State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, WT/3 101 South Webster Street PO Box 7921, Madison WI 53707-7921

# Targeted Runoff Management Program (TRM) Grant Application – CY 2009 Funding

Page 1 of \_

**Notice:** This application form template 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) Brown, County of Name of Authorized Representative (First Last) Name of Governmental Contact Person (First Last) (if different) William Hafs Jon Bechle Title Title **Program Manager County Conservationist** Area Code + Telephone Number Area Code + Telephone Number (920)391-4620 (920)391-4620 Area Code + Fax Number Area Code + Fax Number (920)391-4617 (920)391-4617 E-Mail Address E-Mail Address hafs\_bc@co.brown.wi.us bechle\_je@co.brown.wi.us Mailing Address - Street or Route Mailing Address - Street or Route 1150 Bellevue St. 1150 Bellevue St. City City State Zip Code State Zip Code **Green Bay** WI 54302 **Green Bay** WI 54302 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 San-Ric Holsteins

This application form template was drafted by the Department of Natural Resources.

_	
Page	of

TRM Grant Project Name San-Ric Holsteins								
Project Information (continued)								
D. Droinet Area Lagation								
B. Project Area Location County								
Brown County								
Minor Civil Division Name (city, village, town, etc. – ex. Wrightstown, Village of)	Township (N)	Range	E or W	Section	Quarter	Quarter- Quarter	Latitude ( <b>Nort</b> degrees, minute seconds)	, , ,
Wrightstown, Town of	21	20	E	3	SE1/4	SE1/4	44 18' 52.7"	88 3' 8.3"
Method for Determining Lat	titude & Lon	gitude (ch	neck one	s)				
☐ GPS ☑ DNR WebView or Surfa ☐ Other (specify):				,				
C. Project Summary								
The proposed project site has several environmental concerns associated with the current livestock operation and will target agricultural runoff in order to protect groundwater and surface water. An in-place earthern manure storage facility is situated in an area of shallow and exposed bedrock, saturation areas, and is composed of materials unsuitable for earthen manure storage. Test holes recently done around the storage facility support this as well and demonstrates the need to update this facility to current NRCS standards. The current storage facility's design and liner composition has the potential to influence groundwater contamination. The project site is in the East River watershed, which is listed on the 303d impaired waters list for phosphorus, sedimentation, and metals. An unnamed tributary to the East River flows through the farm operation before exiting into the East River. A TMDL project for the Lower Fox River Basin has also been proposed.								
The existing barnyard sediment basin has direct runoff to waters fo the state and is not meeting the manure management prohibitions. The barnyard system will be redesigned to collect all polluted runoff, which then will be transferred to the proposed storage facility. The projects main focus will be udating the current manure storage system to current standards and eliminating all direct polluted runoff from entering waters fo the state. Implementation of the proposed BMPs will go a long way in protection groundwater and reducing agricultural runoff.								
D. Watershed & Waterbody (see Attachment A. Example: Watershed Name: Oconomowoc River; Watershed Code: UR09; Primary Waterbody Name: Oconomowoc River; Nearest Waterbody: Flynn Creek.)								
Watershed Name Watershed Code Primary Waterbody Name Nearest Waterbody Name								
East River Watershed	East River Watershed LF01 East River unnamed tributary							
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.

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

	Project Information (continued)						
		F. Request for Funding for "Total Maximum Daily Load" Implementation					
		<ol> <li>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, 2008) or an EPA-approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).</li> </ol>					
		a. If "Yes", provide the title of TMDL report this project addresses.					
		Integrated Watershed Approach Demonstration Project: A Pollutant Reduction Optimization Analysis for the Lower Fox iver Basin and the Green Bay Area of Concern					
$\boxtimes$		<ol><li>Final reimbursement for eligible, TMDL implementation project costs will be requested no later than September 20, 2010.</li></ol>					
		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."					
	$\boxtimes$	<ol> <li>There are endangered or threatened resources, as identified in s. 29.604, Wis. Stats., and ch. NR 27 in the project area.</li> </ol>					
	$\boxtimes$	2. There are archaeological sites, historical structures, burial sites, or other historic places identified in s. 44.45, Wis. Stats., in the project area.					
	$\boxtimes$	3. There are wetlands in the project area that are governed by water quality standard provisions of ch. NR 103.					
		K. Environmental Contamination					
		The applicant is aware of environmental contamination [other than nonpoint source pollution, e. g., volatile organic compounds (VOCs), or polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)] 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					
		Project will serve existing development only. If no, provide attachments and the following:					
		100% Percentage of total design volume that will be generated by <u>existing</u> development. (change default % if necessary)					
		M. <u>Urban Projects Only</u> : Alternative Funding Possibility					
		This applicant requests that the DNR also submit a copy of this application to the Clean Water Fund loan program.					

