State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, WT/2 PO Box 7921, Madison WI 53707-7921 Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

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

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. **Applicant Information** Governmental Unit Applying: (name & type) (example: Madison, Town of) **Vernon County Land & Water Conservation Department** Name of Authorized Representative (First, Last) Name of Governmental Contact Person (First Last) (if different) **Kelly Jacobs** Paul Krahn Title Title **County Conservationist Conservation Technician** Area Code + Telephone Number Area Code + Telephone Number 608 637-5475 608 637-5478 Area Code + Fax Number Area Code + Fax Number 608 637-8322 608 637-8322 E-Mail Address E-Mail Address kjacobs@vernoncounty.org pkrahn@vernoncounty.org Mailing Address - Street or Route Mailing Address - Street or Route 220 Airport Road 220 Airport Road Zip Code State State Zip Code City City Viroqua WI 54665 Viroqua WI 54665 Consulting Firm Name (if applicable) Consulting Contact Person Name N/A Title N/A Area Code + Telephone Number **DNR Use Only** N/A Area Code + Fax Number N/A E-Mail Address N/A Mailing Address - Street or Route N/A City State Zip Code N/A N/A N/A **Project Information** A. Project Name Frederick Wang **B. Project Area Location** County Vernon

Project Information (continued)    Project Information (continued)								
Minor Civil Division Name (civ. village, town, etc. – ex.   Township   Range   Range								
Clinton			Proj	ect Informa	ation (cont	inued)		
Clinton	(city, village, town, etc ex.			Section	Quarter		Latitude (North)	Longitude (West)
Method for Determining Latitude & Longitude (check one)  GPS  DNR WebView or Surface Water Data Viewer  Other (specify):  // Pernon County GIS  Droject Summary  Problems: NR 151 violations; unconfined manure stacks, feedlot runoff and trampled streambanks.  Potential Solutions:  Relocate feed lot to ridge top farmstead. Construct a concrete sediment basin, L-shaped loafing shed for wind protection, filterstrip, and watering system. Also develop and implement a 590 Nutrient Management Plan. In the valid pasture construct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring to Knapp creek. Construct a cattle access ramp on (napp creek for water source. Develop pasture management plan to limit herd size.  I. Eliminate cattle. Reconstruct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring. Enroll the pasture in the CREP program Plant trees in the land eligible for CREP and enroll this along with more woodland into the Managed Forest Law program.  D. Watershed & Waterbody (see Attachment A)  Watershed Name   Watershed Code   LW07   West Fork of the Kickapoo River  Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes   No   E. Project Target   1. The project will control agricultural runoff.   2. The project will control urban runoff.   5. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation   1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).	, , ,			9	SW		43 42' 15.6"	90 44' 50.1"
□ GPS □ DNR WebView or Surface Water Data Viewer □ Other (specify):    Pernon County GIS   Project Summary   Problems: NR 151 violations; unconfined manure stacks, feedlot runoff and trampled streambanks.   Protential Solutions:   Relocate feed lot to ridge top farmstead. Construct a concrete sediment basin, L-shaped loafing shed for wind rotection, filterstrip, and watering system. Also develop and implement a 590 Nutrient Management Plan. In the valle asture construct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring to Knapp creek. Construct a cattle access ramp on mapp creek for water source. Develop pasture management plan to limit herd size.   Eliminate cattle. Reconstruct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring. Enroll the pasture in the CREP program relation trees in the land eligible for CREP and enroll this along with more woodland into the Managed Forest Law rogram.   Watershed & Waterbody (see Attachment A)								
GPS   DNR WebView or Surface Water Data Viewer   Other Vespecify :   Interior County GIS   Other (specify):   Interior County GIS   Project Summary	1ethod for Determining Lat	itude & Lona	itude (check	one)				
