



**Land and Water Conservation Board
County Land and Water Resource Management Plan
Review of LWRM Plan Revisions**

County: Dane

Implementation Covering Past Five Years and Future Directions

Answer these four questions in writing (not to exceed 4 pages)

1. Provide a representative number of accomplishments within the last five years that can be directly traced to activities identified in multiple work plans. For each accomplishment, explain how the planning process helped the county achieve its outcome, including planning adjustments that helped better target county activities.

The following accomplishments represent a small sample of what the Dane County Land & Water Resources Department (LWRD) has completed over the past five years as outlined in the LWRMP:

- **Invasive Species Management:** Over the past five years, the management of invasive species has been a priority through updating plans such as the Aquatic Plan Management Plan for the Yahara Chain of Lakes and River and the Dane County Emerald Ash Borer Management Plan to managing carp removal and stocking native species in numerous lakes around the county. These efforts not only prevent the introduction and/or spread of invasive species but also preserve existing species and have both habitat and water quality benefits. Having these efforts identified in the LWRMP has continued to allow them to be priorities through allocating staff time for implementation and building partnerships as well as obtaining funding through grants and the county budget process.
- **Yahara WINS Service Agreement:** The LWRD is contracted as a service provider for Yahara WINS to assist with the implementation of an adaptive management plan for the Yahara Watershed. The past five years has seen the transition from a pilot project in a smaller, sub-watershed to a full scale project for implementation. This has resulted in a ramping up of staffing, funding for practices, and exploring new and innovative ways to address resources concerns for phosphorus reductions. Having broad goals identified in the LWRMP was a starting point for developing more detailed goals, priorities and work plans for the Yahara WINS effort and how the county could provide assistance to the project.
- **Issuance of FPP Certificates of Compliance:** While FPP has always been part of the LWRMP, the past few years has seen an increase in workload which has been reflected in the recent annual work plans. In 2016, all participants (approximately 1,100) were issued certificates of compliance with numeric codes which allowed for better tracking of participants, acres included in the program and compliance with the applicable standards. Building status reviews into the annual work planning allows staff an opportunity to meet with landowners and operators to

discuss the FPP requirements but also other conservation opportunities available to them. This aids in increasing the amount of conservation that is implemented throughout the county and feeds annual work planning

2. Identify any areas where the county was unable to make desired progress in implementing activities identified in recent work plans. For each area identified, explain the work plan adjustments that were made to refocus planned activities. If no areas are identified, explain how the county was able to make progress in all the areas planned.

There are a few areas where the county was not able to make the desired progress towards implementation for a variety of reasons.

- **Outreach & Education:** While some aspects of the county's outreach and educational programming has been successful as it relates to volunteer activities, watershed groups, and storm water management, efforts on the agricultural side have long been under-represented due to workload and available resources. Recognizing this gap, the LWRD has begun building more educational opportunities into the work plan, making it a priority by obtaining resources to assist with training (i.e. rainfall simulator trailer) and partnering more with UWEX, farmer-led groups, nonprofit organizations and other stakeholders specific to agricultural themes. Future work plans will likely see an increase in the amount of planned workshops, demonstrations and field days hosted by LWRD or in collaboration with other partners.
- **TMDL Implementation:** TMDL implementation has not been the primary focus of day to day workload or work planning. The scale of the TMDLs in the county are too large and broad to see effective responses in the water quality systems. Rather, the county has focused on smaller areas within or outside of TMDL areas to focus and direct resources for implementation. An example will be the work in the Yahara Watershed which is part of the Rock River TMDL. This area has been a high priority for implementation efforts while other portions of the Rock River TMDL are not currently being work planned for (i.e. Koshkonong Creek, Mauneshia River). Efforts may be evaluated for future work plans to work in these areas as funding comes available but without implementation resources for TMDLs, broad implementation efforts will not occur but rather targeted efforts where there are available resources will be the priority.
- **Door Creek Watershed Plan:** Originally, the goal was to develop a 9-key element watershed plan to be approved by DNR and EPA for the Door Creek Watershed. The plan was developed and went through a number of review and comment periods with DNR and EPA. In the end, the county opted to withdraw the request to have EPA approve the plan as a 9-key element plan due to some of the conditions being placed on the plan requirements and how these conditions correlated with existing planning efforts (i.e. Yahara WINS adaptive management plan). In addition, the selected watershed was not eligible for s. 319 funds for implementation so an approved 9-key element plan would not open up additional cost-share funds for practices. However, the LWRD found value in developing the plan and are moving into year three of implementation of the plan which is being incorporated by reference into the LWRMP revision.

