Targeted Runoff Management Program (TRM) Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page 1 of _

Notice: This document was drafted by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Application is hereby made to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Watershed Management, for grant assistance consistent with s. 281.65, Wis. Stats., and Chapter NR 153 and NR 154, Wis. Adm. Code. Collection of this information is authorized under the authority of s. 281.65, Wis. Stats. The information contained in this form will be used for program budget analysis and project evaluation in the Targeted Runoff Management Grant Program. Personally identifiable information collected will be used for program administration and may be made available to requesters as required under Wisconsin's Open Records Law [ss. 19.31 - 19.39, Wis. Stats.]. Unless otherwise noted, all citations refer to Wisconsin Administrative Code.

Instructions: Complete all sections as applicable.

| | | Applica | nt Information | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|---|-------|----------|--|
| Governmental Unit Applying: (name | & type) | (example: Madi | ison, Town of) | | | |
| Buffalo, County of | | | | | | |
| Name of Authorized Representative | (First, L | ast) | Name of Governmental Contact Person (First Last) (if different) | | | |
| Julie Fernholz | | | Same | | | |
| Title | | | Title | | | |
| County Conservationist | | | Same | | | |
| Area Code + Telephone Number | | | Area Code + Telephone Number | | | |
| 608-685-6261 | | | Same | | | |
| Area Code + Fax Number | | | Area Code + Fax Number | | | |
| 608-685-6213 | | | Same | | | |
| E-Mail Address | | | E-Mail Address | | | |
| julie.fernholz@buffalocounty.com | | | Same | | | |
| Mailing Address - Street or Route | | | Mailing Address - Street or Route | | | |
| PO Box 88 - 407 S. Second Street | | | Same | | | |
| City | State | Zip Code | City | State | Zip Code | |
| Alma | WI | 54610 | Same | Same | Same | |
| Consulting Firm Name (if applicable) | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |
| Consulting Contact Person Name | | | | | | |
| ΝΑ | | | | | | |
| Title | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |
| Area Code + Telephone Number | | | DNR Use Or | nly | | |
| ΝΑ | | | | | | |
| Area Code + Fax Number | | | | | | |
| ΝΑ | | | | | | |
| E-Mail Address | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |
| Mailing Address - Street or Route | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |
| City | State | Zip Code | | | | |
| NA | NA | NA | | | | |
| | | Projec | ct Information | | | |
| A. Project Name | | | | | | |

Mk Barnyard Management

B. Project Area Location
County

Buffalo

TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

TRM Grant Project Name

Mk Barnyard Management

Project Information (continued)

| Minor Civil Division Name (city, village, town, etc. – ex. Wrightstown, Village of) | Township (N) | Range (E/W) | Section | Quarter | Quarter- Quarter | Latitude (North) | Longitude (West) |
|---|-----------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Dover, Town of | 23 | 10W | 31 | NE | NW | 44 26' 10.8" | 91 38' 44.8" |
| Dover, Town of | 23 | 10W | 31 | NE | NW | 44 26' 9.3" | 91 38' 46.3" |
| | | | | | | | |

Method for Determining Latitude & Longitude (check one)

GPS

DNR WebView or Surface Water Data Viewer

Other (specify):

C. Project Summary

The purpose of this project is to reduce sediment discharge to local streams and phosphorus runoff from the farmstead. By implementing a barnyard runoff system(NR154.04)(5), waterway(NR154.04(39) and/or other conservation practices needed, phosphorus discharge to the local stream will be greatly reduced. Clean water will be addressed by implementing a diversion and/or roof gutters as needed. Buffalo County has been completing total farm assessments and will continue to address all problematic areas on farmsteads.

| D. W | atersh | ed & Waterbody (se | e Attachment A) | |
|----------------|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| Watershed Name | | ed Name | Watershed Code | Primary Waterbody |
| Lo | wer B | uffalo River | BTO7 | Buffalo River |
| | | ne project is in more gh-efficiency street s | | rate application for each watershed, unless this application |
| Yes | No | | | |
| | | E. Project Target | | |
| \boxtimes | | The project w | ill control agricultural runoff. | |
| | \boxtimes | 2. The project w | ill control urban runoff. | |
| | | F. Request for Fu | nding for "Total Maximum Daily | Load" Implementation |
| | | | 8 8 | t practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the pollutant- oril 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load |
| | | a. If yes, prov | ide the title of TMDL report this pro | ject addresses. |
| | \boxtimes | 2. Final reimbur September 2 | 5 <i>i</i> 1 | ntation project costs will be requested no later than |

TRM Grant Project Name Mk Barnyard Management

Project Information (continued) G. Request for Funding of Land Acquisition or Easements \boxtimes Requesting funding for either land acquisition or purchase of easements as part of this application to support eligible BMPs. If yes, attach the property acquisition proposal, as defined in Attachment B, to the completed application form. H. Request for Retroactive Funding for Design Costs \boxtimes Requesting reimbursement for design costs that have been or will be incurred before issuance of the grant. I. Request for Funding for Force Account Work \boxtimes Requesting reimbursement for technical services to be performed by governmental unit staff (force account). J. Endangered and Threatened Resources, Historic Properties, and Wetlands Check the appropriate box for each question based on what the governmental unit knows to occur where the project disturbs land. If you have no evidence of the items below, check "No." \boxtimes 1. There are endangered or threatened resources, as identified in s. 29.604, Wis. Stats., and ch. NR 27 in the project area. \square \boxtimes 2. There are archaeological sites, historical structures, burial sites, or other historic places identified in s. 44.45, Wis. Stats., in the project area. \boxtimes 3. There are wetlands in the project area that are governed by water quality standard provisions of ch. NR 103. K. Environmental Contamination \square \boxtimes The applicant is aware of environmental contamination of the soil and/or groundwater or potential for contamination in the project area. L. Urban Projects Only: Pro-rating for Existing versus New Development Project will serve existing development only. If no, provide attachments and the following: Percentage of total design volume that will be generated by existing development. (change default % 100% if necessary) M. Urban Projects Only: Alternative Funding Possibility This applicant requests that the DNR also submit a copy of this application to the Clean Water Fund loan program.

