



Land and Water Conservation Board Agenda

October 1, 2024

The Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB) will meet on **October 1, 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 300651480# 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 August 6, 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 5 Year LWRM Plan review for Bayfield County
Ben Dufford, Bayfield County LWCD Director; Marty Milanowski, Land Conservation Committee Chair

- 4 Recommendation for approval of 5 Year LWRM Plan review for Calumet County
Anthony Reali, Calumet County Conservationist; Nick Kesler, Land and Water Conservation Committee member

- 5 The zone of interaction: Assessing water quality risk through soil sampling - A participatory research project.

*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*

**Chelsea Zegler, Ag & Water Quality Outreach Specialist
UW-Madison Extension**

- 6 Presentation of 2025 Joint 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 5 Year LWRM Plan review for Portage County
**Steve Bradley, Portage County Conservationist; Nancy Eggleston, Land and Water
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 December 2024 LWCB Meeting -
Mark Cupp, LWCB

- 13 Adjourn

**MINUTES
LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING**

August 6, 2024
2811 Agriculture Drive, Board Room &
Microsoft Teams Meeting

Item #1 Call to Order—pledge of allegiance, open meeting notice, approval of agenda, approval of June 4, 2024, LWCB meeting minutes.

Call to Order

The Land and Water Conservation Board (Board) met in person at 2811 Agriculture Drive, Madison WI 53718 and over Microsoft Teams on **August 6, 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 **9:05 a.m.** and the pledge of allegiance was conducted.

Members and Advisors Present

Members: Mark Cupp, Monte Osterman, Brian McGraw, Andrew Buttles, Tim Anderson, Andrew Potts, Ron Grasshoff, Rebecca Clarke, Yogesh Chawla and Chris Clayton for Jill Schoen. A quorum was present.

Advisors: Matt Krueger (WI Land + Water), Nathan Fikkert (NRCS), Amber Radatz (UW-Extension)

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 June 4, 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 five-year Land and Water Resource Management Plan review for Marquette County

Patrick Kilbey, County Conservationist, and Dennis Fenner, Land Conservation Committee Chair, formally requested a recommendation of approval from the Board regarding the County's five-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, Grasshoff motioned to recommend approval of Marquette County’s five-year LWRM plan review, seconded by McGraw, and the motion carried unanimously.

Item #4 State of Wisconsin Nutrient Reduction Strategy

Joe Bonnell, Nutrient Reduction Strategy Coordinator, DNR, presented an introduction the current state of Wisconsin Nutrient Reduction Strategy as well as future direction for development of a revised nutrient reduction strategy.

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

Evan Lund, County Conservationist, and Nicholas Trimmer, Price County Administrator, formally requested a recommendation of approval from the Board regarding the County’s five-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 Price County’s five-year LWRM plan review, seconded by Grasshoff, and the motion carried unanimously.

Item #6 Presentation of the 2025 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan

Susan Mockert, DATCP and Joanna Griffin, DNR presented to the Board the 2025 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan. The 2025 Joint Preliminary Allocation Plan document is available online at the LWCB website within the August 6, 2024 [meeting packet](#).

Item #7 DNR Presentation of Preliminary Scores and Rankings of Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Projects for CY 2025

Joanna Griffin, DNR, presented to the Board the Scores and Rankings of Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Applications for CY 2025. The memo describing the preliminary 2024 Scores and Rankings of TRM projects for CY 2025 is available within the August 6, 2024 [meeting packet](#).

Item #8 DNR Presentation of Preliminary Scores and Rankings of Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Management Projects for CY 2025

Joanna Griffin, DNR, presented to the Board the Scores and Rankings of Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Management Applications (UNPS) for CY 2025. The memo describing the preliminary 2025 Scores and Rankings of UNPS projects for CY 2025 is available within the August 6, 2024 [meeting packet](#).

Item #9 Recommendation for approval of five-year Land and Water Resource Management Plan review for La Crosse County

Matt Hanewall, County Conservationist and Kevin Hoyer, Land Conservation Committee Chair, formally requested a recommendation of approval from the Board regarding the County's five-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, Osterman motioned to recommend approval of La Crosse County's five-year LWRM plan review, seconded by Grasshoff, and the motion carried unanimously.

Item #10 LWCB Advisory Committee on Research- Committee Updates

Grasshoff reported that the Committee met on July 2, 2024 and updated its work plan. Looking forward there is an opportunity to focus on outreach and research and to build a lasting relationship between the board and universities.

Item #11 Agency Reports

- a. FSA- was absent.
- b. NRCS- Fikkert introduced himself as the state Conservationist. Fikkert submitted a written report that is available online at the Land and Water Conservation Board website within the August 6, 2024 [meeting packet](#).
- c. UW CALS- was absent.
- d. UW Madison- Extension- Radatz submitted a written report that is available online at the Land and Water Conservation Board website within the August 6, 2024 [meeting packet](#). In addition Radatz reported field day season at UW-Extension is in full swing, extension educators and regional specialists are participating in and engaging with Producer Led Watershed Protection Grant and NOPP programming and practices; Extension is planning for the [Water and Soil Health Conference](#) December 17 and 18 of 2024.
- e. WI Land + Water- Krueger reported WI Land + Water's Board approved a revised policy and timeline for elections to the state Land and Water Conservation Board. Elections are to conclude by November 29. Krueger discussed an emphasis on training of new county employees and new agency employees including plans for their ongoing mentorship program, new conservation professionals group to meet the needs of a changing workforce. The association is also reviewing legislative and budget priorities.
- f. DOA- Potts reported that budget season is starting, agencies are in the process of developing budget requests. Agency budget requests are due September 16, 2024.
- g. DATCP- Anderson submitted a written report that is available online at the Land and Water Conservation Board website within the August 6, 2024 [meeting packet](#).

- h. DNR- Schoen submitted a written report that is available online at the Land and Water Conservation Board website within the August 6, 2024 [meeting packet](#).

Item #12 Planning for the October 1, 2024 LWCB meeting

The Board should expect the following at the next LWCB meeting, which will be a hybrid meeting:

- 5-year Review Bayfield, Calumet and Portage Counties
- Recommendation for approval of the 2025 Joint Final Allocation Plan
- If available, the 2023 Annual Soil and Water Conservation Report
- LWCB Advisory Committee on Research Updates
- Chelsea Zegler, Ag and Water Quality Outreach Specialist, UW-Extension to discuss outreach works related to current soil and water practices, ground water quality and soil health

Item #13 Adjourn

Motion

Cupp motioned to adjourn, seconded by Osterman, and the motion carried unanimously. The business meeting was adjourned at 12:43 p.m.

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: September 20, 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 *Bayfield 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 Bayfield 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, Bayfield 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: Ben Dufford, Director, Bayfield County LWCD
Marty Milanowski, Land Conservation Committee Chair



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

County: Bayfield County

Implementation Covering Past Five Years and Future Directions

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

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

Goal 1 Accomplishments 2020-2024: 1 Pesticide Management Pad; 11 Shoreline Protection Projects (1,550 LF); 5 Animal Trails / Walkways (1,365 LF); 4 Livestock Fencing (8,150 LF); 13 Wetland Restorations (45 Ac); 4 Livestock Watering Facilities; 3 Riparian Buffers (3,570 SF); 3 Well Closures; 3 Access Roads (1,030 LF); 1 Livestock Roof Structure; 1 Barnyard Runoff Control System; 4 Manure Pit Closures; 3 Stream Crossings (460 LF); 3 Critical Area Stabilizations (600 LF / 2200 SF); 65 Shoreline Mitigations; 4 Stormwater Mitigations; 22 NR 135 Plans; 1,000 new SEG Acres in NMP 30 +/- Bluff Erosion field visits; Post Flood Asst to 8 townships

Planning - We have maintained several Ag BMPs with several of our farmers, one project with a new producer. We have seen a dramatic shift to more shoreline project requests, and shoreline mitigation workload. Same for wetland restorations, and have chased grants through a variety of sources to help accomplish these projects. Also, as identified in our plan, we have secured funding to begin a 9KE Planning Process for Fish Creek.

Goal 2 Accomplishments 2020-2024: Currently maintain 1.5 full time positions, securing approx. \$75,000 annually for both Terrestrial and Aquatic Invasives. Avg of 4 seasonal staff for treatment and control. Annual operation of portable boat decon unit; several hundred lake users reached annually. 225 +/- Acres treated.

Planning - The AIS program took a funding hit 3 years ago when WDNR reformed their grant program, going to funds in each county vs. competitive grants. The county now funds part of this program. The terrestrial invasive program has stable funding annually from multiple sources.

Goal 3 Accomplishments 2020-2024: 13 wetland restoration sites constructed, approx 45 acres. USFWS funds for habitat projects approx. \$20,000 annually. One fish passage project in '24, totaling \$45,000.

Planning - Recently secured EPA funds for a variety of projects in Fish Creek Watershed, implementation funds '24-'26 amounting to \$227,000. Wetlands, Ag BMPs, bank erosion, fish passage, are slated in the scope of work. Currently working with local college on another big bluff stabilization project that will include implementation funds for the dept.

Goal 4 Accomplishments 2020-2024: Monthly dept updates to county weekly messaging, several social media post from invasive species programs; multiple social media posts about fall CWD outreach and education program, deer dumpster program; county fair outreach; staff the annual LEEP days in Drummond; annual poster speaking contest participation; participation in Lake Superior Collaborative group; multiple site visits with landowners distributing bluff stabilization materials (100 +/-); Annual fall tour for county board members; Utilize drone flights to assess wildlife damage
Planning - Outreach and education will remain to be a priority for all the staff in the department. Planning to continue all of these programs, and add others as opportunities arise.

Goal 5 Accomplishments 2020-2024: Over the last 5 years, several meetings and onsite with WDNR water regs staff to review permit requirements, transparency, making sure we are all on the same page; State tech committee, staff keeping up on standard changes; Attend available tranings for engineering credits; Great increase in bluff erosion site visits and assistance;
Planning - Currently pursuing grant opportunitives with partner agencies to accommodate larger structures at stream crossings specifically, same for bluff erosion. Staff will continue to keep up on changing WDNR rules, DATCP standards, etc.

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.

Ag BMP's - Identified in several of the last 5 years work plans was several BMPS listed annually, however with the loss of several farmers milking, we did accomplish as many as listed. We did manage to do a couple drinkers, waterlines, fencing out of sensitive areas annually, animal trails and walkways annually, and avg of 2 ag related crossings annually, one roof, one barnyard. In our LWRM Plan I listed an avg of 12 Ag BMPs annually, and with the big decrease in farmers in general, we have done less than that goal. The shift over 5 years has been less Ag, and a dramatic increase in shoreline projects, wetland restorations, and fish passage crossings.

Farmland Preservation - No interest from producers in the AEA's of the county.

Well Abandonment - Our goal in our LWRM Plan is 6 annually and we do 1-2 per year. Until 2022 we offered C/S at 100%, and those funds were cut '23 and '24. We promote this and still struggle for participation.

One big addition / adjustment we made was adding a 4-County Ag Technician assisting producers with NMP planning, grazing plans, and Ag practices on the farm. This is funded thru an NACD grant, and some funds from the 4 counties.

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.

We do still use our GIS inventory of the different farm operations in the county; dairy, beef, sheep, fruit, etc. We also partner with NRCs - EQIP, and some new EPA funds for

ag bmps. As stated earlier there are fewer farmers every year that we have to work with. We still focus on the fish creek watershed, in particular the South Fish Watershed, where most of our remaining Ag is located. This watershed is still listed as impaired, so it's a long standing priority of the dept. Currently implementing EPA funds in this watershed, some of which will be Ag work; drinkers, waterlines, livestock fencing, 3 Ag crossing all slated for '25-'26. Outreach with the Ag community is ongoing. Since we have a declining number of producers in the county, we do know all of them, and the ones willing and able to costshare projects on the farm are priority. We host annual grazing workshops and NMP trainings, which will continue. Our 4 - County Ag Technician currently funded by NACD, and the 4 counties, is currently completing an inventory of all remaining producers in the county, all of types of producers, for outreach and trying to implement more farm practices in the county.

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.

Cropland, soil health, and or NMP - Currently request \$8,000 annually. We plan to increase this, possibly up to \$20,000 annually, per the recommendation of the 4-Co Ag Technician.

Livestock - Currently listed 1 watering facility, 1 water well, \$12k C/S. Will keep this the same, perhaps increase the amount depending on interest.

