

Appendix A. Bayfield County LWRMP Citizens Survey Results

Surveys sent via USPS: 357

Received: 95 (via USPS)

Received: 22 (via electronic)

RTN/NFS: 4

Approximate return rate: 33%

1) WHICH STAKEHOLDER GROUP(S) DO YOU MOST CLOSELY ALIGN YOURSELF WITH? (CHOOSE UP TO THREE)

DAIRY PRODUCER:	8	7	1																	
BEEF PRODUCER:	8	8	0																	
ROW CROP PRODUCER:	4	2	2																	
HOBBY FARMER:	11	10	1																	
FRUIT GROWER:	1	0	1																	
ORGANIC GROWER:	4	3	1																	
LAKE PROPERTY OWNER:	37	4	33																	
RIVER PROPERTY OWNER:	9	4	5																	
RECREATIONAL LANDOWNER:	11	2	9																	
TIMBER INDUSTRY:	10	8	2																	
HUNTING/FISHING ASSOC.:	8	3	5																	
ELECTED OFFICIAL:	23	4	19																	
RESOURCE AGENCY STAFF:	6	2	4																	
REAL ESTATE/DEVELOPER:	0	0	0																	
LAKE SUPERIOR PROPERTY OWNER:	4	0	4																	
TOURISM INDUSTRY:	3	0	3																	
OUTDOORS RECREATIONIST:	24	2	22																	
INTERESTED CITIZEN:	25	3	22																	
ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP EDUCATOR:	5	0	5																	
OTHER:	11	1	10																	

Blue = Total Rcvd

Green = Agriculture

Red - Lake Assoc./Other

- 1) Retired Dairy farmer
- 2) Extension educator
- 3) Town board (Washburn)
- 4) Lake Assoc. leader
- 5) Citizen/Countywide conservation organization 2
- 6) Very poor survey
- 7) Hay, small grains
- 8) Property owner association
- 9) Rural landowner
- 10) Commercial fisherman

2 - I AM FILLING OUT THIS SURVEY AS:

INDIVIDUAL / FAMILY:	72	19	53											
REPRESENTATIVE OF GROUP/ASSOC:	12	2	10											
MEMBERS:														

Blue = Total Rcvd

Green = Agriculture

Red - Lake Assoc./Other

3 - MY RESIDENCY STATUS IN BAYFIELD COUNTY IS CURRENTLY:

FULL TIME:	65	20	45											
PART TIME (4-6 MONTHS):	6	1	5											
SEASONAL (1-3 MONTHS):	6	0	6											
NON-RESIDENT:	7	0	7											

4 - IN BAYFIELD COUNTY I CURRENTLY RESIDE:

CITY OR VILLAGE:	3	0	3											
RURAL TOWNSHIP:	31	12	19											
ON A FARM:	14	9	5											
LAKE, RIVER OR STREAM:	36	3	33											
DON'T LIVE IN BAYFIELD COUNTY:	7	1	6											

5 - I CURRENTLY OWN PROPERTY IN BAYFIELD COUNTY WHICH INCLUDES APPROXIMATELY: (FILL ALL THAT APPLY)

FARMLAND / PASTURE:	29	18	11											
WOODLAND / WETLAND:	34	12	22											
LAKE, RIVER, STREAM:	43	5	38											
TOWN LOTS:	3	0	3											
DON'T LIVE IN BAYFIELD COUNTY:	6	0	6											

6) WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE 5 MOST IMPORTANT CONSERVATION OR NATURAL RESOURCES ISSUES FACING BAYFIELD COUNTY IN THE NEXT TEN YEARS THAT COULD BE EFFECTIVELY ADDRESSED BY THE LWCD?

AGRICULTURAL LAND PRESERVATION:	19	12	7																	
AIR QUALITY:	7	1	6																	
ANIMAL WASTE MGMT.:	4	4	0																	
FLOODING:	4	2	2																	
FOREST MGMT. ISSUES:	28	10	18																	
LARGE FARMING OPERATIONS:	4	4	0																	
INVASIVE SPECIES:	55	8	47																	
WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT:	36	4	32																	
RURAL DEVELOPMENT:	23	7	16																	
INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION:	3	2	1																	
GROUNDWATER QUANTITY:	12	2	10																	
GROUNDWATER QUALITY:	25	4	21																	
MINING AND GRAVEL PITS:	3	1	2																	
NUTRIENT MGMT.:	14	1	13																	
LAND USE ISSUES:	43	9	34																	
IMPACT FROM RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES:	32	5	27																	
SHORELINE EROSION:	18	1	17																	
WETLAND LOSS / DEGRADATION:	15	2	13																	
THREATENED / ENDANGERED SPECIES:	3	1	2																	
WILDLIFE HABITAT LOSS:	24	7	17																	
URBAN LAND USE:	1	0	1																	
CONSTRUCTION SITE EROSION:	3	1	2																	
STORM WATER MGMT.:	9	3	6																	
SOIL EROSION:	4	1	3																	
SOIL HEALTH:	2	0	2																	
OTHER:	13	6	7																	

