### Final Report Form 3400-189 (rev. 7/30/09)

- Targeted Runoff Management Grant Program (ch. NR 153)
- . Notice of Discharge Program (ch. NR 153)
- Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant Program (ch. NR 155)

**NOTICE**: This Final Report is authorized under ss. 281.65 and 281.66., Wis. Stats., and chs. NR 153 and NR 155, Wis. Admin. Code. Personally identified information collected will be used for program administration and may be made available to requesters as required under Wisconsin Open Records Law [ss. 19.31-19.39, Wis. Stats.].

INSTRUCTIONS: Your grant agreement requires you to submit a Final Report with your final reimbursement request. This Final Report form must be used in conjunction with the "FINAL REPORT INSTRUCTIONS." The instructions detail how to complete and submit the report to DNR as described in the instructions.

PILL NA ADDITION AT 110 DIGITATION							
1. GRANT TYPE. Check the one that applies.							
☐ Targeted Runoff Managemer	nt Grant – Agricultural		☐ Targeted Runoff Management Grant – Urban				
Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant – Construction			Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant – Planning				
☐ Notice of Discharge Grant							
2. PROJECT NAME & LO	OCATION.						
2.1. Project Name:			2.2. Grant Number:				
Stormwater Plan / Water Quality Calculation Updates			USP-UR01-28291-12B				
2.3. Governmental Unit Name:			2.4. P	2.4. Primary Watershed Name: 2.5. Watershed Code:			ed Code:
City of Watertown			Middle	Rock River		UR01 / 07090	0011103
NOTE FOR SECTION 2.6 (whic	h follows):						
discrete project locations, attach	Section 2.6. includes five (5) columns (A. through E.) for recording data about five (5) discrete site locations. If your grant has more than five (5) discrete project locations, attach additional columns for Section 2.6 as described in the instructions. If your project occurs in more than one 12-digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC), use the space in adjacent columns to record other HUC numbers.					nore than five (5) e than one 12-digit	
2.6 Site Location(s) →	A.	В.		C.		D.	E.
Name of Cost-Share Recipient or Governmental Unit	Watertown, City						
Cost-Share Agreement Number (Agricultural only)							
12-Digit Hydrologic Unit Code(s) (HUC) Where Work Was Completed	070900011103	VACCARE PRIMER PROTOCOLOGY					
Nearest Surface Receiving Water Affected							
Name:	Rock River						
Waterbody Identification Code(s) (WBIC):	788800						
Nearest Impaired Water Affected							
Name:	Rock River						
Waterbody Identification Code(s) (WBIC):	788800						
Pollutants Reduced	Sediment, Phosphorous						
Impairments/Impacts Addressed	Sediment, Phosphorous						

- Final Report Form 3400-189 (rev. 7/30/09)

  Targeted Runoff Management Grant Program (ch. NR 153)

  Notice of Discharge Program (ch. NR 153)

  Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant Program (ch. NR 155)

Project Location(s) (cont.) →	Α,	В,	C,	D,	E,
Project Coordinates:					
Town	08N and 09N				( Control of the Cont
Range	15E				
Section	3-10, 15, 16 (T08N) 21, 28-34 (T09N)				
Quarter	All				
Quarter-Quarter	All				
Latitude (degrees, minutes, seconds North of Equator; use the DNR's Surface Water Data Viewer (SWDV))	43 deg, 11 min, 34 sec				
Longitude (degrees, minutes, seconds W of Prime Meridian, use the SWDV)	88 deg, 43 min, 39 sec				

3. SUMMARY OF RESULTS.					
Table A. Agricultural Projects. – Ch. NR 151 Performance Standards and Prohibitions and Other Water Resources Management Priorities					
A.1. Management Measures	Units of Measure	Quantity	Measurement Method Used		
Sheet, rill and wind erosion	Acres meeting "T"	acres			
Manure Storage Facilities:	Number of facilities	facilities			
New Construction/Alterations	Number of animal units	animal units			
Manure Storage Facilities: Closure	Number of facilities	facilities	·		
Manure Storage Facilities:	Number of facilities	facilities			
Failing/Leaking Facilities	Number of animal units	animal units			
	Pollutant load reduction	lbs.			
Clean Water Diversions in WQMA	Number of farms with diversions	farms			
	Number animal units	animal units			
Nutrient Management on Agricultural Land	Acres planned	acres			
Prohibition: Manure Storage Overflow	Number of farms	farms			
Profibilion: Maridie Storage Overnow	Number of animal units	animal units			
Prohibition: Unconfined Manure Pile in WQMA	Number of farms	farms			
	Pollutant load reduction	lbs.			
Prohibition: Direct Runoff From Feedlot/Stored Manure	Number of facilities	facilities			
	Number of animal units	animal units			
Direction to the standard I for a final A annual	Feet of bank protected	feet			
Prohibition: Unlimited Livestock Access	Number of farms	farms			