Water Quality - Currently listed 2 Streambank / Shoreline, 2 Critical Area Stab., 2 Well Closures, 4 Culverts; \$275K (+/-) With additional grants likely keep most of these the same, 1-2 less culverts most likely, and possibly increase in Streambank / Shoreline Protection projects, 4-5 annually

Forestry - Currently listed - offer tech asst for critical area stab and stream crossings - 2 annually. Likely several more site visits, BayCo Forestry is undertaking culvert inventory on the forest, to for a more watershed based approach; we have offered to help with that work, watershed area, hydro analysis, etc..

Invasive - Currently, 1.5 full time staff, (\$75K) AIS and Upland Invasive surveys, (50 +/-) Control efforts, (225 Ac.) Boat Wash Stn, (200 +/-) Interns, (\$20K) Plan Updates, (both annually) Invasive Sp. ID Days, (40 +/-) Field Season Outreach / Trainings / Workshops (20 +/-). All funds for both programs are stable, so continuation of all this for 5 years.

May increase treatment control efforts depending on funding / number of seasonals.

Wildlife - Wetlands - Habitat - Currently listed; 6 wetland projects, (\$45K) administered WDP, (DNR Grant funded) CWD Prevention Program / Deer Dumpster Program. (\$4K) With our new EPA funds, and future proposal in '27-'28 we would like to increase wetland projects (\$50-100K) prioritizing the slow the flow / habitat initiatives. WDP and CWD program likely stay fairly similar as years past.

Watershed Strategies - Currently listed; Fish Creek 9KE Planning and Implementation, 2 bluff restoration sites on Fish Creek. \$327K secured for 9KE and projects. '25-'26 intend to apply with partners for additional bluff stabilization work. Our funds likely will be \$200K + for mulit year upland BMP implementation.

Other - Currently listed; NR 135 Plan Reviews (4) Shoreline Mitigation (15) NR 135 likely stay the same, Currently at 18 mitigations in '24, so likely will see an increase in these plan requests, 20-25 annually.

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: 9/19/24

Signature of Authorized Representative:  **Date:** 9/19/24
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

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

**BAYFIELD COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category **2023 Accomplishments are in RED**

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	200 Acres NMP cost sharing DONE NMP Plan Updates DONE	\$8,000 cost sharing DONE 5 farm visits DONE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Livestock</i> 		
Livestock	1 Watering facility / heavy use protection 0 COMPLETED 1 Water well 0 WELLS INSTALLED 1 ANIMAL TRAILS / WALKWAYS	\$12,000 cost sharing (150 lbs P Reduction) \$ 7,500 260 LF
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Water quality</i> 		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	2 Streambank / Shoreline Protection 1 DONE 2 Critical Area Stabilization 2 DONE 2 Well Abandonment 0 DONE 4 Culvert Replacements 1 DONE, 2 CARRYOVER	\$12,000 cost sharing \$13,750 \$10,000 cost sharing \$14,000 125 LF (COMBINED) \$1,000 cost sharing \$0 \$250,000 (+/-) cost sharing from multiple sources \$140,000 \$450,000 CARRYOVER TO '24-'25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forestry</i> 		
Forestry	Critical Area Stabilization and stream crossing technical assistance	2 crossings 5 SITE VISITS WITH BAYCO FORESTRY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Invasive</i> 		
Invasive species	1.5 full time Invasive Species Staff Aquatic and Terrestrial Invasive surveys Invasive Control of multiple species Portable Decon Boatwash Station Invasive Interns Invasive Species Plan Updates Invasive Species ID Days Field Season Outreach – Trainings / Workshops	\$75,000 Funding for both positions \$82,000 50 (+/-) surveys of Invasives DONE 225 Acres treated; garlic mustard, curly leaf pondweed, yellow iris, buckthorn, purple loosestrife, others as needed DONE 200 (+/-) boats washed DONE 250-300 (+/-) boaters reached; 1 crew leader, 3 interns Both AIS and NCWMA Annual plan update DONE 40 (+/-) people reached at monthly events 75-100 OR MORE 20 (+/-) Events annually, social media outreach for both programs DONE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wildlife</i> 		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	6 Wetland Restoration Projects 7 WETLANDS Administer Wildlife Damage Program / NMP Position DONE	\$45,000 Cost Sharing; multiple sources 20 (+/-) Acres restored \$85,500 COST SHARING 25 AC (+/-) Grant funding for position DONE

**BAYFIELD COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<i>CWD Prevention Program DONE</i>	<i>Fund Carcass Disposal Program – 14 (+/-) Tons waste is the goal \$1,600 DONATIONS 12 (+/-) TONS</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Urban</i> 		
Urban issues	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Watershed</i> 		
Watershed strategies	<i>Fish Creek 9KE Plan Development IMPLEMENTING 2 Bluff Restoration Sites on Fish Creek</i>	<i>\$327,200 Proposal Submitted for Plan development, bluff stabilization sites, multiple implementation projects in the watershed if funded PLANNING STAGES</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Other</i> 		
Other	<i>NR 135 Plan Reviews Shoreline Mitigations</i>	<i>4 Annually in coordination with BC Zoning (5) 15 (+/-) Sites Annually (20 in 2023)</i>

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	0	0
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	0	0
Manure storage closure	0	0
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	4	5
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	0	0
Shoreland zoning	15	20
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	0	0
Other	0	0

**BAYFIELD COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 3: Planned inspections

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

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	4 3
Field days	50+
Trainings/workshops	25
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	2 3
Newsletters	2 4
Social media posts	25 20
News release/story	3 3

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>County Conservationist</i>	2080	\$95,000
<i>Technician</i>	1950	\$86,264
<i>Office Manager</i>	1950	\$75,552
AIS / Shoreline Technician	1950	\$58,045
Upland Invasive Coordinator	1950	\$48,236
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
<i>Bonding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$125,000 2023 - \$50,000</i>
<i>SEG</i>	<i>N/A</i>	\$8,000

**Bayfield 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>200 Acres NMP Cost Sharing NMP Plan Updates</i>	<i>\$8,000 cost share DATCP 3 NMP updates 2 new NMP Plans</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Livestock</i> 		
Livestock	<i>4 Livestock Crossings 2 manure pit closures 2 livestock watering facilities for cattle</i>	<i>\$20,000 Cost Sharing (200# P Reduction) NRCS Cost Sharing, Possible DATCP Cost Sharing \$12,000 Cost Sharing</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Water quality</i> 		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	<i>1 Shoreline Protection 3 Culvert Replacements Obstruction removal from trout stream 2 ford crossings</i>	<i>\$4,000 Cost Sharing \$200,000 Cost Sharing (+/-) from multiple sources \$15,000 Cost Sharing \$18,000 Cost Sharing</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forestry</i> 		
Forestry	<i>County Forest Culvert Inventory Tech assistance with culvert installs, crossings etc.</i>	<i>Multiple sites over 176,000 county forest acres / road ways</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Invasive</i> 		
Invasive species	<i>1.5 full time Invasive species staff Aquatic and Terrestrial Surveys Control of Invasive Species Portable decontamination Station 3 Interns Invasive Species ID days Field season and outreach</i>	<i>\$88,000 Funding for both positions 40 (+/-) surveys of Invasives 200 (+/-) Acres treated; garlic mustard, curly leaf pondweed, Japanese knotweed,, buckthorn, purple loosestrife 200 (+/-) boats cleaned, several hundred boaters reached 40 (+/-) people reached at monthly events 20 (+/-) Events annually, social media outreach for both programs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wildlife</i> 		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	<i>10 wetland restoration sites Oversee Wildlife damage program CWD Prevention Program</i>	<i>\$100,000 (+/-) Cost Share from multiple sources; 25 (+/-) Acres Contract with Wildlife Services Fund Carcass Disposal Dumpsters; several tons of waste kept off the landscape</i>

**Bayfield 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

• <i>Urban</i>		
Urban issues	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>
• <i>Watershed</i>		
Watershed strategies	<i>Fish Creek 9KE Plan development</i>	<i>EPA funding of \$327,000 for Plan development and for on the ground implementation in the Fish Creek Watershed</i>
• <i>Other</i>		
Other	<i>NR 135 Plan Reviews Shoreline / Stormwater Mitigation</i>	<i>2 annually on-site visits with zoning dept 20+ plans developed annually</i>

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	0	0
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	0	0
Manure storage closure	2	0
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	2	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	5	0
Shoreland zoning	15	0
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	0	0
Other	0	0

**Bayfield 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 3: Planned inspections

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

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	2
Field days	60
Trainings/workshops	15
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	2
Newsletters	2
Social media posts	30
News release/story	2

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>County Conservationist</i>	2080	\$114,511
<i>Engineering Technician</i>	2080	\$96,265
<i>Office Manager</i>	1950	\$80,406
AIS / Shoreline Technician	1950	\$64,420
Terrestrial Invasive Species Coordinator	1950	\$49,499
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
<i>Bonding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>\$100,000</i>
<i>SEG</i>	<i>N/A</i>	\$8,000
<i>EPA</i>	<i>N/A</i>	\$327,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: September 20, 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 *Calumet 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 Calumet 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, Calumet 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: Anthony Reali, County Conservationist, Calumet County LWCD
Nick Kesler, Land & Water Conservation Committee Member



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

County: Calumet

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.

Completion of 9KE Plan for North Branch of the Manitowoc River Watershed - worked cooperatively with WI DNR and a private consultant to complete the 9 key element watershed plan for the North Branch of Manitowoc River Watershed which compliments the CalMan Lakes lake management plan - acquired funding through both DNR Surface Water Grant and Targetted Runoff Management Grant for implementation. Practices installed through the two grants are reflected in the "Practices Installed" section below.

Iron Enhanced Sand Filter - Acquired funding for the installation of an Iron Enhanced Sand Filter for implementation of our stormwater management plan to achieve compliance with the County's MS4 permit. Practice to be installed in fall of 2024.

GLRI - Addressing Phosphorus - Acquired funding in the Pipe Creek/Frontal Lake Winnebago watershed for the installation of 3 Agricultural Runoff Treatment Systems as well as the stabilization of Brothertown Creek at Brothertown Harbor. Practices are in design phase with installation in fall of 2024 and/or spring/summer of 2025.

Stormwater Flood Control Study - utilized ARPA funding to conduct a stormwater/flood control study for the North Branch Manitowoc River and Pipe Creek/Frontal Lake Winnebago watersheds. These watersheds had been previously identified by the County, the general public, and local municipalities as vulnerable areas to flooding and erosion issues.

Groundwater Program - have implemented a well testing and education program over the course of our plan with 1,212 well tests conducted countywide, we have now reached 2,218 of the wells in the County with the estimate of total wells in the County to be at 4,003 per DNR.

Practices installed which have addressed both surface and groundwater and have been funded through DATCP, TRM, MDV, GLRI, DNR Surface Water Grants (CalMan Lakes, Stony Brook) programs - Calumet County Land & Water Conservation Staff provided technical assistance and cost-sharing for a variety of practices which include but is not limited to: 10,774 lineal feet of streambank & shoreline protection, 18.7 acres or 26,919

lineal feet of grassed waterway, diversion or lined waterway, 5 stream crossings, 5 water & sediment control basins, 2,626 acres of nutrient management, 3 waste storage structures, 4 waste transfer systems, 5 waste facility closures, 1 roofed barnyard, 1 waste treatment system and 3 well decommissionings.

The practices mentioned above have resulted in 2,927 lbs. of phosphorus, 2,350 tons of sediment and 8,864 lbs. of nitrogen reduced from Calumet County watersheds with higher numbers coming from the Lower Fox TMDL area which has been in implementation for some time.

In installing the practices mentioned above we have provided \$729,142 in cost-share to private landowners.

Stony Brook - This trout stream project has been ongoing for many years and includes a trout in the classroom component through the Chilton School district. This projects aims to restore portions of Stony Brook as well as replace culverts and crossings with structures that accommodate fish passage. Lengths of the stream that have been restored equal around 1500 feet with the assistance of DNR, Friends of Stony Brook, Trout Unlimited and Lakeshore Natural Resources Partnership as well as the cooperation of private landowners.

CalMan Lakes Watershed - This Lake Management Plan with a small watershed plan component has resulted in the installation of a water and sediment control basin system as well as lakeshore restoration on Becker Lake.