Blue = Total Rcvd

Green = Agriculture

Red - Lake Assoc./Other

- 1) Stream protection 1
- 2) Surface water quality 0 2
- 3) Wolves & other big game 2 2
- 4) Road crossings 1 1
- 5) Too many requirements 1 1
- 6) Land owner rights 1 1
- 7) Wildlife damage to crops 1
- 8) Income off MFC 1

8) RANK THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS CONDUCTED UNDER EACH GENERAL PROGRAM CATEGORY

AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES

FARMLAND PRESERVATION:	1	39	12	27															
	2	30	5	25															
	3	16	2	14															
590 NUTRIENT MGMT.:	1	41	8	33															
	2	35	8	27															
	3	8	2	6															
NR 151 - AG STANDARDS & PROHIBITIONS IMPLEMENTATION:	1	49	13	36															
	2	27	6	21															
	3	9	2	7															
CREP:	1	52	10	42															
	2	25	7	18															
	3	8	4	4															

Blue = Total Rcvd
 Green = Agriculture
 Red = Lake Assoc./Other

WATER ACTIVITIES: SURFACE WATERS, WETLANDS, GROUNDWATER

SHORELINE RESTORATION PLANS:	1	55	10	45															
	2	28	7	21															
	3	6	4	2															
SHORELINE & STORM WATER MITIGATION PLANS:	1	37	6	31															
	2	28	10	18															
	3	10	5	5															
RIP RAP DESIGNS:	1	28	4	24															
	2	38	11	27															
	3	18	6	12															

HABITAT RESTORATION:	1	52	11	41															
	2	24	7	17															
	3	7	3	4															
WETLAND PROGRAM:	1	51	10	41															
	2	24	9	15															
	3	8	2	6															
STREAM CROSSINGS & ACCESS ROADS:	1	54	13	41															
	2	22	7	15															
	3	5	1	4															
CULVERT DESIGN ASSISTANCE:	1	44	8	36															
	2	32	10	22															
	3	6	1	5															
FISCAL AGENT:	1	26	7	19															
	2	44	7	37															
	3	12	5	7															
CULVERT ASSESSMENT:	1	36	10	26															
	2	35	8	27															
	3	12	3	9															
URBAN RUN-OFF:	1	32	9	23															
	2	41	8	33															
	3	12	4	8															
Groundwater Initiative:	1	51	8	43															
	2	26	10	16															
	3	7	2	5															

8) RANK THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS CONDUCTED UNDER EACH GENERAL PROGRAM CATEGORY

INVASIVE SPECIES ACTIVITIES										
AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES:	1	61	10	51						
	2	14	5	9						
	3	7	5	2						
FISCAL AGENT:	1	39	7	32						
	2	27	7	20						
	3	16	7	9						
TERRESTRIAL INVASIVE SPECIES:	1	21	5	16						
	2	39	7	32						
	3	19	8	11						
LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES										
LANDOWNER ASSISTANCE:	1	54	14	40						
	2	24	5	19						
	3	4	2	2						
REVIEW MINE RECLAMATION PLANS:	1	12	3	9						
	2	39	8	31						
	3	31	10	21						
SUPPORT CONSERVANCY ACQUISITIONS:	1	31	4	27						
	2	36	10	26						
	3	16	7	9						
PROVIDE BASIC INFO. RE: MFL AND OTHER FORESTRY PRACTICES AND PROGRAMS:	1	35	6	29						
	2	35	12	23						
	3	10	3	7						
PROVIDE GENERAL STEWARDSHIP ASSISTANCE TO WOODLAND OWNERS	1	30	5	25						
	2	42	13	29						
	3	10	3	7						
PROVIDE GENERAL TREE PLANTING ASSISTANCE	1	31	8	23						
	2	34	10	24						
	3	17	3	14						

