

**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.

Applicant Information

Governmental Unit Applying: (name & type) (example: Madison, Town of)

Door County Soil and Water Conservation Department

Name of Authorized Representative (First, Last) William Schuster			Name of Governmental Contact Person (First Last) (if different) Brian Forest		
Title County Conservationist			Title Conservationist II		
Area Code + Telephone Number 920-746-2214			Area Code + Telephone Number 920-746-2214		
Area Code + Fax Number 920-746-2369			Area Code + Fax Number 920-746-2369		
E-Mail Address wschuster@co.door.wi.us			E-Mail Address forest@co.door.wi.us		
Mailing Address - Street or Route 421 Nebraska Street			Mailing Address - Street or Route 421 Nebraska Street		
City Sturgeon Bay	State WI	Zip Code 54235	City Sturgeon Bay	State WI	Zip Code 54235

Consulting Firm Name (if applicable)

Consulting Contact Person Name

Title

Area Code + Telephone Number			DNR Use Only		
Area Code + Fax Number					
E-Mail Address					
Mailing Address - Street or Route					
City	State	Zip Code			

Project Information

A. Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

B. Project Area Location

County

Door

TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page ____ of ____

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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)
Town of Jacksonport	29N	27E	28	SE	NE	44d57m45s	87d12m32s

Method for Determining Latitude & Longitude (check one)

☐ GPS

☒ DNR WebView or Surface Water Data Viewer

☐ Other (specify):

C. Project Summary

The John Lasee farm is a dairy operation in the Town of Jacksonport and is comprised of approximately 100 milk cows and an equal number of replacements and 15 steers. The original system was constructed in 1991 and was designed for 28 cows, 40 heifers and steers and 20 calves. The issues for this operation include an overflowing manure storage and winter spreading of manure in the Logan Creek and Clark Lake Watersheds. Logan Creek is an Outstanding Resource Water that flows to Clark Lake, a 303(d) listed Impaired Water Body. Nutrient application and winter spreading activities also take place upgradient from a local supper club. The existing barnyard drains to an outdated filter strip that is located adjacent to a wetland that feeds the Logan Creek/Clark Lake complex. Proposed BMPs include Manure Storage and Barnyard Runoff Control System. Nutrient Management will also be required to ensure proper field application as Logan Creek and Clark Lake fall under the January 1, 2005 deadline for compliance with the Statewide Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions.

D. Watershed & Waterbody (see Attachment A)

Watershed Name Upper Door County	Watershed Code TK-06	Primary Waterbody Clark Lake
--	--------------------------------	--

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 pollutant-specific goals of a public comment draft (as of April 9, 2007) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).

a. If yes, provide the title of TMDL report this project addresses.

- ☐ ☒ 2. Final reimbursement for eligible, TMDL implementation project costs will be requested no later than September 20, 2009.

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

Project Information (continued)

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 **Attachment B**, to the completed application form.

H. Request for Retroactive Funding for Design Costs

- ☐ ☒ 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

- ☒ ☐ 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.
- ☐ ☒ 2. There are archaeological sites, historical structures, burial sites, or other historic places identified in s. 44.45, Wis. Stats., in the project area.
- ☐ ☒ 3. There are wetlands in the project area that are governed by water quality standard provisions of ch. NR 103.

K. Environmental Contamination

- ☐ ☒ 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:

100%

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

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

Part I. Screening Requirements

Yes

No

A. Map

An 8.5" x 11" topographic map from USGS or the DNR data/map viewers, showing the project area, is attached.

B. Best Management Practices (BMPs) For Which DNR Funding Is Requested (check all that apply)(see **Attachment D** for additional BMP information)