Form 8700-300 (R 1/08)

Page	of
· ugo	

TRM Grant Project Name San-Ric Holsteins

### Part I. Screening Requirements Yes No A. Map $\boxtimes$ An 8.5" x 11" topographic map from USGS or the DNR data/map viewers, showing the project area, is П attached. If you intend to claim Bonus Points in Part III. Question 5 (Water Quality Needs), include a map of the wellhead area(s), or surface water body. B. Best Management Practices (BMPs) For Which DNR Funding Is Requested (check all that apply) (see Attachment D. for additional BMP information) Practice Wis. Adm. Code Wis. Adm. Code Practice Manure Storage Systems NR 154.04(3) Riparian Buffers NR 154.04(25) $\boxtimes$ Manure Storage System П Roofs NR 154.04(26) NR 154.04(4) Closure $\boxtimes$ Barnyard Runoff Control NR 154.04(5) Roof Runoff Systems NR 154.04(27) Systems Access Roads & Cattle NR 154.04(6) **Sediment Basins** NR 154.04(28) Crossings Animal Trails and Walkways NR 154.04(7) **Shoreline Habitat Restoration** NR 154.04(29) for Developed Areas Critical Area Stabilization NR 154.04(10) **Diversions** П NR 154.04(11) Sinkhole Treatment NR 154.04(30) П Subsurface Drains NR 154.04(33) Field Windbreaks NR 154.04(12) П П Filter Strips NR 154.04(13) П **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) $\boxtimes$ Waste Transfer Systems NR 154.04(36) П Lake Sediment Treatment Wastewater Treatment Strips NR 154.04(37) NR 154.04(16) Livestock Fencing NR 154.04(17) Water and Sediment Control NR 154.04(38) **Basins** Livestock Watering Facilities NR 154.04(18) $\boxtimes$ Milking Center Waste Control NR 154.04(19) Waterway Systems NR 154.04(39) Systems П Prescribed Grazing NR 154.04(22) Well Decommissioning NR 154.04(40) Wetland Development or П Relocating or Abandoning NR 154.04(23) NR 154.04(41) **Animal Feeding Operations** Restoration Streambank and Shoreline Protection: NR 154.04(31) Urban BMPs: NR 154.04(42) (includes associated fencing) **Detention Basin** Stream Crossing П Wetland Basin П Streambank/Shoreline Rip-rapping Filtration Practice Streambank/Shoreline Shaping & Seeding П Infiltration Practice П Streambank/Shoreline Fencing Other Streambank/Shoreline Protection Accelerated or High-efficiency П Street Sweeping System (incl. bio-engineering) - specify below Other (specify)