8) RANK THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS CONDUCTED UNDER EACH GENERAL PROGRAM CATEGORY

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION										
NEWS RELEASES & ARTICLES	1	49	7	42						
	2	27	10	17						
	3	9	4	5						
CONSERVATION YOUTH CAMP	1	29	5	24						
	2	37	11	26						
	3	17	5	12						
ENVIRONMENTAL PRESENTATIONS:	1	49	9	40						
	2	24	7	17						
	3	11	4	7						
CONSERVATION SPEAKING AND POSTER CONTEST	1	11	1	10						
	2	47	12	35						
	3	27	8	19						
NEWSLETTER	1	25	4	21						
	2	39	11	28						
	3	21	6	15						
WEB SITE	1	37	2	35						
	2	31	10	21						
	3	16	9	7						
WORKSHOPS	1	28	3	25						
	2	35	8	27						
	3	20	9	11						
CONSERVATION FIELD DAYS / TOURS	1	24	4	20						
	2	38	11	27						
	3	20	6	14						
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL DISPLAYS	1	30	3	27						
	2	33	10	23						
	3	20	8	12						
AWARD PROGRAM	1	21	4	17						
	2	40	8	32						
	3	22	9	13						
SHORELAND STEWARDSHIP INCENTIVE	1	38	5	33						
	2	27	7	20						
	3	19	9	10						

8) RANK THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS CONDUCTED UNDER EACH GENERAL PROGRAM CATEGORY

URBAN RUN-OFF												
RAIN GARDEN DEMONSTRATION SITE	1	26	6	20								
	2	35	5	30								
	3	20	8	12								
RAIN GARDEN INFILTRATION PROJECTS	1	32	8	24								
	2	36	7	29								
	3	13	4	9								
RAIN BARREL / RAIN GARDEN PLANT SALE	1	30	5	25								
	2	26	4	22								
	3	25	10	15								
HABITAT PROGRAM												
STREAM RESTORATION	1	60	12	48								
	2	17	4	13								
	3	7	4	3								
WETLAND WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT	1	45	6	39								
	2	28	9	19								
	3	10	5	5								
WILDLIFE TREE AND SHRUB SALE	1	47	10	37								
	2	22	4	18								
	3	14	6	8								

Comments, Concerns, Insights

1	Fearful that so many rules & regulations will be made & already are, that landowners will be in violation of something. I don't want to lose my freedoms.
2	Public education/envolvement by news release/programs has been increasing and continued efforts are needed.
3	Have everyone in Bayfield County install holding tanks for their solid waste. We have to keep our water clean.
4	Lots of land in Barksdale are and have been converted to duck swamps on a field on top of a hill. No water in them - no ducks! No farm field anymore either. Poor plan. Just because new landowners wants duck pond doesn't mean they get it.
5	Thanks for your interest in nature.
6	Update LWRMP.
7	Quit giving preference to certain "pet projects" and ramroding them through no matter what and treat all the people equally! The whole zoning department needs to regain credibility, honesty, fairness and common sense!
8	Funding for fish passage projects would be my 1st priority for LWCD along with technical assistance. 2nd priority would be disconnecting swales in Day County from streams where fields are no longer used for Ag.
9	County shouldn't be involved financially w/Nature Conservancy. Their strategies, in my opinion are questionable at best, in their attempts to claim ownership to properties. Other than paying for 5 1/2 staff & office, \$400,000 won't cover much with these grand ideas. How much overlap w DNR? Reinvent wheel? Unless I missed it, why isn't there any reference to DNR & their resources?
10	Increase awareness to the public of the activities & programs offered by LWCD. Continue to provide technical assistance to County Zoning - especially for shoreland restoration and mitigation plans.
11	Maximize programs/project coordinator with zoning, forestry, tribal agencies, DNR, etc.
12	More shoreland owners need to be convinced that they must restore & add buffers if we hope to preserve water quality.
13	Propse greater restrictions on shoreline & land development. Support elimination of billboards along roads/highways Support Bayfield County land conservation efforts to acquire land of wildlife & aesthetic value in order to protect from development.
14	Educate shoreland owners regarding buffers and shoreland restoration.
15	The more land we have in public ownership, the better we can protect lakes, streams, wetlands and other important wild areas. I support the purchase of more publicly owned lands even if it puts greater tax burden on local landowners.
16	Expanding conservation efforts through a news letter and providing tax incentives to restore shoreline vegetation should be given higher priority. Most lake property owners do not revieve the newspaper so a news letter, site visits to proper lake conservation projects would all be effective. Many do attend county fair so that represents a great teaching opportunity for invasive species, shoreland enhancement and habitat management activities for hunting property owners.
17	We are not landowners in Bayfield County, but we owner property on Lower Eau Claire Lake (Douglas County) and are members of the Eau Claire Lakes Property Owners Association. So we are impacted to some degree by what is done by surrounding counties and municipalities. We love the Eau Claire Lakes area and we try to minimize our impact when we stay at our cabin. Our long term goal is to retire to the area and become involved in local associations. Out main concern is about the development of lakefront property and how that increase development will affect lakes in the future. I am surprised that many offenders of no wakes zones are people that live on the lake and not people vacationing. One problem I see on out lakes is the problem of beach erosion and people violating no wake zones. I think the conservation groups are doing an outstanding job of education on invasive species and making the public more aware of the conseceques of allowing invasive species to become part of the lake environment.
18	I believe in public education and in assisting people to help themselves. I fear that some grants and subsidy programs are just targets for people looking for a handout and good at grant writing.
19	Weekly column in County Journal addressing all or most of the above topics (#8).
20	I would like to see more mandatory restoration of lake/rivier frontage. Let's stop beating around the bush, begging for compliance. It's time to put some teeth in the plan.
21	I think Bayfield county should limit their involvement in policing construction run off projects. The DNR spends enough time in that area.
22	Where will you get the funds to perform all of these important projects? We're already taxed too much, so your efforts should be to motivate individual landowners and recreationists to work together to achieve these ends at lower costs.
23	Everything listed here seems important. I tried to think of what is not important for LWCD (from BRW's perspective). Hard to cut things out - also helpful to focus.