| | | | Part I. Screening | g Requ | uirements | |
|-------------|-------------|--|--------------------|-------------|---|-----------------|
| Yes | No | А. Мар | | | | |
| \boxtimes | | An 8.5" x 11" topographic ma attached. | ap from USGS or th | e DNR | data/map viewers, showing the p | oject area, is |
| | | B. Best Management Practice (see Attachment D for addit | | | IR Funding Is Requested (check | all that apply) |
| | | Practice | Wis. Adm. Code | lioniy | Practice | Wis. Adm. Code |
| | | Manure Storage Systems | NR 154.04(3) | | Riparian Buffers | NR 154.04(25) |
| | | Manure Storage System Closure | NR 154.04(4) | | Roofs | NR 154.04(26) |
| | \boxtimes | Barnyard Runoff Control Systems | NR 154.04(5) | \boxtimes | Roof Runoff Systems | NR 154.04(27) |
| | \boxtimes | Access Roads & Cattle Crossings | NR 154.04(6) | \boxtimes | Sediment Basins | NR 154.04(28) |
| | \boxtimes | Animal Trails and Walkways | NR 154.04(7) | | Shoreline Habitat Restoration | NR 154.04(29) |
| | \boxtimes | Critical Area Stabilization | NR 154.04(10) | | for Developed Areas | |
| | \boxtimes | Diversions | NR 154.04(11) | | Sinkhole Treatment | NR 154.04(30) |
| | | Field Windbreaks | NR 154.04(12) | | Subsurface Drains | NR 154.04(33) |
| | \boxtimes | Filter Strips | NR 154.04(13) | | Terrace Systems | NR 154.04(34) |
| | | Grade Stabilization | NR 154.04(14) | \boxtimes | Underground Outlets | NR 154.04(35) |
| | \boxtimes | Heavy Use Area Protection | NR 154.04(15) | | Waste Transfer Systems | NR 154.04(36) |
| | | Lake Sediment Treatment | NR 154.04(16) | | Wastewater Treatment Strips | NR 154.04(37) |
| | \boxtimes | Livestock Fencing | NR 154.04(17) | \boxtimes | Water and Sediment Control | NR 154.04(38) |
| | \boxtimes | Livestock Watering Facilities | NR 154.04(18) | | Basins | |
| | | Milking Center Waste Control Systems | NR 154.04(19) | \boxtimes | Waterway Systems | NR 154.04(39) |
| | | Prescribed Grazing | NR 154.04(22) | | Well Decommissioning | NR 154.04(40) |
| | | Relocating or Abandoning Animal Feeding Operations | NR 154.04(23) | | Wetland Development or Restoration | NR 154.04(41) |
| | | Urban BMPs: NR 154.04(42) | | | mbank and Shoreline Protection: des associated fencing) | NR 154.04(31) |
| | | Detention Basin | | | Stream Crossing | |
| | | Wetland Basin | | | Streambank/Shoreline Rip-rappir | ng |
| | | Filtration Practice | | | Streambank/Shoreline Shaping & | Seeding |
| | | Infiltration Practice | | | Streambank/Shoreline Fencing | |
| | | Accelerated or High-efficiency Street Sweeping System | | | Other Streambank/Shoreline Pro (incl. bio-engineering) - specify b | |
| | | Other (specify) | | | | |

Page ____ of ____

Other (specify)

TRM Grant Project Name

Mk Barnyard Management

Part I. Screening Requirements (continued)

| | C. | | ; You must be able to answer "Yes" to questions e for a grant. | 1-5 and "Yes" (| or "N/A" (Not Applicable) to question 6 to be |
|-------------|----|-----|--|------------------|---|
| Yes | No | | | | |
| \boxtimes | | 1. | Project will be completed within 24 months of | the start of the | grant period. |
| \boxtimes | | 2. | Staff and contractors designated to work on the experience to implement the proposed project | | adequate training, knowledge, and |
| \boxtimes | | 3. | Staff or contractual services, in addition to tho | se funded by th | nis grant, will be provided if needed. |
| \square | | 4. | Best management practices constructed under consistent with) agricultural and non-agricultural Attachment E) | • | |
| \square | | 5. | The local DNR Regional Nonpoint Source Coo this project: | ordinator (see A | Attachment C) has been contacted about |
| | | | Name of the Regional Nonpoint Source | Date | |
| | | | Coordinator Contacted | Contacted | Subject of Contact |
| | | | Micah Oriedo & Cindy Koperski | 3/30/07 | Grant application eligibility |
| Yes | No | N/A | If this is an application to construct pond waterway or wetland permit (chs. 30 or 2 If yes, give the docket number and date Docket Number | 281, Wis. Stats | |

If you answered "No" to one or more of the items in question C above, stop here. The project is ineligible.

| | D. Eli | gibilit | y: Reason For Controlling Nonpoint Source Pollution In The Target Area |
|-----------|-------------|---------|---|
| Yes | No | | |
| \bowtie | | 1. | The need for compliance with performance standards established by the DNR in ch. NR 151. |
| | \boxtimes | 2. | The existence of nonpoint-source-impaired water bodies that the DNR has identified to the U.S. EPA under 33 USC 1313 (d)(1)(A), commonly referred to as the "303(d) List." |
| | \boxtimes | 3. | The existence of outstanding or exceptional resource waters, as designated by the DNR in ss. NR 102.10 and NR 102.11. |
| \square | | 4. | Other water quality concerns of statewide or national significance. (<u>Important</u> : You may only check this box, if you are eligible to score 10 points in Part II, Question #4 "Basin Priorities" of this application.) |
| | \bowtie | 5. | The existence of threats to public health. |
| | \boxtimes | 6. | The existence of an animal feeding operation that has received a notice of discharge (NOD) under ch. NR 243 or a notice of intent (NOI) to issue a notice of discharge. |

If you answered "Yes" to one or more of the items in question D above, continue to Part II. Otherwise, stop here. The project is ineligible.

