

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
ACRA	Anticipated Cost-Share Reimbursement Amount.
APWA	American Public Works Association.
ATCP	Administrative rules promulgated by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection.
AWAC	Animal Waste Advisory Committee. Convened in the early 1990s, this mission of this committee was to evaluate the state's animal waste program and recommend improvements. AWAC recommended the four (4) manure management prohibitions.
BMP	Best Management Practice. A structure, technique, or measure applied to the landscape to address a polluted runoff problem.
CALS	U.W. College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
COMM	The Wisconsin Department of Commerce.
CREP	The federal Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program. Administered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service and the U.S. Farm Services Agency, the program allows states to customize the CREP program to meet state or local resource needs.
CRP	The federal Conservation Reserve Program. Administered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service and the U.S. Farm Services Agency, the program offers rental payments to landowners who keep certain cropland areas out of production.
CWA	The federal Clean Water Act.
CWAC	The Clean Water Action Council.
CWC	The Clean Water Coalition. A coalition of the following groups: the River Alliance of Wisconsin, 1000 Friends of Wisconsin, Wisconsin's Environmental Decade, the Sierra Club, the Wisconsin Wetlands Association, the Wisconsin Stewardship Network, the Friends of the Root River/Sustainable Racine, the Wisconsin Public Interest Research Group, the Madison Audubon Society, Midwest Environmental Advocates, Trout Unlimited, and Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger.
DATCP	The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection.
EPA	The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
FSA	The U.S. Farm Services Agency, an agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture
IPM	Integrated Pest Management.

LAG	Local Assistance Grant.
LCC	Land conservation committee
LCD	County land conservation department.
LWRM	County land and water resource management plans.
LWCB	Land and Water Conservation Board
MEA	Midwest Environmental Advocates, an environmental law and resource center.
MEG	Municipal Environmental Group.
MEP	Maximum Extent Practicable.
MMSD	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District.
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding.
NOD	Notice of Discharge. These are given to livestock operations determined to have caused a significant discharge of pollutants into the waters of the state.
NOI	Notice of Intent.
NRB	The Wisconsin Natural Resources Board.
NRCS	The Natural Resources Conservation Service, an agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
OAC	Outreach Advisory Committee. A 20-member committee representing diverse interests, that assisted the state with the nonpoint program redesign.
PLOW	Private Landowners of Wisconsin.
RISE	Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment.
RPC	Regional planning commission(s).
RUSLE	Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation. Used to estimate the amount of soil erosion likely to occur on a given field over a given time frame.
SEWRPC	Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TSS	Total Suspended Solids.
TU	Trout Unlimited.
USLE	Universal Soil Loss Equation. A tool used to estimate the amount of soil erosion likely to occur on a given field over a given time frame.
WAL	Wisconsin Association of Lakes.

WALCE	The Wisconsin Association of Land Conservation Employees.
WCA	The Wisconsin Counties Association.
WCGA	The Wisconsin Corn Growers Association.
WQMA	Water Quality Management Area
WCHA	The Wisconsin County Highways Association.
WGCSA	The Wisconsin Golf Course Supervisors Association.
WisDOT	The Wisconsin Department of Transportation.
WISPIRG	The Wisconsin Public Interest Research Group.
WLWCA	The Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Association.
WPDES	Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. A permit system for point sources of water pollution.
WPVGA	The Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association.
WSPE	Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers

Comments and Responses on Proposed Nonpoint Source Redesign Rules

Most comments from all interests, written and oral, acknowledged that DNR listened to them, made revisions based on their comments and that this version was much improved. Several comments regarding editorial corrections are not cited, but all changes were made. A list of acronyms used in the comments is attached.

A General Comments on All Rules or More Than One Rule

A1 Comment: (Clean Water Coalition, TU, WAL, Grey Panthers, 4 individuals) We support strong/strongest/stricter rules for the control of nonpoint source pollution.

A2 Comment: (Clean Water Coalition) We would vigorously oppose any attempts to weaken the standards in the current draft.

A3 Comment: Several environmental groups, a friends group, many individuals, and a TU petition signed by 29 people support vegetated buffers (some specified 20 to 35 feet) along all navigable waterways, additional conservation farming 30 feet beyond the buffer, the four manure management prohibitions, infiltration standards for storm water runoff, buffer vegetation for development projects of 50-100 feet (some added new transportation construction), 80% reduction in construction site erosion, increased funding (some support additional funding for county LCDs), a requirement to cost-share agricultural improvements on impaired waterways, and streamlining the process to target impaired waters. They oppose delays in implementing nutrient management plans and exempting WisDOT from the rules. They stated that polluted runoff is costing the state billions of dollars. There is no reason why some people should be entitled to degrade everyone's water because of profit or ignorance of the consequences of their pollution. It is quick and easy to pollute, it is difficult or impossible to clean up.

(**Note:** see Background Memo for similar comments received from postcards, letters and petition).

Response: We appreciate these comments of support. Please see response to comment E149 regarding water quality corridors (vegetated buffers) and the response to the first comment under NR 151.004 regarding the process to target impaired waters.

A4 Comment: (individual) As a homeowner along a small river, I'm very much encouraged by these rules; they are positive. But they could also be strengthened in the incentives part.

Response: The cost-share rates are the maximum allowable under the law. The economic hardship provision (which allows for a higher cost-share rate) was modified to be more responsive to economic situations. Federal and county incentive programs are applicable for many control measures.

A5 Comment: (CWAC) These rules are long overdue. Ten years ago, a legislative study committee of agricultural and other interests worked hard for a year and reached consensus on ways to address these same problems. We have serious water quality problems from extreme levels of over-enrichment from too much sediment and fertilizer. We've spent billions on sewage treatment and industries. We need to address runoff sources.

A6 Comment: (individual) These are tough issues and there is probably some refining to do, but if we wait too long, it's only going to get worse.

A7 Comment: (individual) The degradation of Wisconsin's lakes from polluted runoff is getting worse and will not go away by itself. Sacrifices and commitments must be made if we wish to restore the lakes to what they were 40 years ago. Runoff must be controlled at whatever cost or inconvenience it may cause. Clean lakes are important to tourism and the Wisconsin economy.

A8 Comment: (individual) We need to act now. Wisconsin taking the lead shows that we're progressive, and we should keep the progressive tradition going in Wisconsin.

A9 Comment: (individual) As a former Milwaukeean who suffered through the cryptosporidium outbreak, I urge the DNR to go forward.

Response: We feel we are moving forward with the rules while at the same time being deliberative and inclusive about the decisions we make, recognizing the many agencies, local governments and other stakeholders that will be affected.

A10 Comment: (3 farmers) A lot of young DNR and other staff who could interpret and implement the law differently are coming onto farms. Farmers don't plan year to year any more—they plan 5 years down the road. If they don't know how the rules are going to be implemented or who's going to be applying them, it will be hard to plan their operations. The law should be specific and well defined.

Response: Grant funds can be used for a period of up to four years. LCD staff can use this time to help plan changes according to the farmer's schedule.

A11 Comment (farmer) Many farms, ag-related businesses and small towns will be affected by these proposed rules with a loss of tax revenue. Is this your final goal?

Response: The detailed fiscal analysis that is part of this rules package did not find a significant impact from potential loss of tax revenue. The department believes there may be increased revenue generated in some instances and does not agree that there are situations where tax revenues are expected to decline as a result of these rules.

A12 Comment: (Milw. Co.) The proposed rules language does not recognize the unique fact that Milwaukee County is the only one of 72 counties in Wisconsin that is wholly incorporated. This engenders double jeopardy for our citizens and causes undo grief between the county and its cities and villages. There is no need for both the county and the cities and villages to pass ordinances, do enforcement and charge fees to accomplish the objective of cleaner storm water runoff. This is exactly the type of bureaucratic duplication that the Kettl Commission was so critical of.

Response: Neither NR 151 nor changes to NR 216 would require duplicate regulation of a site by the county and its cities and villages. This is evident in looking at the various requirements. Performance standards for developed urban areas (151.13) must be met by municipalities, but management actions taken by one or more jurisdictions could be combined to meet the standard for any specific area. Performance standards for construction runoff (NR 151.11), post-construction runoff (NR 151.12) and non-municipal landscaped areas (NR 151.14) must be met by landowners and operators. A municipality may choose to develop a local ordinance, but it is not required under NR 151. Duplication of effort under local ordinances will only occur if local governments do not coordinate their local programs. Ordinances may be required under chapter NR 216 to establish an adequate local management program, but this is not a new code provision; it has been in NR 216 since its inception. NR 216 does not require duplicative regulations either and nothing in NR 151 requires counties to enact ordinances to administer the performance standards if all municipalities do so.

A13 Comment: (WLWCA/WALCE, several counties) We are opposed to the package of rules. While we generally support the nonpoint performance standards and many other rule provisions, we believe the rule package as a whole falls short of the original intent of the program redesign in several critical areas. Without an effective implementation strategy, we believe future nonpoint program efforts are subject to many of the same problems of the past, making the past four years of program redesign efforts of questionable value.

A14 Comment: (LCD) We support the concept of performance standards. Getting the rules into a format that is workable and understandable for the counties and landowners is critical.

Response: These comments have been addressed in the responses to detailed comments on NR 151.

A15 Comment: (LCD) The rules often are too prescriptive and either have too much detail or lack detail that should be included. For instance, performance standards should state the desired end result not the means to achieve it. Local administrators and landowners are best suited to prescribe methods of obtaining the results.

Response: Most standards are expressed as desired end results, but this was not practical in every instance. The result is a mix. Also note that the department convened several work groups to assist in revising the rules, and the set of performance standards is a result of that process.

A16 Comment: (lawn care co., 6 individuals) Wisconsin doesn't need to be in the forefront to implement federal clean water standards. Let's allow other states to take the lead and learn from their mistakes.

Also, consider that the Bush administration is considering either a repeal of the Clean Water Act or major modifications to it. It makes no sense to spend hundreds of millions of dollars when there exists a possibility that such rules may not even be necessary.

Response: This code is in response to a state mandate, not the federal Clean Water Act. Even if the CWA is modified, it will not change the outcome of the rules.

A17 Comment: (individual) The proposed rules should have an amendment giving DNR authority to regulate all dams that are previously unregulated, all previous exemptions notwithstanding. Some dams, such as cranberry marsh dams, are currently unregulated due to the cranberry law.

Response: These proposed rules do not have authority to regulate dams. Ch. 30, Stats., regulates dams.

A18 Comment: (RPC) The emphasis of the proposed rules represents a fundamental departure from the past nonpoint source pollution abatement programs that were water quality planning-based, geographically directed at individual watersheds, and designed to achieve specific in-stream water quality conditions for individual stream reaches. The proposed site-based approach will require practices to be carried out that are not directly based on demonstrated water quality improvement needs and thus may be either inadequate to achieve water quality objectives or more stringent than is needed. Without a demonstrated relationship between the site-based performance standard implementation and the water quality in any given receiving watercourse, it will be difficult to justify the significant costs that have been estimated. The rules and the model storm water management ordinance should be revised to allow for the application of storm water management system plans that call for control measures needed to meet the water use objectives of receiving streams, independent of the arbitrary, uniform controls as currently prescribed in draft NR 151.

Response: The rules do not preclude a county, city, etc. from developing a stormwater management plan to address the watershed as a whole. The performance standards set statewide minimums. If the uniform measures are in place and the resource is not achieving water quality standards, the code provides for the development of targeted performance standards. If a governmental entity believes a greater effort is needed to control urban development, it can develop an ordinance with stricter standards than proposed in these rules and enforce them through its own authority. Uniform statewide standards will level the playing field, identify state agency expectations and go a long way toward achieving water quality standards. It is not likely that the performance standards are more stringent than needed and if that should be shown to be true for a particular site, the developer can provide justification for meeting the standard to the maximum extent practicable.

A19 Comment: (chemical co.) The issue of soluble phosphorus and soluble phosphorus in runoff is not mentioned (NR 243 indicates or suggests total phosphorus). Technology is in use to bind the soluble bioavailable phosphorus into a form not readily available to support eutrophication as recognized in NR 154.04(18)(b) and NR 120.14(17). These products, especially alum, are used in manure management for two express purposes: reduction of the environmental stressors, atmospheric ammonia and soluble phosphorus, and grade improvement/agronomic benefit.

Response: DNR does not generally support the use of amendments carried into surface waters with runoff rather than captured and removed as part of a treatment system. These amendments merely mask the presence of a pollutant and do not address its addition to water resources. Department efforts are generally designed to address total phosphorus loading to surface waters given that even insoluble phosphorus present in a surface water may become bioavailable under certain conditions (e.g., changes in pH, byproduct of decay). Phosphorus binding agents may be approved or supported as a means of addressing phosphorus levels already present in a surface water. Approval of such amendments would have to be considered as part of the technical standard for nutrient management or runoff control systems.

A20 Comment: (WLWCA/WALCE, several counties) "Smart Growth" laws are not mentioned anywhere in the rules package, even though nonpoint programs have long recognized the link between land use and water quality. Incentives should be incorporated into urban grants to coordinate watershed protection planning with other local land use planning efforts, and vice versa.

Response: Although the law is not specifically mentioned, there are provisions in the grant scoring system to recognize and award additional points for "consistency with resource management plans." This includes many plans, including those developed to comply with the "Smart Growth" legislation. The exact influence that this will have on point scores will be determined when the detailed scoring system is developed in accordance with the rule.

A21 Comment: (MEG) We continue to support the state's initiative to develop standards to control nonpoint sources of pollution. It is neither cost-effective nor fair to expect point sources to continually upgrade their facilities while nonpoint sources go unaddressed.

Response: We are glad you agree.

A22 Comment: (city) These proposed rules are not helping communities meet the objective of the Clean Water Act by tying them down in bureaucratic mandates. Let the local communities decide the level of clean water its residents want, the costs, and the best way to implement the requirements with general guidelines from the state. Communities are very aware of the importance of storm water management as can be evidenced by the multitude of storm water BMPs going in all over the state.

Response: It is true that communities are more aware of the importance of stormwater management than they once were, but for many, the emphasis is still on flood control. This nonpoint redesign effort is a state mandate to identify performance standards to achieve state water quality standards and is not a federal mandate of the Clean Water Act. If the rules are to achieve water quality standards the decision must be based on the needs of the water resource and not on a local perception of what they are willing to tolerate. Local communities can still be more stringent than these minimums if they believe it is warranted. The performance standards will be implemented through existing programs (NR 216) that have been modified to incorporate the standards.

A23 Comment: (WSPE) Tell the people of Wisconsin and the professionals what you want, then let the professionals design the improvements to meet the best local practice. Specifically, 80% removal of solids is different for mud than it is for drinking water. Government and consulting engineers have dealt with this issue on many specific project studies. Set a quantity number such as you have for wastewater (suspended solids, 20 ppm; BOD, 20 ppm) which will be something everyone can monitor and understand.

Response: In developing the rules, DNR used advisory committees and workgroups to identify the issues and concerns and worked with those affected by the rules to fashion reasonable rule language. The use of a percent reduction does tell the people of the state what we want and leaves it up to the professionals to design the practices to meet it. We chose not to use any one number, because it would not be appropriate in every part of the state. The percent figure, while not perfect, allows flexibility and modification if site conditions warrant it. The standard has to be met to the maximum extent practicable for every site. Unlike at wastewater treatment plants, we will not be asking that a community monitor the discharge from an outfall or a construction site.

A24 Comment: (several LCDs) The rule disregards the intent of the Legislature to redesign the nonpoint program by recreating a virtually identical priority watershed program.

Response: The legislature directed the department to develop a competitive grant program that selects the highest priority (based on score) projects. These projects are smaller in scale and shorter in duration than priority watershed projects. Statewide base grants to counties for maintenance-level resource conservation work is funded by DATCP under ATCP 50.