Appendix B. Bayfield County Soil Erosion Control Waiver

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

State of Wisconsin

DATE: January 16, 1998

TO: Land and Water Conservation Board Members and Advisors

FROM: *Keith Foye (for)*
Dave Jelinski, DATCP
Bureau of Land and Water Resources

SUBJECT: Agenda Item #14: Waiver of Soil Erosion Control Plans for Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron Counties

Recommended Action: The department proposes to grant a waiver to Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, and Iron Counties, releasing those counties from the obligation to develop a soil erosion control plan. This waiver would not release these counties from the obligation to identify other sources of nonpoint pollution in the county, or to develop county activities related to nonpoint pollution. The department asks the LWCB to endorse the department's proposed waiver. A copy of the proposed waiver is attached.

Summary: Under s. 92.10, Stats., and s. ATCP 50.12(1), Wis. Adm. Code, every county must submit a county soil erosion control plan to the department for approval by January 1, 1999. A county must comply with this requirement in order to continue receiving soil and water resource management grants from the department. The LWCB is required to review the soil erosion control plans, and make recommendations to the department.

Under s. ATCP 50.12 (1)(b), Wis. Adm. Code, a county is not required to file a soil erosion control plan if:

“the department, after consulting with the LWCB, grants a written waiver to the county based on a finding that cropland soil erosion is not a high priority problem in that county. The department finding under this subsection shall be based on a county finding that cropland soil erosion is not a high priority problem in the county, and other relevant information.”

Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron counties have applied to the department for waivers under s. ATCP 50.12(1)(b). Certain other northern counties may apply for waivers in the future. The department is inclined to grant the waivers requested by Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron counties, based on a finding that cropland soil erosion is not a high priority problem in those counties.

Under s. 92.10, Stats., the department must identify priority soil erosion control counties by considering the following factors:

Soil Erosion Control Plan Waiver

January 16, 1998

Page 2

- The amount of cropland in the county.
- The magnitude and extent of cropland erosion in the county.
- The availability of soil survey information in the county.

Based on these factors, the department does not consider Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas or Iron Counties to be priority counties. No soil survey has yet been completed for these counties. However, the *Northern Wisconsin Cropland Study*, February 1995, surveyed acres of cropland in Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, and Iron Counties and found no acreage exceeding the tolerable soil loss level.

In fall 1997, the county boards in Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron Counties approved resolutions asking the department to grant them waivers. The resolutions found that cropland soil erosion was not a high priority problem in those counties. The department proposes to grant waivers based on these county board resolutions, and based on the fact that these counties are not priority soil erosion counties.