TRM Grant Project Name

Mk Barnyard Management

Part II. Minimum Qualifications

Question 1. Fiscal Accountability A. Timeline and Source of Staff

For each applicable milestone listed below, fill in the appropriate data:

| Milestone | Target Completion Date (month/year) | Source of Staff |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Completion of design | 4/08 | LCD Staff & DATCP Engineer |
| Obtaining required permits | NA | NA |
| Landowner contacts | 10/27/03 | LCD Staff |
| CSA signing | 6/08 | LCD Staff |
| Bidding | 6/08 | LCD Staff |
| DNR approvals | NA | NA |
| Contract signing | NA | NA |
| BMP construction | 6/08 - 11/08 | Private Contractor |
| Site inspection and certification | Immediately Following Construction | LCD Staff & DATCP Engineer |
| Project evaluation | 12/08 | LCD Staff & DATCP Engineer |
| Purchase street sweeper (urban only) | NA | NA |
| Other (specify) | | |
| | NA | NA |

B. Adequate Financial Budget

Provide the following information for the project. The grant amount is capped at \$150,000.

| | OET IN DEE | |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| Α | В | С |
| Project Activity for Which <u>DNR Funding</u> is Requested | Estimated Total Cost (\$) | Amount from Column B Eligible for DNR Cost Sharing (\$) |
| Construction Components: | | |
| Barnyard Site Preparation (excavaion, sand, and sand grade) | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| Washed Rock & Picket Assembly | 950 | 950 |
| Filterstrip Construction | 3,600 | 3,600 |
| Steel | 3,900 | 3,900 |
| Concrete | 14,150 | 14,150 |
| Seeding/Mulch | 750 | 750 |
| Fencing | 600 | 600 |
| Construction Management & Inspection Services | 0 | 0 |
| Grassed Waterway Excavation | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Grassed Waterway Seeding | 600 | 600 |
| | | |
| 1. Construction Subtotal | \$30,750 | \$30,750 |
| 2. Engineering Services (including design) | \$1,115 | \$1,115 |
| 3. Storm Sewer Reroute (Urban projects only) | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Structure Removal (Urban projects only) | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Subtotal [add rows 1-4] | \$31,865 | \$31,865 |
| 6. Property Acquisition: Fee Title & Easement | \$0 | \$0 |
| 7. Grand Total [add rows 5 & 6] | \$31,865 | \$31,865 |

FINANCIAL BUDGET TABLE

TRM Grant Project Name

Mk Barnyard Management

Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)

Cost-Sharing Worksheet

Eligible Costs:

Multiply the eligible costs (column C) by the percent for proration (if applicable) and the applicable cost-share rate. Enter the result in the column on the right.

| | Prorate % | Cost-Share % | |
|---|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 8. Construction, engineering services, etc. (if other percent | t, specify) 100% | 70% | \$ 22,306 |
| Costs Specific to Agricultural Projects: | | | |
| 9. Land Purchase (Fee Title) \$0 | - | 50% | \$0 |
| 10. Agricultural Easements \$0 | - | 70% | \$ 0 |
| Costs Specific to Urban Projects: | | | |
| 11. Property Acquisition: Fee Title & Easement \$ | 100% | 50% | \$ 0 |
| 12. Storm Sewer Rerouting | 100% | 50% | \$0 |
| 13. Structure Removal | 100% | 50% | \$0 |
| 14. Total Eligible Costs [sum (8) through (13)] | | | \$ 22,306 |
| Cap Test: | | | |
| 15. Maximum State Share [Lesser of (14) or \$150,000] | | | \$ 22,306 |
| State & Local Share: | | | |
| 16. Requested State-Share Amount (Requested Grant Amo | ount) | | \$ 22,306 |
| 17. Local-Share Amount [(7), column B less (16)] | | | \$ 9,559 |
| | | | |

Method(s) Used to Calculate Cost Estimates

Currently the Land Conservation Department(LCD) competitively bid all Barnyard Runoff Control Systems. We use the average cost from the previous year as a guide to determine the estimated cost for barnyards scheduled to be installed the following construction season. On page 21 of this application is a list of the most common practice components that we use and cost estimates that the LCD uses to provide estimates for the landowners installing conservation practices in 2008.

The Buffalo Land Conservation Committee updates annually a Cost Containment Procedure (Pg. 22-24) that spells out how the LCD provides technical assistance, bidding and the payment process for cost shared practices.

In the past three years, Buffalo County Cost Containment procedure has allowed for structural conservation practices to be built on time and materials and the cost share payment will not exceed 70% of the LCD technicians estimate. Using the time and materials option, we found that lower cost earthwork practices were generally constructed under that of the technicians estimate. With costs increasing every year, Buffalo County will be using a new form "Notice of Conservation Practice Installation." This form will be used for conservation practices where competitive bidding is not required and where cost share funds are being used. The intent of this form is to ensure that the landowner, contractor and LCD have had a discussion on the maximum allowable cost for the practice. An example of this form is on page 25 & 26 of this grant application. The form will also provide a better understanding of the cost share grant to the landowner and contractor.

C. Cost-Effectiveness

- 1. Tangible Benefits
 - a. Primary Benefit:

List the nonpoint source pollutants to be controlled by the project. Unspecified nonpoint sources of pollution, baryard runoff (Reduction of Phosphorus) and elimination of sediment discharge.