A25 Comment: (city public works dept.) The proposed redesign of the nonpoint source program will place an additional burden on the state's already financially challenged communities. While nonpoint source runoff management in theory appears attainable, we question whether the actual implementation of the revised requirements is practical. The various rules appear to set the stage for a potential windfall of projects for the consulting industry. Simply reading and understanding what the requirements are from the hundreds of pages involved is a project in itself. Care must be taken in developing programs, rules,

and regulations that result in creation of additional governmental bureaucracy with limited or questionable environmental improvement.

Response: Development, if left unchecked, will continue to degrade the water resources of the state. This has been clearly shown from monitoring around the state. Construction site erosion is recognized at the state and federal level as a serious problem that causes tons of sediment and its associated pollutants to enter lakes and streams. The cost to the municipalities will be the implementation of public education and pollution prevention efforts in the existing developed areas, and development of ordinances to control construction sites and new development. The cost without these controls will be a reduction in tourism and quality of life, not to mention dredging and aquatic weed control costs and nuisance suits between communities and surrounding farmland. The specific rule that sets the performance standards for municipalities only amounts to 13 pages. The remaining pages in the rule package include programs, guidance, and funding opportunities to assist municipalities in this effort. There will be a learning curve associated with a new body of rules, but experience will make this package easier to follow.

A26 Comment: (wastewater utility) The city recently built a new wastewater treatment plant that cost \$22 million, with an annual operation and maintenance budget of \$3.2 million. The plant is the primary flow source to Mill Creek, a man-made channel to the Wisconsin River and a 303(d) listed impaired water (low oxygen conditions). Initial findings of a DNR modeling study indicate the main causes of the low dissolved oxygen levels are the natural characteristics of the channel and nonpoint source discharges. We would not want to be singled out as a point source discharger affecting the water quality of Mill Creek without consideration of the nonpoint sources.

Response: These rules provide regulation of nonpoint sources and together with your control of the point source discharges, will help to clean up Mill Creek.

A27 Comment: (golf course supervisor) The words "voluntary" and "exempt" are being used when it comes to WisDOT and cities—that's just not right. These rules need to apply to every branch.

Response: We agree that the WisDOT, other state agencies and municipalities need to meet the same performance standards that private owners are required to meet. Subchapter IV or NR 151 is specifically developed to address transportation facilities such as WisDOT and other locally owned or operated roads.

A28 Comment: (farmer) Something must be done with the farm economy in order to get these things implemented. You would certainly see a different attitude with a different farm economy.

Response: We are sensitive to the status of the farm economy and have included generous cost-share provisions in the rules.

A29 Comment: (farmer) If these rules go into effect as soon as they are approved, some people will immediately have to comply, and there will be a rush to force others by excluding cost sharing or forcing people into permits. There will be lawsuits to force compliance as soon as someone is identified as a polluter.

Response: These statements are not supported by the rule or the state statutes. Existing sources must be offered cost sharing before compliance can be required, and each grant can be implemented over a period that lasts up to four years. The only sources that must comply immediately are new sources, or those essentially created after the effective date of the rule.

A30 Comment: (OAC member) The OAC did not get to finish their task. A number of members felt we should have met in 2000 after the first set of public hearings prior to submission of these rules to the NRB. That did not happen.

Response: The department felt that the OAC had reached an impasse on many issues and that to go out to public hearing was the best way to encourage stakeholders to get to their "bottom lines". After the first round of hearings, we did establish work groups on specific issues that included many OAC members.

A31 Comment: (OAC member). The rules are very complex. This is the reason we asked for a matrix to simplify things.

Response: The department chose to develop fact sheets on the rules as an alternative to a matrix, which we felt was too limiting in its format for the amount of information that was necessary to be presented.

A32 Comment: (WAL) We should preserve habitat for all aquatic life, not just fish habitat.

Response: The intent of these rules is to achieve water quality standards, which includes meeting beneficial uses and their supporting water quality criteria. The department agrees that beneficial uses are not limited to healthy fish communities, but to healthy aquatic life communities, including fish. The performance standards and other rules are designed to protect all aquatic life.

A33 Comment: (farmer) I've seen nothing in the rules on cut-off dates for variances -- I think that is very important.

Response: A provision has been added to the rule that requires the department to make a determination within 60 days.

A34 Comment: (co. sanitary dist.) The Walworth LCD tested wells in 1998 and found 24% had unsafe bacteria results, with 10% having unsafe nitrate levels. When a home goes up for sale, the septic system needs to be updated or replaced because the area has unsuitable soil for conventional septic systems. There are also large amounts of farm runoff in this area contributing to bacteria problems. There are citizen complaints about sewage running into ditches. We have approached DNR and the county, but nothing has been done. If these situations remain, it's only matter of time before someone becomes seriously ill from bacteria. It is imperative action be given to these areas of potential health threats.

Response: We agree with your concerns, however, these rules do not have authority to regulate septic systems.

A35 Comment: (farmer) A lot of the soil maps are extremely inaccurate. According to the maps, there are 1.25 miles of streams on my property that are supposed to be impassible to farm equipment, but I make hay on just about all of that area. I have several miles of intermittent streams that the map shows are on top of the hill. There's no water up there. The county conservationist says if the soil maps are inaccurate, we have topographical maps. The topographical maps show streams coming right up to my buildings when in actuality, the stream is more than a 1/3 of a mile down the valley.

Response: This comment does not apply to the rule package, it is a local implementation issue.

A36 Comment: (individual) It is hypocritical to closely regulate septic systems and business while allowing thousands of tons of animal waste to be spread on fields to pollute both air and water. I also question allowing cities to dump truckloads of snow, also containing salt, sand, gravel and whatever else was on the street into rivers.

Response: There are many sources of pollution in a watershed and this comment recognizes several of them. These rules are intended to control the nonpoint sources from both agricultural and urban settings. All sources need to be controlled if a stream or lake is to improve.

A37 Comment: (farmer) Keep standards uniform statewide. Develop some kind of appeals for non-uniform implementation. Some areas may be stricter than others -- owners should have recourse.

A38 Comment: (individual) We need standard statewide rules. There should be no county options and no voluntary compliance.

A39 Comment: (farmer) How can you make these rules uniform for everyone when each farm is different with different situations?

A40 Comment: (WI Cattlemen's Assn) These rules need to be more flexible to deal with the uncertainty of our income due to weather, economy and other factors outside our control. The average size herd for the Wisconsin cattleman is 19 cows (1997 census). We are at the bottom of the cattle cycle as far as income goes. For cattle feeders, the profits from cattle finishing are continuing to narrow: the 29-year average profit/head is \$19.97, the 15-year average profit/head is \$13.14 and the 10-year average profit/head is \$5.56. Most of us do not have the financial means to hire legal or technical expertise to help us implement the rules.

Response: We believe we have achieved a balance between uniformity and flexibility in the rules. The performance standards set statewide minimums but the means to achieve them are flexible and recognize the variation in farm crops, crop management, farm site conditions, and water resource conditions. In cases where the commonly used standards are not adequate to meet the water quality goals in an economically feasible manner, there is a variance procedure that the farmer may utilize.

A41 Comment: (farmer) One of the weaknesses of the priority watershed program was that it didn't recognize the individuality of farms and the decision-making process.

Response: Under the proposed rules the land conservation department will be working with each farmer to determine how the farmer can best comply with the performance standards.

A42 Comment: Several farmers commented on the contributions of wildlife to nonpoint source pollution. One farmer stated that higher rates of nitrogen and phosphorus will be on farmland due to wildlife. Another asked, if you're going after us about all the manure from our cattle, what about your geese in Horicon Marsh – how many millions pounds per year is going into that water? A third stated that populations of wildlife, such as ducks and geese, are out of control. It's not just a matter of them passing through---they are living year round in the cities. Their mess doesn't go away; it goes into stormwater, and unless it's properly managed, it's pollution. Another stated that farmers are being asked to follow rules the state and others do not. In the Killsnake Wildlife Area with its 4,000 acres of township, it seems like the governments have exempted themselves from the manure problems that farmers have to deal with. There are no manure rules or requirements concerning geese and other wildlife. Under NR 243, anyone that has animal units in excess of 1,000 for more than 45 days is required to have a permit for discharge. If you look under animal units, you see ducks and turkeys, but there are no geese. Yet the area sees 300,000-400,000 geese.

Response: DNR conducted a detailed study of phosphorus loading of geese in Horicon Marsh, as compared to total phosphorus load. Horicon has the greatest concentration of waterfowl in the state. We calculated that the geese population contributes approximately 8% of the total phosphorus load in the marsh. We need to do further studies to look at this issue, but from that study of the greatest impact, we still have 92% without dealing with wildlife. This is a much greater phosphorus contribution than deer.

A43 Comment: (individual) Dane County spends about \$300,000 a year mowing our lakes, with the biggest problem being polluted runoff. Virtually all the pollution in Lake Mendota comes from polluted runoff. A little more than 20% of the sediment and phosphorus runoff comes from 1% of the land — land that's under development. Wisconsin spent about \$120 million on the priority watershed program, and the Legislative Audit Bureau said it didn't work because we haven't had everyone in the program, and it hasn't been uniform. Unsound practices upstream can undo all the conservation practices downstream. This effort is making the playing field even for everyone. If we would have spent that \$120 million on buffer strips, we could have bought about 120,000 acres that would have protected 10,000 stream miles with 30-foot buffers.

Response: The performance standards will ensure an adequate level of conservation for everyone.

A44 Comment: (2 farmers) The program redesign is very complicated. It would be nice to simplify things so regular people can understand what is in the proposal.

A45 Comment: (farmer) These rules are very complex and refer to other rules. You need to find a simple way to administer the rules so everyone can understand what their requirements are.

A46 Comment: (several counties) The current rules are laced with inconsistencies and have language that cannot be understood so they are useful to counties and landowners.

Response: Administrative rules are meant to handle legal and implementation issues. Inconsistencies have been addressed. We are planning information and education programs that will help citizens understand the new rules.

A47 Comment: (LCC) The rules cover too many items and are difficult for LCD staff to understand. Even if there was adequate funding, there is too much being proposed at one time.

Response: The department believes that a comprehensive set of rules is preferable to a piece-meal approach. Although there is a lot being proposed, these rules have been developed over a 4-year period. During this period there has been extensive public education and the opportunity for input. Overall, the department believes adequate time and information has been provided.

A48 Comment: (consultant) I am not against these rules, but I am against trying to comply with regulations that you can argue one way or another. There's no good answer because it's too confusing.

Response: Revisions to the rules have corrected the inconsistencies. Guidance documents and training will be developed outside the rule-making process.

A49 Comment: (DATCP) Under the statutory provision directing the redesign of the nonpoint source programs, DATCP is responsible for promulgating the technical standards necessary to comply with the agricultural performance standards. DNR should not promulgate a duplicate set of technical standards (NR 154). The technical standards will be set in ATCP 50 and NR 154 should reference ATCP 50 regarding technical standards for agricultural conservation practices.

A50 Comment: (farmer) I thought DATCP was supposed to be doing the technical part.

Response: DNR and DATCP have developed a system of cross-references for agricultural performance standards. DNR listed each BMP and made a cross-reference to ATCP 50 for relevant components of the BMP, including technical standards. If there are exceptions to any of the BMP components in ATCP 50, they are noted in the rule.

A51 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) There needs to be consistency between these rules and ATCP 50 for technical standards. They need to include prevention-based practices and need to address all nonpoint source pollution, not just from agriculture. The rules need to address the diversity of nonpoint pollution concerns in the state, including forestry and lake development.

A52 Comment: (LCD) The technical standards still need to do a better job of addressing all nonpoint source pollution concerns, not just agricultural practices. The rules especially need to recognize that nonpoint pollution can come from a wide variety of rural and urban sources.

Response: The DNR and DATCP have met extensively and revised the rules to make them as consistent as possible regarding the technical standards. Cost-share policies have differences because of the differences in the agencies' missions. The department's BMPs address urban as well as agricultural nonpoint pollution sources. DNR has a BMP to help lakeshore owners restore riparian lands to a more natural condition. Urban BMPs can also be used to control urban runoff from lakeshore areas and the department also can cost-share development of storm water management plans to help protect these areas. Forestry concerns have not been included in this version of the rules because the scope of the rules is already extensive and because there is already a program in the state to implement forestry BMPs.

A53 Comment: (farmer) People need access to the technical standards referenced in the codes. Not all of us are familiar with what is in those standards, like 590.

Response: Technical standards are available on NRCS's website, or at LCD, DNR or DATCP offices.

A54 Comment: (farmer) If you make a blanket ruling that these rules begin on x date, Wisconsin agriculture will be severely crippled if not gone. Is it your overall plan to get rid of Wisconsin agriculture? If it is, be honest. If it isn't, help us.

A55 Comment: (farmer) A phase-in period would be better. As farmers retire and operations change ownership, the nonpoint regulations would kick in and cost sharing would become available. The time frame for total compliance could be 20-30 years.

A56 Comment: (WPVGA) It's important that the economics of agriculture are weighed heavily as these rules are considered further. It is important to remember that producers in Wisconsin have to compete in a world market, and most of our competitors will not have the same requirements as Wisconsin producers. This puts us at a competitive disadvantage with producers in neighboring states.

A57 Comment: (farmer) If these rules cost us too much, this may be the last straw for our operation. Does the DNR want to help the farmer and the wildlife we feed for free, or do they want this place to be a farm of houses? The most profitable crop right now is houses.

A58 Comment: (WPVGA) We caution state officials from overburdening producers with too many regulations. The term "save the family farm" is becoming a household phrase. These are the types of regulations that make farming impractical on a small scale and push producers toward larger and larger operations. The economics associated with compliance begin to dictate operation size.

A59 Comment: (farmer) I oppose a whole new layer of regulations on agriculture at a time when we in agriculture cannot afford to implement expensive new rules. Agriculture has not enjoyed the same economic prosperity that almost all of the other segments of the economy have enjoyed over the past 10 years. Other states have taken a more common sense approach and have not gone as far as Wisconsin has in implementing nonpoint source laws. Increased regulation put my neighbors and I at an economic disadvantage to our counterparts in neighboring states and other countries.

Response: There is a delayed start date for the nutrient management performance standard. Because existing facilities and practices impacted by these rules must be provided 70% cost sharing (90% cost-sharing for economic hardship cases) before they are required to comply with the performance standards and prohibitions, and because funding is limited, it will take many years for sufficient cost sharing to become available. Also, technical assistance will be available to operations at the federal, state and local levels to promote compliance. These assistance efforts are intended to avoid or mitigate any negative economic impacts from these rules on agricultural operations and allow them to remain competitive.

A60 Comment: (farmer, shoreland, and golf course owner) People are concerned about more and more restrictions. I'm not anti-DNR, but I am opposed to the things that are being proposed.

Response: The law mandating performance standards was passed because the legislature did not believe that 20 years of the voluntary approach was achieving the desired water quality improvements.

A61 Comment: (farmer) My concerns are for the individual's liberty and property rights. If you're not affecting the rights of your neighbor, you have a right to use your property as you want. If you do cross over that line, then there should be some accountability. The rules could be simplified where it applies to people who cross over that line to see that such concerns are addressed.

Response: No one has the right to degrade waters of the state, which are held in trust for all citizens. If your land use practices impair waters of the state, you are crossing the line you refer to and the rules do hold people accountable for compliance with performance standards. The reason the rule provisions concerning implementation and enforcement are lengthy is because the rule needs to be very clear about expectations, consequences and procedures. The first version of the rules was criticized because this detail was not included.

A62 Comment: (farmer) The Legislature passed COMM 83 to free up 9 million acres in Wisconsin for development with substandard septic systems, and we farmers who have less influence and less money to fight back will face discriminatory regulation.