ernon County GIS  Froject Summary  roblems: NR 151 violations; unconfined manure stacks, feedlot runoff and trampled streambanks.  rotential Solutions:  Relocate feed lot to ridge top farmstead. Construct a concrete sediment basin, L-shaped loafing shed for wind rotection, filterstrip, and watering system. Also develop and implement a 590 Nutrient Management Plan. In the valid asture construct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring to Knapp creek. Construct a cattle access ramp on anapp creek for water source. Develop pasture management plan to limit herd size.  Eliminate cattle. Reconstruct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring. Enroll the pasture in the CREP program lant trees in the land eligible for CREP and enroll this along with more woodland into the Managed Forest Law rogram.  Watershed & Watershed Name Knapp Creek LW07  West Fork of the Kickapoo River  Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes  No E. Project Target  T. The project will control agricultural runoff. F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Loa (TMDL).	☐ GPS ☐ DNR WebView or Surfac	_	•	,				
Project Summary								
Relocate feed lot to ridge top farmstead. Construct a concrete sediment basin, L-shaped loafing shed for wind rotection, filterstrip, and watering system. Also develop and implement a 590 Nutrient Management Plan. In the valid assure construct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring to Knapp creek. Construct a cattle access ramp on knapp creek for water source. Develop pasture management plan to limit herd size.  I Eliminate cattle. Reconstruct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring. Enroll the pasture in the CREP program lant trees in the land eligible for CREP and enroll this along with more woodland into the Managed Forest Law rogram.    Watershed & Waterbody (see Attachment A)								
Relocate feed lot to ridge top farmstead. Construct a concrete sediment basin, L-shaped loafing shed for wind rotection, filterstrip, and watering system. Also develop and implement a 590 Nutrient Management Plan. In the valid asture construct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring to Knapp creek. Construct a cattle access ramp on knapp creek for water source. Develop pasture management plan to limit herd size.  Eliminate cattle. Reconstruct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring. Enroll the pasture in the CREP program lant trees in the land eligible for CREP and enroll this along with more woodland into the Managed Forest Law rogram.  Watershed Name  Knapp Creek  Watershed Code  LW07  West Fork of the Kickapoo River  Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes No  E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff. 2. The project will control urban runoff. F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Loa (TMDL).		ons; unconf	ined manui	e stacks, fe	edlot runof	f and tramp	led streambanks.	
As acture construct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring to Knapp creek. Construct a cattle access ramp on knapp creek for water source. Develop pasture management plan to limit herd size.  I. Eliminate cattle. Reconstruct a grassed waterway and tile seasonal spring. Enroll the pasture in the CREP program plant trees in the land eligible for CREP and enroll this along with more woodland into the Managed Forest Law brogram.  D. Watershed & Waterbody (see Attachment A)  Watershed Name Knapp Creek Watershed Code LW07 West Fork of the Kickapoo River  Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes  No E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff.  2. The project will control argicultural runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).	otential Solutions:							
Watershed & Waterbody (see Attachment A)  Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes No  E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff.  2. The project will control urban runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).	rotection, filterstrip, and asture construct a grass (napp creek for water so	watering sy sed waterway urce. Develon nstruct a gra	rstem. Also y and tile so op pasture assed water	o develop ar easonal spri managemer rway and tile	nd impleme ing to Knap nt plan to li e seasonal	nt a 590 Nu op creek. Co mit herd siz spring. Eni	trient Management onstruct a cattle ac e. roll the pasture in t	Plan. In the valley cess ramp on he CREP program
Watershed Name Knapp Creek  LW07  West Fork of the Kickapoo River  Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes No  E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff.  2. The project will control urban runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).		JIBIE FOR CRE	EP and enro	oli this along	g with more	woodland	into the Managed F	orest Law
Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Watershed Code LW07  West Fork of the Kickapoo River  Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes No  E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff.  2. The project will control urban runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).								
