

**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)

**Waupaca County Land & Water Conservation Department**

Name of Authorized Representative (First Last) <b>Bruce Bushweiler</b>			Name of Governmental Contact Person (First Last) (if different) <b>Corey Schuelke</b>		
Title <b>County Conservationist</b>			Title <b>Engineering Technician</b>		
Area Code + Telephone Number <b>715/258-6245</b>			Area Code + Telephone Number <b>715/258-6483</b>		
Area Code + Fax Number <b>715/258-6239</b>			Area Code + Fax Number <b>715/258-6239</b>		
E-Mail Address <b>bbushw@co.waupaca.wi.us</b>			E-Mail Address <b>cschue@co.waupaca.wi.us</b>		
Mailing Address - Street or Route <b>811 Harding Street</b>			Mailing Address - Street or Route <b>811 Harding Street</b>		
City <b>Waupaca</b>	State <b>WI</b>	Zip Code <b>54981</b>	City <b>Waupaca</b>	State <b>WI</b>	Zip Code <b>54981</b>

Consulting Firm Name (if applicable)

**NA**

Consulting Contact Person Name

**NA**

Title

**NA**

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

**Project Information**

**A. Project Name**

**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project**

TRM Grant Project Name <b>Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project</b>
--

**Project Information (continued)**

**B. Project Area Location**

County

**Waupaca**

Minor Civil Division Name (city, village, town, etc. – ex. Wrightstown, Village of)	Township (N)	Range	E or W	Section	Quarter	Quarter-Quarter	Latitude (North, degrees, minutes, seconds)	Longitude (West, degrees, minutes, seconds)
<b>Town of Lebanon</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>NW</b>	<b>SW</b>	<b>44° 27' 9.4"</b>	<b>88° 46' 32"</b>

Method for Determining Latitude & Longitude (check one)

- GPS
- DNR WebView or Surface Water Data Viewer
- Other (specify):

**County GIS System (Arcmap 9.2)**

**C. Project Summary**

This is a 200 cow dairy farm operation, located in the Township of Lebanon. This area is highly ditched, highly intensive agriculture community where obtaining sufficient landbase to safely winter spread liquid manure is difficult to achieve. These limiting factors, along with high groundwater, underlying sandy soils, and Maple Creek carrying surface runoff directly to Embarrass River (exceptional resource water) contribute to this project being located in a highly sensitive water quality area. With approximately 75% of owned acres directly adjacent to Maple Creek or within 1/4 mile, winter spreading of liquid manure is not an environmentally friendly option.

It is for this reason the BMP's ( manure storage, manure transfer system, milkhouse work transfer system, and access road) will help to eliminate the winter spreading of manure and direct runoff.

Nutrient management will also be required to ensure all manure application is conducted according to the 590 Standard.

**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
<b>Embarrass</b>	<b>WR09</b>	<b>Embarrass River</b>	<b>Maple Creek</b>

*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.

TRM Grant Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project**

**Project Information (continued)**

**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, 2008) 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, 2010.

**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 [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. Urban Projects Only: Pro-rating for Existing versus New Development**

- Project will serve existing development only. If no, provide attachments and the following:

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  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project**

**Part I. Screening Requirements (continued)**

**C. Filters**

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

- |                                     |                          |  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Yes                                 | No                       |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Project will be completed within 24 months of the start of the grant period.  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Staff and contractors designated to work on this project have adequate training, knowledge, and experience to implement the proposed project.   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Staff or contractual services, in addition to those funded by this grant, will be provided if needed.   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 <b>Attachment E.</b> ) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. The local DNR Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator (see <b>Attachment C.</b> ) has been contacted about this project:   |

Name of the Regional Nonpoint Source Coordinator Contacted	Date Contacted	Subject of Contact
<b>Craig Webster</b>	4/02/08	<b>Murphy TRM Grant</b>

- |                          |                          |                                     |   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Yes                      | No                       | N/A                                 |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6. If this is an application to construct ponds that connect with navigable waterways or in wetlands under ch. NR 343, the necessary waterway or wetland permit (chs. 30 or 281, Wis. Stats.) has been issued. If "Yes", give the permit number and date of decision. |

Date of Decision	Permit Number

Please be aware that receipt of a **docket** number does **not** imply permit issuance. The receipt of the docket number merely acknowledges that your permit application has been received and has been assigned a place in the "review queue."