Response: No farmer with an existing facility or practice will have to meet the performance standards unless 70% cost sharing is provided. The same is not true for urban nonpoint sources. Although cost sharing may be made available, it is not required for compliance.

A63 Comment: (farmer) I've only got a few years left to farm. If I was required to put in a manure pit, it would be a waste of taxpayers' and my money because no one in my family is going to continue to farm.

Response: Your county LCD will work with you to find a reasonable solution. No one wants a manure pit that will be abandoned shortly after construction, wasting your and the state's money.

A64 Comment: (WI Agri-Service Assn., WI Pork Producers, WPVGA, WI State Cranberry Growers; WI Cattlemen's Assn.) The proposed rules would require compliance by all farmers but substantially limit compliance by urban communities with a population density of less than 1,000 persons per square mile. Even the standards imposed on NR 216 communities are limited and their implementation substantially delayed (20% control of suspended solids by 2008 and 40% by 2013). This approach is unfair to large urban centers and to farmers. The limits on small urban center compliance are in stark contrast to the requirements of the enabling statute and results in unequal protection of the laws.

Response: It is true that the agricultural performance standards apply to all farmers, but existing non-permitted operations are not required to comply unless 70% cost-sharing is provided (90% for hardship cases). There is also a delayed start date for the nutrient management performance standard. With these restrictions on implementation, DNR's intent is to direct funding toward the worst cases or the most impaired waterbodies first. Even with this focus, the funding limitation will create an implementation timeline spanning several years. The effect is the same for the rural as for the urban areas, but funding will set the schedule and compliance in the rural setting and the code will set the schedule and compliance in the urban setting. The goal is the same--identify the worst cases first and require change in a timely manner.

A65 Comment: (MMSD) The revised program must address agricultural and urban nonpoint pollution with equal diligence. DATCP needs to proceed in a timely fashion with the development of technical standards so that the state can enforce NR 151 provisions applicable to agriculture. The absence of timely application of NR 151 to agriculture will result in an unbalanced enforcement effort and hinder progress towards improved water quality.

Response: DNR has applied equal diligence to the development of rules that address both agricultural and urban runoff. Comments about DATCP should be directed to that agency.

A66 Comment: (WI Livestock Breeders, farmer) We understand that a number of communities may be forgiven any nonpoint obligations under these rules. If all of agriculture needs to comply with the rules, then why not all of the urban communities? This is a fairness issue — don't single out just agriculture.

Response: Agriculture is clearly not singled out since there are urban performance standards which must be met without any cost sharing being required. See the response to the comment A64.

A67 Comment: (nursery) The biggest source of nonpoint pollution is fertilizer (the 4-step program with some getting on the sidewalk is the worst), washing cars, oil changes, etc. done by urban homeowners. The rules must apply to all landowners. Don't single out farmers and homeowners of more than 5 acres. Start where the problem is the worst — the incorporated areas of the state.

Response: In any given watershed, the major source of pollutants could be urban or rural depending on the land use. The amount of land in urban use is much less than any other category in the state (farmland, forests, etc.). We agree that a landowner on a ¼ acre lot may be putting on fertilizers in quantities that may exceed what the farmer is using. However, the lawn is only 50% of the area the landowner owns and it contributes less than 10% of the runoff from the site. All incorporated municipalities with a population density of 1,000 people per square mile will be required to conduct an educational and pollution prevention effort in their existing developed areas. The state is committed to an educational program to inform the landowners of their responsibility to clean water and to the increased involvement of local government to enforce pet waste pickup, disposal of lawn clippings and leaves, etc. for the hundreds of thousands of homes in these areas. Where a municipality has control over its own property, it will be expected to control pollutants from that property in a manner similar to what a farmer will be asked to do on land he/she owns for production.

A68 Comment: (Milw. Co.) The requirement that cost sharing must be made available to install buffers in agricultural areas but not be required for non-agricultural performance standards amounts to an unfunded mandate for urban areas. It is totally unacceptable to treat urban riparian landowners, private or public in this fashion. How can you not offer the same cost-sharing (70-90%) to those who own property along a lake or waterway, regardless of where they live? Milwaukee County has spent many years and dollars to purchase and preserve riparian areas throughout the county, and the DNR proposes an unfunded mandate as a reward for our stewardship.

Response: The statutory language that governs development of the performance standards clearly states that performance standards cannot be imposed on existing agricultural facilities and practices without cost-sharing. This same provision was not included for urban development in the final statutory language. DNR has no authority to change this situation.

A69 Comment: (WCA) There is a lack of parity between the agricultural and non-agricultural standards. Agricultural standards are defined in more general terms, yet non-agricultural standards continue to be defined in very exact numerical requirements. Although 70% cost sharing is a prerequisite for enforcement of agricultural standards, there is limited financial assistance to meet non-agricultural requirements for local units of government. Given increasing financial constraints on local governments, additional unfunded mandates will be directly passed on to the property taxpayers of the state. We request that local units of government be granted significant flexibility in applying BMPs so as to achieve the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

Response: By defining the performance standards as percent controls we are maximizing the flexibility in applying BMPs to achieve the goal. It is unclear why the agricultural performance standards are perceived as non-numeric standards since many of them are. Whether a standard is numeric or prescriptive doesn't diminish its ability to control runoff pollution to equivalent levels. See the response to the previous comment.

A70 Comment: (CWAC) The rules seem weighted toward rural problems, leaving homeowners free to spread fertilizer on their lands with minimum control and education. You see dark green lawns for frivolous purposes--those lawns do not support a family; or provide food. They are simply creating an image they want to project. There should be much tougher standards on lawns.

Response: The rule currently provides for control on residential lawns under 5 acres through an information and education approach. For lawns over 5 acres, nutrient application must be done in accordance with a plan. For existing development, there are performance standards to control pollutants from greater sources of toxicants such as the streets and parking lots. Future development will also have tighter controls.

A71 Comment: (farmer) We have a subdivision near our farm where less than 50% of the land is permeable, and a lot more water comes off them. You will see more flooding. Even if there is grass, it's compacted and the water doesn't soak in. Those of us at the bottom of those hills have that much water coming down, more erosion and more problems with our ditches. And we are going to have more and more houses and they cause significant problems.

Response: The problems this comment identifies are issues related to water quantity and not water quality, which these rules were directed to address.

A72 Comment: (farmer) There's a big building going up 40 feet away from water and cattails. I will be told that I'll need a buffer strip within so many feet of water, but what about this building? The discrepancy doesn't sit well with me or other farmers.

Response: The buffer requirement was removed from the rules.

A73 Comment: (farmer) It seems cities just call the DNR and dump wastes without any repercussions. In our county, a farmer accidentally ran over a storage system near an old waterway. Nothing went into the creek, but he was fined heavily. Within two weeks of his overflow problem, a newspaper story reported that millions of gallons of raw sewage were dumped into the Rock River because the city didn't have enough storage to handle that kind of rainwater.

Response: The proposed performance standards in NR 151 regulate non-point sources and the dumping of raw sewage is classified as a point source discharge and cannot be regulated by the proposed performance standards. However, the discharge of point sources including sewage is already regulated.

A74 Comment: (LCD) It is good to see urban and rural nonpoint pollution concerns addressed together. Often farmers point at urban, urban points at farmers; it's good to see some consistency with these rules. We wish lawn care was made a bigger part of the rule.

Response: We agree that urban and rural nonpoint source pollution need to be addressed together. Larger lawns (five acres or more) will have controls placed upon them. Smaller lawns, of which there are too many for DNR to control, will receive information and education at the local level to encourage responsible application of nutrients.

A75 Comment: (farmer) I looked at several counties by total stream miles listed in the 303(d) list, and concluded that the problems with the water supply seem to be originating at the municipal and urban level, not so much with agriculture. An EPA representative said impairments are being removed, with streams getting better in the long-term. Since we are seeing an improvement, let's leave well enough alone. Why spend more time and money when we are already improving? A lot of money will need to be spent because of these rules, but the money will not be there to work with agriculture. Agricultural sources of nonpoint source pollution should be secondary to urban and municipal causes, since that seems to be where the real problem is.

Response: Although the state has made progress in protecting its waters, much remains to be done. Although urban storm water runoff is the principal cause of degradation in urban streams, runoff from agriculture still has a profound influence throughout much of the state. Both sources must be further controlled to achieve surface water and groundwater quality standards.

A76 Comment: (farmer) My concern is making sure everyone who contributes to the runoff problem is treated equally, whether it's a municipality, construction, or whatever. If you are polluting more than your neighbor, whether it's construction or municipality or farm, they should be the ones who have to fix it first, not necessarily picking on just one group.

Response: The rules do not pick on one group. They are comprehensive and address both agricultural and urban sources of nonpoint pollution. The performance standards are minimum standards that all must meet. We agree that the worst violations should be addressed first and will attempt to do so through our permitting and cost-share programs. Governmental units will also play a major role in setting priorities through development of county land and water resource management plans, other types of plans and by submitting applications for various grants to help finance the needed controls.

A77 Comment: (farmer) There does not seem to be any concern here about Milwaukee dumping millions and millions of gallons of pollution into Lake Michigan, but you're concerned about the cows in the creek. That is just totally ridiculous. I understand it's statutory. I'd like to get that statute replaced until you make Milwaukee abide by the same rules that you expect each individual farmer to follow. I have no power when I go up to the state capitol. Milwaukee does. But if you're going to make me do it - at least accommodate me.

Response: Nonpoint pollution and the discharge from sewerage facilities must both be controlled. Milwaukee is being required to address any by-passing that is a violation of its WPDES permit.

A78 Comment: (individual) The fairness standards are not yet met. Urban use of fertilizers, pesticide, etc., along with the existence of a large percent of impervious areas in urban areas means more needs to be done and addressed through lakeshore areas, Walmarts, lawn care and landscape companies, golf course managers, etc. -- city by city, village by village.

Response: We believe these rules and ATCP 29 (pesticides) address all of these pollution sources.

A79 Comment: (individual) Do not enact these rules until further adequate research has been done. Do not destroy our state with more questionable regulations.

A80 Comment: (WI Cattlemen's Assn.). There is no documentation that these rules are necessary or justified to protect water quality.

A81 Comment: (farmer) Use scientific reasons for developing the rules. The DNR has targeted certain watersheds for protection. If we happen to have a watershed that has 10 times the phosphorus because of rocks on-site, is it fair to have an unattainable standard for people living in that area? Use common sense.

Response: The department is required by s. 281.16 Wis. Stats. to establish performance standards designed to meet water quality standards by limiting nonpoint source pollution. State law does not give us an option. We have held hundreds of meetings with stakeholders, experts and the public in the development of these rules. We are confident that they can be implemented with a limited amount of adverse impact on agricultural and other operations and will provide a significant positive impact on water quality in Wisconsin.

A82 Comment: (individual) DNR has always based its decisions on current law and sound science. These new/revised rules do just that. The new rules are not overreaching by any means. DNR not only allows time for the rules to be phased in but they also give the communities and citizens substantial grant monies to offset the cost to become compliant.

Response: Thank you.

A83 Comment: (individual) There should be surface water modeling and groundwater modeling so you can understand what's happening and how big of a water problem we have (quantity and quality). There would be a different priority put on this program if you knew that.

Response: DNR performed extensive modeling using SLAMM, P8, RUSLE, T55 and other models in the development of these performance standards. We also consulted and relied on countless scientific studies, experts from numerous universities and state agencies, scores of agricultural producers, municipal and transportation engineers, biologists, hydrogeologists, local government officials, and representatives of trade and other associations. We believe we have a better understanding of the water quality problems facing the state than we have ever had in our history and that these performance standards represent a balance between protection and enhancement of water quality and cost-effective implementation.

A84 Comment: (farmer) A farm magazine reported that applying cow manure to farm fields diminishes sediment and phosphorus losses. Researchers at the University of Minnesota used various methods to apply the equivalent of 25 tons of steer manure per acre. They collected the runoff to monitor sediment and phosphorus losses and found that sediment loss was only half as great where manure was applied compared to soil that did not get manure. Phosphorus losses were also lower in the manure-treated plots. When you read the regulation about what we should do and what we can't do, it clearly conflicts with a lot of the science that is available.

Response: The department recognizes that importance of manure as a nutrient and soil conditioner which can have beneficial environmental impacts. The performance standards and prohibitions and associated technical standards do not eliminate the land application of manure on cropped fields. However, they do place restrictions on how and in what amounts the manure may be landspread in order to avoid direct and indirect water quality impacts associated with improper land application of manure.

A85 Comment: (LCD) State, federal, and local agency cooperation will determine the success or failure of this conservation effort. There must be full support of DATCP, FSA, and NRCS.

A86 Comment: (MEG) Coordination between the DNR and DATCP needs to continue. DNR's rules standing alone do not provide a comprehensive nonpoint program. For example, detailed implementation and enforcement language is contained in NR 151.09 and NR 151.095. But this mechanism only applies to cost-share eligibility associated with targeted runoff management (TRM) grants. The implementation and enforcement language for the bulk of the funding that will constitute cost-share dollars through the DNR and DATCP is not contained in NR 151. By proceeding sequentially with their separate rules, DNR and DATCP should be in a better position to avoid some of the inconsistencies that arose in the first round of hearings. However, proceeding sequentially also carries with it the potential for delay. The protections provided by these rules are long overdue and we would urge the DNR and the NRB to work cooperatively but vigorously with DATCP and its Board to ensure that his rule process as a whole moves forward.

Response: We agree and intend to continue working with our state and federal partners.

A87 Comment: (CWC) There should be a way to monitoring the impact of these standards 5, 10 or 15 years from now. One easy way would be to add a grant category that enables county agencies to receive funds to monitor the water quality impact of various best management practices.

Response: The proposed rules allow the department to fund project evaluation activities, including monitoring. However, the monitoring effort must compete for funding and be an integral component of the project being funded. A comprehensive monitoring approach to overall program evaluation is best accomplished through other means, including the department's baseline monitoring conducted through its other water quality evaluation programs. The intergovernmental agreement identified in NR 151.09 will contain an element that addresses monitoring.

A88 Comment: (MMSD) Meeting the performance standards will require significant expenditures by both the private and public sectors. It is important for the state to evaluate the impact of the performance standards on reducing pollutant loadings, and ultimately, on water quality. We would welcome cooperating with the DNR in such an endeavor by making available our water quality data, which would be very useful in establishing a pre-implementation baseline.

Response: We are aware that we need an evaluation strategy for the programs and the performance standards associated with nonpoint pollution. While the rules are more enforceable than the original priority watershed program, because of cost-sharing requirements for rural landowners, the implementation of practices may again be somewhat scattered. If in a given watershed, not all the practices are implemented, then water quality monitoring may not show a response in the stream. Baseline data will be very useful and appreciated. The DNR already evaluates the water resources according to a 5-year plan. This process will continue to operate, although it is not appropriate to include that process in these rules.

A89 Comment: (WLWCA/WALCE, several counties) Water quality monitoring is not mentioned anywhere in the rules, even though past program audits have criticized the department for not being able to document the success of program efforts over the last 20 years. Neither federal, state nor local units of government will ever be able to do this independently. We strongly believe that interagency partnerships and citizen volunteers are needed to get the job done. Somewhere in the rules, state grants and technical assistance should be offered to support local water quality monitoring efforts.

Response: We understand the concern. See the response to previous comments on monitoring.

A90 Comment: (farmer) I've been involved in a test trial project with barnyards in the Waumandee watershed project that has been going on for 11 years. I have spent a lot of money doing no-till, barnyard projects, manure storage, streambank restoration, etc. There are no results to say whether we have improved the water or not. You should see if it's working before requiring anything else.