Watershed Name Knapp Creek  LW07  West Fork of the Kickapoo River  Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes No  E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff.  2. The project will control urban runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).								
Note: If the project is in more than one watershed, submit a separate application for each watershed, unless this application is for a high-efficiency street sweeper.  Yes No  E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff.  2. The project will control urban runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).	). Watershed & Waterboo	 	chment A)					
Yes No  E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff.  2. The project will control urban runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).			•	Code		Primary	v Waterbody	
Yes No  E. Project Target  1. The project will control agricultural runoff.  2. The project will control urban runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Loa (TMDL).	Watershed Name	,	Watershed	Code			•	o River
E. Project Target  □ 1. The project will control agricultural runoff. □ 2. The project will control urban runoff.  F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation  □ 1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the pollutary specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).	Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in a	more than on	Watershed <b>LW07</b> ne watershed		eparate app	West F	ork of the Kickapoo	
<ul> <li>□ 1. The project will control agricultural runoff.</li> <li>□ 2. The project will control urban runoff.</li> <li>F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation</li> <li>□ 1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Loa (TMDL).</li> </ul>	Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in a is for a high-efficiency st	more than on	Watershed <b>LW07</b> ne watershed		eparate app	West F	ork of the Kickapoo	
<ul> <li>2. The project will control urban runoff.</li> <li>F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation</li> <li>1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Loa (TMDL).</li> </ul>	Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in a is for a high-efficiency say	more than on treet sweepe	Watershed <b>LW07</b> ne watershed		eparate app	West F	ork of the Kickapoo	
<ul> <li>F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation</li> <li>□ ■ 1. Requesting funding for eligible best management practices (BMPs) which will directly implement the polluta specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Loa (TMDL).</li> </ul>	Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in a is for a high-efficiency state  Yes No E. Project Ta	more than on treet sweepe	Watershed <b>LW07</b> ne watershed  r.	d, submit a s	eparate app	West F	ork of the Kickapoo	
specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Loa (TMDL).	Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in a is for a high-efficiency safety  Yes No  E. Project Ta	more than on treet sweepe arget ject will contr	Watershed LW07  ne watershed r.	d, submit a s	eparate app	West F	ork of the Kickapoo	
a. If yes, provide the title of TMDL report this project addresses.	Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in a is for a high-efficiency state of the project Table 1. The pro	more than on treet sweepe arget ject will contr ject will contr	Watershed  LW07  The watershed	d, submit a s al runoff. noff.		West F	ork of the Kickapoo	
	Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in a is for a high-efficiency state of the project Table 1. The project Table 2. The project Table 2. The project Table 1. Request for the project Table 1. Request specific	more than on treet sweeper arget ject will contri ject will contri for Funding ting funding fing funding fing soals of a pu	Watershed  LW07  The watershed  The collagricultur  The collagricu	d, submit a s al runoff. noff. laximum Da est manager	nily Load" lu	West F  Dication for e	ork of the Kickapoo each watershed, unle ion which will directly imp	ess this application
2. Final reimbursement for eligible, TMDL implementation project costs will be requested no later than	Watershed Name Knapp Creek  Note: If the project is in a is for a high-efficiency state  Yes No  E. Project Ta  1. The pro 2. The pro F. Request f 1. Request specific (TMDL)	more than on treet sweepe. arget ject will contribet will contribet will contribet ting funding finding findin	Watershed  LW07  The watershed  The color agricultur  The color ag	al runoff. noff. laximum Da est manager nt draft (as c	nily Load" In ment practic of April 9, 20	west F  Dication for e	ork of the Kickapoo each watershed, unle ion which will directly imp	ess this application