<u>Practice</u>	<u>Wis. Adm. Code</u>	<u>Practice</u>	<u>Wis. Adm. Code</u>
☒ 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 for Developed Areas	NR 154.04(29)
☐ Critical Area Stabilization	NR 154.04(10)	☐ Sinkhole Treatment	NR 154.04(30)
☐ Diversions	NR 154.04(11)	☐ Subsurface Drains	NR 154.04(33)
☐ Field Windbreaks	NR 154.04(12)	☐ Terrace Systems	NR 154.04(34)
☐ Filter Strips	NR 154.04(13)	☐ Underground Outlets	NR 154.04(35)
☐ Grade Stabilization	NR 154.04(14)	☒ Waste Transfer Systems	NR 154.04(36)
☐ Heavy Use Area Protection	NR 154.04(15)	☐ Wastewater Treatment Strips	NR 154.04(37)
☐ Lake Sediment Treatment	NR 154.04(16)	☐ Water and Sediment Control Basins	NR 154.04(38)
☐ Livestock Fencing	NR 154.04(17)	☐ Waterway Systems	NR 154.04(39)
☐ Livestock Watering Facilities	NR 154.04(18)		
☐ Milking Center Waste Control Systems	NR 154.04(19)		
☐ 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)		Streambank and Shoreline Protection: NR 154.04(31) (includes associated fencing)	
☐ Detention Basin		☐ Stream Crossing	
☐ Wetland Basin		☐ Streambank/Shoreline Rip-rapping	
☐ Filtration Practice		☐ Streambank/Shoreline Shaping & Seeding	
☐ Infiltration Practice		☐ Streambank/Shoreline Fencing	
☐ Accelerated or High-efficiency Street Sweeping System		☐ Other Streambank/Shoreline Protection (incl. bio-engineering) - specify below	



Other (specify)

TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page ____ of ____

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

Part I. Screening Requirements (continued)

C. Filters

Note: You must be able to answer "Yes" to questions 1-5 and "Yes" or "N/A" (Not Applicable) to question 6 to be eligible for a grant.

Yes	No							
☒	☐	1. Project will be completed within 24 months of the start of the grant period.						
☒	☐	2. Staff and contractors designated to work on this project have adequate training, knowledge, and experience to implement the proposed project.						
☒	☐	3. Staff or contractual services, in addition to those funded by this grant, will be provided if needed.						
☒	☐	4. Best management practices constructed under this grant will not work at cross-purposes to (are consistent with) agricultural and non-agricultural performance standards under ch. NR 151. (see Attachment E)						
☒	☐	5. The local DNR Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator (see Attachment C) has been contacted about this project:						
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of the Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator Contacted</th> <th>Date Contacted</th> <th>Subject of Contact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>JohnYoung</td> <td>3/7/07</td> <td>Project Scopes for Potential Grants</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of the Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator Contacted	Date Contacted	Subject of Contact	JohnYoung	3/7/07	Project Scopes for Potential Grants
Name of the Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator Contacted	Date Contacted	Subject of Contact						
JohnYoung	3/7/07	Project Scopes for Potential Grants						
Yes	No	N/A						
☐	☐	☒						
		6. If this is an application to construct ponds in navigable streams or in wetlands, the necessary waterway or wetland permit (chs. 30 or 281, Wis. Stats.) has been received. If yes, give the docket number and date of issuance.						
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Docket Number</th> <th>Date of Issuance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> </tbody> </table>	Docket Number	Date of Issuance				
Docket Number	Date of Issuance							

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

D. Eligibility: Reason For Controlling Nonpoint Source Pollution In The Target Area

Yes	No	
☒	☐	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."
☒	☐	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. (<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.)
☒	☐	5. The existence of threats to public health.
☐	☒	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 Application – CY 2008 Funding

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page ____ of ____

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project**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	03/08	SWCD Technical Staff & DATCP Engineer
Obtaining required permits	04/08	SWCD Technical Staff & Landowner
Landowner contacts	01/07 - Ongoing	SWCD Technical Staff
CSA signing	04/08	SWCD Technical Staff & Landowner
Bidding	05/08	SWCD Technical Staff & Contractors
DNR approvals	03/08	SWCD Technical Staff
Contract signing	06/08	Contractor & Landowner
BMP construction	07/08	Contractor
Site inspection and certification	07/08	SWCD Technical Staff & DATCP Engineer
Project evaluation	08/08	SWCD Technical Staff & DATCP Engineer
Purchase street sweeper (urban only)		
Other (specify) Notification of Noncompliance and Offer of Cost-Sharing	03/08	SWCD Technical Staff