Response: What we have learned from our priority watershed projects is that a comprehensive effort must be made before measurable water quality improvement can be made. We would not expect to be able to determine the extent of improvement based on the efforts at one farm. We would need a whole farm effort in at least 60% of the farms in the watershed (preferably 80%) before we would expect to see significant improvement in water quality. These performance standards are designed to provide a base from which such a comprehensive effort can be achieved.

A91 Comment: (farmer) When we do these things, like installing a 10-foot buffer, we would like to see some numbers on what has happened and how it has improved things. It would also let the DNR see what is the most effective practice. We might need to reassess practices that are not working.

Response: DNR, NRCS, DATCP and counties have been tracking BMP installations for years and these rules provide for evaluation of conservation practices.

A92 Comment: (individual) Increase funding education, monitoring, and enforcement. One of the failings of the current nonpoint program is that it's very difficult to enforce against a small percentage of irresponsible people.

Response: We hope to be able to obtain the resources to accomplish this. Effective enforcement will be best achieved through state-local partnerships. We believe our rules promote this.

A93 Comment: (individual) We need to continue working on information and education, possibly a website with information.

Response: We agree. We currently maintain a website with this information.

A94 Comment: (individual) Nothing is said in the regulations about educating the public. Construction folks, farmers, (and) municipal governments are well educated. The common landowner needs to be educated. I don't see that requiring permitted municipalities to perform information and education for the public will be effective.

A95 Comment: (farmer) One of the biggest strengths of the priority watershed program was the education component. We shouldn't lose that.

A96 Comment: (UW CALS) To complement and enhance any regulatory action, effective information and education strategies and delivery mechanisms must be in place. Farmers need information to allow them to judge the impact of management practices on the economics and sustainability of their farming operations. Education programs that deliver practical, research-based information and also compliment the proposed regulations must also be offered to farmers.

A97 Comment: (LCC) Education plays a large role in landowners complying with the standards. Those responsible for meeting these new performance standards need assistance as their operations change to continue to be in compliance.

Response: We agree that education is an important component and we will be working with counties, UWEX, DATCP and other agencies to deliver educational materials and training for both rural and urban residents affected by the rules. County LWRM plans will also have an education component. DATCP will provide support funding for this under ATCP 50.

A98 Comment: (golf course supervisor/former municipal official) Our attitude on the municipal level is that these rules are a great idea, and if this has to happen, it's going to cost us taxpayers money to make it happen. No big deal. It's the right thing to do. We hope they are implemented and handled properly on the state level. Let's just use our head and document things and figure out the right way to handle this.

Response: While the rules don't identify the evaluation effort that will be used, we heartily agree that we need to measure the response to the rules. The water resources are already monitored on a recurring basis to assess their improvement or decline. If the performance standards are implemented such that all nonpoint sources are controlled in a watershed, then we should see significant improvement, particularly in streams dominated by nonpoint sources.

B General Funding and Cost-share Comments

B1 Comment: (farmer) The estimated cost of \$930 million over a 10-year period to implement the rules is staggering. Not only am I outraged by the portion of this price tag that will be placed on me as a producer, but as a taxpayer who will help pay the other 70 percent.

Response: The revised state cost estimates to implement the agricultural performance standards range from \$356-434 million over 10 years. This price tag is a fraction of what it costs to restore water resources once they have been degraded.

B2 Comment: (LCC) There is a need to re-evaluate the way budgeting is done when proposing project resources. Under budgeting is done to get support for the programs. Once projects are underway, they are reduced in scope or additional funds are needed because of other demands for the money. At least use inflationary increases, or strive for a lesser degree of correctness. Under budgeting and delays or cancellations of projects have created a lot of discouragement with our employees and their customers.

Response: This comment is not germane to these rules.

B3 Comment: (individual) We're already bearing costs of nonpoint source pollution in impacts on fisheries, on the tourism industry, and in impaired waterways affecting the health of humans and other species. Certainly, there will be further costs.

B4 Comment: (student) We have a choice: if we're going to have a good environment or pay more taxes so businesses can be well-off. It's a trade-off. Imagine how bad the water will be in 20 years if we do nothing. One way or another, we will end up paying taxes to have clean water.

Response: We agree that these are all good reasons to promulgate this rule.

B5 Comment: (Corn Promotion Bd.) The costs that were presented to the NRB were not the true costs. We commissioned a study by Randy Fortenbery, UW agricultural economist, ("A Study of Costs of Compliance Related to Non-point Pollution Rules for Wisconsin Crop Producers") that shows \$61-80 million annual costs associated with this for about 5 million acres of corn and soybeans grown in Wisconsin. These costs include the farmers' share of compliance with the rules on land rated above acceptable levels of soil loss, including the costs of idling land in strips and contours. It does not address

any costs by livestock producers or the cost of preparing nutrient management plans for all Wisconsin cropland. It also does not address the state share of the costs and these will be larger, as most costs will be shared on a 70/30 basis with the state picking up the 70% share. Any area where a large share of the farmland would be forced to strip crop, contour farm or use no till will pick up a disproportionate share of the cost. (Note: See Background Memo for related comments from postcards.)

Response: The study focuses on lost revenue involved in bringing all Wisconsin cropland to the tolerable soil loss value and ignores the long-term benefit and cost-savings of maintaining soil productivity.

B6 Comment: (RPC) Are there any estimates of the costs involved for the agricultural and non-agricultural standards, including implementation of the rules?

Response: State cost estimates for implementing the rules are described in the Fiscal Estimate for NR 151, part of the rules package. Costs to implement BMPs to meet the agricultural performance standards and prohibitions are estimated to be \$35.6-\$43.4 million annually. Costs to implement the non-agricultural performance standards are estimated to be range from \$28.7-\$31.9 million annually from 2002 to 2007, from \$58.7 -\$61.9 million from 2008 to 2012 and from \$90.2-\$96.4 million annually starting in 2013.

B7 Comment: (individual) Increase funding for full implementation. Farmers can't do it on their own, but if we have an effective program in place, it will be easier to get the funding.

Response: We believe the cost-share program provides adequate support to farmers required to comply with the performance standards. We agree that full funding to cover implementation is desirable, but that is a legislative issue.

B8 Comment: (state senator) It's a pipe dream to tell people that anything less than 100% paid construction cost will be a reality. Environmental progress should be paid for with general tax dollars--that is a fair way of reaching our environmental objectives. We need to spend a lot more effort in the future providing incentives for better environmental management and less effort on regulations.

Response: The state law requires that cost sharing under DATCP or DNR programs not exceed 70% except in cases of economic hardship. Governmental units can use other funding sources to increase the cost share rate above this amount if they so choose.

B9 Comment: (farmer) Lack of funding will greatly devalue existing operations and increase the difficulty of selling. Perhaps the only way to sell land under these conditions will be to a developer. The economic impact in rural Wisconsin will be significant.

Response: We do not agree with the comment. The availability of funding to implement performance standards should not have an effect on operations or their market value.

B10 Comment: (MEG) The performance standards will be meaningless in the absence of adequate funding and a commitment of resources from the DNR for education and enforcement. We encourage and support the DNR's effort to receive adequate funding for cost-sharing and program implementation.

Response: We agree with the importance of education and welcome your support for the rule.

B11 Comment: (LCC/LCD) There needs to be ample funds allocated annually to make this rule package succeed.

B12 Comment: (WI Env. Decade) While not within the purview of the DNR rule-making actions, we note that the effectiveness of the proposed rules depends upon sufficient cost-share resources, and we support full funding for all conservation programs called for in the rules.

B13 Comment: (individual) Suggestions can be made to legislators who will be writing the checks.

B14 Comment: (WAL) It is critical to support adequate funding for this program.

Response: We agree.

B15 Comment: (CWC) We support full funding of the nonpoint program in the 2001 biennial budget to ensure full implementation of the agricultural performance standards. The costs of polluted runoff in terms of tourism, water treatment and the degradations of our fisheries have reached billions of dollars.

We support the need for adequate funding for implementation of the non-agricultural performance standards. We oppose the proposal in the Governor's budget to reduce funding for the urban nonpoint program and to combine that program with the urban flood control program. We will be urging the Legislature to split these two programs and to increase the funding from the current \$11 million in the Governor's budget to the \$28 million level proposed by the DNR. We further believe that the primary source of funding for the nonpoint program should be derived from vehicle transfer fees and not from general purpose revenues.

Response: These comments will be passed on to the legislature as part of final rule promulgation. We appreciate the support for this program evident in the comment.

B16 Comment: (WI Agri-Service Assn., WI Pork Producers, WPVGA, WI State Cranberry Growers) The rules create expectations for substantive reduction in nonpoint source pollution but, despite the statutory requirement for cost sharing, provide no significant funding sources to support the hundreds of millions of dollars of required cost sharing. The rules require compliance by every farmer in the state regardless of a farmer's ability to pay a 30% cost share.

Response: The state law limits the amount of funding offered under DNR and DATCP programs to 70% (90% for economic hardship). A governmental unit need only provide 70% cost sharing in order to enforce compliance under local ordinances. Although a governmental unit can use several funding sources to increase the cost-share rate for a farmer, doing so is at its own discretion. The law recognizes that farmers must pay part of this cost.

B17 Comment: (WI Agri-Service Assn., WI Pork Producers, WPVGA, WI State Cranberry Growers) These rules should not be implemented until the cost-sharing funds are available. The great expectations created by these rules cannot be realized until the reality of over a half billion dollars of state cost-sharing support is identified.

B18 Comment: (farmer) The \$20-\$30 million for funding doesn't amount to much when spread over the entire state. When and where does it become available? You can pass rules, but then you say they don't go into effect until I have cost-sharing money to make the required changes. Why pass rules until we have money to put them into effect? There's no money in the state budget now; when will it be there?

Response: The legislature directed DNR to develop these standards regardless of the money to be made available for implementation. The legislature, through its future budget bills, will decide how much funding to dedicate to this program and consequently how long it takes to implement the standards statewide. Funding under s. 281.65 is considered available when a landowner receives a written offer of cost share from either DNR or a governmental unit.

B19 Comment: (farmer) There may be money initially for cost sharing, but how do we finish the work cost-sharing funds have initially started?

Response: Once compliance is achieved, the landowner will be responsible for the cost of long-term maintenance.

B20 Comment: (LCD) The lack of program funding will put an extraordinary strain on the producers and the LCD in our county. Based on our cost-share funding in 2000 and the projected amount available in 2002, the average landowner can expect to receive cost sharing once every 17 years. The LCD was never able to match the need for cost sharing for structural erosion control practices. With the promulgation of these rules, the demand for cost sharing and technical assistance will be even greater and complaints of non-compliance will be higher. Our LWRM plan was approved in 1999. Through 2002, the state will have funded less than 8% of the cost sharing approved in the plan. We request a review of the well-documented historic and ongoing need for cost sharing assistance in the county to determine a reasonable state match to maintain a minimum conservation effort in the county.

Response: The legislature has decided what the state match will be. The proposed rules provide for the highest cost-share rates allowable under the law. DNR's programs are, by law, competitive grant programs and not programs designed to insure a minimum level of funding for on-going, baseline conservation efforts in every county. Cost sharing is available for base-line maintenance through DATCP under ATCP 50.

B21 Comment: (farmer) I'm glad to see the continuing programs you've started. A problem in the past was that the funding stops, and then you're sitting with half of a (nutrient management) plan done.

Response: We regret any circumstances that led to your situation. DNR has worked with county organizations to be fair in our statewide allocation of available budget resources. Once a county has its allocation, it makes specific decisions about which BMPs are provided funding in any given year.

B22 Comment: (farmer) Make sure you have enough money for these programs because the farmer can't bear the costs on their own right now with the prices being what they are. We have many conservation practices that I don't mind keeping up, but don't make it too hard on us — just be reasonable. Before I lay out a large amount of cash to do something, I will quit.

Response: The legislation requires that 70% cost sharing be made available as a condition of requiring compliance at existing sources (90% in cases of economic hardship). The county can combine different programs to provide an even greater cost-share rate if it so chooses. There are also generous federal cost share programs. The rule requires that new agricultural facilities and practices achieve compliance regardless of the availability of cost sharing.

B23 Comment: (individual, River Alliance, Sierra Club, WISPIRG, TU) Additional funding is needed for county LCDs. These agencies will be the ones most responsible for implementing and enforcing these new standards and need adequate funding to do the job.

B24 Comment: (LCD) As a function of total county levy, Buffalo County provides more than the regional average amount of funds to the LCD. If Buffalo County were to lead the region in funding, we still would be unable to meet the need for landowner technical assistance under the state's current funding scenarios. To meet the greater demands these proposed rules will place on landowners, our LCD will need to retain at a minimum, the 3 technicians we currently have. Under the current funding scenarios proposed by the state agencies, this will not be possible. The state must, at a minimum, meet the obligations in Act 9 to fund 100% of the first position, 70% of the second, and 50% of the remaining LCD staff.

B25 Comment: (WCA) Adequate and consistent financial assistance to county LCDs for both cost sharing and staff support is the key to successful implementation. The uncertainty of state funding from one fiscal year to the next severely impedes the ability of counties to adequately plan for and prioritize workloads. The gap between funding and expectation put on counties continues to widen. The DNR and counties must work jointly to secure the level of funding that is necessary to meet state and local water quality goals and to simplify and stabilize county funding sources.

B26 Comment: (LCC) With the Legislature defining the rules of the various state agencies in the area, the DNR is responsible for establishing the agricultural performance standards. It is important that the counties have adequate funding to support staff in assisting and enforcing these rules.

B27 Comment: (LCC) County LCDs are the local team players, each with different capacities and abilities to carry out the performance standards. All this will take staff and money, and without this the performance standards mean nothing.

B28 Comment: (LCC) There is no viable staffing strategy that will provide adequate dollars or a secure funding source to address the workload associated with standards implementation. A staffing strategy should look at where intensive agriculture is taking place, current staff capability and the impact on water quality, not a simplistic 3 staff per county approach. A staffing strategy is important because: 1) it can take years for staff to build confidence and develop a relationship with a farmer before the farmer is willing to spend money on new conservation practices that may be expensive; and 2) cost-share dollars must accompany staffing for technical assistance — one without the other will result in lack of implementation; and state requirements to cost-share agreement forms, program tracking and reporting have gotten progressively more detailed and time consuming.

B29 Comment: (CWC) We strongly support additional funding for county LCDs. The DNR should take the concerns of WLWCA very seriously. We recognize that they are much more involved than any other interest group in the process. The county conservationists will be on the front lines in implementing and enforcing the new standards and to the extent possible their concerns must be addressed if these rules are going to be effective. We don't believe that the WLWCA concerns merit opposition to the rules. If we

had waited for all the enforcement and implementation issues to be resolved in the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, or the Endangered Species Acts, we would likely still not have any of these laws on the books.

B30 Comment: (individual) Often more money is available than staff to help use it. With all the grant programs at the state and federal level, our biggest need is personnel to administer the programs.

Response: We agree that staffing is critical. The DATCP is responsible for the allocation of state funds to support county staff. We have, and will continue, to support DATCP and counties in developing and implementing fair statewide staffing strategies.

B31 Comment: Several producers, crop consultants, a UW professor, and agricultural companies and organizations commented that 70% cost sharing was not enough, and that funding should not be limited to only capital improvements. They cited management considerations, manure transport, nutrient management plan writing, and other costs incurred to implement nutrient management, additional equipment needs, up-keep, loss of production, additional property taxes, future problems that need correcting, other potential impacts and manure storage while the ground is frozen. One LCD estimated it will cost \$80,000 to \$100,000 to build a retaining wall and filter strip and another \$130,000 for a nutrient storage facility. Another noted that farmers cannot pass the cost of environmental protection on to the consumers as industries can, so they should not be expected to shoulder the entire burden. Cost sharing must be significant and permanent.