The waivers would release the counties from the obligation to prepare cropland soil erosion control plans, but would not release them from other (recently expanded) obligations under s. 92.10, Stats. Until recently, counties were only required to prepare soil erosion control plans containing the items listed under s. 92.10(6)(a), Stats. However, 1997 Wis. Act 27 added items related to nonpoint source pollution, and converted the "soil erosion control plans" to "land and water resource management plans." Under s. 92.10(6)(a), as amended by Act 27, these plans must:

1. Specify maximum acceptable rates of soil erosion (predates Act 27).
2. Identify the parcels and locations of the parcels where soil erosion standards are not being met (predates Act 27).
3. Identify land use changes or management practices which would bring each area of land into compliance with standards adopted by the land conservation committee (predates Act 27).
4. Specify procedures to be used to assist landowners and land users in controlling soil erosion (predates Act 27).
5. Establish priorities for controlling soil erosion (predates Act 27).
6. **Identify causes, other than soil erosion, of nonpoint source water pollution (new in Act 27).**
7. **Describe all proposed county activities related to nonpoint source water pollution (new in Act 27).**

The waivers proposed by the department will release the counties from the obligation of developing the soil erosion component of their future land and water resource management plans. However, the waivers will not release them from the obligation to identify other sources of nonpoint pollution in the county, or to describe county activities related to nonpoint pollution.

Soil Erosion Control Plan Waiver
January 16, 1998
Page 3

Nor will the waivers release the counties from any additional plan obligations which the legislature may impose in the future.

Materials Provided:

Proposed waiver, including findings, conclusions and order
Resolution number R09-1997-499, Ashland County
Resolution number 97-052, Bayfield County
Resolution number 106-97, Douglas County
Resolution number 97-2273, Iron County

Presenter: Sue Porter, DATCP
Land and Water Resources Bureau

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION
2811 Agriculture Drive, P.O. Box 8911
Madison, WI 53708-8911

IN THE MATTER OF COUNTY SOIL EROSION CONTROL PLANS FOR ASHLAND, BAYFIELD, DOUGLAS AND IRON COUNTIES)))))	DOCKET NO. _____ WAIVER
--	-----------------------	--------------------------------

The State of Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection ("department"), having consulted the State of Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Board ("LWCB"), makes the following findings and conclusions and enters the following order under s. ATCP 50.12(2)(b), Wis. Adm. Code:

FINDINGS

(1) Under s. 92.10, Stats., and s. ATCP 50.12(1), Wis. Adm. Code, counties are required to prepare county soil erosion control plans for department approval by January 1, 1999. A county must comply with this requirement in order to continue receiving soil and water resource management grants from the department. The department must review and approve county plans in consultation with the LWCB.

(2) Under s. ATCP 50.12(1)(b), Wis. Adm. Code, the department may waive the filing of a county soil erosion plan if the department, after consulting the LWCB, finds that cropland soil erosion is not a high priority problem in that county. The department's finding may be based on a county board finding that cropland soil erosion is not a high priority problem, or on other information which the department considers relevant.

(3) The county boards of Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron Counties have adopted resolutions finding that cropland soil erosion is not a high priority problem in those counties

(see resolutions attached).

(4) The Northern Wisconsin Cropland Survey, dated February 1995, surveyed cropland in Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron Counties, and found no acreage exceeding the tolerable soil loss level.

(5) Based on findings (3) and (4), it does not appear that cropland soil erosion is a high priority problem in Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas or Iron Counties. Those counties are not priority soil erosion control counties under s. 92.10(3), Stats.

(6) There is no compelling need for Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas or Iron County to prepare a soil erosion control plan under s. 92.10(6)(a)1. to 5., Stats., or s. ATCP 50.12, Wis. Adm. Code. However, those counties should comply with ss. 92.10(6)6. and 7., which are newly created by 1997 Wis. Act 27.

(7) The LWCB reviewed this matter at its meeting on January 27, 1998, and endorsed the department's proposed findings, conclusions and order as contained in this document.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) Under s. ATCP 50.12(1)(b), the department may waive the filing of county soil erosion control plans by Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron Counties.

(2) Based on the findings above, the department should issue a waiver that exempts Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron Counties from filing cropland soil erosion control plans under s. 92.10(6)(a)1. to 5., Stats., and s. ATCP 50.12, but does not exempt them from their other responsibilities under s. 92.10(6), Stats.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to s. ATCP 50.10(1)(b), Wis.

Adm. Code, that:

(1) The department waives the filing of cropland soil erosion control plans under s. 92.10(6)(a)1. to 5., Stats., and s. ATCP 50.12, Wis. Adm. Code, by Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas and Iron Counties.