Page of _	
-----------	--

TRM Grant Project Name San-Ric Holsteins

### Part I. Screening Requirements (continued)

.,	<b>C</b> .		You n	nust be able to answer "Yes" to questions 1 ble for a grant.	through	5 and	d "Yes" or "N/A" (Not Applicable) to Question
Yes	No □	4	Dro:	act will be completed within 24 months of th	a atart a	f tha	grant pariod
$\boxtimes$		1. 2.	-	ect will be completed within 24 months of th f and contractors designated to work on this			-
	Ш	۷.		erience to implement the proposed project.	, project	nave	adequate training, knowledge, and
$\boxtimes$		3.	Staf	f or contractual services, in addition to those	e funded	by th	nis grant, will be provided if needed.
		4.	cons	t management practices constructed under sistent with) agricultural and non-agricultural chment E.)			
		5.		local DNR Regional Nonpoint Source Coor project:	dinator (	see A	Attachment C.) has been contacted about
			1	Name of the Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator Contacted	Date Contac		Subject of Contact
			Cra	ig Webster	4/3/0		San-Ric Holsteins TRM grant proposal
				3			3
Yes	No	N/A ⊠	6.	<ol> <li>If this is an application to construct ponds that connect with navigable waterways or in wetland under ch. NR 343, the necessary waterway or wetland permit (chs. 30 or 281, Wis. Stats.) has issued. If "Yes", give the permit number and date of decision.</li> </ol>			
				Date of Decision		Per	mit Number
				Please be aware that receipt of a <b>docket</b> the docket number merely acknowledges been assigned a place in the "review quet	that you		<b>not</b> imply permit issuance. The receipt of mit application has been received and has
		$\nabla$	7.	If this is a proposed urban project which remust either:  a) currently have control of this property;	•	hat th	ne applicant have control of the property, you
					tion that		will obtain control of this property prior to the
lf vou	anew	arad "	'No" 1	o one or more of the items in questi			ston here. The project is inclinible
ı you				•			
Yes	No	igibilit	y: Rea	ason For Controlling Nonpoint Source Po	Dilution	ın ın	e Target Area
$\boxtimes$		1.	The	need for compliance with performance stand	dards es	tablis	hed by the DNR in ch. NR 151.
$\boxtimes$		2.		The existence of nonpoint-source-impaired water bodies that the DNR has identified to the U.S. EPA under 33 USC 1313 (d)(1)(A), commonly referred to as the "303(d) List."			
		3.		existence of outstanding or exceptional resc NR 102.11.	ource wa	ters,	as designated by the DNR in ss. NR 102.10
		4.		r water quality concerns of statewide or nati f you are eligible to score ten (10) points in			
$\boxtimes$		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				

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 Project Name San-Ric Holsteins

### **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	11/2009	Chris Flicek
Obtaining required permits	12/2009	
Landowner contacts	9/2009	
CSA signing	1/2010	
Bidding	1/2010	
DNR approvals	2/2010	
Contract signing	2/2010	
BMP construction	6-7/2010	County staff and contractor
Site inspection and certification	9/2010	
Project evaluation	10/2010	
Purchase street sweeper (urban only)		
Other (specify)		

### **B.** Adequate Financial Budget

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

### FINANCIAL BUDGET TABLE

A.	В.	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 Facility	170,000	170,000
Barnyard Runoff Control System	10,000	10,000
Waste Transfer System	20,000	20,000
Milking Center Waste Control Systems	5,000	5,000
Manure Storage System Closure	10,000	10,000
Construction Subtotal	\$215,000	\$215,000
2. Engineering Services (including design)	\$5,000	\$5,000
3. Storm Sewer Reroute (Urban projects only)	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
4. Structure Removal (Urban projects only)	\$0	\$0
5. Subtotal [add rows (1) through (4)]	\$220,000	\$220,000
6. Property Acquisition: Fee Title & Easement	\$0	\$0
7. Grand Total [add rows (5) and (6)]	\$220,000	\$220,000

Form 8700-300 (R 1/08)

Page _	of	
--------	----	--

TRM Grant Project Name
San-Ric Holsteins

### 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 p	ercent, specify)	100%	70%	\$	154,000
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:		-		,	
11. Property Acquisition: Fee Title and Easement	\$	100%	50%	\$	0
12. Storm Sewer Rerouting		100%	50%	\$	0
13. Structure Removal		100%	50%	\$	0
14. Total Eligible Costs: [sum rows (8) through (13)]				\$	154,000
Cap Test:					
15. Maximum State Share: [(row 14) or \$150,000, wh	nichever is less]			\$	150,000
State & Local Share:					
<ol><li>Requested State-Share Amount (Requested Grar</li></ol>	nt Amount)			\$	150,000
17. Local-Share Amount: [(row 7), Column B. less (ro	ow 16)]			\$	70,000

Method(s) Used to Calculate Cost Estimates

Based on the most recent projects and their bill of materials.