		nt Application – CY 2008 Funding 00 (R 1/07) Page of
TRM G		Project Name <b>Wang</b>
		Project Information (continued)
		September 20, 2009.
		G. Request for Funding of Land Acquisition or Easements
		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 <b>Attachment B</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."
		1. There are endangered or threatened resources, as identified in s. 29.604, Wis. Stats., and ch. NR 27 in the project area.
	$\boxtimes$	<ol><li>There are archaeological sites, historical structures, burial sites, or other historic places identified in s. 44.45, Wis. Stats., in the project area.</li></ol>
	$\boxtimes$	3. There are wetlands in the project area that are governed by water quality standard provisions of ch. NR 103.
		K. Environmental Contamination
	$\boxtimes$	The applicant is aware of environmental contamination of the soil and/or groundwater or potential for contamination in the project area.
		L. <u>Urban Projects Only:</u> Pro-rating for Existing versus New Development
	$\boxtimes$	Project will serve existing development only. If no, provide attachments and the following:

%

program.

 $\boxtimes$ 

if necessary)

M. Urban Projects Only: Alternative Funding Possibility

Percentage of total design volume that will be generated by existing development. (change default %

This applicant requests that the DNR also submit a copy of this application to the Clean Water Fund loan

Page \_\_\_ of \_\_\_

TRM Grant Project Name Frederick Wang

		Part I. Screening	Requ	uirements	
No	A. Map				
	An 8.5" x 11" topographic ma attached.	ap from USGS or th	e DNR	data/map viewers, showing the pr	oject area, is
	B. Best Management Practic (see Attachment D for addi			IR Funding Is Requested (check	all that apply)
	<u>Practice</u>	Wis. Adm. Code	,	<u>Practice</u>	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)
	Barnyard Runoff Control Systems	NR 154.04(5)		Roof Runoff Systems	NR 154.04(27)
	Access Roads & Cattle Crossings	NR 154.04(6)		Sediment Basins	NR 154.04(28)
	Animal Trails and Walkways	NR 154.04(7)		Shoreline Habitat Restoration	NR 154.04(29)
	Critical Area Stabilization	NR 154.04(10)		for Developed Areas	
	Diversions	NR 154.04(11)		Sinkhole Treatment	NR 154.04(30)
	Field Windbreaks	NR 154.04(12)	$\boxtimes$	Subsurface Drains	NR 154.04(33)
	Filter Strips	NR 154.04(13)		Terrace Systems	NR 154.04(34)
	Grade Stabilization	NR 154.04(14)		Underground Outlets	NR 154.04(35)
	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)		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)			ambank and Shoreline Protection: udes associated fencing)	NR 154.04(31)
	Detention Basin		· 🗆	Stream Crossing	
	Wetland Basin			Streambank/Shoreline Rip-rappir	ng
	Filtration Practice			Streambank/Shoreline Shaping &	-
	Infiltration Practice			Streambank/Shoreline Fencing	
	Accelerated or High-efficiency Street Sweeping System			Other Streambank/Shoreline Pro (incl. bio-engineering) - specify b	

Page	of
------	----

TRM Grant Project Name Frederick Wang

# Part I. Screening Requirements (continued)

	C.		You n	nust be able to answer "Yes" to questions 1 grant.	-5 and "Yes" (	or "N/A" (Not Applicable) to question 6 to be			
Yes ⊠ ⊠	No	1. 2.	Staf	eject will be completed within 24 months of the start of the grant period.  If and contractors designated to work on this project have adequate training, knowledge, and					
$\boxtimes$		3. 4.	Staf Bes	erience to implement the proposed project. f or contractual services, in addition to thos t management practices constructed under sistent with) agricultural and non-agricultura achment E)	this grant will	not work at cross-purposes to (are			
		5.	this	local DNR Regional Nonpoint Source Cooproject: Name of the Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator Contacted  Helsel	Date Contacted 3/21/07	Subject of Contact  NR 151 violations			
Yes	No	N/A ⊠	6.	If this is an application to construct ponds waterway or wetland permit (chs. 30 or 20 If yes, give the docket number and date of	81, Wis. Stats				
lf you	answ	ered "l	No" 1	Docket Number		Date of Issuance , stop here. The project is ineligible.			

Yes	D. Elig No	gibilit	y: Reason For Controlling Nonpoint Source Pollution In The Target Area
$\boxtimes$		1.	The need for compliance with performance standards established by the DNR in ch. NR 151.
		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.
		4.	Other water quality concerns of statewide or national significance. (Important: You may only check this box, if you are eligible to score 10 points in Part II, Question #4 "Basin Priorities" of this application.)
	$\boxtimes$	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.

Page \_\_\_ of \_\_\_

TRM Grant Proje	ect Name
Frederick Wai	ng

## **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	8/07	LWCD
Obtaining required permits	8/07	LWCD
Landowner contacts	5/07	LWCD
CSA signing	6/07	LWCD
Bidding	8/07	LWCD
DNR approvals	8/07	LWCD
Contract signing	8/07	LWCD
BMP construction	9/07 & 5/08	LWCD
Site inspection and certification	9/07	LWCD
Project evaluation	6/08	LWCD&DNR
Purchase street sweeper (urban only)	N/A	
Other (specify)		
	N/A	