(2) The waiver under sub. (1) does not exempt the counties from the requirements under s. 92.10(6)(a)6. or 7. Nor does it exempt them from any other requirements which have been imposed or may be imposed under ch. 92, Stats., or ch. ATCP 50, Wis. Adm. Code.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 19____.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

By _____
Ben Brancel, Secretary

Appendix C. Conservation/Best Management Practices

Use with Cost Share Applications			
Tech Guide Practice Code	Practice	ATCP 50 #	Unit of Measurement
560	Access Road or Cattle Crossing	50.65	FT
575	Animal Trails and Walkways	50.66	FT
350	Barnyard Runoff Control System	50.64	#
360	Closure of Waste Impoundment		#
332	Contour Buffer Strips		Acres
330	Contour Farming	50.67	Acres
340	Cover Crop/Green Manure	50.68	Acres
342	Critical Area Planting		Acres
362	Diversion	50.70	FT
382	Fencing/Exclusion	50.75	FT
386	Field Border		Acres
393	Filter Strips	50.72	Acres
395	Fish Stream Improvement		#
490	Forest Site Prep		Acres
410	Grade Stabilization Structure	50.73	#
412	Grassed Waterways	50.96	Acres
561	Heavy Use Area Protection	50.74	Acres
422	Hedgerow Planting		Acres
468	Lined Waterway or Outlet		Acres
360	Manure Storage Abandonment-Closure of Waste Impoundments	50.63	#
313	Manure Storage Facilities	50.62	#
635	Milk House Waste Control-Waste Treatment Strip	50.77	#
484	Mulching		Acres
590	Nutrient Management	50.78	Acres
500	Obstruction Removal		#
595	Pest Management-Field Crops	50.79	Acres
595	Pest Management-Specialty Crops		Acres
516	Pipeline		FT
528A	Prescribed Grazing-Cropland	50.80	Acres
528A	Prescribed Grazing-Pasture		Acres
329B	Residue Management Mulch-Till	50.82	Acres
329A	Residue Management No-Till & Strip-Till		Acres
393	Riparian Filter Strips (non-CREP)	50.83	Acres
558	Roof Runoff Management -Gutter	50.85	#
350	Sediment Basin-Barnyard		#
350	Sediment Basin (Non-Barnyard)		#
725	Sinkhole Treatment	50.87	#
574	Spring Development		#
313	Stacking Pad		#
580	Streambank Stabilization & Shoreline Protection	50.88	FT
585	Stripcropping	50.89	Acres
606	Subsurface Drain	50.90	#
600	Terraces	50.91	FT
612	Tree/Shrub Establishment	50.71	Acres
620	Underground Outlet	50.92	#
472	Use Exclusion		Acres
634	Waste Transfer system	50.93	#
635	Waste Water Treatment Strip	50.94	FT
638	Water and Sediment Control Structures	50.86	#
638	Water/Sediment Control Basin	50.95	#
614	Watering Facility Trough/Tank	50.76	#
642	Well Abandonment	50.97	#
657	Wetland Restoration	50.98	Acres
380	Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment		Acres

Appendix D. Glossary of Terms

ANIMAL WASTE MANAGEMENT

Practices designed to minimize the impacts of animal manure on surface and groundwater resources. These practices include barnyard runoff management, nutrient management, and manure storage facilities

AQUIFER

A water-bearing stratum of permeable rock, sand, or gravel.

AREAWIDE WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN (208 PLAN)

A plan to document water quality conditions in a drainage basin and make recommendations to protect and improve basin water quality. Each basin in Wisconsin must have a plan prepared for it, according to section 208 of the Clean Water Act.

BASIN PLAN

See "Areawide Water Quality Management Plan."

BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs)

The most effective, practical measures to control nonpoint sources of pollutants that run off from land surfaces.

BUFFER STRIPS

Strips of grass, shrubs, trees, and other vegetation between disturbed areas and a stream, lake, or wetland.

CONSERVATION DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

Grouping homes on part of a property to maintain a large amount of open space on the remaining land.

CONSERVATION EASEMENT

A legal document that limits the use of land for purposes such as farming, open space, or wildlife habitat. A landowner may sell or donate an easement to a government agency or a private land trust.

COST-EFFECTIVE

A level of treatment or management with the greatest incremental benefit for the money spent.

ECOSYSTEM

A biological community interacting with its nonliving surroundings.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (USEPA)

The federal agency responsible for enforcing federal environmental regulations. The Environmental Protection Agency delegates some of its responsibilities for water, air, and solid waste pollution control to state agencies.

EROSION

Wearing away of the land surface by wind or water.

EUTROPHIC

Refers to a nutrient-rich lake. Large amounts of algae and weeds characterize a eutrophic lake (see also "Oligotrophic" and "Mesotrophic").