Between the Lakes Demonstration Farm Network - Starting our first agreement with NRCS for the network in 2020, we have partnered with Manitowoc, Sheboygan and Fond du Lac Counties to provide outreach to farmers among others on soil health practices and have demonstrated other innovative practices such as wastewater irrigation and the 360 Rain autonomous wastewater/manure applicator.

For each of these accomplishments the work planning process helps to keep certain projects and deadlines in our minds and guides our workload planning as we go through the year. There are many reasons plans can be adjusted, most notably projects where we are addressing a discharge or contamination issue which will then take priority over other projects in the workplan.

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.

Overall I think we make good progress in meeting our goals in the workplan as well as the overarching goals of our LWRM plan. I think that we always feel that we can do more and that some projects don't progress as swiftly as we would like. Looking at our annual reports it appears that for the most part when we don't meet workplan goals for one item, we are exceeding goals in another. In addition, the way we have set up workplans is that once a new project or grant gets started that the goals of that grant will hit the workplan. Those items may be carried over into future workplans but having them on the radar in the

workplan keeps the project in everyone's mind so that progress can be made towards completion of a project or grant.

Overall practice implementation in targeted areas such as TMDL and 9 Key Element watersheds can always be improved although we have had great success with the funding and resources that we have acquired. One reason for our plan being adjusted is when a complaint or violation discovered. Although a site may not be in a priority area or the practice needed is not in the workplan, these are issues that cannot be ignored or be put to the bottom of the pile. They need to be addressed and results in a re-allocation of resources sometimes for multiple staff.

In Calumet County we now have 3 TMDL watersheds (Lower Fox, Upper Fox/Wolf and Lakeshore), addressing surface water but are not able to only focus on those due to our vulnerable groundwater aquifer in the County. Groundwater contamination events, when they occur, have to become the priority and investigation work needs to take place to try to determine the source of the contamination. Groundwater is very difficult to understand and although we do have maps of groundwater flow it is extremely difficult to fully understand the groundwater aquifers beneath our feet.

Implementing the silurian bedrock performance standards has not progressed as we would like but with the additions to ATCP 50 and cost-sharing for the incorporation of the performance standards into nutrient management plans we will have another tool for raising the awareness of the standards, the purpose of the standards, and will help to facilitate one on one discussions with the producers that the standards will apply to.

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.

First and foremost our priority farm strategy focuses on compliance within the Farmland Preservation Program. We are charged with confirming compliance with the farms and issuing them certificates of compliance so that they can claim their tax credits. The outreach on standards to be met is done yearly as a mailing to all known participants and a postcard to return indicating changes to land ownership and acknowledgement of the standards.

Secondly, if well contamination or a discharge is discovered in our Groundwater Protection area, resources need to be allocated to inventory the area for sources and/or compliance concerns. Staff has included outreach materials for the silurian bedrock performance standards in newsletters, via mailings and staff has presented at multiple field days on the new standards and how to achieve compliance.

Thirdly, the farms in targeted watershed areas (TMDL, 9KE areas) are reached through mailings, newsletters and boots on the ground. Inventories are done of cropland and farmsteads and DNR and GLRI funding is currently and in the past acquired for implementation.

NOD, TRM, Bond, SEG, NMFE and GLRI funding sources as well as our Demo Farm agreement have been used as tools in providing outreach and implementing compliance measures within our priority farm strategy.

In conclusion, I would say that we don't often get past the top three farm priority areas that are mentioned above as the top three cover the majority of the farms in the County.

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.

Although the silurian bedrock performance standards have been on our radar for some time the addition of the standards into ATCP 50 and the cost-share opportunity will cause us to spend more time reviewing NMPs for compliance and reaching out to producers whose NMP doesn't include the standards but should. This may cause an adjustment in which way we prioritize the use of SEG funds and should result in more specific benchmarks within the plan for implementation of the standards

As mentioned previously in this review, Calumet County is now a 3 TMDL county so work will need to take place to prioritize our resources to get out best bang for our buck for implementation. This is going to include working closely with DNR and neighboring counties to model and then prioritize highest loading watersheds and acquire funding and other resources for implementation. More emphasis may be put on promoting soil health practices, keeping the ground covered and reducing the amount of tillage being done. We have been able to hire a Soil Health Specialist/Agricultural Educator for our department which will help assist in our outreach efforts as well as our capacity to provide technical assistance to landowners who are hesitant to try new things. Again, more specific benchmarks for implementation and planning should result.

One specific example of a possible addition to our workplan is looking at climate change and resilience. We have in the past worked with this topic, specifically the Stormwater and Flood Control Study mentioned in question #1 above as well as entering into agreement with the Fox/Wolf Watershed Alliance for the Climate Smart Agronomy grant funded through USDA. Many agricultural practices that are meeting the goals of the Climate Smart Agronomy Grant also move us towards water quality goals. However, Calumet County does not have an organized Climate Resiliency Plan within our LWRMP or otherwise. This may be something we will look at prior to doing our next LWRMP and may be seen in future workplans.

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:
9/5/2024

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



Date:

9/5/24

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

**CALUMET 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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cropland</i> <p>Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management</p>	<p><i>Install cropland practices throughout the County but concentrating in existing TMDL watersheds as well as karst areas for nutrient management compliance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Install 8714 ln. ft. (5.0 acres) of waterway</i> • <i>Install 69 ln. ft. of rock lined waterway (0.1 ac.)</i> • <i>537 new NMP acres implemented/reviewed</i> • <i>375 new acres of nutrient management plans contracted</i> • <i>Install 1 stream crossing</i> • <i>Install 350 ft. of underground outlet/subsurface drain</i> • <i>Install 1 ac. of critical area seeding</i> • <i>Establish 700 acres of Cover Crops</i> • <i>100 acres with no-till adopted</i> <p><i>Monitor and track nutrient plan updates and implementation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>94,848 acres of NMP plans reviews and entered into GIS database</i> • <i>10% of total NMP plans with thorough review for quality assurance</i> <p><i>Utilize karst feature inventory during NMP review – emphasize areas where well contamination events are common</i></p> <p><i>Assist and partner with WI DNR in manure hauling/spreading audits targeting areas of known well contamination</i></p> <p><i>Provide education and outreach in regard to new NR 151 Silurian Bedrock Performance Standards, review NMPs for incorporation of standards</i></p>	<p><i>5 Acres of grassed waterway</i></p> <p><i>424 acres of new NMPs</i> <i>822 new acres contracted</i></p> <p><i>1 ac. of critical area seeding</i> <i>100 acres of cover crops and no-till – adjusted strategy due to interest in NMP</i></p> <p><i>93,326 acres of NMPs reviewed – 10% reviewed for quality assurance</i></p> <p><i>This is utilized during e-coli occurrences and during reviews but will expand once the Silurian bedrock standards are getting incorporated into NMPs – this is an area where we will need to focus more efforts.</i></p> <p><i>This has been complaint based in the past and will continue to be – again, with Silurian standards incorporated into NMPs this will be an area to focus more efforts</i></p> <p><i>See summary of nutrient reductions and cost-share at end of workplan</i></p>

**CALUMET COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<p><i>Emphasis in county adopted groundwater protection area</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis in approved and developing TMDL areas (HUC 0403020302, Lower Fox) (HUC 0403020303, Upper Fox, Winnebago) (HUC 0403010103, North Branch Manitowoc)</i></p>	
<p>• <i>Livestock</i></p>		
<p>Livestock</p>	<p><i>Install livestock practices</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Install 1 roof runoff systems (290 ft.)</i> • <i>2 Waste Storage Structures</i> • <i>2 Waste Transfer Systems</i> • <i>4 Waste Storage Facility Closures</i> <p><i>Emphasis in county adopted groundwater protection area or NR 151 compliance issues</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis in approved and developing TMDL areas (HUC 0403020302, Lower Fox) (HUC 0403020303, Upper Fox, Winnebago) (HUC 0403010103, North Branch Manitowoc)</i></p>	<p><i>1 barnyard runoff control 1 waste transfer 3 waste storage closures</i></p> <p><i>See summary of nutrient reductions and cost-share at end of workplan</i></p>
<p>• <i>Water quality</i></p>		
<p>Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)</p>	<p><i>Install 2112 ln. ft. of streambank/shoreline protection</i></p> <p><i>Partner with FSA & NRCS to negotiate 2 agreements to establish buffers under CREP or similar program</i></p> <p><i>Utilize DATCP Innovative Practices Grant to contract 10 acres of harvestable buffers</i></p> <p><i>Treat 1 sinkhole</i></p> <p><i>Properly decommission 1 unused well</i></p> <p><i>Install 2 Agricultural Runoff Treatment Systems Install 2 Phosphorus Removal Systems</i></p> <p><i>Assist and continue participation in steering team activities in regard to implementation of the Lake Winnebago and pool lakes management plan</i></p>	<p><i>1248 ln. ft. of streambank/shoreline protection installed</i></p> <p><i>1.2 acres established in 2023, 4.9 acres installed/to be installed in 2024</i></p> <p><i>Decommissioned 2 wells</i></p> <p><i>ARTS and PRS to be installed in 2024 and spring 2025</i></p> <p><i>See summary of nutrient reductions and cost-share at end of workplan</i></p>

**CALUMET COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<p><i>Continue identifying and confirming karst features to add to GIS data set for tracking</i></p> <p><i>Groundwater program – 250 private wells sampled and tested countywide, conduct one group sampling event, conduct educational workshops on test results and countywide data</i></p> <p><i>10 well checks/audits</i></p> <p><i>Citizen monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provide assistance w/ 5 WAV monitoring sites, 1 citizen monitoring site in CLMN</i> <p><i>Install and Carry out Nitrogen Leaching study in cooperation with UW Discovery Farms and Calumet County Ag Stewardship Alliance</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis in county adopted groundwater protection area</i> <i>Emphasis in approved and developing TMDL areas (HUC 0403020302, Lower Fox)</i> <i>(HUC 0403020303, Upper Fox, Winnebago)</i> <i>(HUC 0403010103, North Branch Manitowoc)</i></p>	<p><i>This is an ongoing process – updated NMPS with help expedite the tracking</i></p> <p><i>In 2023 301 wells were sampled and tested in the County, our biggest well testing program that we have had.</i></p> <p><i>Promoted the DNR ARPA Well Compensation Program, offering assistance to 46 well owners, including tests, well checks/audits, and application support. 16 well owners in high-risk areas for bacteria and nitrate have benefited from the program, some new wells and some treatments devices, mainly UV.</i></p> <p><i>Worked together with UW Discovery Farms and UW Stevens Point to install equipment at the selected site. 2023 was a pretty dry year so samples could not be pulled from the pan lysimeters. Sampling has started in 2024.</i></p>
--	---	---

• *Forestry*

Forestry		
-----------------	--	--

• *Invasive*

Invasive species	<p><i>Conduct Clean Boats/Clean Waters project</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Grant funded intern – 250 hours of watercraft inspections at two landings, data reported in SWIMS</i> <p><i>Provide support for Phragmites control grant</i></p> <p><i>AIS Snapshot Day</i></p>	<p><i>Unable to fill position in 2023</i></p> <p><i>Provided outreach on project via mail to 254 landowners which resulted in 126 acres being treated.</i></p> <p><i>5 sites monitored by Water Resource Specialist.</i></p>
-------------------------	---	--

• *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	<p><i>Administer Wildlife damage program</i></p>	<p><i>Processed 3 damage claims and provided funding (\$13,845) through the program to install a permanent woven wire fence to protect an organic apple crop.</i></p>
--	--	---

**CALUMET COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<p><i>1 Tree and plant sales program</i></p> <p><i>Assist DNR, Friends of Stony Brook and Trout Unlimited in the restoration of trout habitat on Stony Brook – 1250 ln. ft.</i></p> <p><i>Complete 1 wetland restoration/enhancement</i></p>	<p><i>7050 trees distributed to Calumet County residents. Starting in 2025/2026 tree sale Calumet County will be developing our own program and no longer be partnering with Outagamie County.</i></p> <p><i>Completed – reflected above under Water Quality</i></p>
--	--	--