#### B. Adequate Financial Budget

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

#### FINANCIAL BUDGET TABLE

A	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:		
Sediment Basin	25,000	25,000
Filter Strip	2,000	2,000
Watering System	2,750	2,750
Loafing Shed (Windbreak)	9,000	9,000
Stream Watering Ramp	2,000	2,000
Waterway System	9,500	9,500
1. Construction Subtotal	\$50,250	\$50,250
2. Engineering Services (including design)	\$0	\$0
3. Storm Sewer Reroute (Urban projects only)	\$0	\$0
4. Structure Removal (Urban projects only)	\$0	\$0
5. Subtotal [add rows 1-4]	\$50,250	\$50,250
6. Property Acquisition: Fee Title & Easement	\$0	\$0
7. Grand Total [add rows 5 & 6]	\$50,250	\$50,250

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page	of
i ugo	01

TRM Grant Project Name Frederick Wang

## 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, specify)	100%	70%	\$	35,175
Costs Specific to Agricultural Projects:					
9. Land Purchase (Fee Title)	\$ 0	-	50%	\$	0
10. Agricultural Easements	\$ 0	] -	70%	\$	0
Costs Specific to <b>Urban</b> Projects:	<u> </u>	_		<u>-</u>	<u>.</u>
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)]				\$	35,175
Cap Test:					
15. Maximum State Share [Lesser of (14) or \$150,0	00]			\$	35,175
State & Local Share:					
16. Requested State-Share Amount (Requested Gra	int Amount)			\$	35,175
17. Local-Share Amount [(7), column B less (16)]				\$	15,075

Method(s) Used to Calculate Cost Estimates

Based upon last years costs and past experience.

#### C. Cost-Effectiveness

- 1. Tangible Benefits
  - a. Primary Benefit:

List the nonpoint source pollutants to be controlled by the project.

Manure runoff, sediment, organic and nutrient loading to Knapp creek.

b.	ch of the following secondary benefits will be achieved by implementing this project? (check all that by)  Fish and wildlife habitat enhancement  Enhancements to recreation  Public safety  Economical operation, economical maintenance and enhanced life expectancy of the BMP  Other (specify):

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page \_\_\_ of \_\_\_

TRM Grant	Project Name
Frederick	Wang

#### 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.

Alternative will be to use the court system to enforce NR 151, which result in the proposed bmps being installed anyway with cost share requirement still in place.

Yes No 3. Alternatives

 $\boxtimes$ 

a. There is more than one way to achieve the benefits checked above. If no, go to part b.

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 Analys	sis	
	A	В	С	D
		Cost	Effectiveness	
	Alternative	Estimated Amount	Estimated % of Pollutant Load Reduction	(B ÷ C) Cost-Effectiveness
1	Cease raising beef cattle. Enter into the CREP program and MFL.	\$ 9,000	100 %	9,000
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.

Land operator wants to continue raising beef for income.

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.

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07) Page \_\_\_ of \_\_\_

TRM Grant Project Name

TRM Grant Project Name	
Train Grant Froject Name	
Frederick Wang	
₹	

#### 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.

#### A. Modeling & Measures of Change

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 model
	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
$\boxtimes$	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
$\boxtimes$	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
Ш	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	
	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)		
Yes	No B. Monitoring (not eligible for cost share	ing at this time)	
	The project evaluation strategy will promonitoring. If "Yes," check all that ap		ion from water resource
	☐ The project will evaluate the physical		nical conditions.

A one-page summary of the monitoring strategy is attached.