- Secondary Benefits: Which of the following secondary benefits will be achieved by implementing this project? (check all that apply)
 - Fish and wildlife habitat enhancement
 - Enhancements to recreation
 - Public safety

| | | TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding Form 8700-300 (R 1/07) | Page of |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---|---------|
| | | TRM Grant Project Name | |
| | | Mk Barnyard Management | |
| | | | |
| | Part II. Minim | num Qualifications (continued) | |
| \boxtimes | Economical operation, econo | mical maintenance and enhanced life expectancy of the | BMP |
| | Other (specify): | | |
| | | | |

TRM Grant Project Name

Mk Barnyard Management

Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)

2. Cost-Effectiveness

Explain why the proposed project is cost-effective considering the environmental benefit(s) and cost of the project.

The concrete barnyard runoff control system proposed in this project was chosen as the best management practice for the situation. Through the installation of this conservation practice, we (LCD & Landowner) can reduce phosphorus runoff from 47.6 lbs./year to 2.6 lbs./year (Pgs. 27 & 28). In the last five years, Buffalo County Land Conservation Department has received cost-share grant funds through DNR TRM program and DATCP Land & Water Resource Management grant funds to install eleven barnyard runoff control systems in the Lower Buffalo River Watershed, such as the one proposed in this application. The findings from the installation of these barnyard practices, by using the BARNY model shows there has been a significant reduction in phoshorus discharge to the Lower Buffalo River.

The barnyard runoff control system will use the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) practice standard #350 sediment basin, #635 wastewater treatment strip and #393 filter strip. Each landowner who installs a barnyard runoff control system must follow an operation and maintenance agreement for 10 years following construction. This entails: cleaning the lot every 10 days or sooner, inspect the screen assembly to ensure it is free flowing, stack manure scrapings on upstream areas of the lot, cut and remove filter strip clippings at least two times/year, clean out spreader pad basin as needed and prevent grazing and farm traffic in the filter area.

The grassed waterway, #412 is also designed by using a 10 year, 24 hour storm event. By using the Concentrated Flow Worksheet, it has been determined that roughly 64 tons/yr of soil are deposited downstream via the unconstructed waterway. By implementing a constructed waterway in conjunction with the existing grade stabilization, soil loss will be at zero tons/year. If left untreated, the existing water run will continue to gouge away at the landscape and again increase each year in sedimentary discharge.

Yes No 3. Alternatives

 \boxtimes

- a. There is more than one way to achieve the benefits checked above. If no, go to part b.
 - 1) If **yes**, complete the following table with information for the alternative you have chosen and one or two other alternatives. Note that the table requires information about the cost and pollutant load/potential reductions.

| | Alternatives Analysis | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| | A | В | С | D | |
| | | Cost | Effectiveness | | |
| | Alternative | Estimated Amount | Estimated % of Pollutant Load Reduction | (B ÷ C) Cost-Effectiveness | |
| 1 | | \$ | % | | |
| 2 | | \$ | % | | |
| 3 | | \$ | % | | |

2) If the applicant is not choosing the alternative with the lowest ratio of cost to pollutant load/potential reductions, explain why it was not chosen in terms of any of the following: feasibility, secondary benefits potential, or other mitigating factors.

Page ____ of ____

TRM Grant Project Name Mk Barnyard Management

Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)

b. If the answer to part 3.a. was **no**, explain why there is no other reasonable alternative to achieve the reduction in pollutant loading/potential or the secondary benefits checked above.

The concrete barnyard runoff control system is the most efficient way for the landowner to manage his barnyard area. Our experience shows that when a landowner is interested in finding a solution for their barnyard runoff, they are looking for a long-term solution and which is efficient to manage. The landowner in this project is a small family farm and without the use of outside labor, time management has become as important as money management. The additional utilization of manure will be much appreciated as far as a nutrient aspect and fertilizer savings will come into play. A lot of times farmers don't realize how much manure a cow deposits onto a barnyard untill they have concrete, scraping up the manure and actually being able to calculate costs savings is unforcene to many.

Barnyard runoff control systems are designed and constructed to NRCS conservation standards and procedures, the installed barnyard will have phosphorus runoff levels of less than 5lb throughout the longevity of the practice. Landowners will need to do their part and follow the Operation & Maintanence Plan (Pg. 29), to ensure the functionality of the system. The Land Conservation Staff periodically make visits to past projects just checking on the condition of the concrete and make sure the practice is functoning correctly.

By using the BARNY model, we can make sure that the designed project has phosphorus output levels of less than 5 lbs. annually. This practice has be proven to be the best BMP for the farmer and for Buffalo County.

The waterway in conjunction with the existing grade stabilization structure is also an efficient way to control sediment runoff from agricultural fields. The grassed waterway will further help reduce soil deposition into the lower reaches of the watershed. The life of the waterway is very dependent upon the cropping method used, in this case the landowner has a conservation plan and plans to follow it as long as he opperates his farm.

Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)

Question 2. Project Evaluation Strategy

The applicant must agree to provide a description of the modeled results or changes in pollution potential in the final project report. The project evaluation strategy will be based on comparing pre- and post-project changes in modeled pollutant loading to water resources or will be based on the quantity of units managed.

Modeling & Measures of Change Α.