B. Adequate Financial Budget

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

FINANCIAL BUDGET TABLE

A	B	C
Project Activity for Which <u>DNR Funding</u> is Requested	Estimated Total Cost (\$)	Amount from Column B Eligible for DNR Cost Sharing (\$)
Construction Components:		
Manure Storage Earthwork	15,600	15,600
Manure Storage Concrete	81,500	81,500
Manure Storage Equipment	16,500	16,500
Barnyard Collection Earthwork	4,500	4,500
Barnyard Collection Concrete	18,200	18,200
Barnyard Collection Equipment	7,300	7,300
Animal Waste Storage Permit Fee	1,136	1,136
1. Construction Subtotal	\$144,736	\$144,736
2. Engineering Services (including design)	\$7,236	\$7,236
3. Storm Sewer Reroute (Urban projects only)	\$0	\$0
4. Structure Removal (Urban projects only)	\$0	\$0
5. Subtotal [add rows 1-4]	\$151,972	\$151,972
6. Property Acquisition: Fee Title & Easement	\$0	\$0
7. Grand Total [add rows 5 & 6]	\$151,972	\$151,972

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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%	66%	\$ 100,302
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)]				\$ 100,302
Cap Test:				
15. Maximum State Share [Lesser of (14) or \$150,000]				\$ 100,302
State & Local Share:				
16. Requested State-Share Amount (Requested Grant Amount)				\$ 100,302
17. Local-Share Amount [(7), column B less (16)]				\$ 51,670

Method(s) Used to Calculate Cost Estimates

The cost estimate procedures used were both the "competitive bids method" and the "average cost method". These methods are based on SWCD experience of past projects, input from colleagues, inquiry to contractors and suppliers in the area and analysis of bids submitted for comparable projects completed in recent years. These methods have proven both practical and accurate for all SWCD projects over many years of construction experience. These methods have been applied to a design of appropriate BMPs agreed upon by the landowner, the SWCD and the area DATCP Engineer. These BMPs have been established to achieve maximum pollutant control as well as compliance with statewide agricultural performance standards and prohibitions.

C. Cost-Effectiveness

1. Tangible Benefits

a. Primary Benefit:

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

The primary benefit of this project will be the protection of surface water and ground water quality through construction of a no-runoff system where all potential impacts from bacteria, nitrates and phosphorus are controlled through storage of all waste and associated runoff and proper application in appropriate areas through an approved nutrient management plan.

b. 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

☒ Economical operation, economical maintenance and enhanced life expectancy of the BMP

☐ Other (specify): _____

TRM Grant Project Name
Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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 proposed BMPs were selected through a cost analysis based on the most cost-effective alternative. They have been selected to take advantage of existing conditions and equipment at the site.

Due to the fragile geology and shallow depth of soils to bedrock, most projects in Door County require an above-ground storage. The proposed manure storage will be sized to store manure for 210 days and eliminate the need to winter spread manure. This sizing reduces the cost of having to store manure for a full year. The new manure storage will also work in conjunction with the existing storage to take advantage of the capacity of the old system. The old system will remain functional for manure from the adjacent building, the barnyard and the young stock.

A lined manure storage will provide a system that will provide total confinement of all waste, runoff and precipitation. A concrete-lined manure storage is the most feasible option as bedrock conditions do not allow for an in ground system and an earth above ground system would be extremely costly. An above ground steel tank would also be less cost effective for an equal amount of pollutant load reduction.

The existing barnyard will be modified to eliminate the failing filter strip and store all runoff in the constructed storage. This alternative is more cost effective than placing a roof over the barnyard or designing another method of diverting clean water. A filter strip or buffer for the barnyard is no longer feasible for this operation as criteria for construction of a filter strip has changed since the installation of the original system and the site conditions would no longer meet their criteria of the standard.

These practices were chosen to provide optimal pollutant control through total containment of the waste generated at the project site.

Yes



No



3. Alternatives

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	B	C	D
	Alternative	Cost	Effectiveness	(B ÷ C) Cost-Effectiveness
		Estimated Amount	Estimated % of Pollutant Load Reduction	
1	Concrete-Lined Pit	\$ 113,600	100 %	113,600
2	Steel-Lined Storage	\$ 200,000	100 %	200,000
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.

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.

TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page ____ of ____

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)

TRM Grant Project Name
Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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 Construction/Alterations	Number of facilities	count
		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) Elimination of Winter Spreading	Acres Planned	count
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 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.

TRM Grant Project Name
Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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.

Question 3. Evidence of Local Support

The level of local support that currently exists for the proposed project.