Form 8	TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding Form 8700-300 (R 1/07) Page of  TRM Grant Project Name				
	erick V		ame		
			Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)		
Yes	No	C.	Additional Monitoring		
			The applicant is willing to participate with the Department to do monitoring in the project area should funding become available.		
Ques	tion 3.	Evide	ence of Local Support		
		The I	evel of <u>local support</u> that <u>currently</u> exists for the proposed project.		
			cultural Projects:		
Yes	No	Α.	Government		
		1.	Regulatory Situations 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.		
		a.	At least 75% of the total project cost is attributed to the resolution of a Notice of Discharge (NOD) or 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.		
$\boxtimes$		b.	At least one of the following is attached to this application form:		
			1. copy of the NOI issued under NR 243, or		
			2. copy of the NOD issue under NR 243, or		
			<ol><li>copy of letter signed by DNR stating that DNR will issue an NOI or NOD under NR 243 if cost sharing is provided, or</li></ol>		
			<ol><li>copy of letter signed by DNR and the county that a notice, under s. NR 151.09 or 151.095, will be issued if necessary, or</li></ol>		
		•	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.	The governmental unit has developed:  i. a detailed pollution control plan with the landowners that identifies specific best management		
	$\bowtie$		practices (BMPs).  ii. general assessments of the pollution sources within the project area.		
		b.	The governmental unit has contacted the landowner(s)/land operator(s) about the proposed BMP		
	Ы	D.	installations.		
			If yes, provide details.		
			Meeting made April 3, 2007 with Landowner, DNR (Dan Helsel) and LWCD (Paul Krahn). Notified of NR 151 violations. Discussed possible options to correct problem. BMPs proposed in this grant are what the landowner favored.		
Yes	No	В.	Landowners & Partners		
	$\square$	1.	Level of Landowner Participation		
Ш	$\boxtimes$	a.	A majority of the affected landowners/land operators have specifically indicated that they will sign a cost- share agreement (CSA) to install the practices requested in this grant application.		
$\boxtimes$		b.	A majority of the affected landowners/land operators have indicated a general interest to participate in the project.		
	$\boxtimes$	C.	Letters of support for the project from affected landowners/land operators are attached.		
		2.	Involvement of Partners		
		a.	Partners, in addition to the unit of government (applicant) and landowner, have committed resources (materials, equipment, staff or financial resources) towards the BMP installation, maintenance, or evaluation of the project.		

If yes, list the project partner(s).

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

 $\boxtimes$ 

**TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding** Form 8700-300 (R 1/07) Page \_\_\_ of \_\_\_

TRM Grant Project Name  Frederick Wang				
		Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)		
		Urban Projects:		
Yes	No	A. Government		
		1. The local-share funds for the construction/installation expenses:		
	$\boxtimes$	<ul><li>a. are already included specifically in an <u>adopted</u> budget.</li><li>b. will be included in a proposed budget.</li></ul>		
		<u> </u>		
Ш	$\boxtimes$	<ol><li>The governmental unit has already conducted public information activities within the project area for this practice.</li></ol>	S	
		If yes, provide details on the opportunity for public reaction the governmental unit provided and indicate general public support or non-support for the project that was indicated.	the:	
Yes	No	B. Landowners		
_	_	1. The governmental unit:		
		a. already owns, or holds an easement for, the land on which the project is to be installed.		
Ц	$\boxtimes$	<ul> <li>is submitting with the application a list of landowners, occupants, or tenants that occupy the property an information indicating each party's willingness to sell or ease the necessary parcel.</li> </ul>	nd	
		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)		
	A.	Clean Water Act s. 303(d) List of Impaired Waters		
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 pollutants for which the water is listed.				
	B.	Outstanding 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.	Amendment 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 DNR State of the Basin report indicates a need to amend the NPS Rankings List because the stream, stresegment, or lake is being affected by nonpoint sources of pollution.		
	E.	Amendment of the NPS Rankings List Using Other Data Sources		
		Project is located within a watershed ranked low or not ranked on the NPS Rankings List, but adequate date exists to request a ranking of high or medium for a waterbody that that is being affected by nonpoint source of pollution.		
	F.	Sources of Information for Areas Not Included in State of the Basin Reports		
		For some border waters, there is no State of the Basin report (i.e., along the Mississippi River or the Grea Lakes). For these situations, another governmental document, accepted by the Regional NPS Coordinato can be used to classify the resource as having a significant nonpoint source pollution impairment.		
	G.	Governmental Notices		
		The applicant has checked "Yes" to both parts of Part II, Question 3, A.1.		
1 1	H.	Not Included in Other Categories Above		