• *Urban*

<p>Urban issues</p>	<p><i>Issue 3 large scale post-construction stormwater permits</i></p> <p><i>Issue 5 large site (> 1 ac.) erosion control permits</i></p> <p><i>Issue 10 small site (< 1 ac.) erosion control permits</i></p> <p><i>Develop MS4 Annual Report and submit to DNR in compliance with permit conditions</i></p> <p><i>Conduct EC contractor training and outreach activities in accordance with MS4 permit requirements</i></p> <p><i>Install iron enhanced sand filter</i></p>	<p><i>3 large scale post-construction stormwater permits issued</i></p> <p><i>3 large site erosion control permits issued</i></p> <p><i>11 small site erosion control permits issued</i></p> <p><i>Completed annual report, made available for public comment, presented to Land & Water Conservation Committee and submitted to DNR by deadline.</i></p> <p><i>65 erosion control & stormwater inspections carried out with 35 follow-ups for minor compliance issues</i></p> <p><i>ISF to be installed October 2024</i></p>
----------------------------	--	---

• *Watershed*

<p>Watershed strategies</p>	<p><i>Watershed and Lake Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Continue assistance with Winnebago Waterways Recovery effort, including participation on steering and tech teams. Effort includes implementation of 9KE plan</i> <p><i>Watershed plan implementation, funding & planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Plum/Kankapot Watershed – Lower Fox (HUCs 040302040203 & 040302040204) Funding acquired, additional grants needed/applied for</i> <i>• North Branch Manitowoc River (HUC 0403010103) includes CalMan Lakes watershed</i> 	<p><i>Staff have been involved in the 9KE planning process including running models for determining load reductions and goals. Streambank inventory has been completed and data is being extrapolated for use within the plan. Plan is close to being ready for final review.</i></p> <p><i>Watershed plans for Plum & Kankapot & North Branch Manitowoc are complete with plans for Pipe Creek-Frontal Lake Winnebago to be completed soon. Grant funding has been ongoing utilizing TRM, GLRI and DNR Surface Water Grants. Load reductions are reflected in question #1 in 5 Year Review Questionnaire as well as at the end of this workplan.</i></p>
------------------------------------	--	---

**CALUMET COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<p><i>First phase funding acquired for Spring Creek and Calman Lakes watersheds, continue implementation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pipe Creek – Frontal Lake Winnebago (HUC 040302030401)</i> <i>Acquire funding/applied for, utilize MDV funds when available</i> <p><i>Lake Management Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Coordinate with Chilton Lake District on initial stages of planning including acquiring DNR Lake Management Planning funding</i> <p><i>P-compliance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Apply for MDV funds based on point source participation/funds available</i> • <i>Complete watershed plans for eligible watersheds</i> • <i>Install BMPs for NR 151 compliance and phosphorus reductions in approved watersheds</i> • <i>Complete annual reports</i> <p><i>TMDL coordination</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Continue work with Manitowoc River stakeholders in the development of the Lakeshore TMDL as well as implementing 9KE plan for North Branch Manitowoc River watershed (Spring Creek)</i> • <i>Continue work with project partners on TMDL implementation in Lower Fox River watershed</i> • <i>Begin planning for implementation of Upper Fox/Wolf TMDL, apply for funding</i> <p><i>Producer-led</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Continue advisory work with Calumet County Agricultural Stewardship Alliance (CCASA)</i> • <i>Assist with well testing subcommittee</i> <p><i>Demo Farm</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Conduct field days and tours as outlined in project deliverables</i> 	<p><i>Plan completed, focuses on aquatic vegetation management – staff assisted with plan development including contributing watershed information and have started meeting with property owners on erosion issues along the millpond shoreline.</i></p> <p><i>Did not apply for any new funding but the County currently has roughly \$100,000 in funding for which watershed plans have been submitted.</i></p> <p><i>Calumet LWCD has installed mainly cropland practices utilizing roughly \$75,000 dollars in MDV funding.</i></p> <p><i>Lakeshore TMDL has been adopted and discussions have begun with DNR on prioritizing sub-watersheds for initial implementation based on pollutant loading models.</i></p> <p><i>Lower Fox Implementation has ben and still is an ongoing process. TRM, GLRI and DATCP Bond & SEG funding</i></p> <p><i>Awaiting approval of the Pipe Creek – Frontal Lake Winnebago 9KE plan to be approved. However, practices are being planned and installed utilizing funding sources such as GLRI, DATCP Structural Bond & SEG and MDV funds.</i> <i>Continue in an advisory role with the CCASA Board as well as facilitate their well testing program with a 3rd party sampler. Assist with DATCP PLWPG grant application and management. CCASA has expanded their program to now include field days, well testing and cost share for soil health practices.</i> <i>Conducted 2 field days in 2023 with one field day having 155 attendees to showcasing the 360 Rain manure and wastewater applicator. Other subjects discussed at field days include.</i></p>
--	---	--

**CALUMET COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Other*

Other	<i>Stormwater/Flood Control Study – Work with Consultant and municipalities on completing study for North Branch Manitowoc River and East Winnebago watersheds</i>	<i>This ARPA funded study has been ongoing since April/May 2023 and should be completed before the end of this calendar year. Work has included meeting with watershed cities, villages and towns to hear from them on their concerns/problem areas and developing recommendations for infrastructural improvements/modifications but will also include watershed wide recommendations.</i>
--------------	--	---

Table 2: Planned activity related to permits and ordinances

Permits and Ordinances	Plans/application reviews anticipated	Permits anticipated to be issued
Feedlot permits	0	0
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	5	5 - 5
Manure storage closure	3	3 - 1
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	15	15 - 18
Shoreland zoning	0	0
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	5	DNR Issues
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	60 - 45
For FPP	50 - 45
For NR 151	10 - 45
Animal waste ordinance	20 - 20
Livestock facility siting	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	100 - 65
Nonmetallic mining	0

**CALUMET COUNTY 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	2 - 2
Field days	3 - 2
Trainings/workshops	2 - 2
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	2 - 2
Newsletters	1 - 1
Social media posts	150 - 84
News release/story	2

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>County Conservationist</i>	1950	\$130,881.37
<i>Water Resource Specialist</i>	1950	\$113,290.08
<i>Land Resource Specialist</i>	1950	\$111,584.58
Erosion Control & Stormwater Specialist	1950	\$109,240.23
Conservation Technician	1950	\$88,978.54
Conservation Technician	1950	\$94,487.82
Watercraft Inspector	350	\$5,711.00
Total Conservation Staff Costs		\$654,173.62
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
All Sources – Bond, SEG, TRM, GLRI, EQIP	N/A	\$516,454.40 - \$104,529.86

**** Nutrient reduction summary for all practices installed in 2023**

Phosphorus
420.7 lbs.

Sediment
300.1 tons

Nitrogen
1027.8 lbs

CALUMET COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

Table 1: Planned activities and performance measures by category

<p style="text-align: center;">CATEGORY (goal and objective from LWRM plan can be added in each category)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PLANNED ACTIVITIES WITH BENCHMARKS If applicable identify focus areas, e.g. HUC 12 watershed code (examples of types of “planned activities” in italics)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS (examples in italics)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cropland</i> 		
<p>Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management</p>	<p><i>Install cropland practices throughout the County but concentrating in existing TMDL watersheds as well as karst areas for nutrient management compliance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Install 3500 ln. ft. (2.4 acres) of waterway</i> • <i>Install 10 ln. ft. of rock lined waterway</i> • <i>807 new NMP acres implemented/reviewed</i> • <i>471 new acres of nutrient management plans contracted</i> • <i>Install 4 stream crossings</i> • <i>Install 1.7 ac. of critical area seeding</i> • <i>Establish 1000 acres of Cover Crops</i> • <i>100 acres with no-till adopted</i> <p><i>Monitor and track nutrient plan updates and implementation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>94,908 acres of NMP plans reviews and entered into GIS database</i> • <i>10% of total NMP plans with thorough review for quality assurance</i> <p><i>Utilize karst feature inventory during NMP review – emphasize areas where well contamination events are common</i></p> <p><i>Provide education and outreach in regard to new NR 151 Silurian Bedrock Performance Standards, review NMPs for incorporation of standards</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis in county adopted groundwater protection area</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis in approved TMDL areas (HUC 0403020302, Lower Fox) (HUC 0403020303, Upper Fox, Winnebago)</i></p>	<p><i>Type and units of practice(s) installed</i></p> <p><i>Amount of cost-share dollars spent</i></p> <p><i># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method)</i></p> <p><i># lbs of P reduced (using any approved method)</i></p> <p><i># acres NMP logged into system and tracked</i></p> <p><i># acres of cropland in compliance with a performance standard</i></p>

**CALUMET COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<i>(HUC 0403010103, North Branch Manitowoc)</i>	
--	---	--

• *Livestock*

<p>Livestock</p>	<p><i>Install livestock practices</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Install 1 roof runoff systems (500 ft.)</i> • <i>1 Waste Storage Structures</i> • <i>2 Waste Transfer Systems</i> • <i>4 Waste Storage Facility Closures</i> • <i>1 Milking Center Waste Control System</i> <p><i>Emphasis in county adopted groundwater protection area or NR 151 compliance issues</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis in approved TMDL areas (HUC 0403020302, Lower Fox) (HUC 0403020303, Upper Fox, Winnebago) (HUC 0403010103, North Branch Manitowoc)</i></p>	<p><i>Type and units of practice(s) installed</i></p> <p><i>Amount of cost-share dollars spent</i></p> <p><i># lbs of P reduced (using any approved method)</i></p> <p><i># of livestock facilities in compliance with a performance standard</i></p>
-------------------------	---	---

• *Water quality*

<p>Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)</p>	<p><i>Install 1910 ln. ft. of streambank/shoreline protection</i></p> <p><i>Partner with FSA & NRCS to negotiate 2 agreements to establish buffers under CREP or similar program</i></p> <p><i>Utilize DATCP Innovative Practices Grant to contract 8.8 acres of harvestable buffers</i></p> <p><i>Properly decommission 1 unused well</i></p> <p><i>Install 2 Agricultural Runoff Treatment Systems Install 2 Phosphorus Removal Systems</i></p> <p><i>Assist and continue participation in steering team activities in regard to implementation of the Lake Winnebago and pool lakes management plan</i></p> <p><i>Continue identifying and confirming karst features to add to GIS data set for tracking</i></p> <p><i>Groundwater program – 250 private wells sampled and tested countywide, conduct one group sampling</i></p>	<p><i>Type and units of practice(s) installed</i></p> <p><i>Amount of cost-share dollars spent</i></p> <p><i># lbs of sediment reduced (using any approved method)</i></p> <p><i># lbs of P reduced (using any approved method)</i></p> <p><i># features mapped</i></p>
---	---	---

CALUMET COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

	<p><i>event, conduct educational workshops on test results and countywide data</i></p> <p><i>10 well checks/audits</i></p> <p><i>Citizen monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Provide assistance w/ 5 WAV monitoring sites, 1 citizen monitoring site in CLMN</i> <p><i>Collect samples to carry out Nitrogen Leaching study in cooperation with UW Discovery Farms and Calumet County Ag Stewardship Alliance</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis in county adopted groundwater protection area</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis in approved TMDL areas</i> <i>(HUC 0403020302, Lower Fox)</i> <i>(HUC 0403020303, Upper Fox, Winnebago)</i> <i>(HUC 0403010103, North Branch Manitowoc)</i></p>	<p><i># of wells sampled</i></p> <p><i># Sites monitored, volunteers engaged in monitoring</i></p> <p><i># samples collected</i></p>
--	--	--

• *Forestry*

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

• *Invasive*

Invasive species	<p><i>Conduct Clean Boats/Clean Waters project</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Grant funded intern – 250 hours of watercraft inspections at two landings, data reported in SWIMS</i> <p><i>Provide support for Phragmites control grant</i></p> <p><i>AIS Snapshot Day</i></p>	<p><i>Number of surveys completed, contacts made</i></p> <p><i>Number of control efforts implemented/sites treated</i></p>
-------------------------	---	---

• *Wildlife*

Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	<p><i>Administer Wildlife damage program</i></p> <p><i>1 Tree and plant sales program</i></p> <p><i>Assist DNR, Friends of Stony Brook and Trout Unlimited in the restoration of trout habitat on Stony</i></p>	<p><i>Number of trees sold</i></p> <p><i>Restoration Project Completed</i></p>
--	---	---

**CALUMET COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<i>Brook – 1362 ln. ft. stream restoration</i>	
--	--	--