Agricultural Projects:

- Yes No **A. Government**
1. **Regulatory Situations** *If yes to both 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.
- ☒ ☐ 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
 3. copy of letter signed by DNR stating that DNR will issue an NOI or NOD under NR 243 if cost sharing is provided, or
 4. 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
 5. copy of letter signed by the county that the local regulation will be enforced at the project site.
2. **Non-Regulatory Situations**
- a. The governmental unit has developed:
- ☐ ☐ i. a detailed pollution control plan with the landowners that identifies specific best management 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 installations.
-
- If yes, provide details.

- Yes No **B. Landowners & Partners**
1. **Level of Landowner Participation**
- ☐ ☐ 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.
- ☐ ☐ b. A majority of the affected landowners/land operators have indicated a general interest to participate in the project.
- ☐ ☐ 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.
-

TRM Grant Project Name
Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)

Urban Projects:

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| Yes | No | A. 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 <u>proposed</u> budget. |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2. The governmental unit has already conducted public information activities within the project area for this practice. |
| <p>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.</p> | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| 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. |
| ☐ | ☐ | 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. |

Question 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 pollution, and will reduce the type of 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).
- ☒ **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 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.
- ☐ **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 data exists to request a ranking of high or medium for a waterbody that that is being affected by nonpoint sources 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 Great Lakes). 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. Governmental Notices**
 The applicant has checked "Yes" to both parts of Part II, Question 3, A.1.
- ☐ **H. Not Included in Other Categories Above**

TRM Grant Project Name
Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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

- ☐ **A. 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.
- ☐ **B. Not Fully Meeting Uses**
 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."
- ☐ **E. Surface Water Quality**
 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*

- ☐ **F. Exceeds Groundwater Enforcement Standard**
 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**.
- ☐ **H. 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

- ☒ ☐ 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:
- ☒ a. One wellhead
 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 |
| ☐ Root River | ☐ Kewaunee & Ahnapee Rivers |
| ☐ Oak Creek | ☐ Menominee River |
| ☐ Milwaukee River | ☐ Fish Creek |
| ☐ Sauk Creek | ☐ St. Louis & Nemadji Rivers |
| ☐ Sheboygan & Onion Rivers | ☐ Lake Winnebago |
| ☐ Manitowoc River | |

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

Part III. Competitive Elements (continued)**Question 6. Extent of Pollutant Control**

Yes	No	A. NR 151 Agricultural Performance Standards & Prohibitions
☒	☐	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))
		☒ 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	B. 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.
		The elimination of winter spreading of manure in environmentally sensitive areas is a priority for the SWCD and construction of the BMPs suggested for this project will provide adequate storage capacity for all wastes generated and eliminate the need for application of waste during frozen periods.

Yes	No	C. Planning Data & Source Targeting		
☒	☐	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		
		High Priority Waters meeting the January 1, 2005 requirement for Nutrient Management		
		b. Name of document(s)		
		Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan		
		c. Date(s) published		
		January 24, 2006		
		d. Pertinent page numbers		
		45-46, 49-51		
		e. A copy of non-state document(s) is available:		
		☒ At this website: <u>http://map.co.door.wi.us/swcd</u>		
		☐ Attached to this application form.		
		☐ Contact this person: <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Name: _____</td> <td>Phone: _____</td> </tr> </table>	Name: _____	Phone: _____
Name: _____	Phone: _____			

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

Part III. Competitive Elements (continued)**Question 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.

Recommendations made for this project are consistent with the Agricultural Performance Standards and Animal Waste Storage Ordinance. This ordinance was adopted by the Door County Board and codified as Door County Code Chapter 23 in August of 2004 and is a comprehensive ordinance that outlines local implementation of Statewide Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions.

The Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan, approved in January of 2006, outlines strategies for implementation of the Statewide Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions via Door County Code Chapter 23. This plan also assesses areas of concern for the county; Logan Creek and the Upper Door Watershed are assessed and the impacts of nonpoint pollution on groundwater quality and surface water habitat are listed as areas of concern.

The protection of surface water and groundwater resources from improper management of agriculture facilities has been consistently listed as a high priority in documents such as "A Nonpoint Source Control Plan for the Upper Door Priority Watershed Project, "Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan", "Nonpoint Source Control Plan for the Red River/Sturgeon Bay Watershed Project", "A Guide to Significant Wildlife Habitat and Natural Areas of Door County, Wisconsin", "The State of the Lakeshore Basin" and "Twin-Door-Kewaunee Basin Areawide Water Quality Management Plan".