Pre- and post-project evaluation measures that the applicant will use to ensure success in meeting project goals: (check all that apply)

| Agricultural Performance Standard or Prohibition | Units of Measure | Recommended Measurement Method |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Sheet, rill and wind erosion | Acres meeting T | RUSLE-2 or wind erosion mode |
| Manure Storage Facilities: New | Number of facilities | count |
| Construction/Alterations | Number of animal units | count |
| Manure Storage Facilities: Closure | Number of facilities | count |
| Manure Storage Facilities: Failing/Leaking Facilities | Number of facilities | count |
| | Number of animal units | count |
| Clean Water Diversions in WQMA | Pollutant load reduction | BARNY Model |
| | Number of farms with diversions | count |
| | Number animal units | count |
| Nutrient Management on Agricultural Land | Acres planned | count |
| Prohibition: Manure Storage Overflow | Number of facilities | count |
| | Number of animal units | count |
| Prohibition: Unconfined Manure Pile in WQMA | Number of farms | count |
| Prohibition: Direct Runoff From Feedlot/Stored Manure | Pollutant load reduction | BARNY Model |
| | Number of facilities | count |
| | Number of animal units | count |
| Prohibition: Unlimited Livestock Access | Feet of bank protected | count |
| | Number of farms | count |
| Other Priority for Agricultural Area | | |
| Buffers | Feet of bank protected | CREP formula |
| | Number of farms | count |
| Streambank | Tons of bank erosion reduced | NRCS bank erosion formula |
| | Feet of bank protected | count |
| Other (specify) | | |
| Priority for Developed Urban Area | | |
| 20-40% Reduction in Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | Pounds TSS reduced | SLAMM, P-8 |
| | % TSS reduction | |
| Infiltration | % Pre-development stay-on volume | Recarga, SLAMM, P-8 |
| | Cubic feet stay-on volume | 1 |
| Peak flow discharge | Change in cubic feet per second | TR-55 or equivalent |
| Protective areas | Feet of bank protected | count |
| Fueling & maintenance areas | Oily sheen presence | visual assessment |
| Streambank | Tons of bank erosion reduced | NRCS bank erosion formula |
| | Feet of bank protected | count |
| Other (specify) | | |

 \boxtimes

- **Monitoring** (not eligible for cost sharing at this time)
 - The project evaluation strategy will provide pre- and post-project information from water resource monitoring. If "Yes," check all that apply below.
- The project will evaluate the physical habitat, fisheries, biological, or chemical conditions.
- A one-page summary of the monitoring strategy is attached.

Page ____ of _

TRM Grant Project Name Mk Barnyard Management

Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued) C. Yes No Additional Monitoring \boxtimes The applicant is willing to participate with the Department to do monitoring in the project area should funding become available. **Question 3. Evidence of Local Support** The level of local support that currently exists for the proposed project. **Agricultural Projects:** Yes No Government Α. 1. <u>Regulatory Situations</u> If yes to <u>both</u> items (A.1.a & A.1.b) below, go to Question 4. Otherwise, continue to part A2 of this question. \boxtimes At least 75% of the total project cost is attributed to the resolution of a Notice of Discharge (NOD) or a a. Notice of Intent to Issue an NOD (NOI) under ch. NR 243 or non-compliance with agricultural performance standards and prohibitions under subch. II of NR 151 or a local regulation. \boxtimes At least one of the following is attached to this application form: b. 1. copy of the NOI issued under NR 243, or 2. copy of the NOD issue under NR 243, or copy of letter signed by DNR stating that DNR will issue an NOI or NOD under NR 243 if cost 3. sharing is provided, or copy of letter signed by DNR and the county that a notice, under s. NR 151.09 or 151.095, will be 4 issued if necessary, or 5. copy of letter signed by the county that the local regulation will be enforced at the project site. 2. **Non-Regulatory Situations** The governmental unit has developed: a. \square \boxtimes a detailed pollution control plan with the landowners that identifies specific best management i. practices (BMPs). \boxtimes ii. general assessments of the pollution sources within the project area. \boxtimes The governmental unit has contacted the landowner(s)/land operator(s) about the proposed BMP b. installations. If yes, provide details. Each landowner signs a "Commitment Form" (Pg. 30 & 31) which shows his/her interest in proceeding with the project, pending grant approval. Yes No В. Landowners & Partners Level of Landowner Participation 1. \boxtimes A majority of the affected landowners/land operators have specifically indicated that they will sign a cost-a. share agreement (CSA) to install the practices requested in this grant application. \boxtimes Π A majority of the affected landowners/land operators have indicated a general interest to participate in the b. project. \boxtimes Letters of support for the project from affected landowners/land operators are attached. C. 2. **Involvement of Partners** \boxtimes Π Partners, in addition to the unit of government (applicant) and landowner, have committed resources a. (materials, equipment, staff or financial resources) towards the BMP installation, maintenance, or evaluation of the project. If yes, list the project partner(s). The Buffalo County Board of Supervisors supports the LCD in our search for financial assistance through the Targeted Runoff Management program (Pg. 32).

b. Letters of support from the project partner(s) are attached.