### C. Cost-Effectiveness

- 1. Tangible Benefits
  - a. Primary Benefit:

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

Phosphorus, sediment

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

Form 8700-300 (R 1/08)

TRM Grant Project Name **San-Ric Holsteins** 

### 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 existing storage facility was constructed prior to Brown County's animal waste storage ordinance (1986) and is located on bedrock and doesn't meet existing minimum design standards.

### Yes No 3. Alternatives

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 for each alternative considered.

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

<sup>2)</sup> 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.

It currently does not meet design standards, it is located on bedrock which has been identified as having karst features which may increase the likelyhood of groundwater contamination. The existing facility is within 50 feet of a stream.

Form 8700-300 (R 1/08)

Page	of	

TRM Grant Project Name
San-Ric Holsteins

### 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 and 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
₪	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	Pollutant load reduction	BARNY Model
	Manure	Number of facilities	count
		Number of animal units	count
	Prohibition: Unlimited Livestock Access	Feet of bank protected	count
		Number of farms	count
	Other Priority for Agricultural Area		
	Buffers	Feet of bank protected	CREP formula
_		Number of farms	count
	Streambank	Tons of bank erosion reduced	NRCS bank erosion formula
		Feet of bank protected	count
	Other (specify)		
	Priority for Developed Urban Area		
	20-40% Reduction in Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	Pounds TSS reduced	SLAMM, P-8
		% TSS reduction	
	Infiltration	% Pre-development stay-on volume	Recarga, SLAMM, P-8
		Cubic feet stay-on volume	
	Peak flow discharge	Change in cubic feet per second	TR-55 or equivalent
	Protective areas	Feet of bank protected	count
	Fueling and maintenance areas	Oily sheen presence	visual assessment
	Streambank	Tons of bank erosion reduced	NRCS bank erosion formula
		Feet of bank protected	count
_	Other (specify)		
es	No B. Monitoring (not eligible for cost sha	ring at this time)	
		provide pre- and post-project informat	ion from water resource
	•	Il habitat, fisheries, biological, or cher	nical conditions.

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

_		
age	of	
auc	OI .	

			Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)
Yes	No	C.	Additional Monitoring
$\boxtimes$			The applicant is willing to participate with the Department to do monitoring in the project area should
			funding become available.
Ques	tion 3.		ence of Local Support
	i		evel of <u>local support</u> that <u>currently</u> exists for the proposed project.
V			cultural Projects:
Yes	No	<b>A</b> .	Government  Regulatory Situations If you appropriate "Yes" to both items (A.1.s. and A.1.b) below, so to Ougstion 4.
_	_	1.	Regulatory Situations If you answered. "Yes" to both items (A.1.a and A.1.b) below, go to Question 4. Otherwise, continue to part A.2. of this question.
Ц		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:
			<ol> <li>copy of the NOI issued under NR 243, or</li> </ol>
			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
	_	a.	The governmental unit has developed:
			<ul> <li>a detailed pollution control plan with the landowners that identifies specific best management practices (BMPs);</li> </ul>
$\boxtimes$			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.
			The landowner has been contacted and will be signing the letter of intent to do the project if
			funding is available.
Yes	No	В.	Landowners & Partners
163	110	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.
$\boxtimes$		b.	A majority of the affected landowners/land operators have indicated a general interest to participate in the
$\boxtimes$		C.	project.  Letters of support for the project from affected landowners/land operators are attached.
<u></u>		2.	Involvement of Partners
$\boxtimes$		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).
			USDA-NRCS
$\boxtimes$		h	Letters of support from the project partner(s) are attached.
	Ш	b.	Letters of support from the project partner(s) are attached.

