

NR 153 Advisory Committee Meeting
DNR South Central Regional Office, Fitchburg WI
January 7, 2008
1:00 am – 4:00 pm

In attendance:

Stevenson, Gordon	WI DNR	Klingberg, Kevan	UW Discovery Farm
Billings, Corinne	WI DNR	Masterpole, Dan	Chippewa County
Parsons, Tim	WI DNR	Calkins, Kurt	Columbia County
Pfender, John	WI DNR	Cleerman, Greg	Marinette County
Kirsch, Kevin	WI DNR	Sebo, Paul	Washington County
*Lueders, Laura	WI DNR	Crass, David	Representing DBA
*Holden, Carol	WI DNR	Zelazny, Julian	WLWCA
Cihlar, Sandi	Producer	Maxted, Jeff	UW – Madison
Castelnuovo, Richard	DATCP	*Fallat, Coreen	DATCP
Nowak, Pete	UW Soils	*Hoyer, Will	Clean Wisconsin
Koepke, Al	PDPW	*Lamb, Jordan	Dewitt, Ross & Stevens
Zimmerman, Paul	WI Farm Bureau		

*Observers – These individuals are not on the Advisory Committee

I. Project Categories; Scoring Criteria

Discussion: The committee members were asked for feedback on the proposed project categories and scoring criteria.

Committee Comments:

- Concern that too large of a proportion of funding will be budgeted for TMDL projects when there is not the demand or need. DNR stated that the actual allocation of dollars will happen after the applications have been received to enable them to match the appropriate funds with each category.
- Money can only be distributed through governmental units (e.g. counties). If the governmental unit does not apply, we can not fund practices with our TRM money.
- There is support from committee members on the four categories. The categories allow flexibility for the local agencies to decide where to solve problems.
- DNR staff said that an implementation or pre-inventory will be required either as a part of the application for a large scale project, or as a condition of receiving a grant. In the latter, the county would have to deliver the inventory results early in the project. Some committee members said the inventory should be required prior to application submittal, others said it would be good to have an option for the county to do the inventory once the grant funds are received. In the latter, we could give more points to the applicant that already has the inventory done. Concerned that some counties would not have the resources to do so; while others are already doing it. Committee members wanted more detail as to what this inventory would entail. Members agreed that

grantees should not be required to hire new staff in order to spend the local assistance grants.

- Committee member asked what the measure of accomplishment would be in large scale nonpoint source projects? DNR replied it would probably be the same as the TMDLs, and probably include some water resource monitoring. In the case of the small scale projects, we would probably just monitor the increase in compliance with the performance standards.
- Concern on the lack of reference to concept of adaptive management from one project to the next.
- Concern on the lack of monitoring to determine if projects are successful.
- Question if local assistance grants can be used for inventory and/or monitoring
- Mixed opinions on how to apply the findings of the Wisconsin Buffer Initiative. Some feel that they should be applicable to only the TMDL projects, other feel that they should be applied to both large-scale TMDL and large-scale nonpoint source.
- There was a question as to the role of the existing land and water resource management plans in project selection.

II. Funding Scenarios

Discussion: DNR presented a hypothetical scenario of how funding may be distributed to the various categories. The source of the funds does determine how they can be spent. Federal 319 funds must be spent on impaired waters. State GPR may be spent anywhere statewide for either hard or soft practices. State bonding can be spent anywhere in the state, but only for hard practices. See [NR153_FundingScenario.pdf](#).

III. Other Issues

1. Regional ranking boost: Committee members supported a limit on how far a regional boost can aid a project.
2. Funding caps: Committee members do not want limits placed on the total funds per grantee.
3. The screening criteria for local NR 151 programs was not discussed.
4. Bacteria/beaches (see Public Health Concern and Beach Project Limitations for TRM documents) was not discussed.
5. Inter-agency coordination criteria was not discussed.
6. A committee person said that we need an alternative to easements. It is difficult to achieve easements using the method DNR prescribes. CREP equivalency is the logical alternative. The committee did not have time to discuss this further.

Meeting on February 18 to further explain impaired waters and TMDLs, and how they affect NR 151 and NR 153 revisions. There was a suggestion made that committee be polled after February 18th meeting as to need for a fourth meeting which is tentatively scheduled on March 10th.