## Final Report Form 3400-189 (rev. 7/30/09) Targeted Runoff Management Grant Program (ch. NR 153)

- Notice of Discharge Program (ch. NR 153)
   Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant Program (ch. NR 155)

	Units of Measure	Quantity	Measurement Method Used
	Units (use feet, acres or		
	number as applicable)		
	Pollutant load reduction (if method available)		
	Units (use feet, acres or		
	number as applicable)		
	Pollutant load reduction (if		
	method available)		
	Units (use feet, acres or number as applicable)		
	Pollutant load reduction (if		
	method available)		
	Units (use feet, acres or		
	number as applicable)		
	Pollutant load reduction (if		
	method available)	<u> </u>	***
Fable B. Urban Construction Projects Se	rving Developed Areas.		
3.1. Required Management Measures	Units of Measure	Quantity	Measurement Method Used
20 1070 10tal 000poliada 00liad (100)	TSS reduced	lbs.	
Reduction for NR 216 communities	TSS reduction	%	
3.2. Other Management Measures			
20-40% Reduction in TSS for	TSS reduced	lbs.	
non-NR 216 communities	TSS reduction	%	
	Pre-development stay-on volume	%	
	Stay-on volume	ft³/year	
Peak flow discharge for 2 year/24 hour design storm	Change in cubic feet per second for design year	ft³/sec	
Protective areas	Bank protected	feet	
Fueling & maintenance areas	Oily sheen presence reduced	□Yes □ No	
	Bank erosion reduced	tons	
Streambank & Shoreline Protection	Bank protected	feet	
	Pollutant load reduction (if method available)		
Other:	Units (use feet, acres or number as applicable)		

## Final Report Form 3400-189 (rev. 7/30/09)

- Targeted Runoff Management Grant Program (ch. NR 153)
  Notice of Discharge Program (ch. NR 153)
  Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant Program (ch. NR 155)

C.2. Estimate total acres covered by the planning product:	Existing Developed Urban Areas	New Development	Total Acres			
pranning product.	5790 acres	Redevelopment Only acres	5790 acres			
		2000-000-000-000-000-000-000-000-000-00				
C.3. Products developed (check all below that apply)	ldi	entify Documents by Name (if applicable				
Storm Water Plan	alternatives to comply with the g	to the City's existing water quality m oals set forth in the Rock River TMDL entitled "Water Quality Master Plan -	The results of the analysis			
Construction or Erosion Ordinances						
Post-construction Storm Water Ordinances						
Other Types of Storm Water Quality Ordinances						
Financing Methods: identified and evaluated		ended plan on the City's existing stor d in the document entitled "Water Qu				
Financing Methods: developed or implemented						
☐ I & E Plan						
I & E Implementation Activities						
Other:						
C.4. Identify the Storm Water goals addressed (check all that apply)						
Reduce TSS	Comments:					
Maintain infiltration	- Commonto.					
Control Peak Flow	The master plan included an update to the City's 2006 Storm Water Management Plan. Specifically, the 2006 Source Loading and Management Model (WinSLAMM) was updated following the Department's October 20, 2014 TMDL Guidance for MS4 Permits (guidance #3800-2014-04), allowing the City to understand where they stand with regard to the sediment and phosphorous reduction					
Protective Areas						
Control of Fueling & Maintenance Areas	goals set forth in the Rock River recently constructed storm water	TMDL. The updates also incorporated facilities and included an alternative	d changes to the model, added			
Remove Illicit Discharges	TMDL compliance options.					
☑ Other: Reduce Phosphorous						

- Final Report Form 3400-189 (rev. 7/30/09)

  Targeted Runoff Management Grant Program (ch. NR 153)