 \square

| | | | Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued) | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Urba | n Projects: | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | Α. | Government | | | | | | |
| _ | | 1. | The local-share funds for the construction/installation expenses: | | | | | | |
| | | a. | are already included specifically in an <u>adopted</u> budget. | | | | | | |
| | | b. | will be included in a proposed budget. | | | | | | |
| | | 2. | The governmental unit has already conducted public information activities within the project area for this practice. | | | | | | |
| | | | If yes, provide details on the opportunity for public reaction the governmental unit provided and indicate the general public support or non-support for the project that was indicated. | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | B. 1. | Landowners The governmental unit: | | | | | | |
| | | а. | already owns, or holds an easement for, the land on which the project is to be installed. | | | | | | |
| | | b. | is submitting with the application a list of landowners, occupants, or tenants that occupy the property and information indicating each party's willingness to sell or ease the necessary parcel. | | | | | | |
| | | 2. | Evidence of citizen (non-governmental) support for the project (such as letters from the neighborhood association, a civic group or an environmental organization voicing support) is attached. | | | | | | |
| Ques | tion 4 | . Basin | Priorities (check one, A-H) | | | | | | |
| | Α. | Clear | n Water Act s. 303(d) List of Impaired Waters | | | | | | |
| | | A | Project with water quality goals directly dealing with a waterbody (lake or stream) on the latest Clean Water Act (CWA) s. 303(d) List of impaired waters, where the cause of the water quality impairment is nonpoint source pollution, <u>and</u> will reduce the type of nonpoint source pollutants for which the water is listed. | | | | | | |
| | В. | | tanding and Exceptional Resource Waters | | | | | | |
| _ | Waterbody is included in s. NR 102.10 (Outstanding Resource Waters) and/or s. NR 102.11 (Exceptional Resource Waters). | | | | | | | | |
| \boxtimes | C. NPS Rankings | | | | | | | | |
| | Project is located in a large-scale watershed, a small-scale watershed, lake watershed, or other area ranked high or medium on the NPS Rankings List, where the goals of the project are directly associated with the reason for the ranking on the NPS Rankings List. | | | | | | | | |
| | D. | | ndment of the NPS Rankings List Using State of the Basin Reports | | | | | | |
| | | Project is located within a watershed ranked low or not ranked on the NPS Rankings List, but information in a DNR State of the Basin report indicates a need to amend the NPS Rankings List because the stream, stream segment, or lake is being affected by nonpoint sources of pollution. | | | | | | | |
| | Е. | Ame | ndment of the NPS Rankings List Using Other Data Sources | | | | | | |
| | | e | Project is located within a watershed ranked low or not ranked on the NPS Rankings List, but adequate data exists to request a ranking of high or medium for a waterbody that that is being affected by nonpoint sources of pollution. | | | | | | |
| | F. | Sour | ces of Information for Areas Not Included in State of the Basin Reports | | | | | | |
| | | L | For some border waters, there is no State of the Basin report (i.e., along the Mississippi River or the Greatakes). For these situations, another governmental document, accepted by the Regional NPS Coordinator, can be used to classify the resource as having a significant nonpoint source pollution impairment. | | | | | | |
| | G. | | ernmental Notices | | | | | | |
| _ | | | The applicant has checked "Yes" to both parts of Part II, Question 3, A.1. | | | | | | |
| \Box | н. | Not I | ncluded in Other Categories Above | | | | | | |

Part III. Competitive Elements

Question 5. Water Quality Needs

The water quality category which best identifies the water quality goals for the project directly deals with: (check one)

Note: For border waters where a State of the Basin Report does not exist, another governmental document acceptable to the Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator may be used to identify the water quality need.

Surface Water Considerations

 \square Α. 303(d) Listed Waterbody A waterbody (lake or stream) on the latest Clean Water Act (CWA) s. 303(d) List of impaired waters, where the cause of the water quality impairment is nonpoint source pollution, and will reduce the type of nonpoint source pollutants for which the water is listed. Not Fully Meeting Uses \square В. A waterbody (lake or stream) identified in a DNR State of the Basin report as not meeting or partially meeting designated uses due to nonpoint sources, but is not on the 303(d) List. C. **Threatened Waterbody** A waterbody (lake or stream) viewed as "threatened" by nonpoint sources in a DNR State of the Basin report. D. **Outstanding or Exceptional Resource Waters** Prevention of degradation due to nonpoint sources of outstanding or exceptional resource waters or high quality, recreationally significant waters, but not including waters listed as "threatened." Surface Water Quality Ε. Prevention surface water quality degradation due to nonpoint sources. Waters in this category are neither high quality, recreationally significant waters nor "threatened" waters. **Groundwater Considerations***

Exceeds Groundwater Enforcement Standard F. Groundwater within the project area where representative information indicates there are levels for NPS contaminants that exceed groundwater enforcement standards. G. Groundwater Quality The project area is within a geological area defined in s. NR 151.015(18) as susceptible to groundwater contamination. See Attachment G. н. **Exceeds Groundwater Preventive Action Limit** Groundwater within the project area where representative information indicates there are levels for NPS contaminants that exceed groundwater preventive action limits. *Work with the regional DNR drinking water and groundwater specialist or the county extension office. **Bonus Points:** Yes No \boxtimes П Water quality goals relate to the control of nonpoint source contaminants in public drinking water supplies. 1. If yes, and the source of drinking water affected by the project area is groundwater, the project protects: \square One wellhead a. OR b. More than one wellhead 2. If yes, and the source of drinking water affected by the project area is surface water, check the source water assessment area (drainage area) in which the project is located: **Pike River & Creek** Twin Rivers П Root River Kewaunee & Ahnapee Rivers \square Oak Creek Menominee River Milwaukee River Fish Creek Sauk Creek St. Louis & Nemadji Rivers Sheboygan & Onion Rivers Lake Winnebago

Manitowoc River

Part III. Competitive Elements (continued)

| Ques | tion 6 | Exte | nt of Pollutant Control | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Yes | No | Α. | NR 151 Agricultural Performance Standards & Prohibitions | | | | | | |
| \boxtimes | | | The proposed project addresses at least one of the NR 151 agricultural performance standards and prohibitions. Indicate the performance standard(s) or prohibition(s) that is the focus of this project. (check all that apply) | | | | | | |
| | | | a. Sheet, rill, and wind erosion. (NR 151.02) | | | | | | |
| | | | b. Manure storage facilities: new/significant alterations. (NR 151.05(2)) | | | | | | |
| | | | c. Manure storage facilities: closure. (NR 151.05(3)) | | | | | | |
| | | | d. Manure storage facilities: existing failing/leaking. (NR 151.05(4)) | | | | | | |
| | | e. Clean water diversions. (NR 151.06) | | | | | | | |
| | | | f. Nutrient management. (NR 151.07) | | | | | | |
| | | | g. Prohibition: Prevention of overflow from manure storage facilities. (NR 151.08(2)) | | | | | | |
| | | | h. Prohibition: Prevention of unconfined manure piles in water quality management areas (within 300 ft. of a stream, 1000 ft. of a lake, or areas where the groundwater is susceptible to contamination). (NR 151.08(3)) | | | | | | |
| | | \boxtimes | i. Prohibition: Prevention of direct runoff from a feedlot or stored manure into waters of the state. (NR 151.08(4)) | | | | | | |
| _ | | | j. Prohibition: Prevention of unlimited livestock access to waters of the state where high concentrations of animals prevent the maintenance of adequate sod cover or self-sustaining vegetation. (NR 151.08(5)) | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | в. | Other Water Resources Management Priority | | | | | | |
| | \square | | The proposed project addresses a water resources management priority other than an NR 151 agricultural performance standard or prohibition. | | | | | | |
| | | | If yes, describe the priority and how the project addresses this priority. | | | | | | |