Response: We do not agree that all of these factors should be fully compensated since some practices simply reflect sound stewardship. The grant provisions cover the reasonable value of farmers' in-kind contributions of donated labor, materials, equipment and supplies (excluding normal operating routines). Economic hardship funding will allow needy farmers to receive cost sharing of 90%. In addition to cost sharing structural practices, the rules provide cost sharing for several lower cost non-structural BMPs such as nutrient and pest management, prescribed grazing and conservation tillage practices.

B32 Comment: (WI Cattlemen's Assn.) Requiring manure storage while the ground is frozen is expensive. Additional equipment will be required to handle stored manure.

Response: Manure storage is not a requirement of these rules, but those farmers that may need to install manure storage will have 70% cost sharing available for the construction of the facility. In cases of economic hardship, the cost share increases to as much as 90%. In addition, storage facilities allow the farmer to spread manure at a time when nutrients can be used more effectively by crops and reduce the need for purchasing commercial fertilizers.

B33 Comment: Several different cost-share rates were suggested. One farmer said that cost-sharing major projects at 75-85% would keep farmers from going out of business, a county LCC recommended 80-85% and elimination of the economic hardship clause, another farmer recommended 85%, five farmers, WI Livestock Breeders, WI Cattlemen's Assn. and DATCP recommended 90%, WI Pork Producers, WI Agri-Service Assn., WPVGA, and WI Cranberry Growers Assn. commented that the 70 % cost-share rate is the statutory minimum and should be raised to 90%, which they consider to be a major compromise. Another farmer suggested 90% cost sharing with 100% in hardship cases while another farmer suggested 90-100% for everything. Two farmers along with PLOW commented that the cost-share rate should be 100%.

Response: The state law governing DNR cost-sharing for the nonpoint source program states that cost sharing shall not exceed 70% except in cases of economic hardship, when it shall not exceed 90%. DATCP has the same restriction on its programs. In addition, both ATCP 50 and NR 153 do not allow state funds under these programs to be combined in such a way as to exceed these limits. So, the state share may not exceed these rates when the source of funding is for either the DNR or DATCP cost-share programs administered under s. 281.65 and/or chapter 92. A county can assemble a cost-share package that exceeds these rates, but would have to use funds from other sources such as federal sources, local sources or state programs other than those administered under s. 281.65 or chapter 92.

B34 Comment: (farmer) The agricultural economy needs all of the help it can get right now. We are losing money on every acre of corn and soybeans we grow (cost to produce a bushel corn is \$2.40, price has been \$1.50-\$2.00/bushel; cost to produce a bushel of soybeans is \$5.80, price has been \$4.00 -

\$4.80/bushel). We need government funding to break even and will need more help with more regulations.

Response: The state law requires that 70% cost share be made available to the landowner (up to 90% in cases of economic hardship) before compliance can be required for existing facilities and practices. The state cost share laws also limit the amount of cost sharing DATCP and the DNR can provide through their respective grant programs. The rules are consistent with the law. There is also an option for the county to combine other funds with the DATCP and DNR funds to pay for more of the compliance costs. This is a local decision.

B35 Comment: (2 farmers, 2 individuals) Many farmers are in debt and can't come up with the 30% match. Even if/when the farm economy recovers, it will take years for us to be a prosperous operation again.

B36 Comment: (DATCP) Either expand the conditions under which a farmer becomes eligible for an economic hardship award or remove the statutory barriers to increasing the cost-share rate to 90%.

Response: State law essentially requires a local match for state cost sharing, unless the county can bring other funding sources into the picture to increase the cost-share rate. The economic hardship criteria were modified to allow for a hardship finding based on debt repayment capability as well as debt to asset ratio.

B37 Comment: (farmer) It makes little sense in poor economic times for agriculture to make it even tougher for agricultural producers to survive. If these rules are for the public good, the public should participate in the cost.

Response: The state tax payers all contribute by providing cost-share funds for implementation and by paying for county government, which provides the staff resources to assist landowners. Those staff resources are paid both through county levy as well as through state tax revenue.

B38 Comment: (farmer) Cost sharing should be provided for conservation tillage equipment such as no-till drills/planters and/or custom labor performing those tasks. So should moving an operation to a new location.

Response: Cost sharing is provided for all of these.

B39 Comment: (tech. col. ag. instructor) Cost sharing of farmer practices to reduce erosion and nutrient loss needs to remain at 70% or be increased. Farmers are receiving 1979 prices for their dairy products while paying 2001 costs. Grain prices are also at very low levels. Generally, small farms have less erosion than larger farms. Small farms normally have smaller fields, which contribute less erosion. Small livestock farms also rotate crops more and have more acres in legume/grass forage so there is less erosion. Small farms need cost sharing to help pay the expenses for these mandates.

Response: At least 70% cost share must be made available (up to 90% for economic hardship cases) to require compliance, and the state cannot offer more than this amount through its grant program. So, the cost-share rates offered through the state are relatively fixed. A local governmental unit, at its option, can increase this amount but other funding sources must be used. Cost sharing is required for farms, regardless of size, unless the farming operation is a point source under Wisconsin law. Point sources are not eligible for state cost share funding under 281.65.

B40 Comment: (2 farmers) Cost sharing 70% really amounts to 50% because of the added costs associated with those practices. Cost sharing does not cover management of those practices, only capital costs — out of pocket expenses. Last year we estimated an average of \$6,000 per farm across the state while an increase of 20% adds \$1,200 more. This won't break the bank.

Response: We have endeavored to reduce the amount of "slippage" on cost-sharing by allowing payments for farmer's labor and equipment expense.

B41 Comment: (farmer) These rules will have an impact on whether we expand or not. If DNR or government is going to say we have to follow the requirements in these rules, the DNR or the government should pay for it. Farmers should not even have to have the 30% (funding match) loaded onto our backs.

Response: The legislature has specifically authorized the department to require compliance with performance standards at existing facilities provided that 70% cost sharing (90% in cases of economic hardship) is made available. This means that compliance can be required even though the landowner must provide a local match of 30% (10% in cases of economic hardship). Although a local governmental unit can combine other funding sources to increase the cost share rate, this is not required.

B42 Comment: (individual, River Alliance, TU) We support adding a requirement to spend cost-share dollars for agricultural improvements on impaired waterways.

Response: The state statute sets forth a variety of water resources problems that the grant programs may address. Improving impaired waters (303(d) listed waters) is only one of the problems identified. Although projects to improve impaired waters are given higher priority in the proposed rule, other projects may receive funding consistent with the state law.

B43 Comment: (UW rural sociology) With a seemingly very limited state budget looming, financial resources are best targeted to high ranking priority areas. Much of the funding will come from bonding limiting the opportunity to invest in changing management practices. Research has demonstrated that investment in capital expenditures without changing the associated management practices provides little gain in environmental protection. Education and compensation for adopting what is perceived to be risky practices needs more attention in the proposed rules. Using bonded dollars to invest in technical fixes does little for changing these inappropriate behaviors.

Response: The legislative budget process has greatly limited the amount of funding available under these rules that can be used for non-structural management practices. These projects will, however, be conducted in the context of broader county land and water resources management programs funded by DATCP under ATCP 50. Counties that receive those funds must have an approved LWRM plan that, by law, must contain an educational component. The department will develop an intergovernmental agreement with key partners (as required under s. NR 151.09) to help coordinate education, structural and non-structural management changes in areas of greatest need.

B44 Comment: (farmer) I hope you don't come after every farm in a watershed, but look each farm over and target the farms with problems first. I hope you watch residential developments very closely. Waterfront development in our northern county could possibly be a larger problem and do more polluting than farmland.

Response: The county will play the most important role in targeting and working first with priority landowners. DNR will work closely with the county, and only intends to approach landowners directly in those cases where the county is unwilling or unable to take the necessary steps. We agree that waterfront development can be a problem and the rules (both DNR's and DATCP's) contain some provisions that can be used to help address this problem.

B45 Comment: (farmer) Concerning spending priorities: do you want to spend money on concrete when 90% of cropland needs a nutrient management plan? My priority watershed spends \$250,000 on cement. Can taxpayers afford to invest in bricks and mortar when farmers probably will not be in business?

Response: Counties will play a major role in setting priorities during implementation. Most of DNR's money is bonding money and cannot be used for nutrient management. There are some funding sources that can be used for these types of management practices, including a small amount of state GPR funding and federal funding under s. 319 of the Clean Water Act. We hope to work with DATCP and other partners to develop additional resources needed for nutrient management and other cropping practices.

B46 Comment: (WISPIRG) In accordance with the proposed Family Farm Protection Act, we must not simply hand out state and federal dollars to whichever operations apply for them: You need to distinguish between small and large farms. You need to provide cost sharing for subsidies for state- and federally required nutrient management plans giving priority to small farms. We want cost sharing to be directed to small farms, not industrial operations.

Response: The department has no authority to deny cost sharing to larger operations, although once an operation is large enough to require a WPDES permit (for animal waste management) it is not eligible for

funding under ch. NR 120 or ch. NR 153. The rules do contain some provisions to cost share limited expansions at smaller operations.

B47 Comment: (UW rural sociology) Sources of agricultural nonpoint source pollution should be identified, measured, then ranked, with resources allocated to addressing the most significant pollution problems first, rather than regulating all farms regardless of their contribution to nonpoint source pollution. There is an increasing amount of research that demonstrates that the majority of pollutant loading comes from a small area (sub-field) during a few episodic events, such as construction site erosion or a severe storm. The scale of policy implementation needs to match, or at least approximate, the scale where the most severe sources originate.

Response: The state law requires that statewide performance standards be developed so that all farmers will have a common understanding of management expectations. Targeting will occur in the grants process. Counties will submit grant applications to compete for funds, and will be submitting those applications to work in high priority areas identified in Land and Water Resource Management Plans.

B48 Comment: (individual) I urge the application of funds and coalitions with organizations that might provide additional resources to make cleanup feasible now and not cause undue problems for those who live and work in the watershed. Given insufficient funds to do the whole state, I suggest selection of several demonstration projects that are cleaned fully with an intensive effort. An example would be the Brill River, about 12 miles long, that flows out of Long Lake and is the most upstream river to feed directly into the Red Cedar River. The river starts out clean and clear, running through forest and grass-buffered banks, and becomes brown as it runs through agricultural land, where cattle are allowed in the river. DNR should have the will, the power, and the clout to take the lead in cleaning up the river. There are a number of concerned citizens, including hunting and fishing associations, that would help.

Response: Contact your county and work to get funding for this through the TRM grant program administered under ch NR 153. DNR can only issue grants for projects that have been applied for by local governments.

B49 Comment: (LCC) The cost estimates make it seem like agriculture is not doing anything. We disagree — much improvement has been made voluntarily by the industry over the years. It appears that only the "bad actors" will receive the funding. This should not be. One alternative would be to offer "green credits," or utilize the use value assessment law to reward those farmers who are meeting the new standards.

Response: We agree that many conservation practices have been implemented voluntarily, but more needs to be done. Landowners that already meet these standards will not have to implement new measures but will be required to maintain the land in such a way as to continue compliance with the standards. Funding must be made available under the law to achieve compliance, and that is the state's funding priority. This will require a substantial amount of financial resources. Once compliance is achieved, the department believes that the landowner must maintain compliance at his/her own expense.

B50 Comment: (LCC) There is no strategy or schedule to fund the redesign package. Only bonding or general funds have been proposed. Creating the standards without funding or a strategy to implement is meaningless. With costs reported at \$16-\$80 million annually, there needs to be another source of stable and adequate funding, like the title transfer fee revenues that used to pay for water quality improvements but were lost to another program. Three (3) suggestions are offered:

1. License fees from snowmobile and boat trailers. These should be dedicated to funding LWRM plans (staffing and cost sharing).
2. Water use fees. a) The City of New York provides dollars for protection of their drinking water supply—a reservoir in upstate New York. The cost-share dollars pay for agricultural nonpoint pollution protection. b) The City of Appleton (1996) charges a quarterly fee of \$13.50 for a single-family home for storm water management. c) Grand Chute established fees in 1997 and charges a quarterly cost of \$10 for a single-family home.
3. Food tax. Missouri has had a one-tenth of one percent sales tax since 1983, half of which is dedicated to soil and water conservation. In 2001, this portion was \$40 million of which \$20 million was provided

for cost sharing for farmers and the rest for program administration and soil and water conservation districts.

4. Manure fee on WPDES permits. Require the DNR to annually charge 0.0005 cents per gallon of manure that is land spread in addition to the current annual WPDES permit fee. The additional fee must be provided to LCDs in counties with WPDES permitted operations for staff costs to annually review and approve 590 nutrient management plans and landowner compliance with new state standards. The fee on a 1,500 cow operation would generate \$5,118 a year compared to \$18,000 a year for consulting costs to the same operation. For a 700-cow operation, the fee would generate \$2,389 a year compared to a consulting fee of \$8,400 a year for the operation. Currently there is no strategy or mechanism to pay for LCD staff to provide technical assistance on WPDES permits or NR 243 NODs or the new state standards.

Response: These are interesting ideas. Please work with your legislator to see how they might be implemented.

B51 Comment: (farmer) The responsibility for funding should be spread around and not just come from the DNR's budget. The UW could do some monitoring.

Response: Funding and support will come from many sources, including DNR, DATCP, NRCS, FSA, EPA and county government to name a few. UW also plays a major role in training and providing educational and evaluation resources.

B52 Comment: (farmer) Concerning equipment, innovative ways of sharing or financing need to be tried. Concerning the loss of income: even though equipment is expensive, it has some resale value.

Response: Some counties have offered equipment-sharing options to farmers. Contact your county LCD with your suggestion.

B53 Comment: (farmer) Reward good practices. Get every acre on nutrient management plan before trying buffer strips. Cost-sharing intervals and rates should be increased for grid sampling. And there should be a money-back guarantee to try practices on a smaller scale, like the Discovery Farm concept.

Response: Many of these concepts are being investigated such as nutrient management insurance. It should be noted that while nutrient management will reduce the potential of excess nutrients entering surface waters, sediment is also a major pollutant of our lakes, rivers and streams.

B54 Comment: (S. Fork Hay Project Manager) Instead of providing 70% cost sharing, our project has provided a sliding-scale funding formula based on the amount of reduction. Instead of paying on a practice, the payment is based on the value of the reduced amount of phosphorus to waters of the state. It is performance-based. We have only a few projects left this spring; when completed, we will have addressed all critical sites for a total cost of about \$25,000 to the state—less than the traditional barnyard projects alone usually cost (\$35,000). A program like this provides funding to the farmers -- it does not fund contractors or consultants. It also acknowledges that the farmers are the resource managers. LCDs help facilitate this.

Response: Each county staff will work with its landowners to achieve performance standards given the amount and type of funds available. We hope that applicable parts of your approach can be used by other counties, consistent with administrative rule requirements.

B55 Comment: (co. public works dept.) These rules could eat up \$250 million because only 1/3 of every dollar goes to brick and mortar. What the DNR is proposing is funded largely through other budgets. Since the gasoline tax has been maxed out and registration fees are low, maybe there needs to be an additional tax on transportation-related items that could include a tax on tires, parts for tires, and on transportation-related services, because we have to find the money somewhere.

Response: The cost to comply with the municipal performance standards includes retrofitting in existing development in addition to information and education and good housekeeping. DNR is able to offer some cost sharing for the activities but it will clearly not meet the need. The statutes are clear that the performance standards are to be met regardless of cost sharing for urban nonpoint sources. This comment will be passed on to the legislature.

B56 Comment: (individual) This measure provides a good way that urban people, farmers, and conservationists can go to the legislature and the people that reauthorize the Farm Bill and say, "fund these programs." Even though this is a bad time for dairy prices, one of the promising opportunities is more money for green payments. There's about 43,000 acres backlogged in the riparian corridor program in Wisconsin, according to NRCS, 8,000 acres backlogged in the wetland reserve program, 97,000 acres of contour strips backlogged — there's a lot of demand for farmers to be involved in these programs.
Response: We agree that conservation payments are important.