  Notice of Discharge Program (ch. NR 153)

  Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant Program (ch. NR 155)

Notice Information Chs. NR 151 or 243 Notice Type Issue Date From (Name) To (Name) To (Name)  Chas Name Ch	4. Satisfaction of N	otice Require	ements. If cost sharing for this lible below.	oroject was offered under a formal r	otice purs	uant to c	hs. NR 151 or 243,
5. Additional Information. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis over the 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Melke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	Notice Information				Notic	e Satisfi	action Information
5. Additional Information. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis over the 2014, and the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Melke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December		Issue Date	From (Name)	To (Name)	Satis	fied?	Date Letter Sent
The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	Notice Type			, o (Mario)	Yes	No	Date Letter Gent
The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December							
The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December							
The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December						П	
The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December							
The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December							
The City has not yet presented the completed master plan to their elected officials. They plan to do this during the first half of 2015, with an initial summary presentation to the City's Public Works Committee.  The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	F A 3.333						
The City also faces some concern regarding the significant costs that will be required to implement the necessary improvements to comply with their TMDL allocations.  6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December			•	tod officials. Thou plan to do this		a Kiloak L	als as poes and
6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	an initial summary pres	entation to the C	ity's Public Works Committee.	ted officials. They plan to do this	auring tr	e iirst n	iair of 2015, with
6. Summary of Project Challenges. (Space will expand to fit your text.)  Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	The City also faces sor	no concorn road	rding the cignificant costs that	will be required to implement the			
Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December			rumy the significant costs that	wiii be required to implement the	necessar	y impro	vements to
Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December							
Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December		•					•
Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December							
Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December							
Although the City is extremely thankful to the Department for helping fund this project, the timing of the project was extremely challenging. When the grant was originally applied for in spring of 2011, the Rock River TMDL report had recently been released in draft form. The final TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	6. Summary of Pro	ject Challeng	es. (Space will expand to fit you	ır text.)			
TMDL report was issued in July of 2011, so the City expected to have plenty of time to complete the analysis over the 2012-2013 grant period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	Although the City is ex	tremely thankfu	to the Department for helping t	und this project, the timing of the	project w	as extr	emely challenging.
period. When the DNR's MS4 guidance document (which was required to complete the analysis) did not get finalized until October of 2014, the City was essentially left with only 2 months to complete the analysis. The City and Ruekert Mielke certainly understand the effort and corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	When the grant was orig	jinally applied fo Lin July of 2011.	r in spring of 2011, the Rock Ri so the City expected to have n	ver TMDL report had recently bee	n release	d in draf	t form. The final
corresponding challenges that went in to developing the guidance, but it left the City scrambling to complete the project by the December	period. When the DNR's	MS4 guidance	document (which was required	to complete the analysis) did not	get finaliz	ed until	October of 2014,
31, 2014 grant deadline.	corresponding challeng	eπ with only 2 i es that went in t	nonths to complete the analysis o developing the guidance, but	s. The City and Ruekert Mielke ce It left the City scrambling to comp	rtainly un plete the p	derstan roject b	d the effort and by the December
	31, 2014 grant deadline.					-	•
				•			

# Final Report Form 3400-189 (rev. 7/30/09) Targeted Runoff Management Grant Program (ch. NR 153) Notice of Discharge Program (ch. NR 153)

- Urban Nonpoint Source & Storm Water Management Grant Program (ch. NR 155)

7. Grantee Certification.				
Checking here 🔀 certifies that, to the best of your knowledge, the inform	mation contained in this report is correct.			
Name of Authorized Representative (type or print) ↓  Richard Schultz  Title of Authorized Representative (type or print) ↓  Street Superintendent				
Signature of Authorized Representative	Date December 29, 2014			
8. For Departmental Use Only.				
Regional NPS Coordinator — Please complete the following:  8.A. Check here / if you have received the following from the project  • one (1) printed, signed, original Final Report + attachm  • one (1) electronic version of Final Report.  Send the printed, signed original Final Report with attachments + electronic version of Final Report.	nents onic version to the Community Financial Assistance Grants Manager.			
8.B. Comments about this project:				
8.C. Type or print Name of Regional NPS Coordinator → M/K ©  8.D. Signature of Regional NPS Coordinator ↑	Gilbertson  8 E. Date  3/3//2015			

0001359-0000002-0092822