- |                          |                          |                                     |   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
|                          |                          |                                     | 7. If this is a proposed urban project which requires that the applicant have control of the property, you must either:                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | a) currently have control of this property; or  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | b) submit documentation with this application that you will obtain control of this property prior to the commencement of the grant period for this project. |

**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                                  |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 1. The need for compliance with performance standards established by the DNR in ch. NR 151.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 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."  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 3. The existence of outstanding or exceptional resource waters, as designated by the DNR in ss. NR 102.10 and NR 102.11.   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 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 ten (10) points in Part II, Question 4 "Basin Priorities" of this application.) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 5. The existence of threats to public health.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 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 Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm 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%	<b>70%</b>	\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">151,305</span>
<b>Costs Specific to Agricultural Projects:</b>			
9. Land Purchase (Fee Title)	-	50%	\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span>
10. Agricultural Easements	-	70%	\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span>
<b>Costs Specific to Urban Projects:</b>			
11. Property Acquisition: Fee Title and Easement	100%	50%	\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span>
12. Storm Sewer Rerouting	100%	50%	\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span>
13. Structure Removal	100%	50%	\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span>
14. Total Eligible Costs: [sum rows (8) through (13)]			\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">151,305</span>
<b>Cap Test:</b>			
15. Maximum State Share: [(row 14) or \$150,000, whichever is less]			\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">150,000</span>
<b>State &amp; Local Share:</b>			
16. Requested State-Share Amount (Requested Grant Amount)			\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"><b>150,000</b></span>
17. Local-Share Amount: [(row 7), Column B. less (row 16)]			\$ <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">85,350</span>

Method(s) Used to Calculate Cost Estimates

**LWCD utilized local contractor to help project costs to install proposed practices.**

**C. Cost-Effectiveness**

1. Tangible Benefits

a. Primary Benefit:

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

**BOD's, COD's, nitrogen, phosphorous, and bacteria to both groundwater and surface water..**

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): **Allow landowner to better utilize on farm nutrients with more timely application. Also improving neighborhood relations by not having to daily haul and top spread liquid manure on snow covered and frozen ground close to homes.**

TRM Grant Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm 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.  
**Landowner is willing to roof all exposed cattle areas at his own cost to eliminate runoff. This, along with the fact that less rain water entering the system the smaller the manure storage can be, thus lessening the overall cost. The greatest environmental benefit will be not spreading liquid manure on frozen ground throughout the winter.**

- 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 for each alternative considered.

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

- 2) If the applicant is not choosing the alternative with the lowest ratio of cost to pollutant load/potential reductions, explain why it was not chosen in terms of any of the following: feasibility, secondary benefits potential, or other mitigating factors.

- 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.  
**Constructing one manure storage system that will accept pumped manure and milkhouse waste from varying locations is the least cost alternative, rather than build multiple manure storages for shorter periods of time, and not eliminate winter spreading of manure.**



TRM Grant Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm 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 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)

	<b>Agricultural Performance Standard or Prohibition</b>	<b>Units of Measure</b>	<b>Recommended Measurement Method</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sheet, rill and wind erosion	Acres meeting T	RUSLE-2 or wind erosion model
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Manure Storage Facilities: New Construction/Alterations	Number of facilities	count
		Number of animal units	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Manure Storage Facilities: Closure	Number of facilities	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Manure Storage Facilities: Failing/Leaking Facilities	Number of facilities	count
		Number of animal units	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clean Water Diversions in WQMA	Pollutant load reduction	BARNY Model
		Number of farms with diversions	count
		Number animal units	count
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nutrient Management on Agricultural Land	Acres planned	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Prohibition: Manure Storage Overflow	Number of facilities	count
		Number of animal units	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Prohibition: Unconfined Manure Pile in WQMA	Number of farms	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Prohibition: Direct Runoff From Feedlot/Stored Manure	Pollutant load reduction	BARNY Model
		Number of facilities	count
		Number of animal units	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Prohibition: Unlimited Livestock Access	Feet of bank protected	count
		Number of farms	count
<b>Other Priority for Agricultural Area</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buffers	Feet of bank protected	CREP formula
		Number of farms	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Streambank	Tons of bank erosion reduced	NRCS bank erosion formula
		Feet of bank protected	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify)		
<b>Priority for Developed Urban Area</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	20-40% Reduction in Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	Pounds TSS reduced	SLAMM, P-8
		% TSS reduction	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Infiltration	% Pre-development stay-on volume	Recarga, SLAMM, P-8
		Cubic feet stay-on volume	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Peak flow discharge	Change in cubic feet per second	TR-55 or equivalent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Protective areas	Feet of bank protected	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fueling and maintenance areas	Oily sheen presence	visual assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Streambank	Tons of bank erosion reduced	NRCS bank erosion formula
		Feet of bank protected	count
<input type="checkbox"/>	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  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm 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 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.*
- 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.