Page	of
------	----

TRM Grant Project Name Frederick Wang

# **Part III. Competitive Elements**

#### **Question 5. Water Quality Needs**

Manitowoc River

	rne w	valer quality category which best identifies the	water quality go	bals for the project <u>directly deals</u> with. (check one)
	Note:	For border waters where a State of the Basi to the Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinate		not exist, another governmental document acceptable identify the water quality need.
	Surfa	ce Water Considerations		
	A.		ent is nonpoint s	Act (CWA) s. 303(d) List of impaired waters, where cource pollution, <u>and</u> will reduce the type of nonpoint
	B.	Not Fully Meeting Uses A waterbody (lake or stream) identified meeting designated uses due to nonpo		of the Basin report as not meeting or partially is not on the 303(d) List.
	C.	Threatened Waterbody A waterbody (lake or stream) viewed a report.	s "threatened" b	y nonpoint sources in a DNR State of the Basin
	D.	Outstanding or Exceptional Resource Wa Prevention of degradation due to nonpo- quality, recreationally significant waters	oint sources of c	utstanding or exceptional resource waters or high ng waters listed as "threatened."
	E.	Surface Water Quality Prevention surface water quality degrading high quality, recreationally significant was		npoint sources. Waters in this category are neither rened" waters.
	Grou	ndwater Considerations*		
	F.	Exceeds Groundwater Enforcement Stand Groundwater within the project area wh contaminants that exceed groundwater	nere representat	ive information indicates there are levels for NPS andards.
	G.	Groundwater Quality  The project area is within a geological contamination. See Attachment G.	area defined in s	s. NR 151.015(18) as susceptible to groundwater
	H.	Exceeds Groundwater Preventive Action Groundwater within the project area wh contaminants that exceed groundwater *Work with the regional DNR drinking water and g	nere representat preventive action	
Bonu	s Poin	ts:		
Yes	No			
	$\boxtimes$	Water quality goals relate to the control of no	onpoint source c	ontaminants in public drinking water supplies.
	1. a.	If yes, and the source of drinking water affect One wellhead	ted by the projed	ct area is groundwater, the project protects:
$\overline{}$	L	OR		
	b.	More than one wellhead		t and is suffere water about the course water
	2.	assessment area (drainage area) in which th	ted by the project e proiect is loca	ct area is <u>surface water</u> , check the source water ted:
		Pike River & Creek		Twin Rivers
		Root River		Kewaunee & Ahnapee Rivers
		Oak Creek		Menominee River
		Milwaukee River		Fish Creek
		Sauk Creek		St. Louis & Nemadji Rivers
		Sheboygan & Onion Rivers		Lake Winnebago

Page	of

RM Grant Project Name
•
rederick Wang

# Part III. Competitive Elements (continued)

Ques	tion 6	Exte	Question 6. Extent of Pollutant Control			
Yes	No	A.	NR 151 Agricultural Performance Standards & Prohibitions			
		Λ.	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))			
			<ul><li>i. Prohibition: Prevention of direct runoff from a feedlot or stored manure into waters of the state. (NR 151.08(4))</li></ul>			
			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			
			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.	Planning Data & Source Targeting			
l es		U.	The applicant has quantitative planning information that ranks pollution sources from highest to lowest in severity <u>and</u> the proposed project will manage a pollution source contained in the top 50% of the ranked list. If yes, 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 document(s) is available:			
			At this website: http://			
			Attached to this application form.			
			Contact this person: Name: Phone:			

	TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding           Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)         Page of				
	Grant Prerick W	roject Name Vang			
		Part III. Competitive Elements (continued)			
Ques	tion 7.	Consistency with Resource Management Plans			
Yes	No				
		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.			
		Vernon County Land & Water Resource Management Plan - March 2004.			
Ques	tion 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.			
Ques	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.			

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page	of	

TRM Grant Project Name Frederick Wang

### 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.

Yes	No			Document	Page Number
		1.	Inform and educate landowners/operators about performance standards and prohibitions.	Vernon Co. LWRM Plan	25
$\boxtimes$		2.	Conduct compliance status surveys, including on-site visits, for croplands and livestock facilities and convey compliance status to landowners/operators.	Vernon Co. LWRM Plan	26
		3.	Discuss with landowners/operators the best management practices needed to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.	Vernon Co. LWRM Plan	26,27,28
		4.	Seek financial assistance for landowners/operators to achieve compliance with performance standards & prohibitions.	Vernon Co. LWRM Plan	28
		5.	Develop cost-share agreements with landowners/operators and provide them with technical assistance to achieve compliance with performance standards & prohibitions.	Vernon Co. LWRM Plan	27,28
		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.	Vernon Co. LWRM Plan	28,29
		7.	Provide assistance to the Department of Natural Resources to issue notices under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095.	Vernon Co. LWRM Plan	26
		8.	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.	Vernon Co. LWRM Plan	28
		If an	item checked above is not covered by a LWRMP, an updated LV	VRMP work plan or an Inter-Go	vernmental