| Yes | No | C. | Plar | ning Data & Source Targeting | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----|------|---|------------------------|--------|--|--|
| | \boxtimes | | seve | applicant has quantitative planning information that ranks pollution sources from highest to lowes rity <u>and</u> the proposed project will manage a pollution source contained in the top 50% of the rank s, provide: | | | | |
| | | | a. | Description of planning data | | | | |
| | | | b. | Name of document(s) | | | | |
| | | | C. | Date(s) published | | | | |
| | | | d. | Pertinent page numbers | | | | |
| | | | e. | A copy of non-state docu | ument(s) is available: | | | |
| | | | | At this website: | http:// | | | |
| | | | | Attached to this applicati | on f <u>orm.</u> | | | |
| | | | | Contact this person: | Name: | Phone: | | |

| Part III. Competitive Elements (continued) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Quest | tion 7. | Consistency with Resource Management Plans | | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | | | | | | | | |
| \boxtimes | | The project implements a water quality recommendation from a locally approved resource management plan. | | | | | | | |
| | | Summarize the water quality recommendation. Cite the name and date(s) of publication of the document. | | | | | | | |
| Goal #1 (Buffalo County Land and Water Resource Management Plan, 2/06) is to reduce sedimantation to the streams by adressing gully erosion, reducing streambank erosion and reduce sheet, rill and ephemeral erosion. This project also addresses Goal #2 address Nutrient Management Problems by reducing direct runoff from feedlots through the installation of barnyard runoff control systems and the promotion of nutrient management planning. | | | | | | | | | |
| Question 8. Use of Additional Funding | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | | | | | | | | |
| \boxtimes | | A. The state share is below the \$150,000 cap. | | | | | | | |
| \boxtimes | | B. Funding requested is below the maximum allowable cost-share rate. | | | | | | | |
| Quest | tion 9. | City of Racine | | | | | | | |

Yes No

 \boxtimes This is an application from the City of Racine for a project that is necessary for the city to comply with state storm water permitting requirements.

TRM Grant Project Name

Mk Barnyard Management

Part IV. Eligibility for Multipliers

Completion of this part of the application is optional. However, an applicant can increase the final project score by qualifying for a project multiplier.

Agricultural Projects (select all that are in place as of the application submittal date)

A. Local Implementation Program (factor 0.1) (check all that apply) Check activities listed below that are part of the local program to implement agricultural performance standards and prohibitions contained in ch. NR 151. Check all activities that apply. An activity may be checked "Yes" if <u>either</u> of the following is true:

- The activity is currently assigned to the applicant, or another local unit of government, in an approved Land and Water Resources Management Plan (LWRMP), an updated LWRMP work plan or an inter-governmental agreement with the Department of Natural Resources. List the document and page number where the activity is addressed.
- The activity is not currently assigned in one of these documents, but the applicant describes, in the space provided below, who will conduct the activity.

| | | | | | | | Dege |
|--------|-----|----|--|-----------------|----------|------|-----------------------|
| Yes No | 0 | | | | Document | | Page Number |
| |] 1 | 1. | Inform and educate landowners/operators about performance standards and prohibitions. | Buffalo Plan | County | LWRM | 17,18,64,66 |
| |] 2 | 2. | Conduct compliance status surveys, including on-site visits, for croplands and livestock facilities and convey compliance status to landowners/operators. | Buffalo Plan | County | LWRM | 17,32,50,51 |
| |] 3 | 3. | Discuss with landowners/operators the best management practices needed to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions. | Buffalo Plan | County | LWRM | 17,63,64,66 |
| |] 2 | 1. | Seek financial assistance for landowners/operators to achieve compliance with performance standards & prohibitions. | Buffalo Plan | County | LWRM | 17,18,62,63 ,65,66 |
| |] 5 | 5. | Develop cost-share agreements with landowners/operators and provide them with technical assistance to achieve compliance with performance standards & prohibitions. | Buffalo Plan | County | LWRM | 16,17,62,63 ,65 |
| |] 6 | 6. | Track compliance status of croplands and livestock facilities and provide compliance status information to the Department of Natural Resources upon request. This includes notifying DNR when a landowner/operator does not comply with a notice issued under NR 151.09 or NR 151.095. | Buffalo Plan | County | LWRM | 32,33,34 |
| | 7 | 7. | Provide assistance to the Department of Natural Resources to issue notices under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095. | Buffalo Plan | County | LWRM | 33,34 |
| | 3 [| 3. | In situations where local regulations do not require compliance with a performance standard or prohibition, refer cases of non-compliance to the local district attorney or the Department of Natural Resources. | Buffalo Plan | County | LWRM | 34 |

Agreement (IGA) with DNR, list the activity and identify who will carry it out.

If all items (1-8) above are checked "Yes," go on to part B. Otherwise, stop here.