• *Urban*

Urban issues	<p><i>Issue 3 large scale post-construction stormwater permits</i></p> <p><i>Issue 5 large site (> 1 ac.) erosion control permits</i></p> <p><i>Issue 10 small site (< 1 ac.) erosion control permits</i></p> <p><i>Develop MS4 Annual Report and submit to DNR in compliance with permit conditions</i></p> <p><i>Conduct training and outreach activities in accordance with MS4 permit requirements</i></p> <p><i>Install iron enhanced sand filter</i></p>	<p><i>Number of site visits</i></p> <p><i>Number of plans reviews</i></p> <p><i>Number of permits issued</i></p> <p><i>Number of compliance issues resolved</i></p> <p><i>ISF Installed</i></p>
---------------------	--	---

• *Watershed*

Watershed strategies	<p><i>Watershed and Lake Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Continue assistance with Winnebago Waterways Recovery effort, including participation on steering and tech teams. Effort includes implementation of 9KE plan once approved by WI DNR</i> <p><i>Watershed plan implementation, funding & planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Plum/Kankapot Watershed – Lower Fox (HUCs 040302040203 & 040302040204) Funding acquired, additional grants needed/applied – MDV funds utilized</i> • <i>North Branch Manitowoc River (HUC 0403010103) includes CalMan Lakes watershed</i> <i>First phase funding acquired for Spring Creek and Calman Lakes watersheds, continue implementation – Utilize MDV funds</i> • <i>South Branch Manitowoc – explore options to carry out 9KE planning for South Branch or select subwatersheds</i> • <i>Pipe Creek – Frontal Lake Winnebago</i> 	<p><i>Number of meetings attended/presentations given</i></p> <p><i>Modeling completed, if applicable</i></p> <p><i>Number of partner contacts made</i></p> <p><i>Number of partnership development activities accomplished</i></p>
-----------------------------	---	---

**CALUMET COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

	<p><i>(HUC 040302030401)</i> <i>Acquire funding/applied for, utilize MDV funds</i></p> <p><i>Lake Management Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Coordinate with Chilton Lake District on implementation of Lake plan – assist with shoreline property concerns and AIS</i> <p><i>P-compliance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Apply for MDV funds based on point source participation/funds available</i> <i>Complete watershed plans for eligible watersheds</i> <i>Install BMPs for NR 151 compliance and phosphorus reductions in approved watersheds</i> <i>Complete annual reports</i> <p><i>TMDL coordination</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Continue work with Manitowoc River stakeholders in the development 9KE watershed plans as well as implementing 9KE plan for North Branch Manitowoc River watershed (Spring Creek)</i> <i>Continue work with project partners on TMDL implementation in Lower Fox River watershed</i> <p><i>Producer-led</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Continue advisory work with Calumet County Agricultural Stewardship Alliance (CCASA)</i> <i>Assist with well testing subcommittee</i> <p><i>Demo Farm</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Conduct field days and tours as outlined in project deliverables</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Other</i> 		
<p>Other</p>	<p><i>Stormwater/Flood Control Study – Work with Consultant and municipalities on completing study for North Branch Manitowoc River and East Winnebago watersheds.</i></p>	<p><i>Plan completed – shared with other municipalities</i></p>

**CALUMET 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	0	0
Manure storage construction and transfer systems	5	5
Manure storage closure	3	3
Livestock facility siting	0	0
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	0	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	15	15
Shoreland zoning	0	0
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)	5	DNR Issues
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	60
For FPP	50
For NR 151	10
Animal waste ordinance	20
Livestock facility siting	0
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	60
Nonmetallic mining	0

**CALUMET COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	1
Field days	5
Trainings/workshops	3
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	1
Newsletters	1
Social media posts	52
News release/story	2
Ag Community Events (County Fair, Sundae on the Farm)	2

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
County Conservationist	1950	\$143,832
Water Resource Specialist	1950	\$123,318
Land Resource Specialist	1950	\$123,825
Erosion Control & Stormwater Specialist	1950	\$118,697
Conservation Technician	1950	\$102,726
Conservation Technician	1950	\$81,978
Soil Health Specialist/Ag Educator (Grant Funded)	1950	\$68,309
Total		\$762,685
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
70% Cost-Share Funding Sources Bond, TRM, MDV	N/A	\$143,710
100% or Unit Rate Practices GLRI, TRM, MDV, SEG, DNR Surface Water USDA Climate Smart, NFWF, DATCP Innovation, EQIP	N/A	\$457,696
Total		\$601,406



State of Wisconsin
Governor Tony Evers

Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
Secretary Randy Romanski

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: September 20, 2024

TO: Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors

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

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

Recommend Action: This is an action item. Staff request that the Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB) recommend approval of the 2025 Final Joint Allocation Plan.

Procedural Summary: On July 26, 2024, DATCP provided a link to the 2025 Preliminary Joint Allocation Plan and Environmental Assessment (EA) to interested parties, including county land conservation departments and current and former DATCP grant cooperators. Interested parties were advised of their opportunities to comment on the preliminary allocation including the option of submitting written comments by September 6, 2024. Two written comments were submitted.

Allocation Summary: The *2025 Final Joint Allocation Plan* provides details on how both the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) will allocate \$23,421,931 of available nonpoint grant funds to county land conservation committees and other project cooperators. This plan does not include DNR award of grants to cities, towns, and villages for projects under ss. 281.65 or 285.66, Wis. Stats.

The Final Allocation Plan makes the following change from the preliminary allocation:

- Shawano's SEG cost-share award was decreased to fund a NMFE award for Shawano County.
- DNR's response to a county's inquiry regarding potential to increase awards was documented.

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

Materials Provided:

- 2025 Final Joint Allocation Plan, 2025 Environmental Assessment

Presenter: Katy Smith (DATCP)

Wisconsin - America's Dairyland

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

An equal opportunity employer

2025 Joint Allocation Plan

Final

October 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
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 Final Allocation	16
2. UNPS Final Allocation.....	17
3. Notice of Discharge Program	17
Tables	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 Final 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

The DATCP portion of the final allocation plan includes the following change from the preliminary allocation plan: Shawano County’s SEG cost-share award is decreased to fund an NMFE award for Shawano County.

While there were no substantive changes to the DNR section, a comment received from Marinette County addresses the disparity in county needs and the TRM awards. DNR issued the following response: *Thank you for your comments. We understand that costs of construction have been increasing. After noticing similar trends in 2019, we raised the Small-Scale TRM grant cap from \$150,000 to \$225,000 in the 2020 grant cycle. We have limited funding and have to balance the cost of practices with funding as many projects as we can. Our funding is not increasing to adjust for the increase in construction costs. We will continue to evaluate the costs in the next grant cycle (2026).*

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

Steven 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 Notice of Discharge (NOD), and Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Management Construction Projects (UNPS Construction) 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	\$441,875	\$2,166,125
Cooperator Contracts (SEG)	\$1,144,007	\$121,246	\$1,022,761
Innovation Grants (SEG)	\$334,950	\$265,102	\$69,848
NMFE Grants (SEG)	\$416,266	\$0	\$416,266
SUBTOTAL	\$31,360,552	\$12,821,152	\$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)
\$2,166,125	DATCP SEG from s. 20.115(7)(qf)
\$5,816,125	DATCP Subtotal
\$1,948,833	DNR Bond Revenue from s. 20.866(2)(tf)
\$85,000	DNR Bond Revenue from s. 20.886(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
\$10,211,056	TOTAL Cost-Share Grants
Nutrient Management Farmer Education (NMFE) & Other Project Cooperator (OPC) Grants	
\$416,266	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)
\$1,508,875	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, \$2,166,125 will be provided to counties for landowner cost-sharing, \$416,266 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 \$2,166,125 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.

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-four 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
Shawano Co	15,375	1,500		\$16,875
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	381,116	27,150	8,000	\$416,266
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.

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 83% of the SEG funding requested by counties for cost-sharing, which is \$441,875 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 final 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 final 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 Final 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 Final 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 Final Allocation

This Final 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.

Tables

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	3,125	208,122	
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	Waushara	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	\$2,166,125	\$17,030,525	
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				416,266	
UW-GNHS				35,000	Innovation Grants				69,848	
UW NOP Support				60,000	Sub-Total Cooperator Allocation				\$1,508,875	
WLWCA				233,426						
ALLOCATION TOTALS						TOTAL	\$11,214,400	\$3,650,000	\$2,166,125	\$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 Final 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
La Crosse	\$430,000	\$170,000	\$0	\$0	\$600,000
Kewaunee	\$178,427	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,427
Marinette	\$225,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$225,000
Oconto	\$188,785	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$188,785
Outagamie	\$209,899	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$209,899
St. Croix	\$375,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$525,000
Washington	\$560,000	\$40,000	\$85,000	\$0	\$685,000
Waupaca	\$472,400	\$127,600	\$0	\$0	\$600,000
Wood	\$70,420	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$70,420
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	47,625	208,122
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	10,211,056	21,913,056
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			416,266
UW-GNHS			35,000	Innovation Grants			69,848
UW NOP Support			60,000	Sub-Total Cooperator Allocation			1,508,875
WLWCA			233,426				
PROGRAM ALLOCATION TOTALS					\$ 11,702,000	\$ 10,211,056	\$ 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
Iowa	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	Waushara	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	\$3,125
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						\$2,166,125	
County Name in Italics = County transferred funds awarded in prior grant year NA= County did not apply for SEG funds				County Name Shaded = 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

Final

October 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 Final Joint 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 September 19, 2024 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 9/19/24 By 
Brian D. 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 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.

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: September 13, 2024

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

FROM: Joanna Griffin
Watershed Management Bureau, DNR

SUBJECT: **DNR Scoring and Ranking of Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Grant Applications for Calendar Year (CY) 2025 Funding**

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

Summary: The DNR, pursuant to s. 281.65(4c)(b), Wis. Stats., is informing the LWCB of the Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) grant applications ranked list for CY 2025 funding. Scoring results for projects being considered for 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 \$2,070,725
- Based on available funding, the Department proposes to allocate \$2,070,725 to fully fund grant requests for twelve (12) eligible projects.
- The final ranked list includes the following changes from the preliminary ranked list.
 - The Village of Deforest state share request was corrected to \$221,281 from \$371,900.

C. Large-Scale Non-TMDL

- No applications were submitted in this project category.

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.

TRM Scoring by Project Category & Rank for 2025

The attached tables show the final rank order of applications.

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 Grant Applications

	Preliminary Allocation			
	Bond Revenue	GPR	319	Seg
Structural BMPs (including force account and engineering)	\$1,955,812	\$1,595,464	\$230,134	\$300,000
Non-Structural Practices (e.g., cropping)	\$0	\$473,500	\$367,000	\$0
Local Assistance	\$0	\$131,655	\$210,000	\$145,945
Total TRM	\$1,955,812	\$2,200,619	\$807,134	\$445,945

Large-Scale and Small-Scale TRM Grant 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	\$948,833	\$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	\$221,281	\$646,281
3	Kewaunee County	Kirchman Project	NER	146	Yes	\$178,427	\$824,708
4	Racine City	Uptown Green Infrastructure	SER	161	No	\$225,000	\$1,049,708
5	Manitowoc City	Shoreline Restoration in Silver Creek	NER	129	No	\$205,000	\$1,254,708
6	Saukville Town	Milwaukee River Wetland Restoration	SER	127	No	\$80,000	\$1,334,708
7	Outagamie County	Susan Schaumberg	NER	120	No	\$209,899	\$1,544,607
8	Oconomowoc City	Cottonwood Creek Restoration	SER	114	No	\$205,500	\$1,750,107
9	Wood County	Wood County LWCD & Kerry Lewis	WCR	103	No	\$70,420	\$1,820,527
10	Watertown City	Fannie Lewis Park Shoreline Stabilization	SCR	98	No	\$113,943	\$1,934,470
11	Sheboygan City	Pigeon River Water Quality Improvement at Maywood Nature Park and Evergreen Park	SER	91	No	\$136,255	\$2,070,725

*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: September 16, 2024

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

FROM: Joanna Griffin
Watershed Management Bureau, DNR

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

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

Summary: Through this memo, the DNR is informing the LWCB of Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management (UNPS) grant application scores for projects to be considered for calendar year (CY) 2023 grant funding. Scoring results for projects being considered for CY 2023 funding are presented in the attached table.

The DNR funds UNPS projects under authority of s. 281.66, Wis. Stats. The purpose of this program is to control polluted runoff from urban project areas. Funds may be used for two types of projects:

1. Construction projects (may also include land acquisition) and 2. Planning projects. Each project type has its own application process and funding source. Consequently, construction projects and planning projects do not compete against each other for funding.