An extensive study has been done on the Clark Lake Watershed to identify and inventory existing conditions and characteristics of the lake and the associated watershed. Several documents have been produced in November of 2006 by the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. These documents include "Clark Lake Watershed, Door County Wisconsin: Sensitive Area Report", "2006 Summary and Comparisons of Clark Lake-Door County: Aquatic Macrophyte Community Surveys" and "Delineation of Area Contributing to Clark Lake's Water-Door County, WI". A final report will be generated in 2008; identification of potential threats as well as a plan to address these threats will be an integral part of this report.

Question 8. Use of Additional Funding

Yes No

- ☒ ☐ A. The state share is below the \$150,000 cap.
- ☒ ☐ B. Funding requested is below the maximum allowable cost-share rate.

Question 9. City of Racine

Yes No

- ☐ ☒ 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
Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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 either 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.	Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan	49
☒	☐	2. Conduct compliance status surveys, including on-site visits, for croplands and livestock facilities and convey compliance status to landowners/operators.	Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan	50
☒	☐	3. Discuss with landowners/operators the best management practices needed to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.	Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan	50
☒	☐	4. Seek financial assistance for landowners/operators to achieve compliance with performance standards & prohibitions.	Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan	50
☒	☐	5. Develop cost-share agreements with landowners/operators and provide them with technical assistance to achieve compliance with performance standards & prohibitions.	Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan	50
☒	☐	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.	Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan	50
☒	☐	7. Provide assistance to the Department of Natural Resources to issue notices under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095.	Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan	50
☒	☐	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.	Door County Land and Water Resource Management Plan	50

If an item checked above is not covered by a LWRMP, an updated LWRMP work plan or an Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) with DNR, list the activity and identify who will carry it out.

TRM Grant Application – CY 2008 Funding

Form 8700-300 (R 1/07)

Page ____ of ____

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

Part IV. Eligibility for Multipliers (continued)

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

TRM Grant Project Name

Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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:

Chapter 23 - Agricultural Performance Standards and Animal Waste Storage Ordinance

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

- ☒ Found at this website (provide <http://map.co.door.wi.us/swcd>
most direct web page URL):
- ☐ Attached to this application form.
- ☐ Already submitted with another application.

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

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.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Yes | No | A. 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 | B. 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
Clark Lake / John Lasee Project

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)

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 Door County Soil and Water Conservation Department is committed to implementation of the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions as outlined in NR 151 and Chapter 23 Door County Code. Please see the attached letters illustrating this support and please consider them as evidence of local support as required in Part II, Question 3 of this application.

Extensive monitoring has been done to identify and inventory physical habitat, fisheries, biological and chemical conditions of the Clark Lake Watershed. The Clark Lake Advancement Association has organized this effort in conjunction with the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. Bill Schuster, County Conservationist and Department Head of the SWCD, is on several committees involved in the monitoring and reporting of conditions of the lake and the associated watershed. Part II, Question 2 of this application requires evidence of the monitoring strategy. Please see the attached plan and consider this evidence as required in that section.

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
--	-------------

William Schuster County Conservationist

Telephone Number **920-746-2214**

E-Mail Address **wschuster@co.door.wi.us**

Mailing Address **421 Nebraska Street Sturgeon Bay WI 54235**

[name and title]

Fax Number **920-746-2369**

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



0 1800 3600 Feet

■ Watershed Boundary (Hydro Unit)
■ Project Drainage
✱ Project Location





- Watershed Boundary (Hydro Unit)
- Project Drainage
- Project Location







Existing Filter Strip
Adjacent to Wetland



Existing Manure Storage at
Half-Capacity in December



**DOOR COUNTY
Soil & Water
Conservation Department**

421 Nebraska Street
Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin 54235
(920) 746-2214
FAX (920) 746-2369
E-mail SWCD@co.door.wi.us

April 4, 2007

Mr. Gordon Stevenson
Runoff Management Section
Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

Mr. Stevenson:

The purpose of this letter is to assure the Department of Natural Resources that the Door County SWCD is committed to the implementation of the State Standards and Prohibitions under subch. II of NR 151 and Door County's CHAPTER 23 AGRICULTURAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND ANIMAL WASTE STORAGE ORDINANCE.

