriculum will incorporate both traditional and citizen science to demonstrate the mindset necessary to be successful as a soil health farmer. The primary audiences are LCD staff, other Agriculture Professionals in Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Farmers. Secondary audience would potentially be community members. The first objective is to discuss what soil health is (and isn't) by defining some basic vocabulary and concepts! The second objective is to demonstrate how soil health systems can be implemented on Wisconsin farms. For questions regarding this training or the soil health program contact Randy Zogbaum at randall.zogbaum@wisconsin.gov.
- Upcoming Soil Health Trainings
 - Silvopasture Walk: Get the Scoop on Silvopasture and Soil Health - Summer is flying by, and our second Wisconsin Farmland Protection Partnership field day is approaching on Thursday, August 29.

We're excited to explore silvopasture and soil health practices at the Savanna Institute's North Farm with experts from Sauk County LRED, DATCP, NRCS, and our hosts. This will be a walk-and-talk pasture trek with ample opportunities to see silvopasture practice in action.

- Date: Thursday, August 29
Time: 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.
Location: Savanna Institute North Farm,
E6856 WI-60 Trunk, Spring Green, WI 53588
Registration: <https://forms.office.com/r/JGijKEfppY>

- Conservation Finance Ag Educator Training: The Soil Health Nexus, UW-Madison Division of Extension, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP), Wisconsin Land + Water, and other multistate extension partners are hosting a regional training for agriculture educators focusing on conservation finance at the Arlington Agricultural Research Station September 16-17, 2024. This training is two days and includes a classroom focused day at the Arlington Agricultural Research Station on Monday, September 16 and a field day with tours of the US Dairy Forage Research Farm and Schoepp Farms on Tuesday, September 17. Attendees can register for just September 16 or for both days. For those attending on September 17, a bus is available for transport.
 - [Register for September 16](#)
 - [Register for September 16 and 17](#)

Nitrogen Optimization Pilot Program (NOPP)

- [NOPP program staff](#) would like to meet with any groups interested in learning more about on-farm research and how to put together your own research plan before the winter 2024 application cycle.

Cover Crop Insurance Rebate Program

- Application closed until December 2024. To qualify, cover crops must be planted in the fall of 2024 on fields to be cropped in spring of 2025. The acres cannot receive cover crop funding support during this same time. Please retain your FSA-578 for the application process.

Legislation Updates

- The 2023-2024 Legislative Session ended in mid-March.

Staffing Updates

- The Agency Liaison (0.9 FTE) position has been posted with an application deadline of August 12. Go to wisc.jobs and search for job 15053 to learn more about the position and apply. If you have any questions, contact Tim Anderson at Timothy1.Anderson@Wisconsin.gov.

DATE: July 17, 2024

TO: LWCB members and advisors

FROM: Jill Schoen, DNR

SUBJECT: DNR Update, June 2024 - July 2024, for August LWCB meeting

Surface Water Grant Program

The public notice period for the DNR Surface Water Grant Applicant Guide and Program Guidance was open from June 8, 2024 to June 24, 2024. Minor changes were made between the draft posted in June 2024 and the final version. The updated program guidance for FY25 was published to the [Surface Water Grant website](#) in July 2024. Notable changes include:

- Healthy Lakes and Rivers applications will be accepted on a year-round basis.
- Projects funded under Surface Water Restoration and Management Plan Implementation categories need to be advanced enough for construction to begin soon (i.e., shovel-ready).
- Update to scoring criteria for Surface Water Planning, Comprehensive Management Planning, County Lake, Surface Water Restoration, Ordinance Development, Management Plan Implementation, and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Population Management.
- One grant application allowed per cycle in the Surface Water Restoration, Management Plan Implementation, AIS Prevention, and AIS Population Management categories.
- Algae management, sedimentation management using aeration and/or additives and emerging technologies are considered ineligible costs.
- The public shall be allowed to review and comment on management plan updates, and any public noticing period must be completed before the pre-application deadline.

To kick off the upcoming surface water grant cycle, program staff have recorded an informational webinar that has been posted to the Surface Water Grant website. Pre-applications are due on September 15 and final grant applications are due on November 15. More information, program guidance, and application forms are available at <https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/aid/SurfaceWater.html>.

Drinking Water Update (from July 9, 2024 DNR News Release)

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR's) [2023 Annual Drinking Water Report](#) is now available!

This report allows you to learn more about the work water professionals across the state are doing to protect the quality and quantity of drinking water. It also highlights the challenges and accomplishments in working with federal, state and local partners to manage Wisconsin's drinking water resources effectively.

We encountered new challenges in 2023 but also had some amazing accomplishments. The state benefited greatly from additional federal Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) funding, which totaled more than \$155 million in 2023. This meant more dollars available for replacing lead service lines and addressing emerging contaminants like manganese and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). By the end of 2023, more than 1,800 Wisconsin public water systems obtained PFAS monitoring test results to comply with the DNR's newly established drinking water standard for two PFAS chemicals. Wisconsin also suffered a drought in parts of the state that affected water quantity, but the DNR and its partners monitored conditions and provided data and water conservation tips to help.

The [Annual Drinking Water Report website](#) includes a popular interactive map highlighting state projects funded by the Safe Drinking Water Loan Program and the Private Lead Service Line Replacement Program.

Get additional information about the [Annual Drinking Water Report](#) on the DNR's website or call 608-266-1054 to request a printed copy.

More information about the work the DNR is doing to ensure safe drinking water for everyone is available on the DNR's [Drinking Water website](#).