EUTROPHICATION

The process of nutrient enrichment of a lake leading to increased overall production of aquatic organisms. Eutrophication can be accelerated by human activity such as agriculture and improper waste disposal.

FECAL COLIFORM

A group of bacteria used to indicate the presence of other bacteria that cause disease. The number of coliform is particularly important when water is used for drinking and swimming.

FISHABLE AND SWIMMABLE

Refers to the water quality goal set for the nation's surface waters by Congress in the Clean Water Act. All waters were to meet this goal by 1984.

GROUNDWATER

Water that fills internal passageways of underground, porous geologic formations (aquifers) and flows in response to gravity and pressure. Often used as the source of water for communities and industries.

HABITAT

The place or type of site where a plant or animal naturally lives and grows.

HERBICIDE

A type of pesticide that is specifically designed to kill plants and can also be toxic to other organisms.

MACROPHYTE

A rooted aquatic plant.

MESOTROPHIC

Refers to a moderately fertile nutrient level of a lake between the oligotrophic and eutrophic levels. (See also "Eutrophic" and "Oligotrophic".)

MILLIGRAMS PER LITER (mg/l)

A measure of the concentration of a substance in water. For most pollution measurements this is the equivalent of "parts per million."

MITIGATION

The effort to lessen the damages from a particular project through modifying a project, providing alternatives, compensating for losses, or replacing lost values.

NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION (NSP)

Pollution whose sources cannot be traced to a single point such as a municipal or industrial wastewater treatment plant discharge pipe. Nonpoint sources include eroding farmland and construction sites, urban streets, and barnyards. Pollutants from these sources reach water bodies in runoff, which can best be controlled by proper land management.

NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

A guidance document that provides fertilizer and manure spreading recommendations for crop fields based upon soil test results and crop needs. Plans are sometimes referred to as NRCS 590 plans for the Natural Resources Conservation Service Standard that guides their preparation.

OLIGOTROPHIC

Refers to an unproductive and nutrient-poor lake. Such lakes typically have very clear water. (See also "Eutrophic" and "Mesotrophic.")

ORDINARY HIGH WATER MARK

The point on the bank or shore up to which the water leaves a distinct mark on the shore or bank from its presence, wave action, or flow. The mark may be indicated by erosion, destruction of or change in vegetation, or another easily recognizable characteristic.

PESTICIDE

Any chemical agent used to control specific organisms. Pesticides include insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, etc.

PHOSPHORUS

A nutrient that, when reaching lakes in excess amounts, can lead to overfertilized conditions and algae blooms.

POINT SOURCES

Sources of pollution that have discrete discharges, usually from a pipe or outfall.

POLLUTION

The presence of materials or energy whose nature, location, or quantity produces undesired environmental effects.

PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND

Farmland that has gentle slopes and well-drained soils and requires a minimum of conservation practices. It is the easiest land to farm. Class I and II soils, as defined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service are considered prime agricultural soils.

PRIORITY WATERSHED

A drainage area selected to receive state money to help pay the cost of controlling nonpoint source pollution.

PRIVATELY OWNED WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS (POWTS)

means a sewage treatment and disposal system serving a single structure with a septic tank and soil absorption field located on the same parcel as the structure. This term also means an alternative sewage system approved by the department including a substitute for the septic tank or soil absorption field, a holding tank, a system serving more than one structure or a system located on a different parcel than the structure. A private sewage system may be owned by the property owner or by a special purpose district.

PRODUCTIVITY

A measure of the amount of living matter supported by an environment over a specific period of time. Often described in terms of algae production for a lake.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The active involvement of interested and affected citizens in governmental decision-making.

PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

The voluntary sale of the rights to develop a piece of property. The sale price is determined by an appraisal. The land may be restricted to farming or open space.

REDUCED TILLAGE

Planting row crops while only slightly disturbing the soil. With reduced tillage, a protective layer of plant residue stays on the surface and erosion rates decrease.

RIPARIAN

Belonging or relating to the bank of a lake, river, or stream.

RIPRAP

Broken rock, cobbles, or boulders placed on the bank of a stream to protect it against erosion.

RUNOFF

Water from rain, snowmelt, or irrigation that flows over the ground surface and returns to streams and lakes. Runoff can collect pollutants from air or land and carry them to receiving waters.

SEDIMENT

Soil particles suspended in and carried by water as a result of erosion.

SEPTIC SYSTEM

Sewage treatment and disposal for homes not connected to sewer lines. Usually the system includes a tank and drain field. Solids settle to the bottom of the tank. Liquid percolates through the drain field. A type of privately owned wastewater treatment system (POWTS).