The Door County SWCD is pursuing grant monies through the Targeted Runoff Management Grant program specifically to enforce statewide agricultural performance standard and prohibition violations on six existing farms within the Joint DATCP and DNR Grant Application for Calendar year 2008. The applications being submitted for Ron Clark, Patrick Olson, Ken Baudhuin, Tim Tanck, John Lasee and Norbert Haberli have numerous animal waste prohibition violations that we intend to resolve by making an official offer of cost sharing through Chapter 23 and NR 151. Upon receipt of approved grants, the SWCD will officially inventory and notify each landowner of standard and prohibition violations and make an offer of cost sharing for required BMP's with a compliance schedule conducive to the grant period.

All six of the aforementioned farm sites exist in areas of the County that are not covered or eligible through a priority watershed project, therefore the SWCD is depending on TRM program cost sharing to meet objectives stated in its LWRM plan approved by the DATCP on January 24, 2006.

Sincerely,

William E. Schuster
County Conservationist



**DOOR COUNTY
Soil & Water
Conservation Department**

421 Nebraska Street
Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin 54235
(920) 746-2214
FAX (920) 746-2369
E-mail SWCD@co.door.wi.us

April 4, 2007

Ms. Mary Rose Teves
Grants Section Chief
Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

Ms. Teves:

The purpose of this letter is to assure the Department of Natural Resources that the Door County SWCD is committed to the implementation of the State Standards and Prohibitions under subch. II of NR 151 and Door County's CHAPTER 23 AGRICULTURAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND ANIMAL WASTE STORAGE ORDINANCE.

The Door County SWCD is pursuing grant monies through the Targeted Runoff Management Grant program specifically to enforce statewide agricultural performance standard and prohibition violations on six existing farms within the Joint DATCP and DNR Grant Application for Calendar year 2008. The applications being submitted for Ron Clark, Patrick Olson, Ken Baudhuin, Tim Tanck, John Lasee and Norbert Haberli have numerous animal waste prohibition violations that we intend to resolve by making an official offer of cost sharing through Chapter 23 and NR 151. Upon receipt of approved grants, the SWCD will officially inventory and notify each landowner of standard and prohibition violations and make an offer of cost sharing for required BMP's with a compliance schedule conducive to the grant period.

All six of the aforementioned farm sites exist in areas of the County that are not covered or eligible through a priority watershed project, therefore the SWCD is depending on TRM program cost sharing to meet objectives stated in its LWRM plan approved by the DATCP on January 24, 2006.

Sincerely,

William E. Schuster
County Conservationist

Clark Lake Watershed Monitoring Strategy

Extensive monitoring has been done to identify and inventory physical habitat, fisheries, biological and chemical conditions of the Clark Lake Watershed. The Clark Lake Advancement Association has organized this effort in conjunction with the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point and The Ridges Sanctuary.

Several documents were produced in November of 2006 by the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. These documents include "Clark Lake Watershed, Door County Wisconsin: Sensitive Area Report", "2006 Summary and Comparisons of Clark Lake-Door County: Aquatic Macrophyte Community Surveys" and "Delineation of Area Contributing to Clark Lake's Water-Door County, WI".

The information in this summary was taken from the document titled "Water Quality and Biotic Evaluation and Strategic Planning in the Clark Lake Watershed, Door County, Wisconsin". This document and all other material relating to this watershed study can be found at the following website:

<http://www.clarklakewi.com/default.aspx>

The following characteristics were inventoried during the two-year evaluation for this study:

- Fish Spawning Habitat
- Map Critical Fish Cover/Vegetation
- Aquatic Macrophyte Survey
- Macro Invertebrate Sampling
- Hines Emerald Dragonfly Habitat
- Creek Flow Measurements and Water Quality
- Lake Water Quality
- Turbidity Assessment
- Aquatic Plant Survey
- Sensitive Area Survey

In discussion with the President of the Clark Lake Association, plans were outlined for upcoming monitoring:

- Continuous Flow Monitoring
- Aquatic Macrophyte Survey
- Turbidity
- Phosphorus
- Chlorophyll A
- Dissolved Oxygen
- Nitrate Levels from Groundwater
- Land Use
- Invasive Species

Baseline monitoring will occur on a biweekly schedule for turbidity and a monthly schedule for other chemical parameters.