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 for the UNPS bond revenue and GPR total \$3,181,370
- Based on available funding, the Department proposes to allocate \$2,787,391 in bond revenue and GPR to fund grant requests for 21 of the 24 projects.
- Additionally, DNR's Clean Water Fund Loan Program received funding from the USEPA Sewer Overflow and Storm Water Reuse Municipal Grants Program (OSG). DNR is awarding these funds to eligible UNPS grant applicants (<http://www.epa.gov/cwsrf/sewer-overflow-and-stormwater-reuse-municipal-grants-program>). With this additional funding (\$2,313,001), DNR will be able to fund six projects. These projects are identified with an * below in the table.
- The final ranked list includes the following changes from the preliminary ranked list.
 - OSG funding has been included.
 - Due to grants closing with some underspending, DNR can fund an additional grant on the ranked list. The City of Racine's project will be funded partially by UNPS funds. Because

the City of Racine also applied for and will receive a Small-Scale Urban TMDL TRM grant for the same project, the city is limited to 70% of the total project cost. Therefore, they are only able to receive \$73,521 of the \$150,000 for the state share request. These new numbers are reflected in the updated memo and ranked list.

The attached table shows the current rank order of applications.

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.

Proposed Allocation				
	City	Village	Sewerage District	County
Bond Revenue, GPR, & SEG	\$1,772,491	\$779,900	\$150,000	\$85,000
OSG Funding	\$1,702,211	\$313,740	\$297,050	\$0
Total	\$3,474,702	\$1,093,640	\$447,050	\$85,000

UNPS Construction Scoring by Rank for 2025

Rank	Applicant	Region	Project Name	Score	State Share	Cumulative
1	Bellevue Village	NER	Schmitt Industrial Park Storm Water Pond	121	\$199,900	\$199,900
2	Sheboygan Falls City*	SER	5th St Det Basin	111.6	\$363,300	\$563,200
2	Whitewater City	SER	Starin Park Underground Wet Detention Basin	111.6	\$150,000	\$713,200
3	Waupun City	SCR	Gateway Drive Pond	109.4	\$150,000	\$863,200
4	Howard Village	NER	Valley Brooke Park Pond	108.6	\$80,000	\$943,200
5	Kimberly Village*	NER	Papermaker Pond	107.7	\$463,740	\$1,406,940
6	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District*	SER	30th Street Corridor Wet Weather Relief Phase 2 Stormwater Basin	105.6	\$447,050	\$1,85,3990
7	Marshfield City	WCR	Braem Park Wet Detention Basin	103.2	\$150,000	\$2,003,990
8	Milwaukee Public Schools*	SER	Greener Schools, Stronger Communities - Humboldt Park School	102.3	\$525,724	\$2,529,714
8	Milwaukee Public Schools*	SER	Greener Schools, Stronger Communities - Samuel Clemens School	102.3	\$581,939	\$3,111,653
8	Milwaukee Public Schools*	SER	Green Schools, Stronger Communities - Walt Whitman School	102.3	\$756,248	\$3,867,901
9	Weston Village	WCR	WisDOT Right-of-Way Wet Detention Basin	102.1	\$150,000	\$4,017,901
10	Monona City	SCR	Reach 64 Stormwater Project	101.9	\$150,000	\$4,167,901
11	Schofield City	WCR	Kort Street Wet Detention Basin	98.8	\$150,000	\$4,317,901
12	Fond du Lac City	NER	Arndt Street Wet Detention Basin	94	\$150,000	\$4,467,901
13	Washington County	SER	Washington County Campus Stormwater Improvements	93	\$85,000	\$4,552,901
14	Elkhorn City	SER	Elkhorn Lake Bioretention	91.3	\$111,000	\$4,663,901
15	Ashwaubenon Village	NER	Willard Pond	89.8	\$200,000	\$4,863,901
16	Sheboygan City	SER	North Point Bluff Water Quality Improvement Project	84.2	\$90,000	\$4,953,901
17	De Pere City	NER	26-09 Honey Court Pond Construction	80.3	\$72,970	\$5,026,871
18	Racine City	SER	Uptown Green Infrastructure	79.2	\$73,521	\$5,100,392
19	Platteville City	SCR	2024 Rountree Branch Streambank Protection	77	\$100,000	\$5,200,392
20	Kenosha City	SER	South Creek Restoration & 89th and 39th Basin Green Infrastructure	74.7	\$110,000	\$5,310,932
21	Brookfield City	SER	Rolling Meadows Park Pond Conversion	55	\$107,500	\$5,417,892

Black font = proposed to be fully funded

Red font = funding not available

*= OSG Funding recipient

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM _____ **State of Wisconsin**

DATE: September 20, 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 *Portage 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 Portage 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, Portage 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: Steve Bradley, County Conservationist, Portage County LWCD
Nancy Eggleston, Land & Water Conservation Committee Chair



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

County: Portage

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.

We have completed seven well abandonment projects over the last five years in order to eliminate the potential of a conduit to groundwater contamination. This activity is consistent with our LWRM Plan as well as our county Groundwater Management Plan.

We worked with the Village of Plover to restore wetlands as part of the Little Plover River Watershed Enhancement Project. The Project converted 160 acres of irrigated cropland to wetland and prairie habitat. This reduced groundwater pumping and nutrient loading in the watershed, as outlined by two Goals contained in our LWRM Plan.

Implementation of lake management plans is another priority in our LWRM Plan and has been a focus of our efforts over the last five years. With the help of DNR Healthy Lakes Grants, we have worked with over two dozen riparian landowners to install water quality and habitat improvement projects.

Windbreak establishment is a Goal of our LWRM Plan and continues to be a priority. Over the last five years, approximately 15 miles of windbreaks have been planted and maintained in the county to reduce wind erosion.

Youth education has been a successful objective within our LWRM Plan by participating with WI Land+Water Conservation Association camp scholarships along with poster and speaking contests, and staff assistance at the Wisconsin Envirothon. We also provide staff to work with local schools to promote land and water conservation activities.

We continue to work with our UWEX Ag Agent to assist as needed with the Farmer Led groups in the County as specified in our LWRM Plan. Implementation of cover crops and no-till have been popular with these groups. Several tours/field days and meetings with guest speakers are held annually. We also participate with the Upper Fox/Wolf Watershed Demonstration project, where NRCS funds a network of farmers in nine counties to test and demonstrate the best conservation practices to reduce nutrients and sediment leaving

cropland. Additionally, two Portage County farms are participating in the DATCP Nitrogen Optimization Pilot Program in an effort to reduce nitrogen applications.

Manure storage has been a successful component of our nutrient management education efforts in the County. These projects enable livestock farmers to utilize more of their manure, which is a great source of organic fertilizer. The County has long recognized that manure can be a valuable asset in reducing nitrates in groundwater. The manure builds soil organic matter and provides a slow release of nitrogen to crops compared to commercial nitrogen, which can readily leach into groundwater following a heavy rain. This long term storage eliminates the need to winter spread manure, which minimizes manure runoff from reaching surface waters during the most vulnerable snow melt periods of the year.

Both aquatic and terrestrial invasive species control is a priority in our LWRM Plan and has been a partnership with our local RC&D and Friends of Mill Creek organizations. Fortunately we have an energetic volunteer weed commissioner leading an effort to identify and treat wild parsnip.

Also prioritized in our LWRMP is the administration of a non-metallic mine reclamation program. Staff time is spent at 26 sand and gravel mines each year to ensure compliance with NR 135.

An example of planning adjustment occurred in April 2022 when 2.3 million dollars of American Rescue Plan Act funding became available and Portage County created the WATER (Well Owner Assistance for Treatment and Economic Recovery) Project to provide safe drinking water for Portage County residents. Testing to identify nitrate nitrogen concentrations in wells occurred and funds are used to pay for water filters and new wells for concentrations exceeding the drinking water enforcement standard. Approximately 60 reverse osmosis filters have been funded through this project.

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.

We continue our nutrient management education efforts to reduce nitrates in groundwater by encouraging farmers to apply less nitrogen on corn than the University of Wisconsin recommended rates. However, our progress has been hampered since the University increased their recommended rates around 2012. As part of this effort, we recognize the value of the dairy industry to the County and encourage those farmers to favor more alfalfa in their cows diet instead of corn silage. This is significant since alfalfa doesn't require applied nitrogen fertilizer and corn is inefficient at utilizing nitrogen on sandy soils before it leaches to groundwater. This has also become more challenging in recent years since the University has been recommending more corn silage over alfalfa in dairy rations because of higher productivity. We anticipate even

more difficulty in asking farmers to reduce nitrogen applications on corn due to a publication the DNR and DATCP released earlier this year suggesting farmers increase their nitrogen applications. It is titled: "Adjusting Nutrient Management Plans Due to Excessive Wet Conditions". A quote from this publication says: "The 590 standard allows for an additional 46 lb. of N to be applied as a rescue treatment following a period of heavy rain...".

Even though we have not made the desired progress we would like, we have had some success working with farms to convert fields that have been historically managed as row crops to rotational grazing. This cost shared practice is one of the few available that will improve groundwater quality. Because this practice demands a wholesale farm management change of feeding a grass based diet instead of row crops to livestock, it has been a challenging sell to the larger livestock farms. However, we have had a couple smaller farms make this conversion as well as a several new landowners who purchased small farms to initiate a rotational grazing operation. Our desire is that their success will resonate with their fellow farmers to expand this effort. A work plan adjustment is not anticipated because this conservation practice will continue to be a priority.

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.

Our priority farm strategy remains the same as outlined in our LWRM Plan. Currently, we are not aware of any farms in violation of the state prohibitions or performance standards. After we assist farms with the installation of conservation practices, we will work toward certifying them compliant with the state 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.

We will change our work planning in the upcoming five years as needed to incorporate any new activities identified to reduce nitrates in groundwater. We will continue to strive for success with the priorities identified in our current LWRM Plan.

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:

8/6/24 and 9/3/24

Signature of Authorized Representative: Steve Bradley Date: 9-5-24
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

Send completed questionnaire and attachments to:

Lisa.Trumble@wi.gov

**Portage 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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Cropland</i> 		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	<i>Wind erosion control NM planning and training</i>	3 miles of windbreaks: \$25,000 in cost share funds 9000 acres of NMP Checklist documentation: \$0 cost share funds
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Livestock</i> 		
Livestock	<i>Practice installation</i>	1 feedlot runoff containment compliant with NR151: \$0 cost share 1 manure storage structure: \$0 cost share 70 acres row crop conversion to rotational grazing: \$15,000 c/s
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Water quality</i> 		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	<i>Practice installation Groundwater testing Planning (e.g. lake, source water)</i>	1 well abandonment: \$700 cost share funds 7 groundwater monitoring wells in Nelsonville: \$0 cost share 4 Lake Management Plan updates: \$0 cost share 10 Healthy Lakes grant projects: \$7,000 DNR cost-share funds
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forestry</i> 		
Forestry	<i>Practice installation</i>	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Invasive</i> 		
Invasive species	<i>Control</i>	40 sites treated for wild parsnip: \$0 cost share EWM control on 2 lakes: \$0 cost share
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wildlife</i> 		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	<i>Wetland restoration Wildlife damage program Tree and plant sales</i>	Assisted with Little Plover River wetland restoration project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Urban</i> 		
Urban issues	<i>Stormwater control Construction site erosion control</i>	25 site visits 125 stormwater plans reviewed 50 stormwater permits issued 10 stormwater compliance issues resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Watershed</i> 		
Watershed strategies	<i>Producer-led</i>	Partner with 2 farmer led groups Partner with Upper Fox-Wolf demo farms network

**Portage County 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Other*

Other	<i>Non-metallic and frac sand mining</i>	25 Non-metallic mine plans reviewed 25 Non-metallic mine 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	1	1
Manure storage closure	1	1
Livestock facility siting		
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	25	25
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	125	50
Shoreland zoning		
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)		
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	25
For FPP	0
For NR 151	0
Animal waste ordinance	5
Livestock facility siting	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	25
Nonmetallic mining	25

**Portage County 2023 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

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

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>All LWCD Staff</i>	10400	\$430,000
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
	<i>N/A</i>	\$59,000