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

			Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)		
		Urba	n Projects:		
Yes	No	A.	Government		
163	INO	7. 1.	The local-share funds for the construction/installation expenses:		
		a.	are already included specifically in an <u>adopted</u> budget;		
H		b.	will be included in a proposed budget.		
		2.	The governmental unit has already conducted public information activities within the project area for this		
Ш	Ш	۷.	practice.		
			If "Yes," provide details on the opportunity for public reaction the governmental unit provided and indicate the general public support or non-support for the project that was indicated.		
			the general public support of non-support for the project that was indicated.		
V	NI-		l and annual		
Yes	No	<b>B.</b> 1.	Landowners The governmental unit:		
	П	т. a.	The governmental unit: already owns, or holds an easement for, the land on which the project is to be installed;		
H	H	a. b.	is submitting with the application a list of landowners, occupants, or tenants that occupy the property and		
Ы	ш	ъ.	information indicating each party's willingness to sell or ease the necessary parcel.		
		2.	Evidence of citizen (non-governmental) support for the project (such as letters from the neighborhood		
			association, a civic group or an environmental organization voicing support) is attached.		
Ques	tion 4.	Basiı	n Priorities (check one, A through H)		
$\boxtimes$	A.	Clear	n Water Act s. 303(d) List of Impaired Waters		
		A S	Project with water quality goals directly dealing with a waterbody (lake or stream) on the latest Clean Water Act (CWA) s. 303(d) List of impaired waters, where the cause of the water quality impairment is nonpoint source pollution, <u>and this project</u> will reduce the type of nonpoint source pollutants for which the water is isted. (See <b>Attachment A.</b> )		
	В.	Outs	tanding and Exceptional Resource Waters		
		Waterbody is included in s. NR 102.10 (Outstanding Resource Waters) and/or s. NR 102.11 (Exceptional Resource Waters).			
П	C.		Rankings		
	<b>o</b> .	Project is located in a large-scale watershed, a small-scale watershed, lake watershed, or other area ranked high or medium on the NPS Rankings List, where the goals of the project are directly associated with the reason for the ranking on the NPS Rankings List.			
	D.		ndment of the NPS Rankings List Using State of the Basin Reports		
		F	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.	Ame	ndment of the NPS Rankings List Using Other Data Sources		
		$\epsilon$	Project is located within a watershed ranked low or not ranked on the NPS Rankings List, but adequate data exists to request a ranking of high or medium for a waterbody that that is being affected by nonpoint sources of pollution.		
	F.	Sour	ces of Information for Areas Not Included in State of the Basin Reports		
		L	For some border waters, there is no State of the Basin report (i.e., along the Mississippi River or the 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.		ernmental Notices		
_			The applicant has checked "Yes" to both parts of Part II, Question 3, A.1.		
$\Box$	H.	Not I	ncluded in Other Categories Above		

Page	of
aye	OI .

TRM Grant Project Name	
San-Ric Holsteins	

### **Part III. Competitive Elements**

### Question 5. Water Quality Needs (check one, A through G)

The water quality category which best identifies the water quality goals for the project directly deals with:

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.

Curfaca	Water	Cancida	rations

	Surfa	ace Water Considerations		
	A.	Clean Water Act s. 303(d) List of Impaired Waters  A waterbody (lake or stream) on the latest Clean Water Act (CWA) s. 303(d) List of impaired waters, whe the cause of the water quality impairment is nonpoint source pollution, <u>and this project</u> will reduce the typ of nonpoint source pollutants for which the water is listed. (See Attachment A.)		
	В.	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.	Outstanding or Exceptional Resource Waters  Prevention of degradation due to nonpoint sources of outstanding or exceptional resource waters or high quality, recreationally significant waters.		
	D.	Surface Water Quality  Prevention of surface water quality degradation due to nonpoint sources. Waters in this category are not high quality, recreationally significant waters.		
	Grou	Indwater Considerations*		
	E.	Exceeds Groundwater Enforcement Standard  Groundwater within the project area where representative information indicates there are levels for NPS contaminants that exceed groundwater enforcement standards.		
	F.	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.)		
	G.	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.		
3onu	ıs Poin	nts:		
es	No			
$\boxtimes$		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:		
$\boxtimes$	a.	One wellhead protection area;*		
		OR		
	b.	More than one wellhead protection area.*		
	2.	If "Yes," and the source of drinking water affected by the project area is <u>surface water</u> , check the source water assessment area (drainage area) in which the project is located:		
		Pike River & Creek		
		Root River		
		Oak Creek		
		Milwaukee River		
		Sauk Creek St. Louis & Nemadji Rivers		
		Sheboygan & Onion Rivers   Lake Winnebago		
	1 1	Bronstown of Liver		

\*Contact the Regional DNR Drinking Water and Groundwater Specialist or the county extension office.