SHORELAND

The area within 1000 feet of a lake and 300 feet of a stream.

SLOW THE FLOW PRACTICES

Best management practices designed to reduce the quality and velocity of runoff. These practices are commonly applied to areas of heavy clay soils where infiltration rates are low.

STORM SEWERS

A system of sewers that collect and transport rain and snow runoff. In areas that have separated sewers, such stormwater is not mixed with sanitary sewage.

SUSPENDED SOLIDS (SS)

Small particles of solid pollutants suspended in water.

TOLERABLE SOIL LOSS

The tolerable soil loss rate, commonly referred to as "T," is the maximum average annual rate of soil erosion for each soil type that will permit a high level of crop productivity to be sustained economically and indefinitely (ATCP 50.01(16)).

TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS

The maximum amount of a pollutant that can be discharged into a stream without causing a violation of water quality standards.

TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

Property rights that may not be used on the land from which they come. TDRs may be sold to be used on a designated site in a receiving (growth) area. When TDRs are sold, the land they came from is then restricted to farming.

TROPHIC STATUS

The level of growth or productivity of a lake as measured by phosphorus content, algae abundance, and depth of light penetration.

TURBIDITY

Lack of water clarity. Turbidity is usually closely related to the amount of suspended solids in water.

UNIFORM DWELLING CODE

A statewide building code enforced in municipalities with more than 2500 residents specifying requirements for electrical, heating, ventilation, fire, structural, plumbing, construction site erosion, and other construction related practices.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION (UWEX):

A special outreach and education branch of the state university system.

VARIANCE

Government permission for a delay or exception in the application of a given law, ordinance, or regulation. Also, see water quality standard variance.

WASTE

Unwanted materials left over from manufacturing processes; refuse from places of human or animal habitation.

WATER QUALITY CRITERIA

A measure of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of a water body necessary to protect and maintain different water uses (fish and aquatic life, swimming, etc.).

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

The legal basis and determination of the use of a water body and the water quality criteria; physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of a water body that must be met to make it suitable for the specified use.

WATER QUALITY STANDARD VARIANCE

When natural conditions of a water body preclude meeting all conditions necessary to maintain full fish and aquatic life and swimming, a variance may be granted.

WATERSHED:

The land area that drains into a lake or stream.

WETLANDS:

Areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support a variety of vegetative or aquatic life. Wetland vegetation requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.

WISCONSIN ADMINISTRATIVE CODE:

The set of rules written and used by state agencies to implement state statutes. Administrative codes are subject to public hearing and have the force of law.

WISCONSIN NONPOINT SOURCE WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT GRANT PROGRAM:

A state cost-share program established by the state legislature in 1978 to help pay the costs of controlling nonpoint source pollution. Also known as the nonpoint source element of the Wisconsin Fund or the Priority Watershed Program.

Appendix E. References

Bayfield County Forest Comprehensive Land Use Plan 2010.

Douglas County Land and Water Conservation Department and Harmony Environmental. *Land and Water Resource Management for Douglas County*. December 2009.

Kotar, J., Kovach, J.A., Burger T.L. *A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Northern Wisconsin (Second Edition)*. Department of Forest Ecology and Management. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Madison, Wisconsin. 2002.

Northwest Regional Planning Commission and Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. *Northwest Sands Landscape Level Management Plan*. December 2000. 52 Pages plus appendices.

Northwest Regional Planning Commission. *Bayfield County Land Use Plan*. March 2003.

Short, Elliot, and Hendrickson, Inc. *Bayfield County Comprehensive Plan*. December 2009.

Stable Solutions. *Bayfield County Land and Water Resource Management Plan. 2005 – 2008*. March 2005.

U. S. Census Bureau. *Bayfield County, Wisconsin Quick Facts*.
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/>

Wisconsin Blue Book. 2007-2008.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. *Groundwater Retrieval Network. October 2007*. From wi.water.usgs.gov/gwcomp.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. *Self-Help Citizen Lake Monitoring*. December 2009. <http://www.dnr.state.wi.us.org/water/fhp/lakes/selfhelp>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. *The Lake Superior Water Quality Management Plan*. March 1999

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. *The St. Croix River Water Quality Management Plan*. PUBL-WR-270-94-REV. February 1994.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. *The State of the St. Croix Basin*. March 2002. 136 Pages.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. *Wisconsin's Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality Field Manual*. Publication #FR093. 1995.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. *Wisconsin Wellhead Protection Program* Summary. October 2007.

Additional web references are listed throughout text.