B57 Comment: (farmer) I would like to bring up the importance to the environment of the use-value assessment being discussed concerning the state's farmland. Once fragile land is gone, it's gone forever.
Response: These rules do not address use-value.

B58 Comment: (agricultural crop consultant) Federal farm programs for the last 60 years encourage maximum production. They try to tie environmental programs to the entitlement programs that really do not make a lot of sense in the farmer's mind. You really need to separate federal farm programs from environmental compliance. They should eliminate federal farm programs and pay farmers directly for environmental compliance.
Response: The department does not have authority to change federal programs.

B59 Comment: (farmer) If a person is required to install a rain gutter as a cost-share practice, if that happens to be torn off is that replaced? Is there funding to replace those again? What if it is damaged by a weather event?
Response: There is provision for cost-share funds to replace them.

B60 Comment: (farmer) New and existing operations with animal units under 1,000 head should be eligible for cost sharing under any and all conditions.

B61 Comment: (farmer) All farms regardless of whether they are new and existing operations or regardless of how many animal units they have, should be eligible for cost sharing

B62 Comment: (WI Agri-Service Assn., WI Pork Producers, WPVGA, WI State Cranberry Growers) The distinctions drawn between large and small farms must be eliminated, especially those that limit or eliminate cost sharing for large farms. These distinctions are inconsistent with the enabling statute and result in unequal protection of the laws among persons in the same class (all farmers).

Response: New or existing facilities and practices, including those with less than 1,000 animal units, are eligible for cost sharing, unless they are required to obtain a WPDES permit. However, for new facilities and practices, cost sharing is not required in order to enforce compliance with the performance standards and prohibitions. Operations required to obtain a WPDES permit are considered point sources and are not eligible for cost sharing under s. 281.65, Wis. Stats, for activities covered under the WPDES permit.

B63 Comment: (farmer) The requirement that new operations have to be constructed to meet performance standards immediately and without funding really defeats family farming and minimizes the number of young people who would enter into a new farming operation.

B64 Comment: (farmer) These proposed cost-sharing eligibility requirements eliminate financial support for new family farms, thus making it next to impossible for young farmers to get started because of the additional financial burden.

Response: It should be noted that a new farming operation is not defined by a simple change of ownership. It must be an operation where either no agriculture existed before or where there is a substantial change in the type of agriculture practices — for example changing from hogs to dairy. Even there, cropping practices would not be affected. A daughter or son that wishes to continue a farming operation practiced by a parent would not be considered a new operation and will continue to be eligible for cost-sharing. New operations, structures or practices are those that are installed or substantially altered after the date of rule promulgation and can be designed to meet the performance standards and prohibitions immediately upon construction without costly retrofitting. While cost-sharing is not required if enforcement action is needed to make a new operation, practice or structure meet a performance

standard or prohibition, it is still eligible for cost-sharing and may receive cost-sharing if deemed a high enough priority by the department and/or the county.

B65 Comment: (CWAC) We need to provide adequate dollars for these rules. The agricultural community is suffering, and farmers need help. We support the idea of means testing. Some large operations with absentee owners are quite wealthy. Taxpayers should not have to subsidize large operations. Most people would be happy to help small farmers that need more help. If that means most get 90% cost sharing, that is reasonable. Green Bay spent something like \$75 million to upgrade one sewage treatment plant. Our state can certainly muster \$75-\$80 million to help our farmers achieve water quality at their home sites.

Response: The amount of money available for cost-sharing BMPs will be determined by the legislature. With the current budget crises at the state level, it remains to be seen what resources will be allocated to this effort.

B66 Comment: (farmer) Everyone should get help. Small farmers might need more help than big farmers, not necessarily in money. Because small farms are not regulated, they're slightly out of touch.

Response: Small farms may be regulated under these performance standards and prohibitions because they apply to all sizes of operation. As a requirement of regulation however, these operators must be offered cost-sharing and will be offered technical assistance as well.

B67 Comment: (farmer) I'm very concerned on how you write exclusions to cost-share dollars. The way you have them now, you can exclude just about anybody.

Response: Cost-share eligibility is extensive under these rules.

B68 Comment: (farmer) We have only 2 kinds of farms in Wisconsin — permitted and not permitted. Some of us may expand, and some of us will stay the same. We don't need to go down the road of determining new or existing—how are you going to determine that? For about 90% of us, expansion comes because of a change in the family operation. The average age of Wisconsin farmers is 55-plus years — we don't want to be sending a negative signal to the younger generation. Let's be cautious when we look at these expanding operations because there are real reasons why we need to grow.

Response: Determinations of whether agricultural facilities and practices are new or existing will be made by DNR in accordance with the requirements of NR 151. The majority of new facilities and practices are eligible for cost sharing; however, cost sharing is not required for new facilities and practices in order to enforce compliance with the standards. Much of the requirement to provide cost sharing for existing facilities and practices is intended to offset the cost of retrofitting and is not designed to fund farm expansions. New facilities should be constructed to meet the performance standards and shouldn't require the retrofitting expenditures. Given limitations on funding, it would be impossible to cost share all new facilities and practices.

B69 Comment: (farmer) The rules are still confusing for those of us who are not eligible for cost sharing. When I read NR 151, it directed me over to NR 154.03, and I still could not find out exactly what you wanted me to do.

Response: NR 151 and NR 154 are only applicable for BMPs that DNR cost shares. ATCP 50, which specifies conservation practices to be used both with and without cost sharing, is the appropriate rule to refer to.

B70 Comment: (LCD) Regarding cost-sharing someone who failed to maintain a practice that we cost shared before, the language in the rules is unclear, and I hope you don't have to cost-share over and over.

Response: We do not have to cost share BMPs that are not maintained.

B71 Comment: (WAL) Funding for purchase of easements (and) buffer strips should be available to qualified non-profits as well as governments.

Response: Non-profits are authorized to hold title to easements, but only the local sponsor or governmental unit can receive a grant through the nonpoint program for the purchase of an easement.

The local sponsor can transfer ownership of the easement (assign) to the non-profit. Non-profits can apply for grants for the purchase of easements through the Stewardship Streambank Easement program.

B72 Comment: (LCD) The following is an example of the potential problems with the current proposal. An operator has 30 head of cattle located within 30 feet of the stream and is currently violating the manure management prohibitions. The rules say that we cannot force them to take action unless cost sharing is offered. What if the operator says that he/she wants to expand to 200 head? This would require a significant facility, of which we are required to provide 70% cost sharing. If we were given unlimited funds for cost sharing, then there is not problem, but if funding is limited like it has been in previous experience, we will be reluctant to offer cost sharing to this individual because it could deplete our funding for the year. As a result, the operator is not required to fix the problem due to lack of cost sharing, we have not improved the resources, and it makes us all look bad in the eyes of the public.

Response: While this issue may arise, it is unlikely. In this situation, the vast majority of costs will be borne by the operator (e.g., cattle, other housing structures, equipment, etc.). The costs to comply with the performance standards or prohibitions could be relatively small in comparison. The cases where cost sharable expenses are high will be very few and the benefits of allowing most small expansions to occur with cost sharing outweigh the risks.

B73 Comment: (LCD) The largest problem I have with the rule package as proposed is that nothing can be done unless cost sharing is made available. This is a great weakness in this set of rules.

Response: The cost-share requirement is in state law, and the rule must be consistent with the state law.

Environmental Assessment

B74 Comment: (turf co.) While Roger Bannerman (DNR) has conducted good work measuring contributions from streets and hard surfaces of phosphorus in urban runoff, we find the methodology he used to measure phosphorus runoff from lawns less than acceptable from an agronomic standpoint. The sampling devices employed in lawns were scientifically flawed and did not measure actual runoff from turf but simply gave mere indications of a natural phosphorus cycle that occurs within the turf environment. Any conclusions drawn from such techniques must be discounted and should not be used in the development of public environmental policy.

Response: The research conducted by Roger Bannerman was designed to measure runoff from real life situations. Residential lawns vary with homeowner effort. A number of lawns were sampled using widely accepted monitoring equipment and techniques. The testing provided information on the relative importance of lawns in contributing phosphorus to local water resources. While the runoff from these lawns may be low, the number of acres of pervious area can be half the total area in a watershed, so the pollutants from this source area can be the highest load for any given watershed. The research done at the university for agronomic purposes was conducted under ideal conditions, including a significant amount of topsoil under the sod. We do not dispute that the amount of runoff is lower on a per acre basis from pervious areas than from all other source areas. However, when conducting statewide or watershed wide planning efforts, this source is still significant and DNR's data is valid in this context.

B75 Comment: (city public works dept.) The code, especially the infiltration performance standard, encourages sprawl development. The impacts of sprawl on the transportation system should be acknowledged in the environmental assessment. These costs include the cost of improving additional roads from cities to the fringe developments and the incremental energy costs that can be expected to be incurred from increased trip generation from these developments to urban centers. Increased amounts of road surfaces in a contiguous development should be addressed in the environmental assessment (i.e., additional roadway per housing unit is encouraged by this code even in contiguous development).

Response: We disagree that the performance standards encourage sprawl. The infiltration standard was revised to reduce the amount of land needed. With creative planning, the BMPs may not require that any more land be set aside than municipalities already require for flood control. When municipalities required flood control to protect property, land was needed to meet this requirement. No one was pointing to that requirement as the cause of urban sprawl. Sprawl is a product of perceived economic advantage either to the landowner or the developer and occurs when development leapfrogs open space to locate beyond the

existing limits of a municipality. The rules do not encourage this kind of development. The impact to a municipality having to serve sprawl development, with adequate infrastructure, is significant and should be looked at more closely outside these rules. The impact of development, wherever it occurs, must be mitigated if the water resources are to be protected and that is the purpose of these rules.

B76 Comment: (LCD) While the EA states that performance standards are intended to be implemented by counties through local ordinances, very little is provided to recognize, much less encourage this.

Response: While the department encourages implementation through local ordinances, it does not have the authority to require them. We re-wrote the implementation section to simplify it, and we will further encourage local ordinances through the MOU process. We also developed the model ordinances in proposed NR 152 as a service to municipalities who wish to voluntarily adopt one or both of them.

B77 Comment: (WAL) Along with costs to individuals, the economic (recreational, tourism, health, aesthetic) benefits gained by having clean water in our communities should be mentioned.

Response: We have included these economic benefits in the EA.

B78 Comment: (WAL) Important issue: "Phosphorus is a particular problem in Wisconsin because 77 percent of the state's soils have tested high or excessively high in phosphorus concentrations."

Response: We agree that phosphorus is a problem.

C NR 120

C1 Comment: (LCD) Many landowners are unwilling to participate in state conservation programs because of the requirement to record the cost-share agreement on landowner deeds. One way to protect the state's investment on structural practices other than as a deed instrument would be to allow the county to pass an ordinance protecting all structural conservation practices. Landowners would be required to receive LCD approval before any structural conservation practice could be removed or altered. Federal conservation programs do not see a need for nor require deed instruments.

Response: The department believes that deed recording is needed for two purposes. It is an effective mechanism to notify one purchasing the property that an obligation has been created binding any owner of the land to comply with the cost-share agreement. The department routinely fields information requests from title searchers indicating that this is an effective notification tool. Second, recording is needed to legally link the cost-share agreement requirements to the land. The department does not believe that local ordinances will, in and of themselves, serve to effectively notify potential buyers of cost-share agreement requirements. The department also believes that deed recording is the most effective mechanism to assure that a link is created to protect the state's interest in the management practices, as local ordinances may be amended over time and local ability to staff ordinance implementation may vary.

C2 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.01(2). Note -- Clarify whether tribal units of government are to be considered as urban grantees.

Response: According to 2001 WI Act 16 (budget bill), the Oneida Tribe is considered a rural grantee, complete with ACRA's from the DNR and LAG funding from DATCP. For other tribal grantees, the distinction is moot for this chapter, since they would fit in under either NR 153 or 155 (NR 120 being only for existing Priority Watershed grantees).

C3 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.02(2). Modify "... Which is determined to be a cost-effective means..." as well as, "The practices, techniques or measures include such activities as land acquisitions..." This last modification is needed to avoid the interpretation that the BMPs only include the specific activities listed.

Response: This definition is verbatim from the statute, and cannot be modified by code.

C4 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.02(15). It is not clear how this differs from a "best management practice". If there is an implied time element for the landowner to fully implement the BMP, that should be clarified.

Response: We clarified the language on how these two definitions differ in the rule.

C5 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.02(18). Modify "...not funded through ss. 20.115(7)(c) and (qd), 20.370(6)(aa) and (aq) or 20.866(2)(te) and (we), or 92.14, Stats."

Response: We agree and changed the specific references to more generally reflect statutory language.

C6 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.08(1)(c)1f. Modify "A projected grant disbursement and project management schedule."

Response: This comment is a moot point since all priority watershed plans have been completed to meet this criteria.

C7 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.09(2). Modify "if the landowner has not ~~signed a cost share agreement~~ for agreed to implement the required best management practices...." Not all BMPs will require cost-sharing.

Response: This pertains to the verification process for critical sites and does not relate directly to whether cost-sharing has been offered or accepted. It is intended to be a screening mechanism. If a cost-share agreement has been signed then verification only has to be done on those parcels for which there is no agreement. The fact that there is no agreement doesn't mean that the ultimate solution will be a cost-shared practice.

C8 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.12(2)(d). Modify "Grantees located within the priority watershed project or priority lake area project shall perform inspections beyond the nonpoint source grant period and shall include this activity in the annual workload analysis submitted to DATCP work plan portion of the county land and water resource management plan to ensure that cost-share recipients are complying with the maintenance requirements described in s. NR 120.13."

Response: We have made the change that is stated in this comment.

C9 Comment: (WLWCA/WALCE, several counties) NR 120.12(2)(d). Delete this paragraph. We oppose having the rule "require" counties to perform inspections and annually report these activities to DATCP.

Response: This requirement has been in place since the inception of the Priority Watershed Grant program. DATCP is the authority on base funding allocations.

C10 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.12(4). Priority watershed grant periods should remain at 10 years and not extend to 12 years.

Response: The grant period extension merely codifies the *Financing Plan for Priority Watershed Projects* adopted by the Land and Water Conservation Board.

(**Comment cont'd.**) Phasing out this program as originally intended would allow more funds to be allocated sooner to other statewide projects and programs as prioritized through the county LWRM plans.

Response: The statutory language of the appropriation funding the nonpoint program includes both the existing priority watershed program and the targeted runoff management program: the funds are allocated jointly to these two, and **only** these two, programs. Therefore, money not allocated to the priority watershed program remains available for the TRM program. By statute, the TRM program is to be competitive, where grants are required to be allocated on the basis of a stipulated scoring system; and, they are neither based upon, nor statutorily intended to fund, county LWRM plans.

C11 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.12(5)(e). Modify "Repay the department the full amount of funds received if the grantee fails to fulfill any terms of the agreement, including failing to install, operate and properly maintain the practices included in the grant agreement, subject to paragraph (8) of this section."

C12 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.12(8). Add a new sentence to the end of the paragraph: "The grantee is correspondingly relieved of the duty imposed under paragraph (5)(e) of this section, to the extent cost-sharing funds are reduced by the department."

Response: C11 and C12 relate to provisions concerning county-installed projects/BMPs, where the county is both the grantee and the recipient/landowner. They do not receive reimbursement unless they

have installed the practice; therefore, if they failed to install it, there would be nothing to return. And, they would, like any other recipient/landowner, be required to fulfill the O&M requirements of the code.