If an item checked above is not covered by a LWRMP, an updated LWRMP work plan or an Inter-Governmenta 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.

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

	_	
age	of	
auc	OI .	

TRM Grant Project Name Frederick Wang

### 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: **Manure Storage Ordinance** Copies of ordinances for which credit is taken in this section are: Found at this website (provide http:// municode.com/resources/gateway.asp?pid=13664&sid=49 most direct web page URL):  $\boxtimes$ Attached to this application form. Already submitted with another application. Full Partial Coverage Coverage Agricultural Performance Standards & Prohibitions Wis. Adm. Code П Sheet, rill and wind erosion NR 151.02 П 1. Manure Storage Facilities: New/Significant Alterations  $\boxtimes$ 2. П NR 151.05(2)  $\boxtimes$ Manure Storage Facilities: Closure П 3. NR 151.05(3)  $\boxtimes$ Manure Storage Facilities: Existing Failing/Leaking 4. NR 151.05(4) Clean Water Diversions 5. NR 151.06 6. **Nutrient Management** NR 151.07 M 7. Prohibition: Manure Storage Overflow NR 151.08(2) П X 8. Prohibition: Unconfined Manure Pile NR 151.08(3) Prohibition: Direct Runoff From Feedlot/Stored Manure 9. NR 151,08(4) 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: N/A Copies of ordinances for which credit is taken in this section are: Found at this website (provide http:// most direct web page URL): Attached to this application form. Already submitted with another application. A. Yes No Local Implementation Program (factor .1) Implement a construction site erosion control ordinance consistent with the performance standards and 1. applicability requirements of s. NR 151.11. П 2. Implement a pollution prevention information and education program targeted at residents, including Implement nutrient management for municipally owned properties where nutrients are applied to at least П 3. 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.

The local regulation requires a written storm water plan.

П

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page	of
. ugu	01

TRM Grant Project Name Frederick Wang

# 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. Check the box next to any of the listed non-agricultural performance standards if there is a local regulation currently in place that requires compliance with that performance standard. (An item may be checked "Yes" only if the minimum applicability requirements of NR 151.12 are met.) (check all that apply)

only if the minimum applicability requirements of the return to 1.12 are metal, (enest all that apply)				
Yes	No	Non-Agricultural Performance Standards	Wis. Adm. Code	
	$\boxtimes$	a. Reduce total suspended solids per	NR 151.12(5)(a)	
	$\boxtimes$	b. Reduce peak flow discharge per	NR 151.12(5)(b)	
	$\boxtimes$	c. Achieve infiltration per	NR 151.12(5)(c)	
	$\boxtimes$	d. Protect riparian areas per	NR 151.12(5)(d)	
	$\boxtimes$	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.

We have received several complaints on this site over the past several years. We have continued to monitor it and have determined it as noncompliant with the state's NR151 performance standards due to the concentrated animals in a waterway, with lack of vegetative cover, causing direct runoff to a nearby waterbody. The landowner has been communicating with both the DNR and LWCD over the last month and is willing to address the problem if the 70 percent cost-share assistance is made available to him. We view this grant program as substantially assisting both the WI DNR and Vernon County LWCD in implementation of the rules while also addressing a tremendous resource concern on the landscape. With your financial assistance, we hope to have this site restored by Spring 2008. Please reference the included information for site evaluation and Vernon County program implementation. Thank you for your consideration.

## **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.

I 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 April 23, 2007

**Kelly Jacobs County Conservationist** Telephone Number 608 637-5475

[name and title]

Fax Number 608 637-8322

E-Mail Address kjacobs@vernoncounty.org

Mailing Address 220 Airport Road Viroqua WI 54665

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