**The LWCD has prepared a preliminary design for the project. The landowner has agreed to intall all before mentioned CMP's, pending cost sharing. (See enclosed letter from landowner)**

- 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  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project**

**Part II. Minimum Qualifications (continued)**

**Urban Projects:**

- |                          |                          |   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Yes                      | No                       | <b>A. Government</b>  |
|                          |                          | 1. The local-share funds for the construction/installation expenses:  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | a. are already included specifically in an <u>adopted</u> budget;   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | b. will be included in a <u>proposed</u> budget.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. The governmental unit has already conducted public information activities within the project area for this 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.

- |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Yes                      | No                       | <b>B. Landowners</b>   |
|                          |                          | 1. The governmental unit:  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | a. already owns, or holds an easement for, the land on which the project is to be installed;   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 through 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 this project will reduce the type of nonpoint source pollutants for which the water is listed. (See **Attachment A.**)
- 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  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project**

**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.*

**Surface 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, where the cause of the water quality impairment is nonpoint source pollution, **and this project** will reduce the type of nonpoint source pollutants for which the water is listed. (See **Attachment A.**)
- 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. 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.

**Groundwater 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.

**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 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 surface water, check the source water assessment area (drainage area) in which the project is located:
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Pike River & Creek	<input type="checkbox"/> Twin Rivers
<input type="checkbox"/> Root River	<input type="checkbox"/> Kewaunee & Ahnapee Rivers
<input type="checkbox"/> Oak Creek	<input type="checkbox"/> Menominee River
<input type="checkbox"/> Milwaukee River	<input type="checkbox"/> Fish Creek
<input type="checkbox"/> Sauk Creek	<input type="checkbox"/> St. Louis & Nemadji Rivers
<input type="checkbox"/> Sheboygan & Onion Rivers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lake Winnebago
<input type="checkbox"/> Manitowoc River	

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

TRM Grant Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm 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/are 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 feet of a stream, 1000 feet. 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.

- Yes  No  **C. Planning Data & Source Targeting**
- The applicant has quantitative planning information that ranks pollution sources from highest to lowest in severity and 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;  
**Planning data is based on Waupaca County Animal Waste Plan and the State of the Wolf Basin Plan (publ WT664 2001)**
  - b. Name of document(s);  
**Waupaca County Land and Water Resource Management Plan**
  - c. Date(s) published;  
**2006**
  - d. Pertinent page numbers.  
**Chapter 3 Page 41**
  - e. A copy of non-state document(s) is available:
    - At this website; <http://www.co.waupaca.wi.us>
    - Attached to this application form.

TRM Grant Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project**

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

Contact this person: Name: **Bruce Bushweiler** Phone: **715/258-6245**

**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.

**The "Waupaca County Land and Water Resource Management Plan" - 2006 identifies the North Branch and Mainstem Embarrass Watershed (WR09) as second of nine for potential water pollution caused by animal waste. The Water Quality recommendation centers on addressing the NR151 prohibitions in the "Water Quality Management Area".**