C13 Comment: (WI Pork Producers) NR 120.12(8). "The department may unilaterally reduce the nonpoint source grant to the amount necessary to meet budgetary limitations." There is no other place in the rules where the DNR could make this unilateral decrease in funding. No similar options exist for producers to make unilateral decisions of this type.

Response: Nonpoint (priority watershed program and TRM) grants are only made to units of government, in this instance, counties -- not to individual landowners/operators. In addition, cost-sharing of at least 70% of eligible installation costs must first be offered to a producer before the standards could be enforced (per statute).

C14 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.13(3). The required parties to cost-share agreements with the DNR should be the same as those required for cost-share agreements with DATCP. At this time, DATCP requires that spouses be included as parties to the agreements, including amendments.

Response: We agree and made this change.

C15 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.13(4)(f) and (4)(k). These two paragraphs seem to say the same thing. Combine them into one paragraph that makes the repayment of funds contingent on a significant increase in on-going pollutant loadings. See the comments made on NR 153.22(3)(k).

Response: We made the change to correct this redundancy of information.

C16 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.13(4)(m). Modify "A requirement for annual progress in pollutant reduction may be imposed by the governmental unit on the landowner of a critical site, subject to availability of cost-sharing funds."

Response: The landlord must meet critical site requirements without cost sharing if he/she does not accept a cost-share offer.

C17 Comment: (WLWCA/WALCE, several counties) NR 120.13(4m) We do not support changing approval requirements from \$50,000 to \$35,000 per practice and from \$100,000 to \$50,000 per contract.

Response: To be consistent with ATCP 50, we require that that the department review any cost-share agreement having a total cost-share rate of \$50,000 or more.

C18 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.13(6)(c). Modify "...the operation and maintenance period for the component practice shall be the same as the operation and maintenance period for the practice for which it is required, consistent with cropping rotations and other management practices identified in the approved conservation plan for the operation."

Response: There is no need to add this statement. The operation and maintenance should already take into account the cropping rotations and other practices.

C19 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.13(7). Modify "...the full amount of cost-shared funds received by the cost-share recipient shall be repaid to the governmental unit who is the grantor of the agreement, with the exception of extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the cost-share recipient (e.g., drought, flood, death of operator, etc.). The extenuating circumstances would need to be of the degree that would result in dire financial or other hardship for the cost-share recipient or, in the case of death, result in dire financial or other hardship for the remaining spouse or otherwise leave minor children and other dependents without adequate means of financial support. In the event of such circumstances, the cost-share recipient may ask the granting agency to forward a request to amend the cost-share agreement to change the terms of repayment. The department shall determine whether or not to approve the request, and may consider alternatives which range from an extension of time to complete the best management practice to forgiveness of the obligation to pay back the cost-share agreement amounts."

Response: We agree there may be extenuating circumstances that occur, but in these special cases a variance under s. NR 120.29 might be applicable here.

C20 Comment: (WI Pork Producers) NR 120.13(11)(b). The use of the word "may" instead "shall" is confusing in "...a governmental unit may fully release a landowner's property from the obligations of the cost-share agreement..."

Response: Using the word "may" indicates that it is the governmental unit's discretion to release the owner from this obligation. It allows the agency to judge whether releasing the owner from this obligation will cause a negative environmental impact. To use the word "shall" requires release even in cases where such release would have a negative environmental impact and in cases of negligence or lack of a good faith effort.

C21 Comment: (DATCP, WLWCA/WALCE and several counties) NR 120.14. NR 120 should not list eligible BMPs; instead, it should cross-reference the list of practices in ATCP 50, as is done in NR 153. Also, the standards for each practice should not identify specific dates but should refer to the design standard that is current as of the date of final publication of the rule.

Response: There are 63 active priority watershed projects representing millions of dollars in existing cost-share agreements that are directly tied to the BMPs in NR 120. Although some modifications will be made to those standards it is not desirable to fundamentally change the list of BMPs as would occur if we referenced those in ATCP 50. State administrative procedures require DNR to include specific reference dates for each of the standards in the rule.

C22 Comment: (WI Pork Producers) NR 120.14(1)(b)1. This leaves open the question of how wildlife habitat should be replaced. Will a producer have to install a tangle of briars and brush elsewhere on his property if same has to be removed to install the BMP? (Also applies to NR 120.18(1)(f)1)

Response: The department has a responsibility to protect other natural resources such as wildlife habitat when providing cost sharing for nonpoint source pollution control. If the destruction of habitat is significant, mitigation will be required. As a note, this mitigation would be eligible for cost-sharing.

C23 Comment: (NRCS) NR 120.14(3)(b). Regarding cost sharing for the installation of subsurface drains in stripcropping systems, where would subsurface drains be needed in stripcropping systems?

Response: The subsurface drains language was removed. The flows that exist for a contour or field stripcropping situation should not result in a need for subsurface drains.

C24 Comment: (NRCS) NR 120.14(4)(c) Why would NRCS FOTG Standard 7. 606 – subsurface drains; September, 1989, be needed for field diversions?

Response: It could be used for sloped areas or to divert flows from an erosive gully to a more stable area.

C25 Comment: (NRCS) NR 120.14(4)(c) Why would NRCS FOTG Standard 8. 620 – underground outlet; June, 1993, be needed for field diversions?

Response: There may be special cases where this provision will be used to reroute flows on unstable soils.

C26 Comment: NRCS noted several corrections to technical standards citations and additions or corrections to various technical standard references.

Response: All corrections were made.

NR 120.14(4)(c): deleted the reference to 356—dikes (not applicable);

NR 120.14(6)(c): added to the list NRCS FOTG Standard 620 Underground Outlet; June, 1993.

NR 120.14(11)(c): added to the list NRCS FOTG Standard 516 Pipeline; May, 1987; NRCS FOTG Standard 574 Spring Development; May 1987; NRCS FOTG Standard 614 Trough or Tank; September 1989

NR 120.14(12)(c): corrected the citation to NRCS FOTG Standard 725 Sinkhole Treatment; March 2000

NR 120.14(13)(c): deleted the following because they are not applicable: 13. 356 – dike; DATE TO BE ADDED and 14. 404 – floodway; DATE TO BE ADDED

NR 120.14(18)(c): corrected to NRCS FOTG Standard 657 Wetland Restoration; September 2000.

NR 120.14(21)(c): changed 1. 393 filter strip; January 1984 to NRCS FOTG Standard 635 Wastewater Treatment Strip; DATE TO BE ADDED

NR 120.14(22)(c): corrected citation to NRCS FOTG Standard 351 Well Decommissioning; April 1999.
NR 120.14(23)(c): deleted Standard e., 359, waste treatment lagoon; DATE TO BE ADDED
NR 120.14(24)(c): deleted Standard 3., 359 – waste treatment lagoon; DATE TO BE ADDED
NR 120.14(25)(c): changed first standard listed to NRCS FOTG Standard 635 Wastewater Treatment Strip; DATE TO BE ADDED; changed Standard e. to NRCS FOTG Standard e. 313 – Waste Storage Facility; September 1998.
NR 120.18(1)(g): deleted the reference to the ACP program that no longer exists.

C27 Comment: (WLWCA/WALCE, several counties) NR 120.14(7) The eligible number of years for which cost sharing can be provided for practices such as high residue management and nutrient management is inconsistent between 120.14, 120.18 and 154.03.

Response: The inconsistencies in 120.14 and 120.18 have been removed. The time periods difference between 154.03 and 120.18 cannot be the same due to statutory limits.

C28 Comment: (WI Pork Producers) NR 120.14(7)(b)4. This discourages continuous no-till and does not appear to be wise in areas where no-till is critical for maintaining erosion control, especially wind erosion. If you have to incorporate manure, it defeats the purpose of no-till.

Response: The blanket prohibition of not allowing surface application of nutrients associated with no-till systems has been removed in cases where an operation demonstrates compliance with the performance standard for nutrient management contained in s. NR 151.07. The prohibition on surface application of nutrients and manure would continue for operations that do not comply with the performance standard for nutrient management. Complying with the performance standard for nutrient management helps to ensure that manure and commercial fertilizer are being land applied appropriately under no-till systems.

C29 Comment: (WI Pork Producers) NR 120.14(8)(c). The NRCS reference to nutrient management plans (590) falls under DATCP, not DNR. Does this reference to 590 move us closer to a phosphorus based standard? This should be clarified.

Response: We will leave the current 590 standard in ch. NR 120 which is nitrogen based.

C30 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.14(11)(b). Modify "This practice may also be eligible if an animal lot that adversely affects groundwater or surface water, provided the animal lot is ~~permanently abandoned~~, adequately addressed through the resulting reduction in animal manure and through use of any additional cost-effective best management practices (e.g., clean water diversions)." The current language creates disincentives for landowners to consider managed intensive grazing, since the animal lot at the barnyard would need to be permanently abandoned.

Response: Language was changed to reflect the above manure reduction and there are also provisions for erosion control through adequate sod or vegetative cover.

C31 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.14(11)(b)2d. Modify to add: "...and electrical connections and supply..." to end of second sentence.

Response: The language was changed to reflect the suggested addition of electrical connections and supply, but must be limited to the immediate area being protected and should not be a means for a farmer getting a free electrical system for the farm.

C32 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(15), SHORELINE AND STREAMBANK PROTECTION. The description should be modified as follows to be inclusive of a wide range of nonpoint pollution issues, not just livestock access: "Shoreline or streambank protection ~~stabilization~~ is the stabilization and protection of the banks of streams and lakes against erosion and the protection of fish and wildlife habitat and water quality from livestock access or other agricultural or non-agricultural activities."

Response: This description will stay as is, there is another practice that covers this.

C33 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(15). Tree planting should be eligible if approved by county conservation department staff we well. Strike out the following words: "if approved by department fish manager."

Response: We agree in part--instead of deleting the clause, we have inserted "if approved by the LCD in consultation with the department fish manager."

C34 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(16), RIPARIAN BUFFERS. Modify the description to include maintenance (protection) of riparian buffers as part of this BMP as follows: "Riparian buffers are areas in which vegetation is maintained, enhanced or established to reduce...."

Response: The descriptions of the practices in NR 120 detail the installation of such practices. While maintenance is intrinsically tied to the success of a practice, maintenance requirements are covered under NR 120.13. As a point of clarification, it is not clear if this comment is intended to include maintenance in the practice description in order to require that cost-sharing is required for maintenance activities. Cost-sharing is only provided for the installation, not maintenance, of practices.

C35 Comment (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(16) Conditions should also include providing cost sharing consistent with other plans including the "County Land and Water Resource Management Plans and DNR Basin Plans."

C36 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(16), NR 120.14(18) and NR 120.14(19). Other eligible practices need to be included in the cost-sharing list including the following: (16)d., (18)5. and (19)4. Conservation easements or land acquisition. (16)e., (18)6. and (19)5. Other practices or programs approved in County Land and Water Resource Management Plans."

Response: (16)d., (18)5. and (19)4.: s. 120.18 and 120.186 already provide for the acquisition (purchase & easement) of property for purposes of the chapter. (16)e., (18)6. and (19)5.: ch. 120 only applies to the priority watershed program, not to general county land management issues; and, it encompasses other activities than those contained in the LWRM plans.

C37 Comment: (WAL) NR 120.14(17). We are glad to see BMPs include inland lake sediment remediation, except dredging. Degraded lakes will not improve without attention to the accumulated nutrients being recycled within the system.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

C38 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(18), WETLAND PROTECTION AND RESTORATION. Add the words "Protection and" to the title of the BMP, and change the wording of the description to include wetland protection and restoration, so the standard goes beyond just berm, tile and ditch work.

Response: If a wetland needs protection from a nonpoint pollution source, this can be accomplished by using other BMPs listed in this section.

C39 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(19). SHORELINE HABITAT PROTECTION AND RESTORATION FOR DEVELOPED AREAS. Change the title to reflect a need to include protection-based strategies as well as restoration and remove the emphasis on "for developed areas."

Response: This is specifically directed toward areas that have the capability of improvement. In the less developed areas where a vegetative protection of water resources is needed, the practices that should be used are described in NR 120.14(16) Riparian Buffers or (15) Shoreline and Streambank Protection.

C40 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(19). Modify the description as follows to include prevention/protection strategies that are important for many of the northern lake counties: "Shoreline habitat protection and restoration is the maintenance or establishment ~~in developed areas~~ of a shoreline buffer zone of diverse native vegetation that extends inland and waterward from the ordinary high water mark. The shoreline habitat design practice seeks to maintain and restore the functions provided by the original, natural vegetation...."

Response: This change is not needed. Protection is included under Riparian Buffer.

C41 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(19). Add the following statement to include protection strategies for existing shoreline habitats: "3. Protection. Where natural shoreline habitat continues to exist, these habitats need long term protection to prevent nonpoint source pollution from occurring. This practice may be implemented using such practices as cost sharing of permanent conservation easements,

land acquisition or other incentives or programs as defined in County Land and Water Resource Management Plans." Note: A good example of other types of practices that should be eligible for funding under this standard is the new, innovative Burnett County shoreline buffer incentives program.

Response: We disagree. We cover this under 120.186(1)(c).

C42 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(19). Regarding accelerated recovery, add the following wording to address other impacted shoreline areas beyond those that are completely converted to mowed lawn: "...where grasses have been maintained for several years, or where one or more layers of natural vegetative cover have been removed."

Response: We made this change.

C43 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(19). Practice design should not be listed as an ineligible cost. The cost of developing shoreline restoration plans should be a cost-shared practice. This will encourage more landscaping firms to become educated and promote shoreline restoration efforts overall.

Response: We agree and have deleted practice design from ineligible costs in this section.

C44 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.14(19). Biologs should not be listed as an ineligible cost, although riprap should be ineligible. The rationale for biologs is that these help to establish natural vegetation at the water's edge that will help to protect shoreline slopes from being eroded by wave action and, therefore, creating areas that will also be less subject to erosion from runoff.

Response: Language was added that will include biologs for situations where the waterbody fetch and expected boat wave action does not exceed the limitations of biologs.

C45 Comment: (WAL) NR 120.14(8)(b)(1). Soil testing must also include residual phosphorus.

Response: No change. We feel that this is already covered under this subdivision.

C46 Comment: (WAL) Regarding shoreland habitat restoration for developed areas, we like the criteria for 3 layers of structure — ground, shrub and tree and the reference to fish and wildlife habitat.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

C47 Comment: (WAL). NR 120.14(19)(b)6.b. We like the language protecting in-lake shoreline habitat.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

C48 Comment: (WAL) NR 120.14(19)(b)7(c). The limitations on use of phosphorus fertilizer are very important and provide equity between the rural and urban parts of these rules.

Response: We agree.

C49 Comment: (NRCS) NR 120.14(20)(c) -- Barnyard Runoff Management, Standards. These standards should be added: NRCS FOTG Standard 313 Waste Storage Facility; September 1998, and NRCS FOTG Standard 635 Wastewater Treatment Strip; DATE TO BE ADDED.

Response: These are not applicable to barnyards. The standards suggested are addressed in NR 120(23) Manure Storage Facilities, and (26) Roofs for Barnyard Runoff Management and Manure Storage Facilities. The Wastewater Treatment Strip cannot be added without a date.

C50 Comment: (WI Pork Producers) NR 120.14(23)(b)7. This defeats the purpose of no-till and does not allow for situations where you may need to spread. Unless the situation is ideal, unless the structure is running over, this may not be very workable.

Response: The requirement that all manure contained in a manure storage facility be incorporated within 3 days after application has been removed. To insure that manure (and commercial fertilizer) is applied appropriately, NR 120.14(23)(b)1 was modified to state that a facility must also demonstrate compliance with the nutrient management performance standard contained in s. NR 151.07. The prohibition on applying manure on frozen or saturated ground has been retained for storage facilities designed to be emptied annually or semi-annually. Operations will need to ensure that manure is emptied annually or semi-annually to ensure that the storage facility does not overflow.