**PORTAGE 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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Cropland</i> 		
Cropland, soil health and/or nutrient management	<i>Wind erosion control</i> <i>NM planning and training</i>	4 miles of windbreaks: \$25,000 in cost share funds Participate in Area Nutrient Farmer Education Grant with Marathon Co: \$0 cost share funds 8000 acres of NMP Checklist documentation: \$0 cost share funds
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Livestock</i> 		
Livestock	<i>Practice installation</i>	50 acres row crop conversion to rotational grazing: \$21,000 c/s
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Water quality</i> 		
Water quality/quantity (other than activities already listed in other categories)	<i>Groundwater testing</i> <i>Planning (e.g. lake, source water)</i>	7 groundwater monitoring wells in Nelsonville: \$0 cost share 4 Lake Management Plan updates: \$0 cost share 24 Healthy Lakes grant projects: \$24,000 DNR cost-share
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forestry</i> 		
Forestry	<i>Practice installation</i>	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Invasive</i> 		
Invasive species	<i>Management plans</i> <i>Control</i>	1 management plan for AIS 30 sites treated for wild parsnip: \$0 cost share EWM control on 3 lakes: \$0 cost share
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wildlife</i> 		
Wildlife-Wetlands-Habitat (other than forestry or invasive species)	<i>Wetland restoration</i> <i>Wildlife damage program</i>	2.5 Acres of wetland restored: \$8,000 cost share Assist APHIS with wildlife damage program: \$0 cost share
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Urban</i> 		
Urban issues	<i>Stormwater control</i> <i>Construction site erosion control</i>	20 site visits 110 stormwater plans reviewed 40 stormwater permits issued 5 stormwater compliance issues resolved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Watershed</i> 		
Watershed strategies	<i>Producer-led</i>	Partner with 2 farmer led groups Partner with Fox-Wolf demo farms network

**PORTAGE COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

- *Other*

Other	<i>Non-metallic and frac sand mining</i>	25 Non-metallic mine plans reviewed 25 Non-metallic mine 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	1	1
Manure storage closure		
Livestock facility siting		
Nonmetallic/frac sand mining	25	25
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	125	50
Shoreland zoning		
Wetlands and waterways (Ch. 30)		
Other		

Table 3: Planned inspections

Inspections	Number of inspections planned
Total Farm Inspections	20
For FPP	
For NR 151	
Animal waste ordinance	5
Livestock facility siting	
Stormwater and construction site erosion control	20
Nonmetallic mining	25

**PORTAGE COUNTY 2024 ANNUAL WORK PLAN
LOCALLY IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES**

Table 4: Planned outreach and education activities

Activity	Number
Tours	2
Field days	2
Trainings/workshops	1
School-age programs (camps, field days, classroom)	10
Newsletters	
Social media posts	5
News release/story	1

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

Staff/Support	Hours	Costs
<i>All LWCD Staff</i>	10400	\$434,000
Cost Sharing (can be combined)		
<i>Ex. Bonding</i>	<i>N/A</i>	\$74,000

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 1, 2024

TO: LWCB members and advisors

FROM: Ian Krauss, Farm Service Agency

SUBJECT: FSA Program Updates for October LWCB Meeting

- Expiration of the extension to the 2018 Farm Bill
 - September 30th, 2024 was the last day of the extension to the 2018 Farm Bill. FSA does not have authority to take on new obligations until a new Farm Bill or second extension is passed. Many programs will remain on pause.
- Federal Fiscal Year 2025 Begins 10/01/2024
- Emergency Forest Restoration Program (EFRP)
 - EFRP is a federal cost share program that provides financial assistance to clean-up and restore forestland after an eligible disaster event.
 - In 2024, Wisconsin had the following approvals for EFRP
 - Rock County – 2024 February Tornado
 - Walworth County – 2024 June Tornado
 - Douglas, Barron, Rusk, and Sawyer Counties – 2022 Blizzard

NRCS Wisconsin

Programs Update - September 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. For FY24, WI NRCS funded two Agricultural Land Easement applications through the Inflation Reduction Act and a third using Farm Bill funds. Wisconsin NRCS will be offering enrollment to 17 Wetland Reserve Easement applications, including 10 under the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) in addition to 3 applications selected for Inflation Reduction Act funding this fiscal year. Applications for the ACEP are taken on a

NRCS Programs Quarterly Fiscal Update

Program		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)	Financial Assistance	\$0	\$10.6M ^{ac}	\$43M ^{ac}	\$58.4M ^a
	Contracts	0	265 ^{ac}	1,224 ^{ac}	1,482 ^a
Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)	Financial Assistance	\$6.7M	\$6.7M ^{ac}	\$6.7M	\$34.4M ^c
	New Contracts	0	0 ^c	0 ^c	673 ^c
	Renewal Contracts	266	266	266	266
Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)	Financial Assistance	0	\$0 ^c	\$667,045 ^c	\$1.68M ^c
	Contracts	0	0	29 ^c	92 ^c
	Easement Parcels	0	0	2 ^c	13 ^c
	Easement Financial	0	\$0	\$689,356 ^c	\$4.1M ^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	\$6.6M
	Easements	0 ^c	0 ^c	1 ^c	17
	Acres	0 ^c	0 ^c	188 ^c	1,344
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)

continuous basis. There are two application deadlines for FY25: October 4, 2024 and December 20, 2024. The second sign up is contingent upon available funding. Contact Dave Gundlach, ASTC-Easements, david.gundlach@usda.gov for more information.

NRCS Chief Cosby Meets with Wisconsin Ag Producers and Partners

Terry Cosby, Chief of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), recently spent three days in Wisconsin. Accompanied by Nathan Fikkert, Wisconsin NRCS State Conservationist, Chief Cosby met with conservation partners, NRCS staff, and agricultural producers during his tour across the state.

[Click here to read more.](#)

Creating Market Opportunities, Delivering Climate Solutions

USDA's Partnerships for Climate-Smart Commodities effort is expanding markets for America's climate-smart commodities, leveraging the greenhouse gas benefits of climate-smart commodity production, and providing direct, meaningful benefits to production agriculture, including for small and underserved producers. Learn more about expanded markets, premiums and incentives for producing climate-smart commodities as well as cost share and technical assistance to implement climate-smart practices.

[Click here to read more.](#)

NRCS Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative Invests \$22 Million in 29 Projects in 36 States

Through the Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, NRCS has awarded \$22 million in 29 projects in 36 in states, [including four projects in Wisconsin](#), that expand access to conservation technical assistance for livestock producers and increase the use of conservation practices on grazing lands.

The projects selected for cooperative agreements have identified barriers to accessing grazing assistance for producers and will include outreach and support for reaching historically underserved producers.

[Click here to read more.](#)

Wisconsin NRCS Announces Inflation Reduction Act Funding for its Agricultural Conservation Easement Program for Fiscal Year 2025

USDA announced today funding provided by the Inflation Reduction Act for the [Agricultural Conservation Easement Program](#) (ACEP) for fiscal year 2025.

NRCS accepts applications year-round for ACEP Agricultural Land Easements (ACEP-ALE) and Wetland Reserve Easements (ACEP-WRE). Interested landowners and partners should apply by the next two batching dates, **Oct. 4, 2024**, or **Dec. 20, 2024**, at their local NRCS office, to be considered for these two state-led funding cycles. In addition, any application submitted to NRCS that was unfunded in fiscal year 2024 will be automatically re-considered during the October 4 funding cycle, unless cancelled by the applicant.

In fiscal year 2025, states will receive Inflation Reduction Act funding and all eligible applications within a state will compete. The current ACEP priorities for the Inflation Reduction Act funding are unchanged from last fiscal year and are available in all states. The Inflation Reduction Act funding is in addition to the funding authorized and available under the Farm Bill and through the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

[Click here to read more.](#)

Efforts for 2024 Conservation Effects Assessment Project Survey of Cultivated Cropland Operations Now Underway

If you're a farmer or other operator, you may be asked to participate in a survey to gather in-depth information about the use of conservation practices on cultivated cropland.

The 2024 Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP) Survey is a joint effort between USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS). NASS will visit nearly 12,000 operators across the contiguous U.S. in August and September to determine survey eligibility. Surveying will be conducted into spring 2025.

This is the first of three years of surveys conducted by NASS. Once surveying is complete, NRCS will combine the data with information from the National Resources Inventory, NRCS field staff, and multiple data sources to estimate environmental and management outcomes of conservation on cultivated cropland across U.S. farms. NRCS will publish the findings as a CEAP Cropland Assessment report. [CEAP Cropland Assessments](#) quantify the effects of voluntary conservation efforts across the nation's cropland at both regional and national scales.

[Click here to read more.](#)

Wisconsin NRCS Success Story: Monotonous Monoculture to Pollinator Paradise

When Dave and Penny Russell purchased 160 acres of farmland in northeastern Price County just north of Brantwood, Wisconsin, their goal was to build the first upland bird hunting facility in the United States for the needs of veterans with physical disabilities and allow those with mobility constraints who have served in the military to enjoy the outdoors.

With technical and financial assistance from Wisconsin NRCS, they found alternative ways to sustainably utilize their cropland and resources long term while benefitted their goals, their bottom line, and the wildlife who call it home.

[Click here to read more.](#)



October 2024

Soil and Water Resources Management (SWRM) Grants

- The 2025 Final Joint Allocation Plan will be presented to the Land and Water Conservation Board at the October 1, 2024 meeting. The plan can be accessed via the [SWRM webpage, Section 6 webpage](#). The new practices included in ATCP 50 are available for contracting as of June 1, 2024. DATCP staff have guidance available to help you implement and offer cost sharing in accordance with the new rule standards, which can be found here: [ATCP 50 Practice Specific Information](#).
- The new practices included in ATCP 50 were available for contracting as of June 1, 2024. DATCP staff has guidance available to help you implement and offer cost sharing in accordance with the new rule standards: [ATCP 50 Practice Specific Information](#).
- For questions about practice cost sharing, review Table 2.2 on the [SWRM Resources webpage](#). As always, reach out if you have further questions and we can help you find answers.
- Many of the SWRM forms have been updated with new content and new numbers. Please refer to [Section 3 of the SWRM Grant Resources webpage](#) to access these forms. **We will be switching to using only these forms in 2025.**
- Requests to transfer cost share funds between counties are due to DATCP by December 1, 2024.

ATCP 50 Update

- ATCP 50 updates went into effect on 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 informative webinars in October. If you have any questions, email datcplandwater@wisconsin.gov.
- **NEW PRACTICE INTRODUCTION:** Conservation Cover (ATCP 50.663). This SEG-funded conservation practice allows for the establishment and maintenance of permanent vegetative cover in an agricultural setting to reduce erosion, improve water quality, and better soil health. Available for lands covered with a nutrient management plan. It requires the county to commit to 10-year minimum planning and monitoring period for this practice. SWRM cost-share will cover the initial installation and the creation of the monitoring plan.
- **This fall, DATCP is hosting ATCP 50 Office Hours** related to non-structural practice updates. Each Office Hour will include a technical primer of the practice, a short discussion of the soil health benefits, and applicable SWRM cost-share requirements. Please send question ahead of time to DATCPLandWater@wisconsin.gov or join to ask questions during the session. All [Office Hours](#) are planned to be recorded and available for future viewing.

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: Thank you to everyone who was able to attend. We truly appreciate the participation and feedback!** During the webinar session, we recorded Cody Calkins' DATCP Nutrient Management Update presentation and the SnapPlus V3 Demo. Both are now available for viewing here:
 - SnapPlus V3: <https://wisconsinlandwater.org/members-hub/on-demand-training/nm-snapplusv3-demo-2024>
 - DATCP NM Update: <https://wisconsinlandwater.org/members-hub/on-demand-training/nm-swrn-and-nutrient-management-updates-2024>
- Nutrient Management Farmer Education classes are beginning to be scheduled. Please email datcpsoilandwatershedmanagement@wisconsin.gov to request a DATCP NM staff to assist with your training. Please let us know the dates, timeline, and what you would like us to present on.
- Be on the lookout in the next week regarding the 2024 Annual Nutrient Management Survey and Calculator. There will also be an Office Hour to follow.
- 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](#).
- The 2024 Annual NM Reporting Survey and Assistant Calculator was sent out to county staff. An Office Hour will be held on October 3 from 10-11 a.m. for those that need some work time or have questions.

Land and Water Conservation Board-LWRM Plans

- At the October 1, 2024 LWCB meeting, Bayfield, Calumet, and Portage counties will be presenting five-year LWRM plan reviews.