Page o	f
--------	---

TRM Grant Project Name San-Ric Holsteins

## Part III. Competitive Elements (continued)

Ques	tion 6.	Exte	ent 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/are the focus of this project. (check all that apply)
			a. Sheet, rill, and wind erosion. (NR 151.02)
		$\boxtimes$	b. Manure storage facilities: new/significant alterations. (NR 151.05(2))
		$\boxtimes$	c. Manure storage facilities: closure. (NR 151.05(3))
		$\boxtimes$	d. Manure storage facilities: existing failing/leaking. (NR 151.05(4))
			e. Clean water diversions. (NR 151.06)
		$\boxtimes$	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 fteet of a stream, 1000 feet. 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
	$\boxtimes$		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.
Vaa	No		Diamaina Data 9 Sauraa Taraatina
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.
			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:

Page	of
Page	01

	Part III. Competitive Elements (continued)			
Quest	ion 7.	Consistency with Resource Management Plans		
Yes	No			
$\boxtimes$		The project implements a water quality recommendation from a locally approved resource management plan.		
		Summarize the water quality recommendation. Cite the name and date(s) of publication of the document.		
		To install conservation practices to correct manure management prohibitions.		
	_	2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan and is also included in the draft 2009-13 Land and Water Resource Management Plan.		
Quest	ion 8.	Use of Additional Funding		
Yes	No			
		A. The state share is less than the \$150,000 cap.		
		B. Funding requested is below the maximum allowable cost-share rate (amount is less than Part II. Question 1. row 15).		
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.		

Form 8700-300 (R 1/08)

TRM Grant Project Name San-Ric Holsteins

### 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 (IGA) 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	1.	Inform and educate landowners/operators about performance standards and prohibitions.	Document  2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan	Page Number 23-24
		2.	Conduct compliance status surveys, including on-site visits, for croplands and livestock facilities and convey compliance status to landowners/operators.	2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan	22
		3.	Discuss with landowners/operators the best management practices needed to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.	2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan	22
$\boxtimes$		4.	Seek financial assistance for landowners/operators to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.	2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan	24
		5.	Develop cost-share agreements with landowners/operators and provide them with technical assistance to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.	2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan	21
$\boxtimes$		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	2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan	21, 24
			notice issued under NR 151.09 or NR 151.095.		
		7.	Provide assistance to the Department of Natural Resources to issue notices under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095.	2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan	24
$\boxtimes$		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	2004-08 Land and Water Resource Management Plan	24
		If an	compliance with a performance standard or prohibition, refer	Resource Management Plan	

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

Form 8700-300 (R 1/08)

TRM Grant Project Name	
San-Ric Holsteins	

### Part IV. Eligibility for Multipliers (continued)

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

If there are local ordinances in place which authorize the governmental unit to <u>require</u> the landowner to correct the nonpoint pollution sources for which cost sharing is being offered, then the applicant may earn an enforcement multiplier.

Complete the following table by identifying each of the performance standards and prohibitions that the grant will address, the estimated portion of the grant that will be used to address each standard and prohibition, and the local regulation that applies to the specific situation being addressed at the site. The Department will calculate the enforcement multiplier based on the extent to which local regulations provide authority for the governmental unit to regulate the specific performance standards and prohibitions for which the cost share is being provided at the specific site being funded.