TRM Grant Project Name

Mk Barnyard Management

Part IV. Eligibility for Multipliers (continued)

B. Local Enforcement Program – Scope of Local Regulations (factor 0.15) (check all that apply)

The ten agricultural performance standards and prohibitions included in chapter NR 151 are listed below. For each of these performance standards and prohibitions, determine if a local regulation currently exists. If a local regulation exists, check the appropriate column based on whether the local regulation provides "full coverage" or "partial coverage" of the state standard. Definitions and examples of full coverage and partial coverage are provided in the Instructions.

Title(s) of ordinance(s) for which credit is taken in this section:

Buffalo County Manure Management Ordinance "Draft"

Copies of ordinances for which credit is taken in this section are:

Found at this website (provide http://

most direct web page ÜRL):

Attached to this application form.

Already submitted with another application.

| Full | Partial | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----|--|----------------|
| <u>Coverage</u> | <u>Coverage</u> | | Agricultural Performance Standards & Prohibitions | Wis. Adm. Code |
| \boxtimes | | 1. | Sheet, rill and wind erosion | NR 151.02 |
| \boxtimes | | 2. | Manure Storage Facilities: New/Significant Alterations | NR 151.05(2) |
| \boxtimes | | 3. | Manure Storage Facilities: Closure | NR 151.05(3) |
| \boxtimes | | 4. | Manure Storage Facilities: Existing Failing/Leaking | NR 151.05(4) |
| \boxtimes | | 5. | Clean Water Diversions | NR 151.06 |
| \boxtimes | | 6. | Nutrient Management | NR 151.07 |
| \boxtimes | | 7. | Prohibition: Manure Storage Overflow | NR 151.08(2) |
| \boxtimes | | 8. | Prohibition: Unconfined Manure Pile | NR 151.08(3) |
| \boxtimes | | 9. | Prohibition: Direct Runoff From Feedlot/Stored Manure | NR 151,08(4) |
| \boxtimes | | 10. | Prohibition: Unlimited Livestock Access | NR 151.08(5) |

Urban Projects (select all that are in place as of the application submittal date)

Title(s) of ordinance(s) for which credit is taken in this section:

| Copie | s of or | dinanc | es for which credit is taken in this section are: | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Found at this website (provide http:// http:// | | | | | | | | |
| | Attached to this application form. | | | | | | | | |
| | Alrea | dy sub | mitted with another application. | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | Α. | Local Implementation Program (factor .1) | | | | | | |
| | | 1. | Implement a construction site erosion control ordinance consistent with the performance standards and applicability requirements of s. NR 151.11. | | | | | | |
| | | 2. | Implement a pollution prevention information and education program targeted at residents, including property owners. | | | | | | |
| | | 3. | Implement nutrient management for municipally owned properties where nutrients are applied to at least five acres. (You may check "Yes" if this item does <u>not</u> apply.) | | | | | | |
| | | 4. | Track, evaluate and report to DNR the status of erosion control and storm water permit activity. | | | | | | |
| | | | If all items (1-4) above are checked "Yes," go on to part B. Otherwise, stop here. | | | | | | |
| Yes | No | В. | Local Enforcement Program (factor .15) | | | | | | |
| | | 1. | There is a storm water management ordinance in effect for new development and re-development in the project area. | | | | | | |
| | | 2. | The local regulation requires a written storm water plan. | | | | | | |

TRM Grant Project Name

Mk Barnyard Management

Part IV. Eligibility for Multipliers (continued)

If items B.1. and B.2. are checked "Yes," go on to part B.3. Otherwise, stop here.

| | | 3. | curre | ck the box next to any of the listed non-agricultural performance stand ently in place that requires compliance with that performance standard. if the minimum applicability requirements of NR 151.12 are met.) (chec | (An item may be checked "Yes" |
|-----|----|----|-------|--|-------------------------------|
| Yes | No | | | Non-Agricultural Performance Standards | Wis. Adm. Code |
| | | | a. | Reduce total suspended solids per | NR 151.12(5)(a) |
| | | | b. | Reduce peak flow discharge per | NR 151.12(5)(b) |
| | | | c. | Achieve infiltration per | NR 151.12(5)(c) |
| | | | d. | Protect riparian areas per | NR 151.12(5)(d) |
| | | | e. | Manage fueling and vehicle maintenance areas per | NR 151.12(5)(e) |
| | | | | | |

Optional Additional Information

Carefully review the answers to all of the questions above. Is there additional information that will add to the understanding of this project? If so, describe here.

The landowner has contacted the Buffalo County Land Conservation office on a voluntary basis reguarding his concerns about NR 151 rules at his farmstead. A Grade Stabilization structure was completed in 2006 upstream of the barnyard site and proposed waterway, in leu of controlling water runoff issues in/near the proposed barnyard site.

Applicant Certification

An Authorized Representative must sign and date the application form prior to submittal to the DNR. All four copies must include original signatures of the Authorized Representative.

| certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application and attachments is correct and true. | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|----|--|--|--|--|
| Signature of Authorized Representative Date Signed | | | | | | |
| • | | Ū. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Julie Fernholz County Conservationist | [name and title] | | | | | |
| Tolophone Number 609-695-6261 | Eax Number 609 695 6213 | | | | | |

| Telephone Number 608-685-6261 | | | Fax Number 608-685-6213 |
|--|------|----|-------------------------|
| E-Mail Address julie.fernholz@buffalocounty.com | | | |
| Mailing Address PO Box 88 - 407 S. Second Street | Alma | WI | 54610 |

To be considered for funding, provide the following for each application submitted:

- One copy of the completed application form (DNR Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)) with original signature in blue ink
- Three additional copies of the completed, signed application form
- One electronic copy of the completed application form on CD or diskette

All application materials must be postmarked by midnight April 16, 2007.

Send to: Department of Natural Resources Attn: Kathy Thompson, WT/2 P.O. Box 7921 Madison, WI 53707-7921