Conservation Engineering

- Hydrologic restoration field visit/trainings that were initially slated for this fall will be moved to 2025. We are currently working on additional trainings that will help inform and prepare for the field visits.
- **Reminder for those in the DATCP Engineering Practitioner Certification and/or NRCS Job Approval Authority programs:** 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 or need to find trainings for PDHs.

DATCP Drainage Program

- DATCP is in the process of updating the Drainage Program website. In an effort to provide the most accurate and up-to-date information, DATCP is requesting that all counties with active drainage districts provide contact information for each drainage board member. Please send the following information to Barton T. Chapman, P.E., Drainage Program Manager, at Barton.Chapman@Wisconsin.gov.

- Name, title (i.e. Chairperson, Secretary, Member, Attorney, etc.), address, phone number, email address, and year of appointment
- The Wisconsin Association of Drainage Boards (WADB) will be holding their annual meeting in October. Meeting logistics have not been finalized. DATCP will provide this information once the meeting has been scheduled.
- 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.

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

- FP Program staff from DATCP and DOR will be hosting a webinar for county staff to discuss the farmland preservation tax credit. The presentation will cover updates to the tax credits, different forms used by claimants, what to do if a landowner receives a notice from DOR, and what happens to the DOR Participant Spreadsheet after it is submitted. Pre-registration is required. To register click the following link: [Farmland Preservation Tax Credit Updates with DOR](#). This meeting will be recorded.
- 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. 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.

Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)

- DATCP CREP Agreement Submittal Deadline is November 8, 2024. FSA accepted new CREP enrollment offers up to September 30, 2024 for federal fiscal year 2024 (Sign up 61). Please contact your local FSA office to see if there are any pending CREP CRP1s that still need the state/county CREP agreement (LWR-283) completed. Friday, November 8, 2024 is the deadline to submit the completed CREP state/county agreement to DATCP to ensure state payment by December 31, 2024 for the 2024 tax year.
- Farm Bill Update: No updates are available for the Farm Bill. With the expiration to the extension of the 2018 Farm Bill, authority to take new CREP enrollment offers will be on hold until there is a new extension or new Farm Bill.
- County CREP Annual In-Kind Cost Reporting: Counties are asked to report their CREP administrative costs to DATCP by no later than December 6, 2024. The county contributions to administer CREP count toward Wisconsin's overall match requirements for federal CREP funds and are important for meeting statewide CREP program requirements reported to FSA by the end of the year. The reporting form ([LWR-282](#)) is on the CREP website. Completed reports should be sent as a pdf via email to Brian

Producer-Led Watershed Protection Grant (PLWPG) Program

- The 2025 application period for Producer-Led Watershed Protection Grants closed. Please reach out to Dani Heisler at dani.heisler@wisconsin.gov if you have questions about the application.

Soil Health Program

- Soil is the vital living ecosystem that sustains plants, animals, and humans. Soil health is about restoring that capacity to provide five crucial soil system functions: regulating water, sustaining plant and animal life, cycling nutrients, providing physical stability and support, and filtering and buffering potential pollutants. Healthy soil systems are created by incorporating the five soil health principles: maximize soil cover (think cover crops and no-till), maximize living roots in the soil (think cover crops, diversifying crop rotation, perennial crops), maximize crop/plant diversity (think cover crops, diversifying crop rotation, perennial crops), integrate livestock (managed grazing, proper manure management), and minimize soil disturbance (no-till, reducing chemical fertilizer, reducing pesticides, i.e. nutrient management).

Soils can be broken down to their three primary properties – chemical, physical, and biological. Soil health recognizes that soil biology drives most of the soil functions in a soil system. Incorporating the five soil health principles creates the environment for soil biology to thrive. (in a gram [~1 teaspoon], there are about 7-11 billion organisms). Soil health has proven to be a great motivator for our producer-led groups, helping to reach new farmers. DATCP hopes to build a common understanding of what soil health is, to facilitate statewide coordination on soil health topics and initiatives, and to provide support to conservation partners and farmers in transitioning to a soil health system.

- 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. Modules 1-3 establish a common language of soil health in Wisconsin agriculture. Module 4 focuses on applying soil health in Wisconsin cropping systems. The curriculum incorporates 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. For questions regarding this training or the soil health program contact Randy Zogbaum at randall.zogbaum@wisconsin.gov.
- Soil health is the systems thinking approach to agriculture implemented by incorporation of the five Soil Health principles as described on [DATCP's Soil Health webpage](#). The revised version of ATCP 50 has incorporated several practices to give counties new tools to address the five Soil Health principles. Each of the ATCP 50 New Practice Office Hours trainings provide an overview of the Soil Health systems thinking approach and how the practice meets the soil health principles, with the final training session in the series (November 12) focusing on soil health.

Nitrogen Optimization Pilot Program (NOPP)

- TENTATIVE PLANS: Cycle 3 of the NOPP grants will be opening mid-October. All research plans must be pre-approved by Monica Schauer, the UW research director for NOPP. Email your ideas to her at mschauer2@wisc.edu for approval by December 1. The full application being due January 31, 2025.

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

- We filled three vacancies this past month! Please welcome Sarah Hovis, who started as an Environmental Specialist on September 9; Jonathon Lisowe, who started as an Environmental Specialist on September 23; and Alex Elias, who will start as the Agency Liaison on October 7, to their new roles!

- **Sarah Hovis – Environmental Specialist Northern Area**

- Sarah received her undergraduate degree in Plant and Soil Sciences and her Master of Science degree in Agricultural Sciences with a focus on Soil and Water Quality from Tennessee State University. After working for a year at the university as a Research Associate, she moved back to her hometown of Kewaunee and began her career in the Conservation Engineering field with an internship in Kewaunee County Land Conservation Department and as a contracted employee for Kewaunee County Natural Resource Conservation Service. She briefly worked as a Soil Conservationist in Spokane Valley, WA with NRCS and spent two years reviewing CAFO permits for the Tennessee Department of Ag before accepting a position as a Conservation Technician with Iowa County, where she stayed for five years. She spent the last year as an Engineering Technician with Brown County, which not only exposed her to different practices in her professional life but enabled her to buy her childhood home.

In her spare time, she enjoys being outdoors and hiking with her three dogs, traveling to new places, attending concerts, and completing home improvement projects. She is also actively involved with White Paws German Shepherd Rescue as a foster home, co-managing the fundraising team and creating t-shirt designs for fundraising campaigns. She has worked closely with state, federal and county colleagues over the years and looks forward to continuing to collaborate towards our common goal of resource conservation!

- **Jonathan Lisowe – Environmental Specialist Southeast Area**

- Jonathan received his undergraduate degree from UW-Oshkosh in Environmental Studies Resource Management. He started his career working for a non-profit in Fond du Lac, collecting water samples; helping write nutrient management plans; and testing how gypsum affected soil health, haylage growth, and water runoff nutrient loads. After the grant funding ending for that position, he started his new career as Calumet County Land and Water as a Conservation Project Technician. Jonathan built a lot of practices during his time at LWCD, ranging from two staged stream banks, grade stabilization structures, cattle crossings, manure pit expansion, and recently a trout stream realignment project that included luncker structures, root wads, and rock riffles.

Outside of work he likes to bow and gun deer hunt, kayak, and relax at his cabin with family in Shawano County. He is looking forward to continuing to learn from others and help others in our conservation world.

- **Alex Elias – Agency Liaison**

- Alex grew up in New Jersey and received her B.S. in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and Political Science from University of Michigan and graduated with an M.S. in Urban and Regional Planning from University of Wisconsin-Madison. She moved to Madison in 2014 and has loved living in Wisconsin. Alex started her resource management career at

the Wisconsin DNR in the Division of Forestry as the Associate Planner LTE and Urban Forestry Grants Manager LTE. Prior to accepting the Agency Liaison position, Alex was the Program and Policy Analyst in the Bureau of Land and Water Resources at DATCP for the past four years.

Outside of work, her toddler, husband, dog, and two cats keep her busy. In her free time, Alex enjoys checking out different playgrounds, traveling, and playing Dungeons and Dragons. She's excited to work with partners in this new role while continuing to support conservation across Wisconsin's farms.

DATE: September 18, 2024

TO: LWCB members and advisors

FROM: Chris Clayton, DNR

SUBJECT: DNR Update, August 2024 - September 2024, for October LWCB meeting

Water Quality Staff Updates

Helena Tiedmann, Ph.D. recently joined the DNR's Water Quality Program as a Water Quality Planning and Climate Resilience Specialist, bringing with her extensive experience in water resource management, resilience, and climate adaptation. Helena will provide technical support for internal and external water quality planning efforts throughout the state, with a specific focus on climate resilience and environmental justice. This includes coordinating with DATCP and Wisconsin Land and Water to support counties in the process of updating and implementing their Land and Water Resource Management Plans. Helena will serve as a resource to counties on accessing and interpreting climate and environmental justice data, identifying appropriate adaptation strategies, and incorporating these factors into county plans. In her role, Helena will also support Regional Planning Commissions in integrating climate and environmental justice into the various water quality plans that they develop, which include regional water quality plans, county Land and Water Resource Management Plans, and watershed plans, in addition to local Sewer Service Area plans.

Surface Water Grant Program

Surface water grant pre-applications were due on September 15. Program staff are currently reviewing pre-applications and providing feedback to applicants ahead of the final grant application due date of November 15.

Electronic notifications were sent out to prompt and remind potential applicants to submit a pre-application by September 15 to ensure they are eligible to compete for a grant in November. A GovDelivery bulletin was sent to over 3,500 subscribers along with a press release that provided additional details on eligible activities and organizations, how to apply, and links to additional resources. The press release can be viewed at [DNR Accepting Pre-Applications For 2025 Surface Water Grants | Wisconsin DNR](#).

The department expects to award over \$6M in the spring of 2025 to support projects that protect and restore waterbodies and prevent and control aquatic invasive species. Due to widespread interest, the grant program is still anticipated to be oversubscribed. More information, program guidance, application forms, and the link to sign up for the GovDelivery mailing list are available at <https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/aid/SurfaceWater.html>.

Partnerships and Watershed Planning

The 2023 Red Cedar Water Quality Partnership has developed a [press release](#) and [social media post](#) to better promote the efforts of stakeholders. DNR Nonpoint and Water Quality program staff have been active members in the group over the course of the decade long history implementing the [TMDL](#), approved in 2012, and most recently, aiding the renewal process of the [9 Key Element Plan](#).

Highlights of the report include decreasing phosphorus levels, continuing high nitrate levels have leveled off slightly, and expansive collaboration among an impressive diversity of agencies and organizations.

Healthy Watersheds, High-Quality Waters Program Update

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is proud to share the [Wonderful Waters of Wisconsin 2024 Progress Report](#), which includes noteworthy activities and accomplishments from the past year that have helped to protect waterbody and watershed health throughout the state.

The purpose of the DNR's Wonderful Waters of Wisconsin initiative, also known as [Healthy Watersheds, High-Quality Waters](#) (HWHQW), is to strike an improved balance between water resources restoration and protection. The 2024 Progress Report documents efforts made to carry out the strategies for success within the [HWHQW Action Plan](#) and profiles the excellent work of partners committed to protecting the wonderful waters of Wisconsin. This includes the work of County Land & Water Conservation Departments (LWCD) who are working to incorporate the HWHQW assessment results into their DNR Surface Water Grant Projects and plan revisions.

Requests for further training, outreach, and technical assistance on the Wonderful Waters of Wisconsin initiative can be directed to Lauren Haydon (Lauren.Haydon@wisconsin.gov or at 414.640.0161).

2024 NPS Grant Update (see also Final Ranked Lists and Memos in October meeting packet)

Grant Category	# Eligible Applications	Total Funding Requested \$	# Proposed Grants Funded	Proposed \$ Allocated
Small-Scale TRM TMDL	12	\$2,070,725	12	\$2,070,725
Small-Scale TRM Non-TMDL	2	\$413,785	2	\$413,785
Large-Scale TRM TMDL	5	\$2,925,000	5	\$2,925,000
Large-Scale TRM Non-TMDL	0	\$0	0	\$0
UNPS-Construction*	24	\$3,104,891	21	\$2,787,391
All Grants	43	\$8,514,401	40	\$8,196,901

*OSG funds are not included in the allocation for UNPS Construction grants in this table. See the ranked list for total funding.