**The "Winnebago Comprehensive Management Plan" - 2001 ranked this watershed a "high" priority because of critical animal waste and soil erosion problems. The data search for the Wolf River Basin Plan indicates severe polluted runoff problems exist, with heavy soil losses, impaired fisheries, excess vegetation, and dissolved oxygen violations. Conservation Warden Mark Beilfuss documented significant runoff concerns along the Mainstem of the Embarrass River at the confluence of the Wolf River. Photographs of the river show high levels of turbidity and total suspended solids during a summer storm.**

**Question 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.

TRM Grant Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm 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 (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		Document	Page Number
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Inform and educate landowners/operators about performance standards and prohibitions.	LWRM Plan	57
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Conduct compliance status surveys, including on-site visits, for croplands and livestock facilities and convey compliance status to landowners/operators.	LWRM Plan	53
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Discuss with landowners/operators the best management practices needed to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.	LWRM Plan	54
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Seek financial assistance for landowners/operators to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.	LWRM Plan	56
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Develop cost-share agreements with landowners/operators and provide them with technical assistance to achieve compliance with performance standards and prohibitions.	LWRM Plan	54
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	LWRM Plan	65
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Provide assistance to the Department of Natural Resources to issue notices under NR 151.09 and NR 151.095.	LWRM Plan	55
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	LWRM Plan	55

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

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

TRM Grant Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project**

**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 require 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)].

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3		Column 4
Performance standard/prohibition to be addressed with funding. Check all that apply, as in Question 6.A.	Estimated portion (%) of the grant award to be spent on the performance standard/prohibition. The sum should equal 100%.	Is there a local regulation which addresses the specific site being funded? Yes      No		If there is a local regulation which addresses the specific site being funded, list the name and applicable section of the ordinance.
<input type="checkbox"/> a. Sheet, rill, and wind erosion. (NR 151.02)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. Manure storage facilities: new/significant alterations. (NR 151.05(02))	<b>100%</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Waupaca County Manure Storage and Land Spreading of Manure Ordinance Sec 10.52 (A)</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> c. Manure storage facilities: closure (NR 151.05(03))		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> d. Manure storage facilities: existing failing/leaking. (NR 151.05(4))		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> e. Clean water diversions. (NR 151.06)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> f. Nutrient management. (NR 151.07)	<b>0%</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Waupaca County Manure Storage and Land Spreading of Manure Ordinance Sec 10.52 (B)</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> g. Prohibition: Prevention of overflow from manure storage facilities. NR 151.08(2))		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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))		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> i. Prohibition: Prevention of direct runoff from a feedlot or stored manure into waters of the state. (NR 151.08(4))		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



TRM Grant Project Name <b>Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project</b>
--

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	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))		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Sum of %: <b>100</b>			

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 <http://www.co.waupaca.wi.us> most direct web page URL);
- Attached to this application;
- Already submitted with another application for CY 2009 funding.

**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.

**A. Local Implementation Program (factor 0.1)**

- |                          |                          |   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Yes                      | No                       |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Implement a construction site erosion control ordinance consistent with the performance standards and applicability requirements of s. NR 151.11.                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Implement a pollution prevention information and education program targeted at residents, including property owners.   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Track, evaluate and report to DNR the status of erosion control and storm water permit activity.   |

**If all items (1 through 4) above are checked "Yes," go on to part B. Otherwise, stop here.**

**B. Local Enforcement Program (factor 0.15)**

- |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Yes                      | No                       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. There is a storm water management ordinance in effect for new development and re-development in the project area. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. The local regulation requires a written storm water plan.   |

**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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a. Reduce total suspended solids per	NR 151.12(5)(a)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b. Reduce peak flow discharge per	NR 151.12(5)(b)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c. Achieve infiltration per	NR 151.12(5)(c)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d. Protect riparian areas per	NR 151.12(5)(d)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e. Manage fueling and vehicle maintenance areas per	NR 151.12(5)(e)

TRM Grant Project Name  
**Maple Creek - Murphy Farm Project**

**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.

**When this project is completed, the farm will comply with NR151 rules.**

**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  
**4/14/08**

**Bruce Bushweiler, County Conservationist,**  
Telephone Number **715/258-6245**  
E-Mail Address **bbushw@co.waupaca.wi.us**  
Mailing Address **811 Harding Street, Waupaca, WI, 54981**

*[name and title, please print]*  
Fax Number **715/258-6239**

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**.

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