Check the appropriate performance standard/prohibition per line. The standard(s)/prohibition(s) selected below should be the same one/s cited in the answer(s) to Question 6.A. [e.g., 6.A.a. "Sheet, rill and wind erosion (NR 151.02)].

	be the same one/s cited in the answer	(s) to Question 6.A. [	e.g., 6.A.	a. "Shee	t, rill and wind erosion (NR 151.02)].
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3		Column 4
addre	mance standard/prohibition to be ssed with funding. Check all that as in Question 6.A.	Estimated portion (%) of the grant award to be spent on the performance standard/prohition. The sum should equal 100%.	Is there a local regulation which addresses the specific site being funded?		If there is a local regulation which addresses the specific site being funded, list the name and applicable section of the ordinance.
			Yes	No	
	a. Sheet, rill, and wind erosion. (NR 151.02)				
	b. Manure storage facilities: new/significant alterations. (NR 151.05(02))	90%			Ch. 26, Animal Waste Management Ordinance
	c. Manure storage facilities: closure (NR 151.05(03))	5%			Ch. 26, Animal Waste Management Ordinance
	d. Manure storage facilities: existing failing/leaking. (NR 151.05(4))				
	e. Clean water diversions. (NR 151.06)				
$\boxtimes$	f. Nutrient management. (NR 151.07)	0%	$\boxtimes$		Ch. 26, Animal Waste Management Ordinance
	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))	5%			Ch. 26, Animal Waste Management Ordinance

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

Part IV. Eligibility for Multipliers (continued)								
	unlim of the conc the m cove	nited live e state entration nainter	on: Prevention of vestock access to waters where high ons of animals prevent nance of adequate sod (f-sustaining vegetation. (5))	0%			Ch. 10 Agriculture Shoreland Management	
				Sum of %: 100				
Check all that apply. At least one (1) category must be checked to earn an enforcement multiplier. Copies of ordinances for which credit is taken in this section are:    Found at this website (provide most direct web page URL);   http://co.brown.wi.us/land_conservation/								
	Attached to this application;							
Urban Projects (select all that are in place as of the application submittal date)								
			e(s) for which credit is take					
	5) 01 01	ulliand	e(s) for which credit is take	en 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;							
Yes	No	A.	Local Implementation F	Program (factor 0.1)				
		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 (5) acres. (You may check "Yes" if this item does <u>not</u> apply.)					
П	П	4.	* ,		-			
<ul> <li>4. Track, evaluate and report to DNR the status of erosion control and storm water permit activity.</li> <li>If all items (1 through 4) above are checked "Yes," go on to part B. Otherwise, stop here.</li> </ul>								
Yes	No	В.	Local Enforcement Pro	gram (factor 0.15)				
		1.	There is a storm water management ordinance in effect for new development and re-development in the project area.					
		2.	The local regulation requ	ires a written storm v	vater plar	١.		
			If items B.1. <u>and</u> B	.2. are checked "Ye	s," go or	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		<u></u>	-Agricultural Perform	ance Sta	<u>ndards</u>	Wis. Adm. Code	
			a. Reduce total suspe	-			NR 151.12(5)(a)	
			b. Reduce peak flow	• .			NR 151.12(5)(b)	
			<ul><li>c. Achieve infiltration</li><li>d. Protect riparian are</li></ul>	•			NR 151.12(5)(c) NR 151.12(5)(d)	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	as per d vehicle maintenanc	e areas p	er	NR 151.12(5)(d) NR 151.12(5)(e)	

Form 8700-300 (R 1/08)

Page	0	f
ı ayc		''

TRM Grant Project Name San-Ric Holsteins

### Part IV. Eligibility for Multipliers (continued)

### **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 existing manure storage facility was built prior to the Brown County's Animal Waste Management Ordinance (ch. 26) and is within 50 feet of a stream that is located on bedrock and seasonally drains to a sinkhole. The manure storage facility is within 1000' of a other than municipal (OTM) well.

# Applicant Certification An Authorized Representative must sign and date the application form prior to submittal to the DNR. All four (4) 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 C. Hafs, County Conservationist, Telephone Number (920)391-4620 E-Mail Address hafs bc@co.brown.wi.us

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

- One (1) copy of the completed application form [DNR Form 8700-300 (R 1/08)] with original signature in blue ink;
- Three (3) additional copies of the completed, signed application form;
- One (1) electronic copy of the completed application form on CD or diskette in Microsoft Word format only.

All application materials must be postmarked by midnight **April 15, 2008**.

Mailing Address 1150 Bellevue St., Green Bay, WI, 54302

Send to: Department of Natural Resources Attn: Kathy Thompson, WT/3 101 South Webster Street P.O. Box 7921 Madison, WI 53707-7921