- SWRM Funding: With recent shifts in how DATCP SWRM funds can be used (i.e. cannot be utilized for WPDES permit compliance including phosphorus compliance options), the LWRD is looking at ways to shift how DATCP SWRM funds are utilized in the county as it relates to various WPDES compliance projects (i.e. Yahara WINS, etc.) Having additional funding sources for conservation implementation is a good problem to have but comes with increased complications for tracking compliance and funding sources.
3. Describe the county's approach to implementation of its priority farm strategy including outreach, farm inventories and making use of multiple funding sources. How has the county evaluated the effectiveness of its priority farm strategy and used this information to improve implementation of the agricultural performance standards and conservation practices on farms?

FPP is the primary approach used to prioritize outreach and inventories followed by WPDES permit phosphorus compliance options (i.e. adaptive management, water quality trading). Funds for practice implementation are targeted to priority areas based on this strategy and the source of funding. Monitoring FPP compliance as well as mapping and tracking nutrient management planning are the main ways the LWRD has monitored compliance. This information is then used to feed various modeling efforts in targeted watersheds to complete analyses and gauge effectiveness (i.e. SWAT analysis for the Yahara River Watershed). Recently, the LWRD has evaluated available funding sources to identify where and when a specific funding source may be best suited for specific projects or targeted areas. This allows the department to be more efficient with allocating existing and securing new funding sources for projects and practices.

4. Provide representative examples that show changes in direction in the county's LWRM plan and annual work plans, with specific examples provided showing adjustments in goals, objectives or planned activities.

One of the major shifts in the LWRMP and annual work plans revolves around the focus on phosphorus reductions as opposed to holistic conservation efforts. With the onset of phosphorus compliance options for point sources working with nonpoint sources, the focus has been directed to practices, monitoring and tracking related to phosphorus reductions rather than implementation of conservation practices and the breadth of benefits these practices have for soil, water, habitat and wildlife. One of the results of this shifting focus was the Healthy Farms, Healthy Lakes Taskforce and the recommendations introduced to address phosphorus management in the county, particularly the Yahara Watershed and Lake Mendota. The recommendations from this taskforce are leading to new efforts requiring the LWRD to shift some priorities going forward. One example is the proposed new manure management ordinance which includes updates to manure storage and winter spreading permitting requirements, inclusion of the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions into the ordinance, and introduces a certificate of use program for existing manure storages. This ordinance will likely result in a shift in work load and work planning going forward which may need to be further incorporated into future LWRMP revisions.

Annual Work Plans

Attach both of the following:

- a. The most current annual work plan, prepared in the current format from DATCP, and addresses all required items such as needed funding and staff hours.
- b. The work plan for the previous year that includes a column that identifies the progress in implementing the planned activities for that year.

Presentation Regarding County Resource Concerns

Prepare and present an 8-10 minute snapshot to the board regarding county resources and management issues. The county must prepare one of following as part of this brief presentation:

- a. A PowerPoint (showing what your county looks like, can include maps), or
- b. A hand out (2 page max)

Guidance on Board Review Process

The LWCB's review supplements, but does not replace compliance with the DATCP checklist for LWRM plan approval. This encourages and supports honest presentations from the county. The county is strongly encouraged to have the LCC chair or committee member be a part of the presentation to the Board to contribute policy and other insights to the discussion. The goal of the review is not to fail counties. The board recognizes the dynamic nature of the planning process. Board members are interested in how counties tackle priorities over time and how they respond to changing conditions in pursuing their priorities. The board will evaluate a county's planning and implementation based on how well the county balances and prioritizes the following: agricultural performance standards, other state priorities (impaired waters, FPP checks), and local priorities. When needed, the Board will provide constructive support to counties to improve the quality of their planning.

Land Conservation Committee Notification

The LCC was provided a completed copy of this form (including attachments) on: November 15, 2018.

Signature of Authorized Representative: _____ **Date:** _____
(e.g. County Conservationist, LCC chair)

Send completed form and attachments to:

Lisa.Trumble@wi.gov