C51 Comment: (individual) NR 120.17(2). Make eligible design work that is completed prior to initiation of a construction grant.

Response: DNR cannot cover design work under this program. Design work is paid for under ATCP 50.

C52 Comment: (WI Pork Producers) NR 120.17(2)(q)1. The phrase, "...the department may consider..." sounds as if the DNR staff is making those decisions. But the rules provide no ideas of what DNR staff would consider significant, arbitrary, and undefined.

Response: DNR in cooperation with DATCP and county LCDs will be making these decisions. Because the situations are so varied, many of the decisions will be on a best professional judgment basis.

C53 Comment: (WI Pork Producers) NR 120.17(2)(q)2.a. If 299 animal units is available for cost sharing, 301 is not, and that seems like a political decision rather than a pollution reduction issue. I'm very concerned that the rule is missing a lot of livestock in the state (300-1,000 animal units). I'm also concerned that this is an unfunded mandate.

Response: Except for situations involving critical sites, NR 120 continues to be a voluntary program. As long as an operation is not required to apply for a WPDES permit, all existing facilities (e.g., manure storage facility) or practices at animal feeding operations are eligible for cost-sharing at their current size. Only portions of an expansion of an existing facility or practice become ineligible for cost-sharing when it is expanded beyond a certain size to accommodate an increase in animal units. DNR wanted to recognize that in many instances, operations are likely to need to expand in order to install new facilities or practices and remain economically viable. However, DNR does not want to fund expansion for the sake of expansion. Determining the size of expansion that would be considered to be beyond what was necessary to remain economically viable and thus should not be eligible for cost-sharing was based partly on current U.S. EPA federal regulatory thresholds for animal feeding operations (1,000 animal units or more, 300 to 999 animal units, and 299 animal units or less) and partly on a general recognition of economies of scale for larger operations versus smaller operations. Under federal regulations, operations with 300 to 999 animal units are more easily designated as a point source and required to obtain a WPDES permit than operations with 299 or less animal units. Expansions of existing facilities or practices at animal feeding operations with more than 250 animal units are still eligible for cost-sharing in order to accommodate up to 20% increase in animal units.

C54 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.18. The maximum cost share rate for riparian buffers should not be \$100 per acre. We have plenty of experience with shoreline restoration projects where the cost per acre is significantly higher, especially where all three layers of native vegetation need to be restored. This practice, as well as the shoreline habitat practice, should remain funded at the 70% cost-share rate. It should be up to the LCD to determine reasonable costs for these areas with the diversity of habitats across the state. Eliminate Lines 1-4 and Line 29 altogether.

Response: We revised the cost-share package for riparian buffers. In addition to cost sharing the installation of the buffer, we may also provide compensation for lost crop production at a rate of 70% of the present value of the county rental rate for a period. Alternatively, an easement could be purchased.

C55 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.18. Costs for appraisals for conservation easements should be eligible for up to 100% cost share. This could be an important incentive for interested landowners to voluntarily donate conservation easements and the permanent protection would be well worth funding in full.

C56 Comment: (individual) Easements should be eligible for the 70% cost-share rate and appraisals for easements be eligible for 100% cost sharing "(5) Allowable cost sharing rate is 70 percent for easements and up to 100 percent of easement appraisal costs."

Response: Easements for urban practices will be cost-shared at 50% and those for rural practices will be cost-share at 70%. The rural rate is capped by statute. The urban rate is capped to be consistent with cost-share policies under NR 153 and NR 155. The cost-share rate for appraisals is capped by statute (ss. 281.65 and 281.66) at 70%, except for work done under TRM grants signed prior to July 1, 1998. The 100% rate for old TRM grants is being maintained. The 100% rate for grants under NR 155 was

mistakenly included in the public hearing draft and should not have been as it is contrary to statute. Therefore, it will be removed in the final version of the rule.

C57 Comment: (Co. Ext., LCD) I applaud the department for recognizing the value of conservation easement donations and believe this should be extended to include easements in other standards.

Response: It already applies as a general condition anywhere an easement is granted.

C58 Comment: (individual) NR 120.18(4). The criteria for determining economic hardship need to incorporate the concepts of cash-flow, not just debt-to-asset ration.

Response: We have substituted amended hardship language that includes cash-flow criteria.

C59 Comment: (co. Ext., LCD) NR 120.185, Easements -- This standard needs to be expanded to include eligibility for conservation easements for other practices.

Response: NR 120.185(1)(d) allows for other BMPs as specified in the priority watershed plan. If the plan does not include the requested BMP, the plan can be amended.

(Comment cont'd.) Riparian buffer -- Leave out the minimum dimensional standard, as it is poorly defined and does not reflect any other buffer distances in the code. The county LCD should determine the dimensional standards to be applied for the diverse habitat types around the state.

Response: We removed this dimensional requirement except for cases when the buffer is purchased directly by DNR.

C60 Comment: (individual) NR 120.185(1). Add structural urban BMPs to the list of practices eligible for easements.

Response: The addition has been made.

C61 Comment: (individual) NR 120.185(4). Add cost-share rate for easements.

Response: We agree. The cost-share rate for urban practice easements will be 50% and for rural practice easements will be 70%.

C62 Comment: (individual) Wetland Protection and Restoration -- This is a great example of an easement eligible practice that should include protecting existing natural wetlands.

Response: There are other grants offered through the department that fund projects for protection. Examples are River Protection grants and Lake Protection grants.

C63 Comment: (individual) Add "(d) Shoreline Habitat Protection and Restoration" as an eligible practice for conservation easements. This would be highly beneficial for long-term nonpoint source pollution prevention. Modify the existing language in this section as follows: "Any other best management practice specified as eligible for easement support in an approved priority watershed plan, County Land and Water Resource Management Plan, DNR Basin Plan, or other approved plan."

Response: We disagree: NR 120 is limited to the priority watershed program and only deals with activities proposed in watershed plans.

C64 Comment: (individual) There is a lack of clarity regarding cost sharing amounts for the purchase of land and easements. It is not clear if there are different cost-share amounts available for land acquisition versus the purchase of an easement or for easements used to support rural practices, as opposed to urban practices. These points need to be clarified.

Response: We have modified the rule language so that the rates for rural easements (70%), urban easements (50%) and all property acquisitions (50%) are clearly stated.

C65 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.19. Would it be possible to define this only under NR 153.23 and cross-reference here? Otherwise, the procedures should be the same in both places.

Response: We agree. The procedures are now the same.

C66 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.25. See comments made for NR 153.29 re single audits.

C67 Comment: (DATCP) NR 120.26. See comments made for NR 153.29 re open records requirements.

Response: (a) regarding single audit - DNR no longer uses the single audit, but instead contracts with outside, independent auditors to review grantee records. (b) regarding open records - we included these two provisions, relating to applicability of the state's open records law to grantee paperwork and sequestering personal information about individuals from this open records requirement. (c) regarding continued tracking requirement by grantee - we included this suggested language, which would bolster our commitment to obtaining information re the effectiveness of the pollution abatement measures installed under grants.

C68 Comment: (WAL) Several key practices, including nutrient management, pesticide management, low-till and cover crops are only required to be maintained during the years cost sharing is received, and cost sharing is limited to 3-4 years (P. 6-7 NR 154). Nutrient management is key to program success. This is very short-term thinking for a long-term problem.

Response: The reference to the maintenance period only refers to the agreement period for cost-sharing (4 years). Compliance with performance standards and prohibitions must be maintained in perpetuity.

C69 Comment: (WAL) We support the flexibility offered by the provision for alternative design criteria.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

D General NR 151 Comments

D1 Comment: (Milw. Co.) The effectiveness of the implementation of NR 151 will be severely handicapped by the lack of consensus among the parties involved. An illustration of this is how the pollutant removal benefits of standards (BMPs) are determined. This seems to be left entirely up to DNR with little local input. It also appears the LCCs have no role in this effort at all.

Response: LCCs through their land conservation departments have been determining pollutant loads in priority watershed projects for over 20 years. DNR in conjunction with other state agencies, LCDs, and interest groups have been developing BMPs and technical standards that may be used to reduce the impacts of nonpoint source pollution for several years. The technical standards development process through the Standard Oversight Committee (SOC), consists of identifying a nonpoint pollution abatement need and forming a group of technical experts to devise a standard to address the problem. The final rules were developed through a consensus process involving many agencies and interests.

D2 Comment: (individual) This is just another situation where the DNR is generalizing all runoff and fertilizer problems into one category. Fertilizing a lawn in northern Wisconsin (sandy soil) is not the same as spreading manure on clay topsoil sloped toward a river in southern Wisconsin. Every situation is somewhat different and must be looked at separately.

Response: The rules cover a number of nonpoint pollution sources both in the agricultural and non-agricultural land uses. The rule for fertilizer use on lawns is different than the one for manure spreading. The rules recognize the need for specific standards to address particular sources. They are, however, applied statewide. If a specific watershed needs something different, then a targeted performance standard can be promulgated.

D3 Comment: (LCD) Some of the standards in the rules are too prescriptive. They go from a description of what needs to be done to enforcement. (LCD) There's no reason to specify BMPs for clean water diversions. The only reason you need BMPs is when you're going to cost-share them. The same applies to buffer areas along streams. We submitted language on minimum soil cover to reduce sediment. There's no reason to prescribe tillage practices. Farmers are flexible.

Response: The rules were modified and removed references to standards except in cases where it is necessary; this is particularly true in reference to tillage practices. If your statement is meant to imply that BMPs should be cited in the rules only when cost sharing is available, the point is taken. If you mean BMPs are only needed when cost sharing is available, we take issue with this position. It is our position that it is the responsibility of DNR, DATCP, LCDs, municipal governments, as well as other state and federal agencies to develop BMPs and guidance for their use in order to reduce nonpoint source

pollution. In addition, landowners should have assistance in informing them of these BMPs and their proper implementation whether cost sharing is available or not.

D4 Comment: (individual) Concerning enforcement by the DNR, we have had some wonderful results. The DNR tries very hard to enforce regulations, but we need more wardens and enforcement people. That would increase compliance and revenues.

Response: We agree.

D5 Comment: (UW Hort. Dept.) The goal of the proposed rule is a worthy one, but the means to achieve it must be based on scientific data. Because some of the rules may be costly to implement and because much of the proposed rules are not based on scientific data, monitoring should be included in the rules to determine if the rules are having a positive effect. This will involve collecting baseline pollutant data before the rules are established and monitoring at several periods after the rules are established. The monitoring should be conducted by trained scientists using validated scientific methods and procedures.

Response: DNR currently has a monitoring program and completes evaluations of water resources statewide on a schedule dictated by staff and funding resources. The 305(b) report to Congress, which reports the findings of this monitoring program, identifies the streams and lakes that are impacted by non-point source pollution. The monitoring effort, conducted by trained biologists and other scientists employed by DNR, will continue. It is not reflected in the rules because it an ongoing department function with multiple purposes. There will not be a separate monitoring effort specific to these rules. The rules are based on research conducted in the state and in other states. Wisconsin is not the first to propose such rules. Some states have even higher expectations than Wisconsin, based on national and local research on sources of storm water pollution.

D6 Comment: (nursery) We strongly oppose NR 151. It does not have the sufficient scientific data that is needed and should not even be considered without it.

Response: We believe we do have sufficient scientific data to make the decisions that have gone into the development of the performance standards, one of which is that nutrients should not be applied in excess of crop needs. The technical standard, which will be developed with the help of the turf scientists, will direct how to meet the performance standard.

D7 Comment: (LCD) The DNR needs to develop consistency between NR 115 and NR 151. If this cannot be accomplished through the rule-making process, we would support legislation that resolves the conflict between ch. 281 and ch. 30, Stats. Currently, there is no mechanism for producers with livestock facilities within the setbacks identified in NR 115 and ch. 30 to comply with the performance standards and prohibition in NR 151.

Response: The rules address different problems, and because of that reason the farm facilities should abide by both regulations.

D8 Comment: (farmer) I estimate I will have 447 acres (53.8% of my land) in proposed WQMA (195 acres from streams, 252 acres from intermittent streams). That equals 432.7 football fields. This will have a significant impact on my farm. All my cattle lots are located in proposed WQMA where I can have no unconfined manure piles and manure cannot be hauled and spread on snow-covered or frozen land with more than 9% slope. Most of my farm has slopes of greater than 9%. FSA maps show I have less than 15 acres out of 283 hay acres suitable for spreading during the winter. How do I economically control rain and snow melt to avoid direct discharge to waters of the state?

Response: Given your description, it would appear that manure storage may be a viable solution to the problem on your farm (there may be others, but being unfamiliar with your farm we are not in a position to suggest other solutions). Cost sharing will be available to construct manure storage for your farm at 70% or up as much as 90% for cases of economic hardship.

D9 Comment: (farmer) The proposed water quality management areas that are susceptible to groundwater contamination are an unknown for me at this time.

Response: Areas that have a high probability of being susceptible to groundwater contamination can be identified from the soil survey information that is available at the county LCD, FSA, and NRCS staff.

D10 Comment: (farmer) I do not understand the definition of a water quality management area as it pertains to the high water mark. That needs to be changed to the water's edge for a clear understanding of a starting point.

Response: The statutes define WQMA's in terms of ordinary high water mark.

NR 151, Subchapter I

NR 151.001 Purpose

D11 Comment: (WLWCA/WALCE, several counties) The purpose statement should reference the other rules or portions of rules that establish the implementation strategy rather than just the runoff pollution performance standards.

Response: A note was added referencing other applicable codes. In addition, a guidance document, separate from the administrative code, will be created that describes the overall implementation strategy.

NR 151.002 Definitions

D12 Comment: (MEG) It is extremely confusing to have some definitions in the general provisions of NR 151.002 and other definitions scattered throughout the other subchapters. This material is difficult enough without having to check multiple sections to see if a term is defined.

Response: The definitions in Subch. I are for terms used primarily in Subchs. III and IV. In only a few cases are there definitions that are used in Subchs. II, III and IV. Subch. II has its own set of definitions because it is the only subchapter that addresses agricultural performance standards. The definitions were separated to address a Legislative Clearinghouse comment.

D13 Comment: (LCC) Even though s. 30.10, Wis. Stats., defines navigability, there are many inferences to navigability as it relates to the performance standards for concentrated flow channels, water quality corridors, clean water diversions and manure management prohibitions. The meaning needs to be very clear and understandable to those involved in implementation of the standards. It must be pointed out that a finding of non-navigability made earlier does not preclude the department of finding navigability at a later date. Navigable waters should be mapped and maintained for the benefit of those sites that will, or will not, be affected by these rules.

Response: DNR would like the definition of "navigable waters" to be as clear and easy to implement as possible. Navigability of larger, continuous creeks, streams or rivers will usually be easy to determine. However, without further statutory clarification, there will be many instances where navigability will need to be a case-by-case determination based on the codes regarding navigability. The concept of navigable waters in relation to the concentrated flow channel performance standard should no longer be a concern as this performance standard has been removed. It is our intent that any navigability determinations will be mapped and maintained for future reference.

D14 Comment: (farmer) Measuring from the high water mark on the existing stream bank need to be better defined. Where is a high water mark?

Response: The concept of navigable waters in relation to the concentrated flow channel or the water quality corridor performance standard should no longer be a concern as these performance standards have been removed.

D15 Comment: (Dept. of Commerce) NR 151.002(3). The definition for "connected imperviousness" seems so broad that it would include a pipe; is that what is intended? The definition refers to an impervious surface. In the workgroup discussions, connected imperviousness is a condition, not a surface. We suggest "connected imperviousness" means a condition where an impervious flow path exists between an area where precipitation occurs and a separate storm sewer or water of the state.

Response: We modified the definition which we hope will improve understanding by the reader.